



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2009

No. 155

## Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, October 26, 2009, at 2 p.m.

## House of Representatives

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2009

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

### PRAYER

Dr. Barry C. Black, Chaplain of the United States Senate, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, by whose providence our forebears brought forth a Nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to equal justice for all, give the Members of this body that same spirit as they seek to make a better world. May this quest for justice motivate them to eliminate those things that obstruct the coming of Your kingdom.

Each day, may they give primacy to prayer, seeking Your guidance as they strive to make decisions that honor You. Guide them by Your higher wisdom so that they will not give in to disappointment, doubt, or despair.

We pray in Your great name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

### CONCERNS REGARDING FUNDING FOR HOME HEALTH CARE AGENCIES

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

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address concerns I have with the cuts in home health care agencies in the reform package. I applaud the hard work that has gone into crafting this legislation; however, I want to make sure that home health care services for our seniors are not interrupted in our efforts to target waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare system.

Home health care agencies, for example, are one of the most cost-effective ways to provide health care, especially in rural areas. In Maine, 86 percent of the home health care agencies will be operating in the red if we pass the cuts in the bill.

It is crucial that we address these cuts in a way that promotes efficient, high quality care, but does not put the access to health care in rural areas at risk. I am hopeful that we will be able to make this legislation better and pro-

vide quality, affordable health care to all Americans, so that Maine's seniors and home health care agencies in Maine will not be faced with an 86 percent cut in Medicare reimbursements that will force them to operate in the red.

### SOUNDS LIKE SOMEBODY'S GETTING A TAX HIKE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the new reformed, revised, special edition version of the Senate health care bill written in the dark, secret caverns of the Capitol is a whopping 1,500 pages long. Americans for Tax Reform did a word search on the bill and they found some interesting words.

Right here on this chart, the word "tax" is used 124 times. You know, that is the government's favorite word. "Taxes," 16 times; "excise tax," 12 times; "taxpayers," 79 times. Here is a bad one, "taxable," 158 times. That is a whole lot of taxes in this bill.

Of course, the words "tax exempt" are found only 15 times in the bill. There are some more bad words like "penalty" and "require" and "must." And here is a bad one, "shall," 2,585 times in this tax bill—I mean health care bill.

Mr. Speaker, these are some bad words, totaling 3,196 words about taking money from the American taxpayer.

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.

H111715

Sounds like somebody is getting a tax hike. No wonder the bill was written in the secret caverns out of public view in this Capitol.

And that's just the way it is.

#### POSITIVE UPDATE ON RECOVERY PACKAGE

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

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give a positive update on the progress of the recovery package.

When the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act came before Congress earlier this year, I had to make a tough decision on how I would vote. I am happy that I voted for the recovery.

We have had recovery funds go towards improving infrastructure, funding our medical research, and improving our schools for our children. Just last week, my district received over \$20 million in stimulus funds to improve water quality and almost \$2 million in medical research funding.

The positive impacts of this legislation are being seen across the State of Ohio and the country. A report recently shows that the Recovery Act has saved or created about 1 million jobs. In fact, in the last month, unemployment has dropped in each of the 12 counties that I represent in Ohio.

With almost three-fourths of the stimulus funds still set to be released, I expect to see additional jobs saved and created across the country and in my district. I am excited to see the progress that we are making and will continue to make.

#### SUCCESS IN AFGHANISTAN IS VITAL TO PROTECTING AMERICAN FAMILIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Obama was correct when he stated as a candidate for President last year, "Our troops and our NATO allies are performing heroically in Afghanistan, but I have argued for years that we lack the resources to finish the job . . . And that is why, as President, I will make the fight against al Qaeda the top priority that it should be. This is a war we have to win."

Our President has chosen CENTCOM Commander David Petraeus and General Stanley McChrystal to implement a strategy in Afghanistan that would train Afghani security forces, destroy terrorist elements, prevent the Taliban from providing safe haven to terrorists, and promote political and civil development in Afghanistan.

Moving forward, we must provide the reinforcements that General McChrystal has requested. Indecision will only endanger our soldiers and empower our enemies.

I agree with Vice President Dick Cheney: The President is dithering. Democrats and Republicans should join, as President Obama said in his Democratic acceptance speech, to finish the fight against the terrorists.

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

#### PROVIDING TRANSPARENCY IN HEALTH CARE PRICING

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

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, isn't it time we had transparency in all health care pricing? Wouldn't you like to know the price of a pill before you buy it? Wouldn't you like to know the price of the greatest discount a hospital offered at your location? Wouldn't you like to know the lowest price an insurance company accepted for payment in full for their health insurance policy?

This is a picture of several pills you can buy at a grocery store, and the price is always openly disclosed. Isn't it time that Congress passed legislation to guarantee that, at all times, any business entity that offers medical products and services for sale to the public openly disclose all of their prices and then accept the lowest price from everybody that they have accepted from anybody else? Isn't it time we had transparency in health care pricing?

#### THE FORGOTTEN U.S. TAXPAYER

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the forgotten U.S. taxpayer. On Wednesday, Neil Barofsky, the special inspector general overseeing TARP, said that recouping the billions of dollars given to the insurer AIG and automakers GM and Chrysler "is far from certain." He also noted that \$50 billion set aside to help struggling homeowners lower their mortgage payments will yield "no direct return."

Also on Wednesday, the former chief of the Obama administration's task force on the auto industry, Steven Rattner, commented on the \$20 billion previously lent to GM, "I don't think we are going to see it again," meaning that all the money is gone.

What is wrong with this picture? \$50 billion here, \$20 billion there. What am I missing? How can we spend, spend, spend without any accountability?

I am concerned as I travel across Kansas, my great State, that I hear countless Kansans express doubts that Congress and bureaucrats would make wise decisions with their tax dollars. They were right. With some of these unwise investment decisions that I mentioned today, I think a dose of Kansas commonsense is desperately needed in Washington, DC.

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, many victims of domestic violence are afraid to tell their story. They are afraid to get help or don't know how. These men, women, and children need someone to stand up for them, to know where to turn. That is what Domestic Violence Awareness Month is all about. In fact, this October is the 20th anniversary of legislation to establish this event.

Domestic violence is shockingly common. One in four American women and almost 10 percent of men will be sexually or physically assaulted by a spouse, intimate partner, or acquaintance at some point in their life.

I strongly support full funding of domestic violence programs for fiscal year 2010. This money is sorely needed. According to a recent study, last year, on one day alone, 10,000 people were turned away from local domestic violence programs due to a lack of resources.

I pledge to work on behalf of domestic violence victims here in Congress. I want survivors to know how much I respect and commend them for their bravery, and I want them to know there are services and support groups that can help.

#### CONGRATULATING FORT BEND, TEXAS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my home county of Fort Bend, Texas, for having the third highest increase in jobs during the first quarter of last year among the Nation's largest 334 counties. It is impressive, given that of those 334 counties, only eight saw any job increase at all.

We already know what a special place Fort Bend is to live and raise a family. For more than 15 years, Fort Bend has been in the top 20 counties in the United States for economic excellence and population growth. Excellent schools, affordable housing, and extensive recreational facilities have attracted families with impressive demographic profiles. And this creates a local employment base that provides relocating companies with a diverse mix of professional, technical, skilled, and unskilled labor with the highest educational attainment levels in the region.

I am very proud of Fort Bend County for this economic accomplishment, and my family and I feel very fortunate to call it home.

SENATE EXERCISING PETTY PARTISANSHIP ON UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, exactly one month ago today the House cast aside partisanship to work together and overwhelmingly pass legislation to extend unemployment benefits, which are running out for an average of 7,000 Americans every day.

While my Republican colleagues in the House recognize that unemployment is an American issue that transcends politics, Senate Republicans are oblivious to the urgent need to pass legislation because people are hanging on by their fingernails. Instead, the Senate Republicans have a choke hold on legislation to extend unemployment insurance benefits, and Americans who need the help the House passed a month ago aren't going to get helped until Senate Republicans stop playing partisan games.

There are positive signs the economy has turned the corner, but the Senate Republicans know what everyone else knows, that unemployment always takes longer to recover. But they still have a choke hold on the bill, which is a choke hold on nurturing the economic recovery.

A caller to my office this morning put it best: There is one reason you may not be able to buy food for your family next week, and it is called the Senate Republicans. Maybe they are the ones who ought to be out of work.

Maybe then the Republicans in the Senate would understand what it means to look to Washington for leadership but see petty partisanship instead.

Release the choke hold and pass the bill to extend unemployment benefits. Thousands of Americans can wait no longer.

□ 0915

EXPRESSING CONCERN REGARDING THE EFFECT OF PROPOSED HEALTH CARE REFORM ON SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the majority party's proposed government takeover of health care and its devastating consequences for small businesses across the Nation. Despite continued calls from me and my Republican colleagues for a bipartisan approach that expands access to affordable health care to all Americans, the majority party insists on engaging in closed door meetings that ignore the input of a significant proportion of Congress and the millions of constituents they represent.

Among the most damaging elements of their proposal is a punitive new tax on small businesses that cannot afford to provide the coverage the Federal Government decides is acceptable. My Republican colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee offered numerous amendments to protect the small businesses that drive our economy from these and other burdensome mandates that threaten their viability, but our attempts were rejected.

Madam Speaker, it is time to push the reset button on this flawed proposal. Members of all political persuasions need to start fresh and work in good faith to bring meaningful health care reform to our constituents and keep our small businesses thriving.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHU). Pursuant to House Resolution 853 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3619.

□ 0915

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3619) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes, with Mr. PASTOR of Arizona (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, October 22, 2009, amendment No. 6 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 111-311.

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk designated No. 7.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

Page 182, after line 14, insert the following:

(g) PROHIBITION ON EARMARKS.—None of the funds appropriated for the Fishing Safety Training Grants Program pursuant to section 4502(i) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by this section, may be used for a Congressional earmark as defined in clause 9(d) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 853, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. This amendment is straightforward and, I believe, non-

controversial. It should be familiar to those of us here. The underlying bill establishes a new competitive grant program called the Fishing Safety Training Grants program. This amendment would simply prevent the new grant program from being a vehicle for earmarking.

I try to offer this amendment as often as I can when new grant programs are established. The reason I do this is because, unfortunately, we have a history now of these grant programs being established and, even if the underlying legislation says that they are to be awarded on the basis of merit or on a competitive basis, then, oftentimes, a little down the road, many of these grant programs are earmarked, some of them, we have learned through sad experience, almost completely earmarked.

Competitive grant programs earmarked by Members of this body, we simply can't have that. Now, I question why the Federal Government is using taxpayer dollars to fund training for individuals who operate commercial fishing vessels. I think that that's something that commercial fishing organizations ought to do themselves. However, if we are going to do this, then we should at least ensure that these grants are awarded on a competitive basis and aren't earmarked.

And so I hope that this can be adopted. I should note that in the 110th Congress, this similar amendment was adopted to H.R. 2357, the Beach Protection Act. It was approved by a roll call vote of 263-117. And in the 111th Congress, this amendment was accepted on three separate occasions, each time by voice vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, though I do not intend to oppose the gentleman.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I want to compliment the House's own version of Survivor Man, not only on surviving on a desert island and doing so very skillfully and astutely. Most of the time when Members of our body wind up with a story in The Washington Post, it's for some misdeed or misappropriation of funds. This was a remarkable story of personal strength and courage that I suspect derives from the gentleman's own upbringing and mission abroad for the church, and for his ability to survive under difficult conditions.

He's also been a survivor on his campaign, Mr. Chairman, to limit earmarks. And this is one case in which our committee agrees with the gentleman. On Page 177, Lines 4 and 5, the bill reads: the Secretary shall award grants under this subsection on a competitive basis. But also, as the gentleman has pointed out, notwithstanding such language in other bills,

there have been deviations from the programmatic language, often by the other body, but also, on occasion, in this body.

We feel that these grants ought to be awarded competitively and, for that reason, very specifically wrote this language into the bill. I suspect that after the vigorous hearings that Chairman CUMMINGS has held over the past 2½ years, exposing failures of the Coast Guard contracting program, that this language will be honored and will be adhered to.

As to the reason for the training grants, this is the deadliest industry by a great many measures. In fact, there is a program on television on fishing entitled "The Deadliest Catch," and it tracks those who put out to sea to earn their living in dangerous circumstances. The safety training grants will deal with those and other similar situations. So on the policy side, I simply want to defend the provision.

But I concur with the gentleman on his concern, and we will accept the amendment.

At this point, I would yield to the gentleman from Maryland, Chair of the subcommittee.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Thank you, Mr. OBERSTAR, for your comments. Thank you for yielding. I agree with you. We've already done basically what the gentleman wants done. And I just want to add something, Mr. OBERSTAR, and that is that this has been something that our subcommittee has—this fishing problem, and safety is something that we've taken extremely seriously. The Bureau of Labor Statistics names commercial fishing as the most hazardous occupation in the United States. For the 11-year period from 1994 through 2004, 641 fishermen and -women lost their lives on fishing vessels, and so we take it very seriously.

I also want to thank the gentleman for constantly making sure that we do what you're hoping that we would do. We did it. Congratulations. And so, therefore, I support the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair, and I thank the chairmen of the committee and subcommittee for their vigilance here to make sure that these awards, these grants, are awarded out on a competitive basis. That's what we're seeking here. I'm glad that's going to happen.

For the record, I found no earmarks on Jabonwod, the island that I stayed on. It was an incredible experience. Thanks for mentioning it.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. LOBIONDO. I'd like to rise in support of amendment, thank Mr. FLAKE, and say that the Republicans on the committee are supportive of the amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 111-311.

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk designated as No. 8.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

Page 182, after line 14, insert the following:

(g) PROHIBITION ON EARMARKS.—None of the funds appropriated for the Fishing Safety Research Grant Program pursuant to section 4502(j) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by this section, may be used for a Congressional earmark as defined in clause 9(d) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 853, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical. It simply deals with a separate grant program established by the underlying bill. This one would refer to the Fishing Safety Grant, the fishing Safety Research Grant program, whereas the last one was the Fishing Safety Training Grants program. So I believe the same arguments apply here.

And with that, if the gentleman will agree to accept the amendment again, then I'll be prepared to yield back the balance of my time. But for now, I'll reserve.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I rise to claim time in opposition, though I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. The language of this provision is similar to the previous: to establish a Fishing Safety Research Grant program for academia, members of nonprofit organizations, businesses involved in fishing and maritime, to conduct research on methods of improving the safety of commercial fishing industry, vessel design, survival equipment.

The gentleman ought to be very concerned about survival equipment. He's a survivor himself. Vessel monitoring systems, de-icing technology and severe weather detection, the gentleman had none of those on the island. He didn't have any equipment to detect severe weather or absence of water. He didn't have a water finder; he had to create his own water using the sun. So he's the antithesis of this language.

But the issue is not the underlying policy. The issue really is competitive basis award of grants. I think the gentleman's language will reinforce the purpose of the committee.

Does the gentleman from Maryland wish to be heard?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Once again, I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for laying that out. And I thank the gentleman for his vigilance with regard to these types of issues. Similar to the previous amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE, which prohibits earmarking of the grants to be awarded under the Fishing and Safety Training Grant program, this amendment would prohibit earmarking of the grants authorized by H.R. 3619. The Fishing Safety Research grant is a complement of the Fishing Safety Training program. The research grant program would provide funding to individuals in academia, members of nonprofit organizations and businesses involved in fishing and other maritime matters and other persons with expertise in the fishing industry to support research to identify measures that will improve safety in this industry. And of course these would be bid on a competitive basis.

But the one thing I did want to say, and I know that the chairman of the committee will agree with me, I must give a lot of credit to Congressman BARNEY FRANK, who worked tirelessly on these issues. And I know I've had at least 10 to 12 conversations with him. I know he's met with the chairman, and I just wanted to make sure that we gave him credit because he has championed this like nobody I've ever known, and I just wanted to say that.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for pointing that out, that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) has been a vigorous advocate for his fishing community, which is largely a Portuguese immigrant community of long ancestry; and he really has been a strong advocate, along with Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 0930

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MRS. KIRKPATRICK OF ARIZONA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 111-311.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona:

Page 312, after line 22, add the following new section:

SEC. —. STRATEGY REGARDING DRUG TRAFFICKING VESSELS.

Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, acting through the Commandant of

the Coast Guard, shall develop a comprehensive strategy to combat the illicit flow of narcotics, weapons, bulk cash, and other contraband through the use of submersible and semi-submersible vessels. The strategy shall be developed in coordination with other Federal agencies engaged in detection, interdiction, or apprehension of such vessels. At a minimum, the strategy shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the threats posed by submersible and semi-submersible vessels, including the number of such vessels that have been detected or interdicted.

(2) Information regarding the Federal personnel, technology and other resources available to detect and interdict such vessels.

(3) An explanation of the Coast Guard's plan, working with other Federal agencies as appropriate, to detect and interdict such vessels.

(4) An assessment of additional personnel, technology, or other resources necessary to address such vessels.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 853, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment today because, while I speak about securing our borders to stop the illegal crossings of drugs, weapons, and people, it is important to remember that our physical border is just one line of defense.

Our fight against the drug cartels—which operate the smuggling routes—actually begins in the jungles of South America. Much of the cocaine that enters the United States today originates in South America before working its way north. For years, the United States, Colombian, and Mexican governments have increasingly cracked down on the major smuggling routes.

As these paths have been squeezed, the cartels have found new and innovative ways to move their product. Recently, the traffickers have begun resorting to semi-submersibles, which are submarine-like boats that skim just below the surface of the water.

To further avoid detection, these boats incorporate advanced technology, including a design that reduces their ability to be detected by radar and utilizing water-cooled exhaust mufflers to reduce their heat signal. They can travel up to 3,000 miles without stopping for refueling, allowing crews to move cocaine from secret shipyards along the Colombian coast to safe harbors in Mexico where they join the land trafficking routes that take the drugs across the land border and into the United States.

With these advances, semi-submersibles are extremely difficult for authorities to track or even locate once they take to sea.

With an estimated 70 boats being deployed this year alone with the sustaining cargo capabilities of up to 10 tons, it is not surprising that over one-third of the cocaine reaching the United States is shipped this way. Even worse, these boats can just as easily be used to smuggle weapons or potential terrorists into the country.

Although the Coast Guard does an excellent job with the resources available to stop these vessels, the fact remains that it is a tough task, and only a small percentage of semi-submersibles are captured.

My amendment calls on the Coast Guard to establish a comprehensive strategy to combat the illegal flow of narcotics, weapons, bulk cash, and other contraband through the use of semi-submersible and submersible vessels.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Yes, I'll yield.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Even as we discussed this amendment, the U.S. Coast Guard has interdicted a self-propelled semi-submersible vessel in the Eastern Pacific with a multi-ton load of narcotics on board. Smuggling using submersible and semi-submersibles have become a part of the increasingly sophisticated smuggling operation.

We accept the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Thank you.

As part of this plan, the Coast Guard will address what additional resources they need to get the job done so we can make sure they get the help they need. Our fight against the cartels is constantly evolving, and we must continue to support those on the front line in adapting new strategies.

Therefore, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition although I am not in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LOBIONDO. As the gentlelady stated and the chairman stated, this is something that the Coast Guard plays a critical role in their interdiction. We have dealt with the issue of submersibles and semi-submersibles to combat the growing drug threat. We need to give the Coast Guard the authority to do this.

We're happy to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Yes, I'll yield.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Thank you very much.

I'll be very brief, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I want to congratulate Mrs. KIRKPATRICK for this outstanding amendment. As our ranking member said, this is something the committee has been addressing for a while. But what we now want to do is make sure that the efforts of the Coast Guard are most effective and efficient, and the study and looking into this is what this

is all about. And I think this will allow us to accomplish a lot more with regard to the equipment that we have.

I've actually seen these submersibles many times. As a matter of fact, I was just in Colombia and Mexico and actually saw them and saw they had been used to get around the Coast Guard.

And I know for a fact that they welcome this amendment, and I want to thank you very much because basically what you've done, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, is you've made a very good bill even better.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlelady from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. KRATOVLIL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 111-311.

Mr. KRATOVLIL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. KRATOVLIL:

Page 312, after line 22, add the following new section:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . REPORT ON THE EFFECT OF FACILITIES INFRASTRUCTURE ON MISSION FULFILLMENT.**

(a) STUDY.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall conduct a national study on the facility infrastructure requirements needed to fulfill the Coast Guard's prescribed missions and capabilities, and ensure that the department in which the Coast Guard is operating maintains the ability to utilize the latest technologies.

(b) REPORT.—Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant shall submit a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a) to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate. The report shall include—

(1) an assessment of any current shortfalls in facility infrastructure, including the extent of the use of temporary trailers and an inventory of the number and type of new facilities needed to meet the Coast Guards's mission needs; and

(2) a plan for how the Commandant will develop the appropriate facility infrastructure, including timelines, budgets, and any additional legislative authority the Commandant determines is required to implement such plan.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 853, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVLIL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. KRATOVLIL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3619 because I believe it is our duty to ensure the Coast Guard has top-notch facilities and infrastructure in order to

effectively play its part in keeping America safe.

My amendment requires the Commandant of the Coast Guard to conduct a national study on the facility infrastructure requirements needed to fulfill the Coast Guard's prescribed mission and capabilities. This amendment is needed to assess the prevalence and effects of the Coast Guard operating out of temporary facilities and buildings.

In Maryland's First District, my district, as an example, the Coast Guard is operating out of a double-wide temporary trailer shared with NOAA operations in Oxford, Maryland. The Oxford Coast Guard does not own its own pier and must lease space from a commercial pier nearly 1 mile away from the temporary trailer. This temporary arrangement could be, obviously, affecting operations and mission capability.

My amendment requires a report to Congress that must include an assessment of any shortfalls in facility infrastructure, including the extent of the use of temporary trailers, an inventory of the number and type of new facilities needed to meet the service's mission, and a plan for how the Commandant of the Coast Guard will develop the appropriate facility infrastructure, including timelines, budgets, and additional legislative authority the Commandant determines is required to implement the plan.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a commonsense means towards ensuring those entrusted with protecting our coasts and shorelines are being given the right tools and facilities to do so effectively.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition although I am not in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the gentleman's amendment. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has repeatedly requested information on the condition and the need for additional Coast Guard shoreside facilities. The gentleman's amendment would require the service to submit a report detailing current shortfalls and future shoreside needs.

We congratulate the gentleman. We fully support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KRATOVIL. The gentleman will yield.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I compliment the gentleman on this amendment. As Mr. LOBIONDO said just a moment ago, there are serious needs, a \$1 billion backlog in the Coast Guard's shore construction program, and the gentleman's amendment is right on point, and I commend him for offering it.

And if the gentleman would yield to the Chair of the subcommittee, I'd appreciate it.

Mr. KRATOVIL. I will yield.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I rise in very strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVIL). This amendment will require the Coast Guard to develop a national inventory of its office buildings and other facilities to assess its facilities' shortfalls. However, we realize there is a service backlog, as the chairman just said, of \$1 billion, a shore facility repair backlog, that is.

So basically what this will do is allow the Coast Guard to more effectively and efficiently address this backlog.

And again, this is a very thoughtful amendment. I want to congratulate the Congressman and sponsor for submitting it. And again, I strongly support it and would urge our colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairmen of the committee and the subcommittee for their leadership. I appreciate and also thank the other side of the aisle for their support and urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVIL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. NYE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 111-311.

Mr. NYE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. NYE:

Page 312, after line 22, insert the following new section:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ AUTHORITY OF THE COAST GUARD TO CARRY OUT ITS HOMELAND SECURITY MISSIONS.**

The provisions of this Act that relate to the Coast Guard's marine safety mission shall not impair the authority of the Coast Guard to carry out its homeland security missions, including—

(1) protecting ports, waterways, and marine transportation systems in the United States from acts of terrorism;

(2) safeguarding the United States' international borders from maritime intrusions by aliens seeking unlawful entry into the United States, and from individuals who aim to traffic in illegal drugs, firearms, and weapons of mass destruction in the United States;

(3) maintaining defense readiness, as one of the armed forces, to rapidly mobilize and deploy defensive security personnel during a national emergency;

(4) coordinating efforts with Federal, State, and local intelligence agencies to deter, detect, and take action against acts of terrorism;

(5) preventing human smuggling operations at ports, on waterways, and throughout the marine transportation system; and

(6) enhancing stability in the United States in support of the national security strategy of the United States as referred to in section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 853, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. NYE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. NYE. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to urge my colleagues to support a commonsense, yet necessary, amendment which will make clear the Coast Guard's critical role in the homeland security of America.

The Coast Guard security mission is not new. Since 1790, the Coast Guard has served as America's principal law-of-the-sea entity with a maritime responsibility of 6 million square miles. However, today the Coast Guard must manage multiple security responsibilities as it faces the extremely difficult challenge of enforcing increasingly complex laws against highly sophisticated adversaries.

Since 9/11, the U.S. has expanded dramatically its port security activities to the more than 300 U.S. ports and millions of Americans who live, work, or recreate near them. This is especially important to my constituents in Hampton Roads. I represent one of the largest ports in the United States, the Port of Virginia. The Port of Virginia is the deepest, newest, and biggest port on the east coast, capable of handling ships loaded 26 containers across.

Last month alone, Virginia's Norfolk International Terminal processed 89,359 container units. With the expanded reopening of the Panama Canal in 2014, the port will only grow, and it will be the mission of the Coast Guard to ensure the safety of all of those affected by its commerce.

The purpose of this amendment is simple. The Coast Guard is a multiple-mission armed force that must have uninhibited freedom to flex its military and security powers and respond to numerous concerns and threats in the maritime domain. This amendment makes clear that this is the most important mission of the Coast Guard, and nothing shall hinder that responsibility.

It is important to note that this amendment does not create new authorizations. It simply makes clear the continued importance of protecting our waterways and ports, maintaining defense readiness and coastal security, and securing our borders against aliens seeking to unlawfully enter the United States.

Americans deserve to know that they will continue to be safe from maritime threats. This amendment does just that by clarifying the Coast Guard's homeland security missions.

I commend to all of my colleagues this commonsense amendment, and I urge its support.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, we accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NYE. I will yield.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. NYE). It's an outstanding amendment. This amendment states that none of the provisions relating to marine safety included in H.R. 3619 would impair the authority of the Coast Guard to carry out its homeland security missions.

I support the amendment and its intention, and I urge its adoption.

That said, the Transportation Committee and the Coast Guard Subcommittee have examined the Coast Guard's performance of its marine safety mission in great detail and have significant concerns that the service has assigned inexperienced and unqualified individuals to conduct casualty investigations, vessel inspections, and other marine-safety functions.

The shortcomings in the program have been well documented by the Homeland Security's inspector general, by retired Coast Guard Vice Admiral James C. Card, and by the committee's own examination of the Cosco Busan allision in San Francisco. And so certainly the provisions of this amendment will be extremely helpful in helping us again help the Coast Guard be most effective and efficient in its efforts, and it can only improve the bill and improve an already great organization, the United States Coast Guard, our thin blue line at sea.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chair, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. NYE) for the following reasons:

The amendment specifies that the marine safety provisions in H.R. 3619 shall not impair the authority of the Coast Guard to carry out its homeland security missions.

The Coast Guard constantly monitors maritime transit zones and the Service's law enforcement authority enables it to apprehend foreign fishing vessels engaged in poaching and interdict vessels carrying illegal drugs, firearms and undocumented migrants.

The Committee has held several hearings regarding the Coast Guard's marine safety program over the past three years. Commandant Thad Allen was very concerned about the condition of the marine safety program, so he asked retired Admiral Jim Card to conduct a thorough analysis of the program. Admiral Card confirmed all of the problems that had been raised by industry and mariners during these hearings. H.R. 3619 addresses these programmatic shortfalls in the marine safety program.

The Coast Guard is a multi-mission agency and it is important that it carries out all of its missions in an effective manner—from marine safety and search and rescue, to homeland security.

Therefore, I support the gentleman's amendment that clarifies that nothing in the marine safety portions of H.R. 3619 will affect the Coast Guard's legal authority to execute its homeland security mission.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

□ 0945

Mr. NYE. I thank the chairmen of the committee and the subcommittee for their support, and I yield back the balance my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. NYE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 111-311.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I rise as the designee of Mr. STUPAK to offer the amendment on his behalf.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. OBERSTAR:

At the end of title 11, add the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall conduct a study and analysis of the feasibility of the restoring the Fresnel Lens in the Presque Isle Light House in Presque Isle, Michigan to operating condition to meet the safety needs of commerce and submit within 180 days the report to the Transportation & Infrastructure Committee after the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 853, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, the Presque Isle Lighthouse at Presque Isle Township on the Upper Peninsula of Michigan is very important, has served a very important navigational purpose over many, many years on those stormy waters of Lake Superior. Those are treacherous waters. Unlike the ocean where waves have a long distance, hundreds of miles to play themselves out, the waters of the Great Lakes, and particularly of Lake Superior, even with a surface of 33,000 square miles, are short and choppy and harsh and brutal in the coming months of November, December, January, February.

The Presque Isle Lighthouse has saved many a mariner. It continues to operate, but its light has been replaced by one of more modern quality and capability with much greater candle power, much greater visibility, and longer distance than the Fresnel lens that the Coast Guard has used for probably 150 years; not only the Coast Guard, but other marine navigation services. Fresnel lenses are treasured historical pieces, but they are not navigational pieces any longer.

The gentleman's amendment would require the Coast Guard to do a study

of the feasibility of reinstalling the Fresnel lens in the lighthouse in a condition so that it can provide safe navigation to commercial vessels on Lake Huron or at the juncture point of the upper waters and also serve as a supplement to the existing light.

I support the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. We are happy to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 111-311.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. LOBIONDO:

Page 312, after line 22, add the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ USE OF FORCE AGAINST PIRACY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding title X of this Act, chapter 81 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 8107. Use of force against piracy

“(a) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—An owner, operator, time charterer, master, or mariner who uses force, or authorizes the use of force, to defend a vessel of the United States against an act of piracy shall not be liable for any injury or death caused by such force to any person participating in the act of piracy.

“(b) PROMOTION OF COORDINATED ACTION.—To carry out the purpose of this section, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall work through the International Maritime Organization to establish agreements to promote coordinated action among flag-and port-states to deter, protect against, and rapidly respond to acts of piracy against the vessels of, and in the waters under the jurisdiction of, those nations, and to ensure limitations on liability similar to those established by subsection (a).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“8107. Use of force against piracy”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 853, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, pirates attacked two American-flag vessels transiting waters off the Horn of Africa. If it were not for the heroic actions of our Special Forces, the bravery



of the captain and the crew of these vessels, a terrible tragedy would have been at hand. Just yesterday we got reports that a Panamanian-flagged vessel had been seized by pirates with hostages being taken. We cannot allow this to continue.

Knowing this would be an ongoing problem, the bill, as it was reported from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, included a very carefully worked out bipartisan agreement that we worked with Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MICA, and myself that would shield U.S. merchant mariners, ship owners, operators, and captains from liabilities in U.S. courts following any action taken to defend a U.S.-flagged vessel, for instance, taken to defend the United States of America against a pirate attack.

Unfortunately, the Judiciary Committee objected and requested Chairman OBERSTAR add language to his recently adopted manager's amendment that appears to be an entanglement for getting the right thing done. The way the Judiciary Committee has worded this in the manager's amendment, a crewmember would be forced to go through a checklist in his mind or her mind of what legal entanglements could occur because of this.

The language in the manager's amendment only grants relief liability to the crew owner, meaning the vessel owners or operators and captains would still be sued. They would not be held without harm. They would have monetary damages, possibly.

Our amendment restores this bipartisan agreement. It's a commonsense agreement, something that the people on the committee worked out. It makes no sense in the heat of an attack, when you have got pirates coming at a U.S.-flagged vessel with automatic machine gunfire, with rocket-propelled grenades, or whatever else may happen, to suggest that a crewmember is going to be able to take the time to check through what is substantially or in excess or whatever the case is. We need to protect American interests.

Under our amendment, an American crewmember would only need to prove that the person attacking the vessel was a pirate in order to receive liability relief.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I fully share the desire of the sponsor of the amendment to effectively combat piracy on the high seas, but I hope this amendment will not be adopted.

As he has pointed out, the manager's amendment does address this issue and does so consistently with well-established, long-observed legal traditions

which go back to the ancient civilizations of Rome and Babylon. The language in the bill, now with the manager's amendment, incorporated language of the Transportation and Infrastructure and the Judiciary Committee in place of what was in the introduced bill.

Now this amendment, unfortunately, goes too far. It grants absolute immunity within the United States on our lakes and rivers to violence against our own citizens. Now, the difference in the two provision, one carefully crafted by the Judiciary Committee and now the one being offered on the floor, is not about enabling ship's crews to respond to piracy. Both do that fine. The difference is that this amendment would eliminate all legal restraints. There will be no legal accountability, not even under criminal law. When they say no liability, the way the bill is drafted, it would be you could commit crimes against people and still be exempt.

Now, I can't imagine that the sponsor actually meant to do this. I think he is talking about civil liability. But when he says—the language in the bill, with the manager's amendment, says that you are totally immune unless you knew what you were doing was substantially in excess of what was necessary.

The language in the amendment, however, is not even limited to a civil liability. It's not even limited to during the attack. It could be after the attack when no one is under any danger, and there is no limit on what crimes can be committed at that point.

I would hope, whether this amendment is adopted or not, if there are still concerns about the amendment, that we would work together cooperatively as we go forward to make sure that we give the crewmembers all of the flexibility they need in these situations without going too far and allowing crime and torture and everything else under criminal law.

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of the committee, Mr. MICA.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, while I know the Judiciary Committee may be well-intended—the Judiciary Committee has the responsibility to make certain and ensure that citizens' rights are protected—we are not talking about any act that is committed within waters of the United States. In fact, there are laws and definitions that rule enforcement and legal proceedings. We are talking about an act of piracy on the high seas.

We are talking about the way the Judiciary Committee has constructed this language that we now have a piracy or a pirate protection provision in the bill that we worked so hard on in a bipartisan manner to make certain that we give every tool possible to those who man our vessels, American-

flagged vessels on the high seas, to take on pirates with whatever force they need. We don't need to have a test and read them their Miranda rights and a whole host of normal, civil procedures.

What we need to do is give those who are being attacked, when we see murder and mayhem on the high seas, give them the tools to respond adequately. Just like a citizen would defend their own home or their own property, we have American-flagged vessels that deserve the protection of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

I urge its adoption.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose a couple of questions to the sponsor of the amendment, if he would respond.

My first question would be whether it's his intent, because the language under the amendment does not limit it to the high seas, is it your intent to limit this application to high seas?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Well, under title 18, an act of piracy is defined as happening on the high seas. The intention is to defend against an act of piracy and, as defined by law, it has to be on the high seas.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Reclaiming my time, I would ask another question, Mr. Chairman.

Is it your intent to limit this to the application of civil law and not criminal law? Would you exempt owners and operators from criminal acts?

Mr. LOBIONDO. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Yes, you do exempt them from criminal acts?

Mr. LOBIONDO. For civil.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Just civil.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Just civil.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I think the wording, as it is, says that an owner-operator who uses force or authorized the use of force to defend a vessel of the United States against an act of piracy shall not be liable for any injury or death caused by such force.

That does not limit it, in its present version, to civil. It would actually exempt him from any liability, that would include criminal. I would hope that the gentleman, whatever happens to the amendment, would work cooperatively so that we would limit it to the intent as he has articulated today.

Mr. LOBIONDO. We certainly would be happy to work with you to make sure that we are in synchronization with what we are all understanding.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Just to close, again, the manager's amendment, the crewmember of the vessel would have to prove in court that he knew at the time, she knew at the time, that the defensive actions were not substantially in excess of what is reasonable. That's not what's going to happen if a piracy attack occurs.



I don't think any Members are going to even want to be close to voting for a piracy protection provision in line with what's going on. What does substantially in excess of reasonable mean? A crewmember is going to have to think through this checklist as a pirate attack is happening?

That's not what we have in mind. I don't think it's the right way to go. I would urge all of our Members to vote in favor of this amendment to make sure that U.S. interests are protected.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on the amendment printed in House Report 111-311 on which further proceedings were postponed:

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. KRATOVIL of Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. KRATOVIL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 398, noes 0, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 812]

AYES—398

Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Adler (NJ)  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NY)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Bocciari  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Bordallo  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher

Edwards (MD)  
Edwards (TX)  
Ehlers  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emerson  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Fallin  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Flake  
Fleming  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxy  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gordon (TN)  
Granger  
Graves  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grijalva  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Halvorson  
Hare  
Harman  
Harper  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Heinrich  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseth Sandlin  
Hill  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Inglis  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Boyd  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Cole  
Conaway  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Dahlkemper  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Deal (GA)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Driehaus  
Duncan

LaTourette  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NY)  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsack  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luján  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Markey (CO)  
Markey (MA)  
Marshall  
Massa  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMahon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Minnick  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (NY)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Norton  
Nunes  
Nye  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olson  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Perriello  
Peters  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pierluisi  
Pingree (ME)  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Polis (CO)  
Pomeroy  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Putnam  
Quigley

Radanovich  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Sablan  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schauer  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Taylor  
Teague  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)

Wittman  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
NOT VOTING—40  
Abercrombie  
Baca  
Barrett (SC)  
Bean  
Biggert  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Braley (IA)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Culberson  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (TN)  
Dreier  
Engel  
Faleomavaega  
Forbes  
Gohmert  
Higgins  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Inslee  
Jones  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Maffei  
Maloney

□ 1040

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

Stated for:

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 812 I was not able to vote on the House floor on the amendment to H.R. 3619, the Coast Guard Authorization Act offered by Representative KRATOVIL due to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 812 the amendment offered by Representative KRATOVIL from Maryland, which requires the USCG to conduct a study on the facility infrastructure requirements needed to fulfill the Coast Guard's missions and capabilities and report the findings within 180 days. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendments being in order, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEINER) having assumed the chair, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3619) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 853, he reported the bill, as amended pursuant to that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 853, the question on adoption of the further amendments will be put en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 11, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 813]

YEAS—385

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

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

Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NY)  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsack  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
    E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Markey (CO)  
Markey (MA)  
Marshall  
Massa  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMahon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Minnick  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (NY)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler (NY)  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Nye  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olson  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Perriello  
Peters  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Polis (CO)

Pomeroy  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Putnam  
Quigley  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
    T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schauer  
Schiff  
Schmidt

Schock  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Taylor  
Teague  
Terry

Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Townes  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
    Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Witman  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Young (FL)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on Friday, October 23, 2009. If I were present, I would have voted: "aye" on rollcall 812, On Agreeing to the Kratovil of Maryland Amendment to H.R. 3619 and "yea" on rollcall 813, On Final Passage of H.R. 3619, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3619, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 3619, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering, cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

NAYS—11

Broun (GA)  
Courtney  
Flake  
Franks (AZ)

King (IA)  
Paul  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)

Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Tiahrt

□ 1100

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I'd like to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) the majority leader, for the purposes of finding out about next week's schedule. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday the House will meet at 10:30 A.M. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business, and on Friday the House will meet at 9 a.m.

We'll consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today. In addition, Mr. Speaker, we will consider H.R. 3854, the Small Business Financing and Investment Act of 2009. We also will consider the conference report, H.R. 2996, on the Department of the Interior, Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and also a House joint resolution making further appropriations for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes, otherwise known as a CR. The CR, as the gentleman from Virginia knows, will run out on the 31st of this month.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the gentleman about some reports that we've been hearing about other bills that could perhaps come to the floor next week, and I wonder if he could add

NOT VOTING—36

Abercrombie  
Baca  
Barrett (SC)  
Bean  
Biggert  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Boyd  
Braley (IA)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Capuano

Cardoza  
Culberson  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (TN)  
Dreier  
Forbes  
Gohmert  
Higgins  
Hinojosa  
Inslie  
Jones  
Loifgren, Zoe

Maffei  
Maloney  
McCaul  
Melancon  
Richardson  
Rogers (MI)  
Rush  
Thornberry  
Walden  
Wamp  
Wexler  
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). One minute is left in the vote.

□ 1057

So 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. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 813 I was not able to vote on the House floor on the passage of H.R. 3619, the Coast Guard Authorization Act due to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 813, final passage of the Fiscal Year 2010 U.S. Coast Guard Authorization Act, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for several votes taken on the House floor today, Friday, October 23, 2009, due to illness. As a result, I missed rollcall votes Nos. 812 and 813.

Had I been present: On rollcall vote No. 812 I would have voted "aye" and on rollcall vote No. 813 I would have voted "yea."

some clarity to that. There have been reports that perhaps an estate tax bill would be coming to the floor next week. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. We're working with the Ways and Means Committee and would like to bring to this floor in the next few weeks, at least, if not next week, a bill to deal with the estate tax issue.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman and, Mr. Speaker, would ask further whether we can expect that bill to include the statutory PAYGO provisions and whether that bill would be compliant with those provisions. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Yes on both questions. We will probably have, either in the bill or by rule, we'll adopt statutory PAYGO, which we pledged to do in our budget, as you know, and it will be compliant.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and I just wanted to reiterate so, in my understanding, that would mean that the estate tax bill would be paid for if it came to the floor of the House. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. As the gentleman will recall, I would remind the House, Mr. Speaker, the budget that we passed provided for baseline spending for four items, that is to say, that the baseline which is, essentially, the premise that I think your party has adopted with respect to tax legislation, that the estate tax, the alternative minimum tax, the middle income tax cuts and the so-called "doc fix," the sustainable growth rates, would be scored at baseline, which means effectively you would not pay for them.

And I would expect us to comply with that budget provision, giving those four exceptions of which the estate tax is one.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, what I'm hearing is that neither the estate tax bill nor the other items included in the budget resolution passed would be paid for, and that there would be an assumption somehow that that money would just be taken care of. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. It's sort of like your assumptions when we have tax bills on the floor, yes.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that observation. Again, I just wanted to make the point that, again, as we are in unprecedented times incurring debt unlike we have ever in this country, that these obviously very important bills that need consideration are coming to the floor without being paid for contributing to the exacerbation of the debt situation on our children and their children. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, further—

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I would yield to the gentleman, sure.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman, of course, knows that if we don't act on

the estate tax that there will be a great cost next year. The gentleman's aware of that which will itself exacerbate the budget.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'd respond to the gentleman, he and I both know that we actually have shared position on the fact that we need to address the uncertainty surrounding the cliff, if you will, in the estate tax expiration of the repeal.

But, again, if we are in the age of being very concerned about the deficit, the Members, I believe, on our side need to know that the bills coming to the floor are not paid for. They may be compliant with provisions in the budget resolution, but simply are not paid for. And the assumptions made about baseline are just those.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield again?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Given my friend's concern, would the gentleman join me in supporting and getting the votes for a statutory PAYGO on its own? I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HOYER. Because of our concern about the deficit, which I share.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say, that I, as well as other Members of our leadership and our conference certainly would be willing to engage in crafting solutions as to how we go about implementing PAYGO provisions without raising taxes because, as we know now, families across this country are hurting, small businesses are having difficulty keeping lights on. And now, certainly is not the time for us to see increased taxes on the working families or small businesses of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman further about what we could expect in terms of the reports surrounding the so-called "doc fix" on the sustainable growth rate formula and whether we can expect such a bill to come to the floor next week and whether that bill would be paid for. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. As you know, when the former administration was in office, we regularly passed the doc fix which, as you know, wasn't paid for. We think that's not appropriate. But we agree with you that now is not the time to raise taxes. However, we also understand that if we do not address the sustainable growth rate for doctors, that Medicare recipients won't have doctors to go to. We want to ensure that Medicare recipients do in fact have providers who can meet their medical needs.

As a result, Senator REID, as you know, tried to pass the sustainable growth rate modification so there wouldn't be a 21 percent cut in January to doctors. Unfortunately, all of your party voted against that and 13 of my party voted against that, so it lost 47-53. But we believe that that's going to be addressed one way or another so

that we assure and we intend to do that, to assure our Medicare recipients that they will not lose the services of their doctors.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the gentleman again, might we expect that bill to come to the floor next week? And if not, when could we expect such a bill to come to the floor? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I'm not sure that we're going to have it next week, but I can assure the gentleman that we do intend to address the issue so that doctors do not confront a 21 percent cut in their Medicare reimbursements for Medicare patients, yes.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. And if I could, Mr. Speaker, turn the gentleman's attention to the question of the bill that Ranking Member ROSLEHTINEN and Chairman BERMAN are working on in terms of the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. This is a bill, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman has indicated to me, as well as to the chief deputy whip, Mr. MCCARTHY, last week that that bill would be coming to the floor within the next few weeks, and would ask the gentleman, does he expect the bill on the floor next week or the week following? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the question. As I have said, Mr. BERMAN expected to mark up the bill, as is my expectation, and Mr. BERMAN will be marking up the bill. As the gentleman probably knows, that bill is subject to joint jurisdiction or co-jurisdiction by three other committees, the Oversight Committee, the Financial Services Committee and the Ways and Means Committee, so they will have to do their work on that bill as well.

But I do look forward to moving that bill, as the gentleman, as I've indicated in the past, and not only that, I want to say to the gentleman, I look forward to discussing it with him in the next couple of days.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that, and appreciate his efforts to try and bring that bill to the floor. I know he and I share a commitment to try and make that happen as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman where we stand as far as the schedule for November and December. As we know now, we are within a week or so of the October 30 targeted adjournment. I guess all of us understand that that is not going to be met. But we've not been given a schedule; and as the gentleman knows, Members on his side as well as ours are used to having some advance notice about scheduling their lives and when they can be home with their families, their constituents, when they will be asked to be here in Washington performing their duties. And I don't recall that we've ever been in a situation where there's not been an official schedule issued this far or this close up to an adjournment.

So I'm asking the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, if he could tell us, officially,

what the schedule could be for the next month and the month succeeding that. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have, for at least 3 weeks now, been indicating what I thought the schedule was going to be in November. As you know, a little earlier this week I modified that. As I caveated when I announced that we would be meeting the first and third weeks of November, and not the second week of November—because Veterans Day, which all of our Members want to be home with those memorializing those we have lost in the defense of freedom and celebrating those who have served in defending freedom and democracy. Our Members want to be with their fellow citizens at home accomplishing that objective, including myself and, I'm sure, yourself.

The fact is, however, I also caveated that with, if we could pass health care we may use a portion of that week. Therefore, let me make it very clear officially, if you will, that I do not expect and do not plan that we'll be here Thanksgiving week. I expect us to be here the first and third weeks, from Monday through Friday of November.

On the second week of November, which starts with the 9th of November, I want Members to make available and ask their schedulers now for Saturday the 7th, Monday the 9th and Tuesday the 10th as possible dates, possible on which we would meet. The contingency will be whether or not we can move the health care bill, which we believe is the most important piece of legislation that we'll consider, and probably both sides believe that, whatever their view of what they're going to do on that legislation, that we will consider.

And if, in fact, it's possible to pass it prior to Tuesday the 10th, then we will possibly be in on Saturday the 7th, Monday the 9th and Tuesday the 10th. On Tuesday the 10th we would meet no later than 3 p.m.

In December—I've had discussions with the majority leader in the Senate. We are of the opinion that we certainly ought to make every effort and will make every effort to be out of this session, the first session of this Congress, by Friday the 18th of December. The following week is Christmas week and we certainly, my view is, want to have people home on Christmas week. And I have no intention of meeting the following week either. We are in discussions about the first, the month of January, not just the first 2 weeks, but the month of January. I'm hopeful that fairly soon I'll be able to announce what we want to do on that.

□ 1115

As a matter of fact, I would be glad to have discussions with the gentleman from Virginia on that issue.

Mr. CANTOR. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, and I would just reiterate the custom, which is to release an official schedule so that, as he knows, Members can do their planning.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. Yes.

Mr. HOYER. We all want that. But I think anyone who has served any time in the House or the Senate knows that as you begin to wind down a session—in this case the first session of this Congress—legislation passing between the two bodies dictates your schedule more than simply arbitrarily saying we'd like to be out on this day. And as a result, we will have to see where we are as we move along.

The Interior bill I was hopeful that we would consider 2 weeks ago, it's on the schedule for this coming week. As you know, we were unable to get to agreement. We now appear to have got an agreement in the conference, and we're ready to move forward.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Again, whether we are in or whether we are out, I don't think we're advocating a position of being out and certainly not completing work.

But, again, it is rather unprecedented where we are without the ability for us to have an official schedule, which is why I continue, Mr. Speaker, to prod on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, if I could then turn to the question of the piece of legislation that the gentleman referred to, health care reform, and about its timing and, frankly, the inclusion of a public option.

We've been hearing a tremendous number of reports—many of them conflicting—about what will be the timing of the health care bill coming on the floor of this House, what may be included. Again, we are in a position being kept in the dark, which is rather odd given the repeated insistence by this White House and the President—both as he is our President now and when he was a candidate for President, when he proclaimed that negotiations over important bills—and, of course, this would be one of them—would occur in the light of day and even appear on C-SPAN. That's obviously not been the case.

We've heard yesterday from the Speaker quoted in the press that she had the votes for a public option. We then have heard today reports indicating that there isn't the support on your side for a robust public option.

Again, this just underscores the fact that there is so much movement on one side of the aisle without any participation by the other.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman to clarify and give us some clarity on this notion and whether he could define for us what is included in a robust public option, what is the difference between a robust public option or something else which seems to have now captured the interest of everybody in this body and certainly those in the press.

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I don't know that I am going to get into a long, extended discussion about the substance of this bill or we could be here until late tonight.

I will tell the gentleman, however, that no one ought to be surprised, having watched this bill being considered over the last 6 to 7 months, some 70-plus hearings that have been held over the last 2 years, to know this is a very difficult subject of great magnitude of impact on the American public and the American economy. One-sixth of our economy is health care expenditures.

No one should be surprised that it's receiving a lot of discussion and attention. No one should be surprised that there are differences as to how to get from where we are—which is a system that is escalating at a very rapid rate. Family costs are increasing by probably \$1,800 a year, families are being forced out of the market, and the uninsured grow. So we are trying to deal with that issue.

The fact is that in terms of the public option as has been discussed, there are a number of ways to provide an alternative assurance of coverage to individuals other than simply an exchange, which would be like the Office of Personnel Management's Federal employee health benefit exchange—which is private sector—folks competing for our business and the business of those that are employed by the Federal Government. There is a lot of discussion about that.

That discussion continues, and I will tell the gentleman that as the Speaker said and I've said, we will bring the bill to the floor when we think it's ready to come to the floor. And I've further asserted emphatically that we will give the 72-hours notice that we had indicated we would give.

I would tell you further that until such time as we've resolved what the bill is going to look like, it is impossible for CBO to give a final score.

We had pledged that we're going to be deficit free, that is to say the bill will be paid for, will not add to the deficit. The President indicated that in his speech to the joint session, and we intend to do that.

So I tell the gentleman we're having continuing discussions on not just the public option, to which the gentleman refers, and to how that will be configured, but there are other matters as well of concern to the public and to all of us.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I think the gentleman makes one of the points I am trying to convey, and that is these discussions, these continuing negotiations are occurring behind closed doors, they're occurring just on one side of the aisle in and around issues of health care that affect every American—young, old, Republican, Democrat, male, female. It is universal in its application, the issue of health care.

So it is troubling, at the very least, for us to sit here and witness these ongoing negotiations behind closed doors when we on our side, I think, have posited alternatives. The gentleman and I have met on discussions surrounding some points that we can agree upon.

But what's troubling right now is the insistence that we continue to read about that there be a public option. My office has received reports about their being three different public options that your side is considering.

Now, we've heard reports that you have whipped those three distinct public options. My question, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman is, what are those three public options? I think the public deserves the right to know. The public has rejected the notion of a public option replacing their health care. That is really the impetus, I believe, that the gentleman would want to put on display about this discussion about the so-called public option and the three versions that are discussed.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I reject the gentleman's conclusion, which I think is incorrect, the premise that the public has rejected. In fact, as the gentleman probably knows, hopefully, the polling data indicates that the support for the public option has risen since August—has risen, I tell my friend. And there are a number of different ways to get there.

The Senate has one that's on public display, has been on the Internet. The House Education and Labor Committee has one option with Ways and Means that has been on the Internet. It's been on the Internet since July. Energy and Commerce has one—a different correlation of that—and it's been on the Internet since July. There have been a lot of discussions, and I would refer my friend to the Internet, and I am sure he has copies of all of those bills.

Nothing is secret, nothing is behind closed doors.

Now, are we having discussions with ourselves about how we want to get there and with people who will vote for the bill?

The gentleman has made it very clear, I don't think your side is for a public option. We disagree on that. That is a fair disagreement. You're not for a public option, and I haven't talked to anybody on your side that's for a public option.

We disagree. We believe that the public option is an option that the public ought to have and not simply be in the sights of insurance companies who may or may not give them the price or the coverage that they could either afford or need. That's the difference. But I haven't talked to anybody on your side who wants a public option no matter how it is configured.

So very frankly, I will tell my friend that discussions with your side on a public option seem somewhat pointless.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'm a little taken aback by the gentleman's statement saying it's pointless for him to have discussions with Republicans regarding health care.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I will.

Mr. HOYER. I didn't say that.

The gentleman, as he cited, we had a meeting. Am I incorrect in saying that the gentleman indicated to me he was not for a public option? Is that an accurate statement?

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman is not incorrect because Republicans believe that a public option doesn't bring about competition. I think both of us, Mr. Speaker, agree that competition is what is needed to bring down prices to increase access.

We believe that real competition comes from the ability for individuals to choose not just from two or three insurance companies that may have 50 percent of market share; we believe real competition comes from the ability for an individual to choose from a thousand different insurance plans for that individual and his or her family. That's where we begin to—that's what we can agree on. The competition brings down prices. We don't believe public option brings competition.

And that is the essence. The end shouldn't be public option.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I will yield when I finish.

And I would further say again to the gentleman's representation about where the American public is because of a poll that was taken this week, I think there have been numerous articles written on debunking the methodology behind that poll. In fact, the question when posed, do you support a public option to compete with private insurance, is and would yield a different response than if you were to ask, would you support a public option that replaces the current health care coverage that you have.

And, Mr. Speaker, this is our position. We believe that if you introduce a government that also makes the rules as a competitor, that there will no longer be an even playing field for competition, that you are on a path to single-payer health care in this country. That is the difference, Mr. Speaker. But I don't think that the gentleman is correct in his saying it is fruitless to have discussions surrounding health care because we have a difference of opinion.

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman misstates what I said. I said discussion regarding a public option when I had talked to nobody on your side who was for a public option.

It seems pointless, from my perspective, to talk to somebody about how a public option ought to be configured if, as you have just stated, you're not for a public option. Therefore, a discussion about a public option does in fact to me seem pointless.

Furthermore, let me say this: The gentleman was here when we—I believe you were here—when we adopted the current part D of the Medicare program. The gentleman will recall in that bill you provided for a public op-

tion. You provided for a public option to provide competition and availability of a health care prescription-drug coverage. Now, you provided it in the event that there was no private sector, or at least not more than one, available in any one segment of our society.

So I tell the gentleman, in your own bill—that I think you supported; I don't know that off the top of my head—but my presumption is you supported it or certainly the overwhelming majority of your party supported with very few Democratic votes, and that provided for an option of a public option.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman there are a lot of differences to the construct of the MMA, the legislation passed that created part D than what is being discussed today.

Mr. HOYER. I agree with that. But it did provide for an option of a public option.

Mr. CANTOR. Reclaiming my time.

So I would say if the gentleman is of that opinion that there is an ability to discuss things surrounding health care, then why is it that we continue to see closed door negotiations?

So the gentleman points to the different options, public options or versions thereof, being discussed in the three different committees in the House. Are those the public options that the gentleman and his side have whipped and are being discussed now behind closed doors?

□ 1130

Frankly, any imposition of a public plan is going to cost taxpayers and small businesses money. I would certainly think the gentleman would share the notion that Republicans should be involved, and it would be of concern to both Republicans and Democrats throughout this country that the American people would want their right to know being realized in these discussions, which is my point as to why is it that we can't hear what these three different public options are and what the differences are therein.

Mr. HOYER. I would repeat, you know exactly what the options are. As I just told you, they are online. They have been discussed. They were discussed extensively in the committee on television. Surely the gentleman would not want the Speaker or anybody else to be misunderstood as the fact that your party doesn't have discussions among yourselves as to what options you want to pursue.

If that's your representation, frankly, I tell my friend, I don't think many people are going to believe that. Are we having discussions? We are. I don't believe either you individually or anybody that I have talked to on your side of the aisle is for a public option.

We are discussing how public option ought to be configured. You don't believe there ought to be a public option, period, for the reasons you have stated. We understand that. We have a difference of opinion on that.

Now, if you are for public option on some configuration, then if you will submit that to me, I would be glad to talk to you about it.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, we have always and continue to represent that we are ready to work with him, his leadership and the other side in crafting and affecting positive health care reform. Again, shutting down discussions is not a route to achieve that that could fairly produce what the American people want.

I don't think it could produce fairly or unfairly what the American people want if it is going to be about my way or the highway as far as health care discussions and a bill that passes on this floor.

I thank the gentleman.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2009

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, October 27, 2009, for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

#### SUFFERING AT HANDS OF HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANIES

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

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I have heard from constituents across my district who are suffering at the hands of health insurance companies.

I have heard from doctors who do their best to treat those without insurance.

I have heard from entrepreneurs who want to start their own businesses but fear that they won't be able to find coverage for their sick children because they have preexisting conditions.

I have heard from women who can't replace their ill children's used catheters because they were denied by their insurance companies.

I have heard from small business owners struggling to afford coverage that their employees depend on.

They need us to act, they are asking us to act, they are demanding us to act, and that's why we must.

We need to fix our broken health insurance system. We need a health insurance system that works for men, for women, for children, seniors and families, for everyone. We need action to combat rising health care costs to make health care more accessible and to offer real choice.

We need a public option. We must demand a public option.

#### HONORING GREATER MIAMI YMCA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the wonderful work of the YMCA of Greater Miami and the addition of its new chief development officer, Pat Morris.

Every day, YMCAs across the country help improve our communities and provide positive programs for youth and adults. Over the past year alone, the YMCA of Greater Miami has cared for 4,700 children. The Miami Y has coached and instructed more than 3,650 children in sports, held summer programs for more than 2,900 kids, and mentored over 100 teens.

The YMCA of Greater Miami is working with other community groups to build affordable homes for families and seniors and will open a brand-new preschool in the near future.

With the help of Pat Morris, the YMCA of Greater Miami will continue to foster positive growth in our neighborhoods.

I congratulate my good friend, Pat, for his position as chief development officer. He has dedicated himself to helping our south Florida community, first as cofounder of the community service organization Hands On Miami and now as a member of the YMCA team.

Congrats to the YMCA of Greater Miami, and I wish the agency continued success as they improve the lives of all of our neighbors.

#### AMERICANS SUPPORT IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent survey by Rasmussen Reports shows that a growing majority of Americans want our immigration laws enforced.

Nearly two-thirds of those surveyed believe law enforcement officers should conduct surprise visits at locations where illegal immigrants are employed. Only 19 percent opposed the visits, compared to 24 percent last April. By a 13-point margin, Americans believe that the Federal Government should not prevent local law enforcement officers from checking on individuals' immigration status.

The Phoenix Business Journal and the Washington D.C. Examiner both reported the poll's findings, but coverage in news outlets that regularly cover immigration issues was glaringly missing.

Mr. Speaker, the media should report all of the facts, not omit those they disagree with.

#### WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

(Mrs. CAPITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I have one question. Where are the jobs?

We are now more than 7 months from passage of the so-called stimulus package, yet it is more apparent than ever that the bill has fallen woefully short. In my home State of West Virginia, the White House predicted that this legislation would create 20,000 jobs. Well, guess what? At this point, since February, the reality is that we have lost 13,000 jobs. Sadly, the stimulus isn't living up to its promise of job creation.

Additionally, the policies of this administration are actually contributing to job losses in my State. Cap-and-trade legislation will put an economic target on the back of our States, States like mine. Meanwhile, the EPA has continued to hold up mine permits across Appalachia, creating an unprecedented sense of unease and uncertainty that's already costing us mining jobs and threatening thousands more.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents deserve better now, and they certainly deserved better when we first debated this bill. I join them in asking: Where are the jobs?

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM SHOULD NOT BE ON BACKS OF OUR SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, we need health care reform, but not on the backs of our small businesses. The proposed plan would impose more than \$820 billion in new taxes, something hardworking Americans and small businesses can't afford.

In a letter, Gilbert Travis of Travis Lumber Company in Mansfield, Arkansas, described how his company and many other lumber companies have been forced to cut back on the number of days a week in operation. Some have met an even worse fate—closure.

Gilbert is not optimistic that the outlook for these businesses will get better any time soon and writes there is no way the American economy, with it's hardworking people, can afford the absolutely wasteful spending and tax increases that Washington is trying to impose at every angle they can possibly think of.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Gilbert. We cannot be imposing new taxes on hardworking American businesses that are struggling to make ends meet in this economic climate. Let's craft a real reform that will decrease health costs, allowing more persons to get the care they deserve.

#### THE STIMULUS: IS THAT ALL THERE IS?

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriate time to ask: Is that all there is?

Yesterday, President Obama's economic adviser, Christina Romer, testified before Congress' Joint Economic Committee on the so-called stimulus plan. Her testimony was illuminating. She indicated that the stimulus plan's greatest impact on economic growth happened between April and September of this year. We lost hundreds of thousands of jobs during each of these months.

How could they possibly consider this a success? If the greatest impact of the trillion dollar stimulus is behind us and we still experience a terrible loss of jobs, that seems the opposite of success.

This whole scenario reminds me of a Peggy Lee song from 40 years ago, called, "Is That All There Is?"

Where are the jobs we were promised in this stimulus? According to President Obama's economic adviser, the main impact is behind us. Really? Is that all there is?

Republicans have better solutions to get Americans back to work that don't involve reckless, ineffective borrowing and spending that drive us further into debt. Americans deserve better.

#### GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OF OUR HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, as a physician, I must say the news coming out of Washington is all bad when it comes to the government takeover of our health care.

Just last night, Speaker PELOSI got the news that she does not have the votes to pass it. The Senate expects the debate to spill over into next year, and even Democrat candidates back home are turning against this crazy idea.

Why is this happening? Simply put, they can't find a way to pay for it. There are not enough taxpayers and insurance policyholders to pay the exploding tab, and the polls show a continued decline in support. Also, they can't depend on the wealth of the Federal Government anymore as we are broke, broke.

This is not a case of Republicans wanting sick people to die quickly. It is a case of wanting this sick, expensive, ineffective, and wasteful government takeover of health care to die quickly.

#### PEOPLE OF AMERICA TALKED TO US IN AUGUST

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems we have here in Washington, DC, is we often seem to be disconnected

with our folks back home. That is a problem. It's sort of an institutional problem, and that's bad enough. When we do it on purpose, that's even worse. We seem to have selective memory, maybe convenient amnesia.

The other side of the aisle appears to have forgotten that there is a month in the year called August. It was when the people of America talked to us, and they told us that they had grave concerns about the proposal that was before us with respect to health care.

Now we are told, well, look at the ABC poll instead. Forget about August. What else have they told us that we can forget about? Oh, that's right, Fox News doesn't exist.

August doesn't exist, Fox News doesn't exist. Maybe next month we will hear that the American people don't exist and we are just here creating a make-believe America with make-believe problems and make-believe solutions. Let's remember August where the real people live with the real problems and the real need for real solutions.

□ 1145

#### AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. PENCE. For every American President, there are moments of decision, moments where the credibility of the United States and the fate of people in foreign lands hang in the balance. President Obama faces such a moment in Afghanistan. The President must decide whether to adequately equip our military in Afghanistan or lose the war to al Qaeda and the Taliban.

General Stanley McChrystal was brought on to implement the counter-insurgency strategy the President himself endorsed in March. And that commander has made it clear what resources he needs to get the job done. If we fail in Afghanistan, we risk that country turning into a training ground again for al Qaeda, increasing instability spilling over into nuclear-armed Pakistan. The consequences to our people would only be a matter of time.

Our soldiers and the people of Afghanistan cannot afford to wait any longer. Now is not the time to risk the hard-fought, blood-bought gains in this critical front in the war on terror by extended deliberations and indecision. Now is the time for our President to act decisively, to give our commanders and our soldiers the resources they need to win the war in Afghanistan and come home safe.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest when our whip and the majority leader were talking a while ago about how they would like to work with us so we can reach some kind of agreement on the public option plan, the government plan. It brought to mind when President Obama came to our caucus, our conference, early on in his administration. He indicated he wanted to work with us and he wanted to have our input. He came with great fanfare, and the media was there saying here is this man, he wants openness, and he wants to work with the Republicans. This is the kind of President we need.

He smiled, he shook our hands, he left the room and then wouldn't talk to us anymore. We have had absolutely no input whatsoever into this health care plan, and yet the facade has been created that we have. And they blame us because things haven't happened. It's because their own caucus can't get together on a plan.

The American people know that there is chicanery going on behind closed doors. And they promised us we would be able to participate in the planning for health care reform. Yeah. That was a lot of baloney then, and it's a lot of baloney now.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

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

#### HONDURAS: A DEMOCRACY IN SPITE OF THE U.S. INTERVENTION

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is trouble in Honduras, and the United States has chosen sides in this conflict. Here are the facts: the people of Honduras are holding an election on November 29. Honduras is a democracy. Their elections will fill 3,000 offices nationwide and all 128 seats of the national congress, and they will elect a new President.

They've had some trouble recently with their current President. Manuel Zelaya attempted to stay in office and be on the November ballot, which is not allowed by term limits in their Honduran Constitution. Zelaya wants to become a permanent President of Honduras and has tried to illegally change the Constitution to keep himself in power.

The people have followed the rule of law, however. They followed their own Constitution. Just as the people of this country would follow our Constitution under similar circumstances, they took proper, legal action to stop Zelaya's illegal behavior, and they removed him from office through the legal court system.



Article 239 of the Honduran Constitution states: "The citizen who has already held executive power"—that would be the President—"may not be President or designee. Anyone who violates this provision or proposes its reform and supports those who do directly or indirectly, must immediately cease the discharge of their duties, and shall be disqualified for 10 years from the exercise of any public function."

Those are pretty simple words. It sounds like the Constitution prevents Zelaya from trying to hijack the government.

The self-governing people of Honduras set forth in their Constitution that a tyrant could not abuse the process and become a dictator. They set rock solid term limits to one term for President. These good people legally removed Manuel Zelaya, the man who would be dictator, a tyrant, and a special friend of Hugo Chavez of Venezuela. Now that's special.

Here's how the people acted legally. After several attempts by legal means to prevent Zelaya from staying in power, the Office of Public Prosecutor filed a criminal complaint. The charges were treason, abuse of authority and usurpation of power in violation of the Honduran Constitution. The Supreme Court of Honduras agreed with the charges and issued an arrest warrant for the armed forces to arrest Manuel Zelaya. So Zelaya was legally arrested. And because he violated the Constitution, he was exiled from the country.

We should be applauding the people of Honduras for following their rule of law. In America, we honor the rule of law. We believe in self-determination and constitutional limits on government power, but we picked the wrong side in this case. We took the side of the tyrant versus the people of Honduras.

Now why would we do that? We cut off foreign aid to Honduras. We have refused to recognize the interim government that followed the rule of law. This is a Honduran Government that is doing everything despite America's interference to make sure that their elections take place as scheduled, to make sure their democracy survives according to the Constitution.

In the meantime, Zelaya, who was exiled, has slipped back into the country. He's holed up in the Brazilian Embassy. He's being funded by guess who? The Communist dictator, Hugo Chavez. Zelaya's thugs are targeting select groups with violent acts, including attacks on Christians. Zelaya is attempting to create chaos, but the popular will does not exist to return this would-be dictator to power. The people want their free elections to take place as scheduled.

One of our Senate colleagues, Senator DEMINT of South Carolina, recently returned from Honduras. He said that the only person he found in Honduras interested in putting Zelaya back in power was guess who? The American ambassador.

Mr. Speaker, it is a moral imperative that we back the rule of law, that we honor the decision of the democratically elected institutions of Honduras, that we support the elections in November, and that we recognize the new government, whoever wins the race.

Why do we, as a Nation, say we believe in self-determination but deny self-determination to Honduras? Why do we say we believe in a constitutional government but bash the nation of Honduras for following their own Constitution? Why do we support the likes of a deposed ruler like Zelaya? And how is it any of our business to determine who should be President of Honduras anyway?

Honduras has been an ally of the United States, yet appears to be another example of how we treat our allies worse than we treat our enemies. We are on the wrong side of things when we stand by the bandit dictator Hugo Chavez and his buddy, Manuel Zelaya.

And that's just the way it is.

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

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

#### LET AMERICA'S HUMANITARIAN VALUES SHINE IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, Afghanistan appears to be headed for a runoff election in the next few weeks. The United States must insist and we must expect that a credible, democratic Afghan government emerges from this political process because so very much is at stake. A democratically elected government in Kabul that has the trust of the Afghan people is necessary because it's our best weapon in the fight against violent extremism in Afghanistan.

Such a government, a stable, honest government, would stabilize the country. It would encourage Afghanistan's neighbors to engage in a regional diplomatic effort. And it would be the strong partner America needs to deliver humanitarian and economic aid to the Afghan people. Afghanistan desperately needs this aid. It has seen two foreign invasions in the last three decades and years of political turmoil.

Afghanistan is also very, very poor. By some measures, it is just about the poorest country in the world. The United Nations issued its annual Human Development Index earlier this month, Mr. Speaker, and it ranks the countries of the world on criteria such as life expectancy, literacy, school enrollment and gross domestic product. Afghanistan ranked 181st out of 182 countries—next to the last.

That's why the United States must put far more emphasis on economic de-

velopment, reconstruction, humanitarian aid and improved governance if we are to succeed in Afghanistan. To do this, we must redouble our efforts to bring a "civilian surge" of aid workers to Afghanistan. In fact, President Obama announced this initiative 7 months ago with a great deal of fanfare, but the results so far have been disappointing.

An adviser to General McChrystal, our commander in Afghanistan, told *The New York Times* last week that "our entire system of delivering aid is broken and very little of the aid is getting to the Afghan people." Another adviser said that the effort has been a "nightmare" and that "vast amounts of aid money have been wasted."

One of the reasons for this problem, Mr. Speaker, is the violence in the country. The aid workers who are on the ground now in Afghanistan are brave and truly dedicated. But some of them are understandably reluctant to leave the relative safety of Kabul and venture out into the countryside.

There are several ways to improve this situation. Some American military personnel could be directed to protect the aid workers. The United States could step up its efforts to train the Afghan army and police so that they can provide local protection. The White House must also provide better benchmarks for measuring the progress of our civilian effort.

We must prove that we are doing a better job of delivering American humanitarian aid, and this can be accomplished with three extremely important goals: it would improve the lives of the Afghan people and give them a reason to reject violence. It would demonstrate that America offers the Afghan people a better future than the extremists offer them, and it would help to remove the impression that the American Army is an occupying army.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to succeed in Afghanistan, we must let America's humanitarian values shine through. That's the best way to help build a stable Afghanistan that can't be used by the Taliban or other extremists to threaten our security, their security, and the peace of our world.

□ 1200

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

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

#### TAKE A LESSON FROM PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration, led by its Council of Economic Advisors, indicated that if we spent \$1 trillion with

the stimulus bill, that we would create 3.5 million new jobs. Well, here it is, what, 8, 9 months later, we've spent a great deal of the stimulus money, and instead of creating 3.5 million new jobs we've lost 3 million jobs. That's a 6.5 million job swing.

Yesterday, Dr. Christina Romer, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, said that the economic stimulus package, \$1 trillion—and remember, we're \$1.4 trillion in the hole this year—that the economic stimulus package at \$1 trillion wasn't going to work anymore for the next several months and we should expect the economy to continue to drift downward, with unemployment reaching 10 percent. The reason I bring this up is because 49 out of the 50 States have lost jobs while we spent \$1 trillion to create the jobs.

Now, just stop and think about that. We're throwing money at this situation as rapidly as possible, the government is getting its nose into every aspect of our economy, moving toward a European socialist-type economy, and the economy continues to drift downward. And why is that? Because we're taking more and more money and spending it that we don't have, number one. And number two, they're going to tax us to death at a time when we're suffering economic calamity in this country.

What should we be doing? Well, Ronald Reagan came into office back in 1980 when Jimmy Carter had 12 percent unemployment—worse than now—and 14 percent inflation—worse than now—with a misery index of 26 percent. And they said you had to raise taxes because we had such problems, we had to have more money. Ronald Reagan said, well, I think we ought to cut taxes. And so they cut taxes across the board, and he was criticized severely for it.

They said, well, there is going to be a shortfall in money coming into the Treasury. We were bringing in \$500 billion a year in taxes at the time, and 4 years later we were bringing in \$1.3 trillion. Do you know why? Because when you cut taxes, you give people more disposable income, business has more money to invest. And so business invests, people buy more products because they have more money, because of that they produce more products, more jobs are created, and the economy expands. It makes common sense; if you have more money, you're going to be able to spend more money.

And so what happened was we had the longest period of economic expansion in the history of this country because we had a President that could see what really needed to be done—let the free enterprise system work and let people have more of their money to spend. Cut government spending and cut government taxes. Well, Reagan did the job.

So what are we doing today? We've got a government that thinks they should control everything, and they're moving toward a socialist economy very similar to what you see in France

and England and other parts of the world that are really suffering and continue to suffer through economic chaos.

All I can say, if I were talking to the President, is, Mr. President, get real. Wake up. Forget this socialist nonsense. Take a look at the history book and look at what Ronald Reagan did. And if you would do that, and instead of raising taxes cut taxes, you would stimulate economic growth, put people back to work, and get this economy heading in the right direction.

I don't know if the President pays attention to what we're saying around here, Mr. Speaker, but if he does pay attention, I hope he'll listen and look at the history books and check out what Ronald Reagan did.

#### WALL STREET, WE ARE WATCHING YOU

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this week, The New York Times reported that Credit Suisse, the largest Swiss bank, stated how it will overhaul compensation for its banking executives. The changes go into effect in January and include their compensation for 2009 and 2010.

Importantly, Credit Suisse ties compensation and bonuses to the firm's future performance and return on equity. In other words, if your decisions yield solid performance, you will be rewarded on that, not on arbitrary bonuses taken just because you can. I'd like to commend Credit Suisse's experience to other big banks in our country. We should follow suit in an even more rigorous reimposition of discipline.

By contrast, in a speech on September 9, 2009, Goldman Sachs' Chief Executive Officer Lloyd Blankfein put forth some principles on compensation. We asked when Goldman Sachs was going to implement those changes; we haven't heard back. But Credit Suisse already did it; they did it in line with the principles established by the G-20 in Pittsburgh earlier this year.

In their press release, Credit Suisse reaffirms the bank's commitment to fair, balanced, performance-oriented compensation policies that align long-term employee and shareholder interests.

So, once again, Wall Street could have led the charge and embraced, for the sake of our Nation, reforms of employee compensation which rewarded short-term gains and encouraged excessive risk-taking as well as increased moral hazard. Instead, Wall Street stood up only for themselves again, first, last, and always. They simply have too much power.

Moreover, Credit Suisse's approach claws back bonuses if the banks perform poorly. Why should America accept that if a bank performs poorly,

that bonuses should be paid out when our taxpayers' money is propping them up and at risk? In particular, if the government saved your bank and therefore your pay despite your poor performance, why should you get a huge bonus? It makes no sense.

Congress and the administration, by allowing huge bonuses in the wake of huge bailouts, have ceded our people's power to Wall Street. These individuals are making three, four, five, six—10 times as much as the President of the United States.

Today, Obama pay czar, Kenneth Feinberg—who was not vetted by the Senate through normal procedures—is supposed to address this situation for our country. Feinberg is expected to cut the average pay only of the top earners at the seven bailed out firms, AIG, Bank of America, Citigroup, General Motors, Chrysler, GMAC, and Chrysler Financial. Remember, the American taxpayer saved them all—for example, they saved Citibank from its downfall. So their jobs were saved, their companies were saved by us, yet they get bonuses?

Some say we would be a lot worse off if this lopsided approach had not been imposed, but far too many Americans find it hard to imagine that as they have lost their jobs, their homes, their access to credit, their sense of hope, and their self-respect. Meanwhile, they see Wall Street titans enriching themselves even more and the biggest banks getting even bigger. That's what is happening across our country.

Wall Street should have been leaders for our republic, helping the Americans whose money saved them, but their culture of ordinary greed continues to stampede forward. They simply don't care about the rest of us. The distance between those elites and our people are growing, and with each step the have-nots suffer more and pay for those that have far too much.

Amidst the compensation fiasco is the core problem: These megabanks are too unaccountable and too big—some call them “too big to fail.” As many have said, those institutions too big to fail are actually too big to exist. It's time to break up the biggest banks, sell off their healthy parts, and never let another bank or financial institution become too big to fail. Wall Street comeuppance is long overdue.

Main Street USA is paying close attention to your shenanigans. We don't intend to take the spotlight off until justice prevails and the stampeding bulls are put back in very tight cages.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 21, 2009]

CREDIT SUISSE OVERHAULS COMPENSATION

(By Graham Bowley)

As Wall Street looks forward to a new era of blowout bonuses, the unthinkable is happening, at least at Credit Suisse, the big Swiss bank. It said on Tuesday that it would radically change the way it paid its employees.

In a break with longstanding industry practices, Credit Suisse intends to alter the

mix of salaries and bonuses for its top employees, tie the bonuses to a specific financial measure and effectively claw back the payouts if the bank's fortunes dim.

The move will not necessarily reduce compensation at Credit Suisse, which is moving aggressively to compete with American banks on Wall Street. But the shift nonetheless brings Credit Suisse in line with pay practices endorsed in September by the Group of 20 nations and puts the bank ahead of resurgent rivals like Goldman Sachs, some of which are contemplating similar changes but have yet to make their plans public.

Goldman, for its part, announced new pay principles in May, which it says embrace best practices on compensation.

A year after Washington rescued the financial industry, bonuses are once again front and center as some big banks roar back in profitability. Goldman, for instance, is on track to award bonuses that could rival the record payouts it made at the height of the boom.

But the likelihood that Wall Street will enjoy big paydays as many ordinary Americans are struggling has angered some policy makers and created a public relations headache for banks. Many are struggling to defuse the resentment directed at the industry.

The Credit Suisse plan will cover roughly 2,000 employees in the United States. Top executives will receive a greater portion of their total compensation in the form of their monthly cash salaries, while bonuses will be split evenly between cash and stock.

The stock will vest over four years, and the cash portion will pay out in three. But both components will be adjusted based on the bank's performance over that period, with a particular emphasis on its return on equity, a closely watched financial measure. The performance of an executive's business will also be taken into account.

By tying payouts to a specific measure like return on equity, Credit Suisse will essentially be able to take back bonuses in the event the bank's fortunes take a turn for the worse. Credit Suisse earlier introduced a bonus plan linked to some of the bank's troubled assets.

Claw-back provisions are becoming increasingly common on postcrisis Wall Street. Critics say the industry's decades-old bonus culture, which focused on short-term profits, encouraged the excessive risk-taking that led to the crisis. Morgan Stanley introduced provisions for a portion of its employees' bonuses last year, and another Swiss banking giant, UBS, imposed similar rules on deferred pay.

But Credit Suisse executives and compensation experts said the bank's plan was the most detailed and comprehensive yet to take back pay if senior executives—and the bank—failed to perform adequately.

"As far as we know, we are the first major bank to announce a compensation structure that is consistent with the best practices laid out at the recent G-20 summit," Brady W. Dougan, chief executive, said in a statement.

The bank is also introducing a minimum share ownership requirement for members of management committees and the executive board to align the most senior executives' pay with shareholders' interests, although it did not specify the new thresholds.

Lynn A. Stout, professor of securities law at the University of California, Los Angeles, said Credit Suisse's four-year stock deferral was at the outer limit of what many banks were considering.

She said many other banks were thinking of changing compensation practices along similar lines to rein in practices that made multimillionaires out of many financial executives during the housing bubble.

"You get a sense that there is a cultural shift in boardrooms and a new awareness about looking to the longer term," she said.

At a meeting of the G-20 last month, leaders agreed on recommendations to defer bonus payouts for several years and reduce the incentives for people to take short-term gambles, although they avoided any explicit call for a ceiling on remuneration. The return to big profits at some banks and big bonus payouts, even at firms that received billion-dollar federal bailouts, has raised questions about whether compensation should be even more tightly controlled.

In the summer, the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, a financial industry trade group, put forward guidelines on best practices, which included tying bonuses more closely to long-term performance and a more independent role for bank compensation committees.

The Federal Reserve is now preparing to release its own guidance on compensation for the more than 5,000 banks it regulates. It would cover staff at all levels within banks, not just at the most senior levels, and would apply to Goldman and Morgan Stanley, which became bank holding companies last year.

In broad scope, the new rules being considered depart from the largely hands-off approach that dominated bank regulation in the United States for the last three decades. They give banks freedom in how they structure their compensation. The rules are intended to inhibit pay plans that encourage reckless behavior by rewarding only short-term gains. But they would not stop million-dollar pay packages or address issues of fairness.

The stimulus bill that President Obama signed into law this year restricts companies that accept federal bailouts from paying bonuses that exceed one-third of an executive's total annual compensation.

Now, Kenneth R. Feinberg, the administration's pay czar, is due to publish by Oct. 30 his finding on pay at the seven major banks that still have not returned large amounts of federal support.

His report will include judgments on the 25 most heavily compensated executives at each of the banks—citing pay levels and composition of pay, and whether compensation is properly aligned with performance.

#### CREDIT SUISSE ANNOUNCES ITS COMPENSATION STRUCTURE FOR 2009 AND 2010

ZURICH.—October 20, 2009.—Credit Suisse today announced its compensation structure for 2009 and 2010. The new structure is consistent with the guidelines for best practice that were recently announced at the G-20 summit and reaffirms the Bank's commitment to fair, balanced and performance-oriented compensation policies that align long-term employee and shareholder interests.

Brady W. Dougan, CEO of Credit Suisse Group, said: "At a time of strong focus on executive compensation, we are announcing a compensation structure that enables us to strike the right balance between paying our employees competitively, doing what is right for our shareholders and responding appropriately to regulatory initiatives and political as well as public concerns."

"We have been using deferred, share-based compensation instruments for many years and we continue to be committed to these principles. They are at the heart of our compensation structure for 2009 and 2010."

"The changes to our compensation system follow a number of measures Credit Suisse has taken over the past two years in response to changes in the financial services sector. These measures include making adjustments to our business strategy, signifi-

cantly reducing our risk exposures, including introducing a reduced-risk, capital-efficient business model in the Investment Bank, and strengthening our capital base."

#### OVERVIEW OF KEY FEATURES

The changes announced today will be effective from January 1, 2010 and will apply to compensation awarded for the year 2009. The most important features of the structure are:

1. A shift in the mix of discretionary variable (bonus) and fixed compensation for Managing Directors and Directors, which will result in a change in the proportion of non-deferred compensation paid as fixed base salary.

2. The introduction of two new instruments for deferred variable compensation awarded to Managing Directors and Directors: Scaled Incentive Share Units (SISU) and Adjustable Performance Plan Awards (APPA). A significant proportion of this population's variable compensation will be delivered in these new type of awards (50% each).

SISU are similar to Incentive Share Units (ISU), an equity based instrument that has been in place for the past three years. The new SISU will deliver a base share amount on a four-year pro-rata basis. Delivery of additional shares will depend on the average share price as well as return on equity (RoE) over four years.

APPA is a cash-based award which will have a notional value that adjusts upward annually based on Credit Suisse's RoE over three years. A mechanism will adjust the outstanding awards downward, should the business area of the employee be loss-making.

The principles and instruments used for Managing Directors and Directors also apply to members of the Executive Board but not to employees at the level of Vice President or below.

In addition, Credit Suisse will introduce minimum requirements relating to Credit Suisse share ownership for members of Divisional and Regional Management Committees and for the Executive Board.

#### CONFORMITY WITH G20 GUIDELINES AND REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT

The new structure and the new vehicles are consistent with the guidelines for best compensation practices that were recently announced at the G-20 summit and reaffirm the Bank's commitment to fair, balanced and performance-oriented compensation policies that align long-term employee and shareholder interests. Credit Suisse will continue to refine the provisions of the plan as well as the governance process for compensation decisions and disclosure to shareholders, based on competitive factors and the evolving regulatory environment.

#### DETAILS OF THE CHANGES IN COMPENSATION 2009/2010

The following is a brief summary of the changes and the new compensation instruments announced today. A detailed description will be included in the Group's Annual Report 2009.

#### CHANGES TO BASE SALARY FOR MANAGING DIRECTORS AND DIRECTORS

In order to strike an appropriate balance between fixed and variable compensation, Credit Suisse is planning a shift in the mix of variable and fixed compensation for Managing Directors and Directors. This will result in the payment of an increased proportion of compensation in the form of fixed base salary. Employees up to and including Vice Presidents will continue to be reviewed for potential annual salary adjustments, consistent with previous practice.

## VARIABLE COMPENSATION

## Cash Awards

Discretionary variable compensation will continue to be paid in unrestricted cash for amounts below CHF 125,000 / USD 100,000 (or the local currency equivalent). For higher amounts, table will indicate the proportion of variable compensation subject to deferral. Deferred compensation will be split 50/50 between SISU and APPA.

## SCALED INCENTIVE SHARE UNITS

Scaled Incentive Share Units (SISU) are similar to the existing Incentive Share Units (ISU) with a new element that increases or decreases in value based on Credit Suisse's average RoE. As with traditional ISU, the base share amount vests annually, in the case of SISU on a four-year, pro-rata basis. My additional shares will vest on the fourth anniversary of the award date, based on the price of Credit Suisse Group AG registered shares. A new feature will link the final number of additional shares to an additional factor: If Credit Suisse's average RoE over the four-year period is higher than a pre-set target, the number of additional shares will be adjusted upwards, and if it is below the target, the number of additional shares will decrease.

## ADJUSTABLE PERFORMANCE PLAN AWARDS

Adjustable Performance Plan Awards (APPA) will have a notional cash value subject to a three-year, pro-rata vesting schedule. Awards adjust upward on an annual basis using Credit Suisse's RoE in the respective year as a multiplier. However, should a business area be loss-making, outstanding APP awards held by employees of that business area will be adjusted downwards. The metrics within the revenue divisions will be based on each business area's financial contribution. The metrics for Shared Services, Regional Management and embedded support functions within the divisions will be based on the financial performance of Credit Suisse Group.

[From Reuters, Oct. 22, 2009]

**CZAR TO SUBSTANTIALLY CUT PAY: SUMMERS**  
(By Caren Bohan and Karey Wutkowski)

WASHINGTON (Reuters).—Top White House economic adviser Lawrence Summers said on Wednesday the administration's pay czar will "substantially reduce" the paychecks at firms that have received billions of taxpayer dollars.

"With respect to the companies that have been major recipients of federal support, Ken Feinberg is reviewing them . . . (and) will, I suspect, produce an outcome where they will be very substantially reduced," Summers told the Reuters Washington Summit.

Feinberg, the pay czar appointed by President Barack Obama in June, is expected to cut total compensation by an average of 50 percent for the top earners at seven bailed-out firms, sources familiar with the matter said on Wednesday.

The administration has faced public outrage, as Wall Street firms that were recently propped up by federal assistance have brought their bonuses back to pre-crisis levels even as the general population faces the highest unemployment level in 26 years.

Summers said Feinberg's rulings—which are expected to be publicly released in the coming days—will ensure taxpayers' interests come before those of shareholders and incumbent management at the beleaguered firms.

The seven bailed-out firms under Feinberg's jurisdiction are AIG, Bank of America, Citigroup, General Motors, Chrysler, GMAC and Chrysler Financial.

## SEES FINANCIAL REFORM BY YEAR END

Summers also said he was still hopeful that legislation to broadly rewrite U.S. fi-

ancial regulations would pass by the end of the year.

"I don't see any reason why it can't get done this year," Summers said.

Analysts following the debate on Capitol Hill have become increasingly skeptical that Obama can meet his goal of enacting it by year-end. Some say that early next year might be a more realistic time frame.

While some critics say the bill is not robust enough, Summers said he believed the changes would have a chance to have a major impact on financial stability for years to come.

He said that while the administration wants to guard against efforts by the financial industry to water down the bill, he said the main principles behind it were not at risk.

"I've always put this in terms of some core principles," Summers said.

If an institution is big enough and interconnected enough that its failure could damage the financial system, then it must have a regulator that is accountable, he said. "And there has to be a plan in place for managing your failure if it comes."

Summers said the proposals under consideration achieve that goal.

## TAXPAYERS FIRST

The administration is also committed to fundamentally reforming pay, starting at the firms that have received multiple government bailouts, Summers said.

"It is important where taxpayers have made a central contribution to make sure that taxpayer interests are being put first rather than those of shareholders and certainly rather than those of incumbent management and that's why Ken Feinberg is involved in reviewing compensation levels at the companies where the TARP has made the most major investments."

Officials have also proposed a broad crackdown on pay, including giving shareholders more say on compensation packages, forcing firms to disclose more on their pay practices and encouraging regulators to shut down risky compensation schemes.

"With respect to companies that are not currently recipients of major support, the focus is really going to be more on process and more on the incentives they create," Summers said.

Amid the rhetoric of a strong clampdown on compensation that encourages risk taking, the administration has been careful to say it does not believe in setting explicit caps.

Summers said the administration is sensitive to the need for firms to keep top talent and remain competitive, while not letting Wall Street return to its old ways.

"We are concerned that some in the financial sector would like to go back to the regulatory nonculture and risk management nonculture of the recent past. That wouldn't be acceptable to us," he said. "But the president's always said that we think it's very important that people succeed in America so framing this in terms of the goal being to reduce profits or to eliminate compensation, that would not be our approach."

[From Financial Times, Oct. 21, 2009]

**UK BANK GOVERNOR CALLS FOR LENDERS'**  
**BREAK-UP**

(By Chris Giles)

Banks should be split into separate utility companies and risky ventures, governor of the Bank of England Mervyn King urged last night, saying it was a "delusion" to think tougher regulation would prevent future financial crises.

Mr. King's call for a break-up of banks to prevent them becoming "too important to

fail" puts him sharply at odds with the direction of domestic and international banking reform.

Mr. King borrowed Churchillian language in a speech in Scotland to highlight the burden banks had placed on taxpayers. "Never in the field of financial endeavour has so much money been owed by so few to so many. And, one might add, so far with little real reform."

The forcefulness of Mr King's language reflects his belief that the structure of the banks needs to be put firmly on the international regulatory agenda, where focus has been on strengthening capital and regulating bankers' pay. The Bank governor wants to see the utility aspects of banking—payment systems and deposit taking—hived off from more speculative ventures such as proprietary trading. "There are those who claim that such proposals are impractical. It is hard to see why," he said.

Although he said ideas to force banks to hold debt that automatically turns into equity in a crisis were "worth a try", he downplayed their likely effect. "The belief that appropriate regulation can ensure that speculative activities do not result in failures is a delusion."

Many experts believe the governor will get his way on separation but by default rather than by design, because proposals for tighter capital regulations on risky parts of banking will make these unprofitable and banks will choose to ditch them.

**U.S.-COLOMBIA FREE TRADE**  
**AGREEMENT**

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reaffirm my long-standing support for the Colombian people, the Colombian-American community in south Florida, and to urge my colleagues to approve the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement as soon as possible.

Colombia is one of our strongest allies in the fight against extremism and drug trafficking, not only in our hemisphere, but around the world.

When I was first elected, Colombia was under siege. Leftist rebel groups and drug cartels such as the FARC and the Medellin and Cali Cartels had taken over large areas of that country. Colombians were prisoners in their own land, fearful for their lives, and watching their country descend further into chaos and darkness. Now, however, after many years of bravery and sacrifice, the Colombian people and its government have taken back their country, and each year Colombia becomes more secure and more prosperous. Colombians have continued to do so despite the unrelenting attack and assault by known FARC sympathizers and supporters of Hugo Chavez and Fidel Castro to derail Colombia's progress. Well, the government and the people in Colombia have persevered.

At a time when U.S. interests throughout the hemisphere are under attack, Colombia has remained a steadfast ally, an indispensable partner in ensuring our security and freedom in the region. The pending U.S.-Colombia

Defense Cooperation Agreement will further strengthen that alliance and will serve as a major boost to our joint efforts to fight narco-traffickers and leftist rebels.

In discussing this agreement last month, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton highlighted, "This agreement ensures that appropriate protections are in place for our servicemembers. It will allow us to continue working together to meet the challenges posed by narco-traffickers, terrorists, and other illegal armed groups in Colombia."

Together, the U.S. and Colombia have had enormous success in battling those groups, but much more remains to be done. This agreement will ensure that we are fully equipped to do so.

The United States and Colombia also share growing economic ties. The U.S. is the largest source of foreign investment in Colombia, which has quadrupled over the past 7 years. My own district in Miami, Florida, had nearly \$6 billion in total trade with Colombia in 1 year alone.

Colombia is Miami's number one trading partner in volume and second leading international market. But although U.S.-Colombian economic ties are strong, we have only just begun to tap their potential. That will require passage of the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement.

Unfortunately, the free trade agreement has been in limbo for 3 years, largely because of partisan opposition. But opponents fail to understand that the primary purpose of this trade pact is to eliminate Colombia's barriers to U.S. goods. Colombia would immediately eliminate a majority of its tariffs on U.S. exports, with all remaining tariffs eventually phasing out gradually. More exports means more sales, which means more jobs here in the U.S. The benefits would be felt immediately.

The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates that U.S. exports to Colombia would quickly increase by over \$1 billion, and that's not even counting a major increase in service-related exports.

Given today's difficult economic climate, with so many hardworking Americans striving to make ends meet, it is unbelievable that Congress continues to refuse to take the simple step to expand trade and create jobs in this country.

But there is more at stake, Mr. Speaker. By strengthening Colombia's ability to fight drug traffickers and fight leftist guerrillas, and by demonstrating that the U.S. will stand by its loyal ally, passage of this trade agreement will advance U.S. security and economic interests not only in that country, but throughout the hemisphere. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to approve the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement and to do so as soon as possible.

Again, I would like to commend the people of Colombia for their remarkable progress that they have achieved

and express my ongoing support for the strong ties between our countries. We are blessed in south Florida to have a wonderful, robust, patriotic, American-loving, Colombian-American community. They have, indeed, enriched our area.

#### DEMOCRATS' PLANS TO REFORM HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the Democrats' plans to "reform" our health care system.

You know, many promises have been made by the other side of the aisle about what these reforms would actually do, but now we actually have a definitive analysis, performed by the chief government actuary of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, to look at the consequences of these reforms. Well, Mr. Speaker, the diagnosis is not that good.

Both the President and his economic advisors have said that whatever bill the President signs he wants to make sure that he bends the cost curve. Well, how does the Democrat health care stack up to that pledge?

□ 1215

According to that chief actuary whom I just mentioned, total spending on health care would actually increase by \$750 billion more than if we did nothing at all. That's right. The Democrats' plan would bend the cost curve all right, but it would bend it in the wrong direction. You see, the real overall cost of this bill would be \$1.2 trillion. That's with a T. By 2019, the annual cost of the entitlement expansion would be \$236 billion, and that would be rising at an annual rate of 9 percent every year. After all of this spending, there would still be around 20-some-odd million uninsured Americans. So, for those folks who are trying to keep score of all of this, that comes out to be about \$35,000 per uninsured person out there.

Now, another promise that the President made was that he said, "if you like your current coverage, you keep it." Well, again, look back to that government actuary whom we talked about before. According to that chief actuary, that's not true if you're a senior on Medicare, because 8.5 million seniors on Medicare today would lose their current coverage, and they would be forced into some different coverage.

Also contained in the bill are what we call arbitrary, across-the-board payment cuts to hospitals, to nursing homes and to home health agencies. Again, let's see what the chief actuary says. The chief actuary says the cuts could force such organizations, such as nursing homes and home health agencies, to leave the Medicare program and, thus, "possibly jeopardizing access

to care for beneficiaries." That doesn't really sound like keeping the coverage you want, does it?

So maybe now, finally, the Democrat leadership in Congress will start to listen to at least a few of the ideas put forward by the Republicans. What we want to do is try to increase the access to health care coverage, to increase access to the health care delivery system and to make insurance more portable and affordable. What we want to do is try to reduce those long-term spending plans and to reduce the curve downward in order to bring down the cost of medical liability and to create a sustainable health care system.

Finally, at the end of the day, Republicans stand today, as we have always in the past, ready to work with the Democrats to enact real reform to our health care delivery system as soon as they are ready to work with us.

#### UNCLE SAM IS GOING BROKE

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this is a poster of Uncle Sam going broke. America is going broke, and we are taking away the future economic security of our children, grandchildren and of everyone listening.

The national debt is racing toward \$12 trillion, and it is growing at rates that haven't been matched since World War II. It will double over the next 10 years.

Maya MacGuineas, president of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, hit the nail on the head in this week's National Journal when she said, "It's like fiscal jenga, where people are piling on more and more debt, and finally, something's going to be the cause of it collapsing, but no one believes their thing is going to be the tipping point."

Why is this Congress, Mr. Speaker, willing to keep piling on the debt? Why are we turning a blind eye toward our children and grandchildren?

The FY 2009 fiscal year ending September 30 registered a \$1.4 trillion deficit, leaving red ink as far as the eye can see, and leaving trillion dollar deficits as far as the eye can see. Medicare and Social Security add up to a massive \$57 trillion in promises Uncle Sam has made but can't keep.

Make no mistake. Unsustainable spending has far-reaching implications for the United States. It touches every sector from health care to job creation, and it gives the foreign investors who hold America's debt more control.

What is this administration doing? Is Congress prepared to let America sink? How can this Congress stand by record joblessness that is almost reaching 10 percent? Does Congress care?

Our manufacturing base is crumbling. The state of the dollar is falling. Foreign lenders own nearly 40 percent of our domestic economy, and China

and Saudi Arabia have now become our bankers. If lawmakers in this body were serious about the debt and about the deficit issues that Americans are increasingly worried about, Congress would have an honest conversation and would do something about it.

In June of 2006, they stood in the same place, and spoke about the introduction of a bill called the SAFE Commission Act. They explained that the country is having trouble. It's a bipartisan commission, and it puts every spending program on. It comes back and requires—it requires, Mr. Speaker—that Congress vote up or down. In a bipartisan manner, Congressman COOPER and I have had this bill in now for 3 years.

I have little faith that this Congress will act through regular order and will tackle this enormous, growing problem. It will take this approach: Instead of dealing with these issues, Congress will ignore them.

In closing, it reminds me of the Simon and Garfunkel song, which they sang in Central Park, called "The Boxer." It says: Man hears what he wants to hear, and disregards the rest. I would change the words to say: Congress hears only what it wants to hear, and disregards the rest.

Therefore, this Congress is allowing Uncle Sam to go broke. It is time for us to deal with it in a bipartisan way for the good of our children, for the good of our grandchildren and for the good of everyone who lives in this country.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### MOVING GUANTANAMO DETAINEES TO U.S. SOIL AND CONGRESSIONAL TRANSPARENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 2009, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the Speaker for the recognition.

Yesterday was a very interesting day in an open hearing in the Intelligence Committee. It's something that doesn't happen very often. We had the opportunity to hear from a small business person from Standish, Michigan—Dave Munson. The hearing was about congressional notification.

When is it the requirement of the executive branch, of the President and of the executive agencies, to fully brief Congress in a timely manner on the actions that they are taking?

The law is fairly clear. Congress needs to be fully and currently informed of intelligence matters.

So why would David Munson, a small business man from a small town in northern Michigan, be testifying in front of the Intelligence Committee?

David Munson is asking that this Congress, that the Michigan legislature, that the city council in Standish, and that the citizens of Standish, Michigan be fully and completely informed and be on a timely basis informed on what this administration's policies are for moving Guantanamo prisoners to the United States.

On January 22, the President made a statement that he now is finding is very, very difficult to finish. He promised that, within 12 months, the prison in Guantanamo would be closed and that the Gitmo detainees would be moved somewhere else, either overseas or perhaps to the United States. Many of us who have been working on this issue for years recognized how ill-advised the President's statement could be.

President Bush had said that he wanted Guantanamo closed, and as he started taking a look at how he would make it happen, he found out it was very, very difficult to do. He diminished the number of detainees in Gitmo, but he wasn't able to close it completely. President Obama, really with no analysis, said he would close it in 12 months. He has now found out how difficult that is.

Other countries don't want to take these detainees. They don't want to take them into their countries. We don't want them in the United States. As soon as they move from Cuba to the United States, they get a whole new set of legal rights and legal authorities. So why would we want to do that for some of the most dangerous people in the world? Yet the President seems committed to moving these people to the United States.

One of the sites that he is supposedly investigating, or that the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice are considering, is a closed corrections facility in Standish, Michigan. The Department of Defense has been there. Mr. Munson believes that some of the elected officials in the commu-

nity are having ongoing discussions with the Department of Defense about moving these detainees, these prisoners, to the State of Michigan even though the community is opposed.

Just like most of Michigan, this is a community that is hurting. We've got a 15.3 percent unemployment rate—the highest unemployment rate in the country, so we need an economic stimulus; but what the people of that community have said is we don't need an al Qaeda stimulus in our community. If the President is considering moving these prisoners to Michigan, what they do want is transparency. They would like to know exactly what the status of the negotiations is.

Are there negotiations actually taking place? If there are, then they'd like to know: What's the impact on our community going to be? They'd like to have a better understanding.

As Mr. Munson said yesterday, exactly who are these individuals we're considering moving into our community? What are their backgrounds? Why are they being held in Gitmo? Why have we detained them for years? He would also like to know, as would other people in the community, if we've held these people in Gitmo for a number of years, what have we learned while we have held these people in detention? What kinds of risks and challenges might they pose to the people who are guarding them and to the community where they are housed? What has been our experience in holding al Qaeda and radical jihadists in prisons around the world? Have there been attempted prison breaks? Have there been attempted prison entries where people outside have targeted the communities where these facilities are held?

These are the kinds of questions that the people in Standish, Michigan and the people of Michigan want answers to. The people in Standish have asked for that information. The Michigan legislature has asked for transparency. I have asked for transparency as the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, but consistently, Secretary Gates and the Obama administration have replied with stone silence. They are totally unwilling to share any information with elected officials or with the citizens of Standish about what their plans and intentions may or may not be.

For an administration that said we are going to be transparent, to have a hearing in the Intelligence Committee where we're saying we want to talk about transparency and about what some would say is a lack of transparency by the previous administration and now by this administration and about keeping Congress fully and completely informed on a timely basis, it was the perfect hearing in which to have that discussion.

What David Munson clearly articulated is that people in Michigan and people in Standish are concerned, and they want answers. This administration has been unwilling to keep the



citizens of Standish informed on this issue. It is disappointing. This is a community that is concerned about their economic future. They are concerned about the character of their community. They are concerned about the future. With the closing of the corrections facility in Standish recently, the city faces some very, very tough economic times. The community faces tough economic times. A lot of people have lost their jobs because of the decisions that have been made by the State of Michigan.

So they're trying to wrestle, and they're trying to deal with those issues, but the thing that they realize is that, as they move forward and as they look toward the future as to how they're going to fill it, they would just like some information. They would like some information and some transparency from this administration, and they're disappointed that they're not getting it.

Today, again, we reiterate the request to the Department of Defense, to the Department of Justice and to the Obama administration: Please, please be more transparent in what your plans and intentions are for the Gitmo detainees because there are two debates. There are many of us who believe that even considering moving the Gitmo detainees to U.S. soil is a genuinely bad idea.

□ 1230

Let's have that debate. Let's have that debate first, and then if somehow at the conclusion of that debate there are still people who believe that moving these individuals to the United States is a good idea, then let's be fully transparent as to the ramifications, the risks, and the implications to local communities.

What we have seen so far is that the Obama administration is totally unwilling to engage in the first debate as to why and what the benefits are to closing Gitmo and moving those prisoners to the United States. Now they have moved directly to the second, without any consideration or any dialogue on the first, and now they are doing the second one in total secrecy.

It is time to change that process. I think it is time to go back to the beginning of this process and reconsider that first decision that says we are going to close Gitmo. Then I think what we will find out is this second discussion may not even be needed.

PROVIDING HEALTH INSURANCE TO EVERY  
AMERICAN

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I want to just change the topic now to how to insure every American on health care.

A colleague of mine wrote an op-ed that was published in the Wall Street Journal recently that said there are different ways to ensure that every American has access to health insurance. People say, do Republicans have a plan? Of course we have plans. We have had plans for a number of years on ways to address the health crisis or

the problems that we face in health care and with health insurance in America today. We were very, very clear that there is a plan that can do that. We also identified what some of the problems may be.

If you take a look at why we have some of the issues, go to your local hospitals. Go to your local doctors. Ask them, when someone comes in with government health care, Medicare or Medicaid, how are you reimbursed for the expenses that you incur? And what they will typically tell you is, well, if someone comes in with a Medicaid card, for every dollar of expenses that we incur, we receive about 40 cents of reimbursement. If they come in as a Medicare patient, they will say, well, that is a little bit better. We get paid at about 60 cents for every dollar of expenses we incur.

You ask, why is the private sector being squeezed and why do you see the insurance rates in the private sector going up? It is because the government programs are terrible payers and the cost has to be borne by the private sector.

There are really five types of patients that will walk into a health care facility: those that are on Medicaid; those that are on Medicare; those that have private insurance; the fourth would be those that have no insurance, they are going to pay out of their pocket; and then the last would be uncompensated care, people that go into an emergency room or go into a doctor's office, they are sick, they are going to get the care, but they have no way to pay for the care that they are going to receive.

All of those, everything except the private insurance plans, they are all squeezing private insurance, and that is what is forcing private insurance plans to escalate their costs and their premiums very quickly. Think about what would happen if the government programs actually paid \$1 of reimbursement for \$1 of care given.

The other thing that we find is that our Tax Code incentivizes employer-provided health care, rewards health insurance companies by insulating them from accountability, and punishes those that lack employer-provided care. If individuals want to go out and buy health insurance for themselves, the Tax Code penalizes them, versus their neighbor who may be getting it from their employer. We need to fix this.

But the bottom line that we come to in terms of insurance and making sure that every American has access to insurance is to empower patients and to give them more choice. We are going to talk a little bit about the alternative plans that are out there in just a minute. But our focus is driving towards patient choice, patient affordability, providing the mechanisms in the Tax Code and through tax credits or subsidies to enable individuals to go out and access health care, rather than having the government-run health care.

It is a very, very different model between the two parties, one of which says we are going to empower individuals and give them access and they are going to keep the authority and the responsibility and the accountability and the opportunity to go out and buy their own health care, ensuring that they keep that power and that control.

We are not empowering anybody. That is a word that we use all too often here, that we are "empowering." No. Individuals already have that authority. The Constitution protects those kinds of individual rights and individual freedoms. They are not getting that from this Congress. They are getting that because that is what the Founding Fathers gave to them. Now what we want to do is create a framework so they are better able to use that power and have access to health care.

On this side of the aisle—and you saw it more recently with the passage of the Baucus bill out of committee over on the Senate side as well as in the bills that have come out in the House side—what do we see? What we see is, rather than individuals having the power, it is this body and Congress taking the power from individuals and taking it into this body and then giving it to Federal bureaucracies. And we know what happens when those decisions move from individuals to Washington.

As a matter of fact, there was an op-ed written in the Investor Business Daily, again written by Congressman SHADDEGG and myself, and the title of that op-ed, as they put it on, we did not, but it says "Lies, Earmarks and Corruption All in One Bill." You kind of take a look at it and say, that is a pretty harsh indictment of a piece of legislation moving its way through Congress. Let me tell you where John and I see some of the evidence of this.

People talk about this legislation and they say, well, it reduces the deficit by \$70 billion or \$80 billion over the first 10 years. And you look at it and say, yes, as my colleague before said, it is time for us to address the deficit. You say, yes, we are excited about that.

But then you peel back the layers and you say, but how does it do that? We have got this massive expansion of health care to more Americans and these types of things. How do we do that and save money? As you peel back the layers, it says, yes, the taxes start day one when this bill goes into effect, but the benefits or the expansion of health care really doesn't start until year 3 or 4. So we have got 10 years of taxes and only 7 years or 6 years of health care.

Well, what happens when we have 10 years of health care and 10 years of taxes? Same old thing. We are back to massive new deficits. Is that a lie? I don't know. But it sure looks like Enron-style accounting. People in the private sector have gone to jail for similar types of accounting.



They also indicate that they are going to pay for this with \$404 billion of cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. If there are those types of savings available in Medicare and Medicaid, let's do those right now. The reality is those types of savings aren't identified in Medicare and Medicaid. They never have been. As a matter of fact, the other body now is considering a doctor fix. They are not going to put it into this health care bill. Why? Because it is an increase of \$250 billion of reimbursements to doctors. It is called the doc fix.

So rather than finding savings in Medicare and Medicaid, what they are identifying is massive new expenditures for Medicare and Medicaid; \$133 billion in cuts to Medicare Advantage.

Earmarks. There are State earmarks. Think about it. There are people from different States in this auditorium and on the floor of the House. There are new massive mandates in here for Medicaid, expansion of Medicaid.

You say, well, let's apply those equally across all 50 States. The mandates go across all 50 States. In 46 of those States, the States have to pick up their share of the costs of these new mandates. In Michigan, it would normally mean we would pick up 40 percent of the cost of these new mandates. But, for some reason, four States are exempted. The Federal Government will pick up 100 percent of the expanded Medicaid costs. Michigan is one of those States. I say to the other 46 States, thank you, in this case, for subsidizing Michigan health care.

There is another feature in here, another earmark, where there are going to be new taxes for individuals who have golden health insurance plans. What is the earmark? You would think this new tax would apply equally to all 50 States. Wrong. Seventeen States are exempted and only phase into this program over a period of time. You say thank you to the other 33 States, because you are now subsidizing, in this case, 17 States who will not have new taxes imposed on them.

Those Senators, those Members of the House, maybe were more effective in negotiating and saying, I will only vote for this health care if you exempt us from the Medicaid, the new Medicaid fees, or if you exempt our State from the new taxes.

It hardly seems fair. It hardly seems to have much to do with the delivery of quality and quantity of health care. It seems to reflect more on who has power and who does not have power in the process of designing this new legislation.

There is a better way. As I have gone through and as some of my colleagues have gone through and said, you know, let's take a look at health care. At one of my first town meetings, someone said, PETE, I know you came out of the business world. Now, you came out of Herman Miller and you came out of a marketing background, but you were working for a Fortune 500 company,

and because you worked in product development, you spent a lot of time working with engineers. Take a look at our health care system from an engineer's standpoint.

What an engineer would do is they would look at this thing systemically. They would identify where the problems were in the system, what parts of the system were broken and what parts of the system actually worked. Then they would focus in like a laser on fixing the parts of the system that were broken and leave the rest of the system working. That is kind of where we are with health care.

Eighty-five percent of Americans have health care. Surveys indicate that most of these folks are satisfied with the health care that they are getting, but they are also compassionate and saying we ought to take a look at fixing the parts of the system that right now are barriers to other Americans getting health care.

So the question is, why not focus on those? I have introduced and sponsored a series of bills that say, let's take a look at these seven targeted fixes for health care reform. They address the issues of cost, so that we have more competition. We have the tax credits and the cost subsidies, so every American will have the resources to go out and buy insurance. And they will also have an opportunity to have more choice, and there will be more competition, so that prices should come down.

In terms of access, we are also going there, because we are saying we do need to do something. It is inherently unfair that individuals who have a pre-existing condition find it difficult, if not impossible, to access health care in America. Let's make sure that we put in place a process in our insurance system that allows people that have pre-existing conditions to make sure that they are covered and that they also have the opportunity to have the confidence that if they get a different illness or they get a different health care problem, that they are covered and they can be covered for their pre-existing condition and other things that may happen to them.

Then we put in a bill that deals with tort reform. All of these bills could be implemented immediately, and in 3 years we would find out how much impact we have had. As a matter of fact, these things could be implemented right now. We would have 3 years of experience in improving our current health care system, and in 3 years we could say, how much have these programs and these bills improved health insurance and health quality and quantity in America? If they are working, we could say, okay, maybe we have to tweak them, we have to modify them a little bit.

But why the 3-year window? Remember that under the President's plan, the health care programs don't kick in for 3 years.

□ 1245

And at the rate that we're going, you wonder why 3 years. It also happens to

be, means they'll kick in after the next election, so Americans who will lose their health insurance or will have to change their health insurance, they won't be hit with that reality until after the next Presidential election. Interesting timing.

But when we get to health care, there's a way to improve health care that says we're going to enable individuals, individual American citizens, to keep the power that they have to direct their health care, the choices that they have versus a plan that says we're going to have that choice and that opportunity and that freedom taken away from individuals and moved to the government and government bureaucracy where we see all the kinds of shenanigans that are going on in the current Senate bill and going on in the current House bills.

There is an alternative: Freedom versus massive government programs. And there are alternatives that go out and say, in a very targeted way, here's how we can address the issues and improve the access, the quality and the price of health care for every American and do it today, rather than waiting 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this gets to be a much more open process than what we have today, a much more open process than what we have had up until this point. It appears that some are driven and they've bought into the idea that government needs to run health care. That is fundamentally wrong because if we move in that direction, it means we will grow government and we will take freedom away from Americans. That is the wrong way to address this problem.

Let's bring Republicans and Democrats together, and let's focus on providing individuals the tools that they need to be able to go out and get the quality and the quantity of health care that they need and that they want.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. MAFFEI (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business in district.

Mr. MCCAUL (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of receiving St. Mary's Law School distinguished alumni award.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. WEINER, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. WOOLSEY for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, October 30.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, October 30.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, October 30.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on October 22, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 621. To require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the establishment of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America.

H.R. 2892. Making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 26, 2009, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4237. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Catastrophic Risk Protection Endorsement; Group Risk Plan of Insurance Regulations; and the Common Crop Insurance Regulations, Basic Provisions (RIN: 0563-AC19) received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4238. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — TRICARE; Reimbursement of Critical Access Hospitals (CAHs) [DoD-2008-HA-0007] (RIN: 0720-AB21) received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4239. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Final Rule Regarding Limited Amendment of the Temporary Liquidity Guarantee Program To Extend the Transaction Account Guarantee Program With Modified Fee Structure (RIN: 3064-AD37) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4240. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Federal Home Loan Bank Boards of Directors: Eligibility and Elections (RIN: 2590-AA03) received October 6, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4241. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Post-Employment Restriction for Senior Examiners (RIN: 2590-AA19) received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4242. A letter from the Acting Deputy General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Operating Fees (RIN: 3133-AD60) received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4243. A letter from the Chief, PRAB, Office of Research & Analysis, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — WIC Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (FMNP): Nondiscretionary Provisions of Public Law 108-265, the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 [FNS-2007-0008] (RIN: 0584-AD74) received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

4244. A letter from the Acting Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received October 6, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

4245. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 090206144-9697-02] (RIN: 0648-XQ95) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4246. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 09100091344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XR30) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4247. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 09100091344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XR20) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4248. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 09100090344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XR40) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4249. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule —

Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 09100091344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XR40) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4250. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fraser River Sockeye and Pink Salmon Fisheries; Notification of Inseason Orders; Correction [Docket No.: 0907301169-91204-01] (RIN: 0648-AY02) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4251. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries in the Western Pacific; Bottomfish and Seamount Groundfish Fisheries; Fishery Closure (RIN: 0648-XN78) received August 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4252. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts [Docket No.: 0809251266-81485-02] (RIN: 0648-XR11) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4253. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Shallow-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 0910091344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XR33) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4254. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Tilefish Fishery; Quota Harvested for Part-time Category [Docket No.: 010319075-1217-02] (RIN: 0648-XP75) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4255. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 29 [Docket No.: 090206149-91081-03] (RIN: 0648-AX39) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4256. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries in the Western Pacific; Pelagic Fisheries; Squid Jig Fisheries [Docket No.: 080206127-91246-03] (RIN: 0648-AS71) received September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4257. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 0810141351-9087-02] (RIN: 0648-XR43) received September 30, 2009, pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4258. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter regarding the efforts to create a "National Strategy for Child Exploitation and Interdiction", pursuant to Public Law 110-401; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4259. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vessel and Facility Response Plans for Oil: 2003 Removal Equipment Requirements and Alternative Technology Revisions [Docket No.: USCG-2001-8661] (RIN: 1625-AA26) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4260. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Direct Final Rule; Safety and Security Zones: Pilgrim Nuclear Power Plant, Plymouth, MA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0311] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4261. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Industry Director Directive #5 Tier I Mixed Service Costs received October 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4262. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance on 2009 Required Minimum Distributions [Notice 2009-82] received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4263. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2009-47) received October 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4264. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Interim Final Rules for Sections 101 through 103 of the Genetic Information Non-discrimination Act of 2008 (RIN: 0938-AP37) received October 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4265. A letter from the Senior Advisor, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Payments to Beneficiaries Residing in Vietnam and Cambodia and Other Conforming Changes [Docket No.: SSA-2008-0047] (RIN: 0960-AG62) received October 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4266. A letter from the Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's fourth quarterly report for fiscal year 2009 from the Office of Security and Privacy, pursuant to Public Law 110-53, section 803; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

#### 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. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2868. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to extend,

modify, and recodify the authority of the Secretary of Homeland Security to enhance security and protect against acts of terrorism against chemical facilities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-205, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1612. A bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service-learning opportunities on public lands, help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, and scenic resources, train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts, and promote the value of public service; with amendments (Rept. 111-312, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3258. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to enhance the security of the public water systems of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. 111-313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

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

The Committees on Agriculture and Education and Labor discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1612 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2868 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MAFFEI (for himself, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3919. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the designation of Clean Energy Business Zones and for tax incentives for the construction of, and employment at, energy-efficient buildings and clean energy facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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. BURGESS:

H.R. 3920. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a waiver of minimum required distribution rules applicable to pension plans for 2010; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana (for himself and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 3921. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for 90 days the first-time homebuyer credit for taxpayers who have entered into a binding contract before the termination of such credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN of Florida (for himself, Mr. MICA, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LIN-

DER, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. MACK, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SHULER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. KILROY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HIMES, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 3922. A bill to ensure that companies operating in the United States that receive United States Government funds are not conducting business in Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Foreign Affairs, 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. POLIS:

H.R. 3923. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain land located in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H. Res. 862. A resolution congratulating the staff, students, and faculty at the Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy for winning the 2009 Star Innovator in the Intel Schools of Distinction competition; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. MASSA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HIMES, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HODES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HALL of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. TITUS, Ms. KILROY, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H. Res. 863. A resolution recognizing the scourge of pneumonia, urging the United States and the world to mobilize cooperation and prioritize resources to fight pneumonia and save children's lives, and recognizing November 2 as World Pneumonia Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H. Res. 864. A resolution congratulating President Obama for winning of the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself and Mr. FILNER):

H. Res. 865. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should adopt a target of 350 parts per million of atmospheric carbon dioxide by which to evaluate domestic and international climate change policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. KIND (for himself and Mr. WAMP):

H. Res. 866. A resolution expressing support for designation of a National Veterans History Project Week to encourage public participation in a nationwide project that collects and preserves the stories of the men and women who served our nation in times of war and conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H. Res. 867. A resolution calling on the President and the Secretary of State to oppose unequivocally any endorsement or further consideration of the "Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict" in multilateral fora; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Ms. FALLIN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CHU, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. BARTLETT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MASSA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. REYES, Ms. SPIER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HARE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BOREN, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. SKELTON):

H. Res. 868. A resolution honoring and recognizing the service and achievements of current and former female members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. DENT (for himself, Mr. DRIEIER, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. FOX, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WALDEN, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. LANCE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CAMP, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr.

SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. GERLACH):

H. Res. 869. A resolution directing the Chief Administrative Officer to install cameras in the hearing room of the Committee on Rules; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 450: Mr. CARTER and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.  
 H.R. 571: Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.  
 H.R. 644: Mrs. CAPPS and Mrs. MALONEY.  
 H.R. 775: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. CUELLAR.  
 H.R. 929: Mr. KING of New York.  
 H.R. 1132: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mrs. HALVORSON.  
 H.R. 1207: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 1250: Mrs. CAPPS.  
 H.R. 1352: Mr. SHUSTER.  
 H.R. 1362: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. HINCHEY.  
 H.R. 1616: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BOSWELL, and Ms. Chu.  
 H.R. 1831: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. REYES.  
 H.R. 1884: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, and Mr. TERRY.  
 H.R. 1974: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. LEE of New York, and Mr. UPTON.  
 H.R. 1987: Mr. FORTENBERRY.  
 H.R. 1990: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.  
 H.R. 2024: Mr. SPACE.  
 H.R. 2102: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 2275: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, and Mr. CONYERS.  
 H.R. 2279: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.  
 H.R. 2377: Mr. KRATOVIL.  
 H.R. 2382: Mr. HARE.  
 H.R. 2406: Mr. CALVERT.  
 H.R. 2413: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HARE, and Ms. GIFFORDS.  
 H.R. 2452: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.  
 H.R. 2534: Mr. SNYDER.  
 H.R. 2547: Mr. SCALISE.  
 H.R. 2548: Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 2567: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.  
 H.R. 2642: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.  
 H.R. 2756: Mr. SCHRADER.  
 H.R. 2807: Mr. SESTAK and Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 2880: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.  
 H.R. 3024: Mr. WAMP and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 3044: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 3245: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 3286: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 3355: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 3467: Mr. KRATOVIL.

H.R. 3519: Mr. GRAVES, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 3524: Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 3669: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3677: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 3702: Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 3711: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3715: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 3731: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 3734: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 3790: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 3799: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 3827: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3906: Mr. MICHAUD.

H. Con. Res. 168: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. SCALISE.

H. Res. 22: Mr. WELCH.

H. Res. 333: Mr. FILNER and Mr. OLVER.

H. Res. 704: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Ms. SUTTON.

H. Res. 729: Mr. CALVERT.

H. Res. 736: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. HOLT.

H. Res. 747: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. LAMBORN.

H. Res. 749: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H. Res. 763: Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 780: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, and Mr. TEAGUE.

H. Res. 787: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 798: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. STARK, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FARR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WU, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SIREN, Mr. LINDER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. INSLEE, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H. Res. 839: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HIMES, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. FARR, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. JONES, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. WU, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. WATSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SIREN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 848: Mr. HOLDEN.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF BILL COSBY, WINNER OF THE MARK TWAIN PRIZE FOR HUMOR

### HON. CHAKA FATTAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a hometown hero and constituent of mine—the distinguished and very funny Philadelphian, William Henry Cosby, Jr.

Bill Cosby has been tickling the nation's funny-bone and prodding its conscience throughout his adult life. He has won a trophy room of honors, but none like this one. Bill Cosby's talents and his insight have earned him the 12th annual Mark Twain Prize for American Humor, awarded by the Kennedy Center on October 26, 2009. The star-studded and laugh-filled presentation will be shown on PBS nationally on Wednesday, November 4, always one of PBS's most popular and acclaimed programs.

Bill Cosby—aka Heathcliff Huxtable, friend of Fat Albert, “America's Dad”—is no stranger to the nation's viewers and comedy fans. Less well known, but looming large in terms of character and values, is the Bill Cosby who has served as role model, activist, educator, author, anti-violence crusader, fundraiser and valued citizen of his native Philadelphia.

Bill Cosby was born in the Germantown section of Philadelphia into a modest family that valued hard work—the son of a maid and a Navy cook. He was raised in the Richard Allen Projects, attending Channing Wister Elementary, Fitzsimons Junior High, Central and Germantown High Schools, playing various roles as class clown, class president, star athlete, shoe repair apprentice, produce seller, and ultimately Navy hospital corpsman.

As a young adult he began a lifetime relationship with Philadelphia's premier public institution of higher learning, Temple University. Building on his high school equivalency diploma, earned through correspondence courses, he enrolled in Temple in 1961 on a track and field scholarship, also playing full-back. Cosby, telling jokes as he earned a living, interrupted his studies to pursue show business, returned to academia and ultimately received a bachelor's degree from Temple.

Eventually Bill Cosby would become Doctor Cosby. He earned a masters and a doctorate from the University of Massachusetts, a springboard to his later involvement in advocating for educational opportunity. But Bill Cosby, proud alum, has never left the Temple family, happily donning the cherry and white for football and basketball games, cheering on the Owls during and after the tenure of his close friend, Coach John Chaney.

Cheerleading isn't all Bill Cosby has done for Temple. He has endowed scholarships (including one for graduates of Philadelphia schools he attended), established a lecture se-

ries, generated the University's Cosby Scholarship Committee of the Provost's office, appeared at numerous fundraisers and alumni functions, and served as the public face for Temple on countless occasions.

Another side of the Bill Cosby Philadelphia Story is his anti-violence work. I have marched with Bill Cosby and my friend Bilal Qayyum through the streets of our city beneath the banner of Men United for a Better Philadelphia to denounce the scourge of violence, murder and gang activity. He has been outspoken—and raised considerable controversy—in denouncing the gang-minded culture and the negative, hateful cultural influences that fan street violence among our youth. He aimed his toughest words at parents, calling on them to step up and take responsibility for their children's education, safety and values.

Education has been another Cosby cause. He and I share the passion for leveling the playing field, providing every child the resources, the quality teachers and the full opportunity to achieve his or her dreams. Earlier this year he donned a T-shirt from Central High School to stand with Governor Ed Rendell and advocate for fairer school funding.

In his famous 2004 “Pound Cake Speech” Bill Cosby raised some hackles by telling African American parents they need to do a better job teaching their children morals at home. He chided those who “had forgotten the sacrifices of those in the civil rights movement” and declared that many young African Americans put too much emphasis on sports, fashion, and acting tough in the streets.

The controversies raised by Bill Cosby still ripple through communities of color, but the points he raises are valid. And of course he has never lost his sense of humor. In all these ways, Bill Cosby is a worthy recipient of the Mark Twain Prize and the legacy of Mark Twain himself.

I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating and thanking Bill Cosby, Philadelphian and American, upon this great occasion.

HONORING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF BENSENVILLE, ILLINOIS

### HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 125th Anniversary of the incorporation of Bensenville, Illinois, in the heart of my Congressional District.

In 1884, the Village of Bensenville was incorporated, and George Cogswell became its first President.

In the years since its humble founding, Bensenville has become a center of culture and commerce, serving as a home to busi-

nesses, professionals, churches and organizations that have made this a vibrant and thriving community. Over the years, Bensenville has developed a well-deserved reputation as an enjoyable place to live, work and raise a family.

On the occasion of this 125th Anniversary, we join together to celebrate Bensenville's legacy of growth and prosperity, and to look ahead to the opportunities facing our local community and our nation. Today both marks 125 years of working together to build a brighter future, and reminds us that our work continues.

Madam Speaker and Distinguished Colleagues, please join me in recognizing Bensenville Village President Frank Soto, the Village Board of Trustees and the citizens of Bensenville in wishing them happiness on this special occasion.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2010

SPEECH OF

### HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 22, 2009*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration of the bill (H.R. 3619) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes:

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3619, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010. In particular, I would like to express my support for Section 220, which requires that Coast Guard vessels homeported in Guam be repaired, overhauled and maintained at American facilities. This provision was included in H.R. 2830 the Coast Guard Reauthorization Act from the 110th Congress and which was included in a manager's amendment that was adopted on the floor. I appreciate Chairman OBERSTAR's and Chairman CUMMING's continued support for including this provision in this bill.

This section clarifies a current loophole in statute that will ensure that Coast Guard ships that protect the waterways of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands as well as the Federated States of Micronesia will be repaired by American workers. Furthermore, the maintenance funds authorized and appropriated by this body will be reinvested in the American economy. This is a common sense provision that simply extends to Guam the same repair American provisions that already apply to the rest of the United States. Again, I would like to express my appreciation to Chairman OBERSTAR of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and to Chairman CUMMINGS of the Coast Guard Subcommittee for their leadership on this bill and for including this provision.

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

## EARMARK DECLARATION

**HON. GEOFF DAVIS**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the Republican Leadership standards on earmarks, I am submitting the following information regarding earmarks I secured as part of H.R. 3183, the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010.

Requesting Member: Congressman GEOFF DAVIS

Bill Number: H.R. 3183

Account: Corps of Engineers—Investigations  
Legal Name of Requesting Entity: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Huntington District  
Address of Requesting Entity: 502 Eighth Street, Huntington, WV 25701

Description of Request: Appropriate \$1,793,000 for the Ohio River Basin Comprehensive Study, WV, KY, OH, PA, IL, VA, AL, TN, NY, MD, NC, MS & GA. Funds will help to complete the Reconnaissance Report and initiate the Feasibility Report. This project is an important use of taxpayer dollars because it is the first step in the development of a comprehensive analysis and strategy for the administration and management of the Ohio River Basin system. The project will eventually identify and document stakeholders and their needs for water resources products and services that are now or could be generated by the current system and will determine the current condition of the system infrastructure.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE  
OF JOE MASELLI**HON. STEVE SCALISE**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor my friend Joe Maselli, the son of Italian immigrants who passed away on October 18, 2009. Joe Maselli was a proud New Orleanian for over 60 years. He may best be known as a proud and tireless advocate for the preservation of Italian heritage and culture, and a devoted family man.

Joe Maselli earned his Bachelor of Arts degree from Tulane University and served for three years in the U.S. Army.

Joe devoted much of his life to the celebration of the Italian cultural contribution to America. He helped create the Italian Village at the 1984 Worlds Fair in New Orleans, and founded the American-Italian Renaissance Foundation, as well as the American-Italian Sports Hall of Fame, which awards scholarships to up and coming athletes and scholars.

Joe was an Ethnic Affairs Advisor to Presidents Ford, Carter, and Reagan. In 1992, the Governor of Louisiana chose him to chair the Louisiana Quincentenary Commission honoring Louisiana's 500th Anniversary.

Even with all of Joe's accomplishments, he always put his family first. Joe is survived by his wife of 63 years, Antoinette Cammarata, their four children, and eight grandchildren, which I know he considered his greatest accomplishments.

I extend my sincere condolences to the Maselli family and will work to ensure that the distinguished legacy of my friend Joe Maselli is not forgotten by future generations.

COLUMN: NET NEUTRALITY ISN'T  
A NEUTRAL TERM, AND IT ISN'T  
GOOD FOR THE NET**HON. JOHN SHIMKUS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I submit the following column, written by David Nicklaus of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

NET NEUTRALITY ISN'T A NEUTRAL TERM, AND  
IT ISN'T GOOD FOR THE NET

David Nicklaus, St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Some beats, like banking, need tougher cops, but others, like the Internet, are doing fine with no cop at all.

So when the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission weighs in on an important Internet issue by vowing to become "a smart cop on the beat," we should worry that the Web's best years, characterized by rapid growth with little regulation, may be behind it.

Of course, FCC Chairman Julius Genachowski doesn't characterize his stance that way. His idea of a "smart cop" is one who enforces the principle that all Internet traffic should be treated equally. And he argues that his brand of policing will encourage innovation, not stifle it.

The principle Genachowski endorsed this week—and one he intends to codify into FCC regulations—is referred to as net neutrality. Despite the lofty-sounding name, however, a net neutrality rule wouldn't be neutral. It would amount to favoring one group of Internet companies, the content creators, in an ongoing turf battle with broadband providers.

Broadband firms, like AT&T, Verizon and the cable TV industry, own the Internet's infrastructure. Companies like Google and eBay own the content that travels over those broadband networks.

These two groups obviously need each other, but that doesn't mean they have to like each other.

A net neutrality rule would require broadband providers to treat all content alike in terms of pricing and access. Without it, content companies worry they might face an extra fee for speedy delivery of bandwidth-gobbling applications, like video downloading sites or Internet telephone services.

Say Microsoft, for example, paid the fee, but Google didn't. Microsoft's site would get an unfair advantage, the net neutrality advocates argue, allowing the Verizons of the world to pick winners and losers—and perhaps to snuff out competitors of their own video and phone businesses.

The broadband companies counter that they have invested huge sums in Internet infrastructure, including \$70 billion last year alone. They generally don't use discriminatory pricing now, but some people in the industry think it would be one way to pay for a next-generation network that could carry far more data at faster speeds.

If those investments aren't made, the information superhighway will eventually look like I-70 at rush hour, with video file-sharers slowing things down for the folks who just want to read e-mail or check an airline schedule.

Scott Cleland, a consultant who runs the broadband-industry-backed site NetCompetition.org, says a strict net neutrality regime would discourage infrastructure investment and make the Internet less secure. If the network owners can't discriminate among forms of content, he argues, they would lose their ability to root out viruses and other malware.

Cleland may be overstating the security argument. Any reasonable FCC regulation would surely allow the broadband companies to police their networks for harmful files. His larger point, though, is a good one: Why risk messing up something that isn't broken?

Existing antitrust law should prevent, say, AT&T from discriminating against an Internet-phone competitor like Skype. Beyond such an obvious abuse, it's hard to see what harm can come from letting the broadband firms price their network however they want.

It's often said that on the Internet, information wants to be free. That four-letter word has two meanings—free as in zero cost, and free as in unregulated and unrestricted—and they are at odds in this debate.

If we impose regulations just to keep down the cost of certain services, we may find that we've lost the very freedom that makes the Internet so successful and so valuable.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNI-  
VERSARY OF STS. CONSTANTINE  
& HELEN GREEK ORTHODOX  
CHURCH IN PALOS HILLS, ILLI-  
NOIS**HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Sts. Constantine & Helen Greek Orthodox Church as they celebrate 100 years of community, faith and service. Throughout their history, the parishioners of Sts. Constantine & Helen Greek Orthodox Church have strived to embody their calling as members of the community of faith, and in doing so have served commendably as a pillar of the Palos Hills community.

Originally located on South Michigan Avenue in 1909, Sts. Constantine & Helen relocated in 1926 when a fire consumed the building, and then relocated to its new location on the corner of 111th Street and Roberts Road in Palos Hills with an opening ceremony in 1976.

Today, Sts. Constantine & Helen is as vibrant as ever under the faithful guidance of Rev. Nick Jonas, and the parish continues to serve the worship needs of over 400 families. The church is expecting some 1,200 participants at its centennial celebration on October 24, at which time Rev. Byron Papanikolaou will also mark his incredible 50th year with the congregation.

It is my honor to recognize Sts. Constantine & Helen Greek Orthodox Church on the occasion of its 100th anniversary. The parish has fulfilled a vision of a proud community that works together, learns together, and worships together. With its legacy of remarkable pastors and committed parishioners, the parish is truly deserving of this recognition.



HONORING THE FISHER HOUSE  
AND THE REPUBLICAN CLUB OF  
CENTRAL PASCO COUNTY, FLOR-  
IDA

**HON. GINNY BROWN-WAITE**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Republican Club of Central Pasco County for their support of the Fisher House at the James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital in Tampa, Florida.

Military families are the first line of support for our servicemen and women: they sit up at night waiting for their phone call and they send them comforts from home to sustain them while they fight for our freedom a half a world away.

Some families are called on to support and encourage their loved ones long after they've returned from the battles of war. For them, the Fisher House often becomes their "home away from home".

Since it opened its doors in 2007, the Fisher House in Tampa has hosted more than 1,200 people. The 16,000-square-foot house can accommodate up to 21 families at a time, and averages 35 guests per night. The average length of stay is two months, but two families have been there since the house opened.

Nationwide, the Fisher House program has made available nearly three million days of lodging since the program originated in 1990. They are operated by the Department of Veterans Affairs and rely on donations to the Fisher House Foundation so that no family has to pay to stay at any Fisher House.

The Republican Club of Central Pasco County, Florida, continually supports the Fisher House Foundation and our military men and women. This weekend, they will host the 2nd biennial event, "A Night for Heroes" in support of the Fisher House Foundation.

Madam Speaker, just as our military men and women believe it is their duty to serve our Nation; it is our duty to support them. The Republican Club of Central Pasco County has truly answered the call. On behalf of this Congress, I thank them for their unyielding commitment to this most important cause.

**COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION  
ACT OF 2010**

SPEECH OF

**HON. JOE COURTNEY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 22, 2009*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration of the bill (H.R. 3619) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes:

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Chair, I want to applaud my friend, Chairman JIM OBERSTAR,

and his committee for putting together a strong bill that invests in the needs of our Coast Guard. This bill makes many key investments in the ability of our Coast Guard to protect our nation, guard our waterways, and make sure it is "always ready" to respond.

However, I rise today in reluctant opposition to this bill because of the very significant changes it makes to the admissions process for the United States Coast Guard Academy.

As many of my colleagues know, the Coast Guard Academy is located in my district, in New London, Connecticut. Established at Fort Trumbull in 1910 first as the School of Instruction to the U.S. Revenue Cutter Academy and then as the U.S. Coast Guard Academy after the consolidation of the Life Saving Service and the Revenue Cutter Service in 1915, the Academy has been a part of New London at its present site since 1932. Over its last century in New London, the Academy has helped to train, educate and shape generations of young leaders of the Coast Guard.

Today, the Coast Guard Academy is a highly competitive educational institution. Called "the best kept secret in higher education" by the Princeton Review, it is a challenging school that attracts driven, committed leaders who go on to serve our nation in the many diverse roles played by our Coast Guard today. In fact, the number of applicants who said that they were not seeking admission to one of the other service academies—that the Coast Guard Academy was their first choice—rose from 61 percent of the class of 2009 to 66 percent of the class of 2011.

As of July 2009, the Coast Guard Academy had 973 cadets enrolled representing 43 states and 15 foreign nations. For the newest class, the class of 2013, 1,672 completed the application process, 411 were offered appointments to the Academy, and 288 cadets—17 percent of those who applied—were sworn in. Nearly 80 percent of Academy graduates go on to graduate programs, with most paid for by the Coast Guard, and 85 percent of graduates choose to serve beyond their required five-year commitment.

The Academy is particularly proud of its high recruitment of women cadets. Of the total corps of cadets, 27 percent are women: 23 percent female in the class of 2010, 30 percent in the class of 2011, 28 percent in the class of 2012, and 29 percent in the class of 2013. Its success in this area sets the Coast Guard Academy apart from other service academies, and is worthy of recognition.

However, there are two areas in which both the Congress and the Coast Guard Academy agree that there is some work to do—the recruitment of underrepresented minorities in the cadet corps, as well as a lack of geographical diversity. I absolutely believe that, as a publicly funded institution, the Coast Guard Academy should represent a cross-section of our society, reflecting the racial, gender and geographic composition of our nation. Any young person, regardless of race, gender or geographic location, should have the opportunity to serve our nation as an officer in the Coast Guard.

In my ongoing discussions with the leadership of the Coast Guard Academy, they have made clear that some of their top priorities include increasing diversity, both of underrepresented minorities and geographical regions, and spreading the word about the excellent education it has to offer to a wider audience. While involving Members of Congress in the application process may be one of the answers to these challenges, there are likely other ways to achieve these goals that should be considered as well before taking this step.

For example, the Academy has significantly increased its efforts to get the word out about their unique institution and what they have to offer to underrepresented minority and geographic populations. For example, they are specifically directing recruitment efforts through mailings, advertising on online college search websites, and ramping up efforts to get recruiters in cities and regions with high minority populations, as well as those states and regions not typically represented at the Academy.

There is some indication that these efforts are paying off. For instance, compared to last year, inquiries to the Academy by minority students are up 40 percent to 1,800. And, online applications from minority students are up 34 percent to 317.

In addition, the Coast Guard Academy recently released a comprehensive Strategic Plan focusing on diversity, leadership, and character development. This plan outlines a clear goal of achieving 20–25 percent representation by underrepresented minorities by 2015, and in faculty and staff by 2020. This plan is getting off the ground now.

Even without congressional nominations, there is much each of us can do to contribute to the makeup of the Academy. For example, we can all include Coast Guard Academy admissions information our offices distribute related to service academy nominations, and direct interested constituents to the institution. And, we can ensure that our websites include information about the Academy. Earlier this year, a survey of congressional websites showed that over half made no mention of the Coast Guard Academy and did not post a link or other information about the institution. In March, I circulated a "Dear Colleague" letter urging that Members make sure their websites reflect this important information—and I will continue to work with my colleagues to encourage them to do so.

I strongly believe that any change to the application process or the character of the institution must be carefully considered, hand in hand with the Academy, before moving forward. The manager's amendment to this bill included a provision to require the Government Accountability Office, GAO, to evaluate the Coast Guard Academy's efforts to improve minority and geographic diversity. While I strongly support this review and look forward to its findings, I am disappointed that this



kind of evaluation was not done first before pursuing changes to the existing admissions process.

To this end, I reluctantly oppose the Coast Guard authorization bill, and hope to continue to work with my colleagues in the House and Senate, as well as the leadership of the Academy, to address these concerns.

SOLAR TECHNOLOGY ROADMAP  
ACT

SPEECH OF

**HON. DAVID WU**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 22, 2009*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration of the bill (H.R. 3585) to guide and provide for United States research, development, and demonstration of solar energy technologies, and for other purposes:

Mr. WU. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 3585, the Solar Technology Road-Map Act. I want to commend Chairman GORDON for his efforts to bring this bill to the floor, and Ms. GIFFORDS for her continued leadership on solar technology.

H.R. 3585 provides funding for solar technology research, development and demonstration activities. It also creates a committee to develop a road map that will assess the near-, mid- and long-term needs for solar research. This assessment will become the basis for future investments in solar energy by the Department of Energy.

My district is a great example of the potential for solar energy. Not because of the amount of sun it receives, but because of the number of jobs it has created. Solar World, a solar panel manufacturer, has its U.S. headquarters located in Hillsboro, Oregon and employs 1,000 people building solar panels and produces enough PV panels to supply the entire North and South American markets. With our state's unemployment rate hovering above 11 percent, this company's investment in our state during these difficult times is welcome news. It is my hope that a continued investment in solar energy will result in thousands of more jobs in the coming years.

We have been working to diversify our energy portfolio to create and develop renewable energy sources and reduce our dependence on foreign fossil fuels. This bill will create further research opportunities for solar technology and will create a plan that will guide our future investments in solar energy.

This bill will help build upon the success of previous investments. It is about economic competitiveness and job creation as much as it is about clean renewable energy and less dependence on imported fuels. Again I thank Chairman GORDON and Ms. GIFFORDS for their leadership.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. DENNIS A. CARDOZA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I was unable to be present for several votes taken on

the House floor yesterday afternoon, Thursday, October 22, 2009, due to illness. As a result, I missed rollcall votes No. 801 through No. 811. Had I been present: on rollcall vote No. 801 I would have voted "no"; on rollcall vote No. 802 I would have voted "aye"; on rollcall vote No. 803 I would have voted "aye"; on rollcall vote No. 804 I would have voted "aye"; on rollcall vote No. 805 I would have voted "aye"; on rollcall vote No. 806 I would have voted "aye"; on rollcall vote No. 807 I would have voted "aye"; on rollcall vote No. 808 I would have voted "aye"; on rollcall vote No. 809 I would have voted "aye"; on rollcall vote No. 810 I would have voted "aye"; and on rollcall vote No. 811 I would have voted "aye."

HONORING THE CITY OF INVERNESS,  
CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA

**HON. GINNY BROWN-WAITE**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the city of Inverness, Florida; they have been designated the "National City of the Year" by the veterans honor organization, the Forty & Eight.

Since 1920, the Forty & Eight organization has worked tirelessly to insure that the legacies of our service members endure alongside the freedom that they fought so selflessly to defend. They are committed to serving our veterans and their families: those who are still with us, those who have gone before us and those whose fate is still yet unknown.

John Kaiserian is the Grand Chef de Train of the Forty & Eight and a member of Voiture 1219 of Citrus County, Florida. He cited several factors which contributed to the City of Inverness receiving top honors on both the state and national level. Among them were the city's numerous parades and ceremonies honoring veterans, monuments that they have erected to honor those killed in combat, the annual Patriotic Evening on July 3rd and the City's very own Liberty Park. He refers to Inverness as Citrus County's "veterans' city".

On September 9, 2009, City Manager Frank DiGiovanni, City Clerk Debbie Davis and Mayor Bob Plaisted traveled to Rochester, New York to proudly accept the award on the city's behalf. They recognized the support of local residents and veterans' organizations that made the award possible. They especially thanked the veterans for all they have given to this country: City Manager, Frank DiGiovanni said, "Loss of life is the ultimate sacrifice and many have given all".

Madam Speaker, the Forty & Eight organization captures the American spirit in communities all across the country. I am honored and very proud to recognize Inverness, Florida as the Forty & Eight "National City of the Year".

RYAN WHITE HIV/AIDS TREATMENT  
EXTENSION ACT OF 2009

**HON. VIRGINIA FOXX**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in 2006, I supported the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Treatment Modernization Act which reauthorized the Ryan White HIV/AIDS program and included important provisions that sunset the program's authorizations. However, the 2009 reauthorization bill, S. 1793, that the House passed on October 21, 2009 repeals all prior sunset provisions. With the current budgetary fiasco facing the federal government, the need for provisions that would sunset program authorizations is more pronounced now than ever. Congress constantly creates new programs with little or no thought to the amount of money that will be needed to finance its eternal life. The thought seems to be that a billion dollars for any specific purpose is so minuscule when compared to the federal deficit that one cannot resist supporting worthy causes and efforts. The problem is that this excuse occurs on a daily basis around here. Collectively, that mentality is what has led us to the insurmountable federal spending levels currently threatening the economy and overall strength of the U.S. dollar.

One simple way to help combat that mentality is the inclusion of provisions that sunset program authorizations. This is a common-sense, prudent and simple step that can be taken regularly to help keep us honest. If a program is worth continuing, its purpose and effectiveness should be defensible in the future. If it is not defensible, then committees can reevaluate and retool its functioning to help restore accountability. Moreover, committee chairmen should wholeheartedly support sunset provisions as their inclusion would more regularly work towards shaping policies under their purview. Some may argue that the programs are too plentiful and the task too overwhelming for Congress to evaluate effectively on a regular basis. This is all the more reason to fight for smaller government, and terminating ineffective and duplicative programs. Congress must put the necessary accountability and oversight measures in place to ensure that American tax dollars are being well spent on worthy, well-functioning priorities.

S. 1793 authorizes the appropriation of about \$2.55 billion for fiscal year 2010, a 14 percent increase from the appropriation the program received in fiscal year 2009 of \$2.213 billion. The bill increases the program's overall authorization levels by an automatic 5 percent each year for total of \$8.44 billion over the 2010-2013 period. In comparison the federal government sought only to increase the defense budget by 3 percent. What is additionally troubling is that there is no Congressional Budget Office (CBO) report available estimating how much this program could cost. Moreover, S. 1793 was considered under a suspension of the House rules, leaving no opportunity for members to amend the bill to address any of these concerns. Therefore, I could not in good conscience support a bill with such a large increase in authorizations coupled with no CBO score or a sunset provision.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION  
ACT OF 2010

SPEECH OF

**HON. LOIS CAPPS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 22, 2009*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration of the bill (H.R. 3619) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes:

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the manager's amendment and the underlying legislation.

I thank Chairman OBERSTAR for his hard work on this bill.

As someone who represents over 200 miles of coastline, I am keenly aware of the importance of the Coast Guard and this legislation.

H.R. 3619 provides the Coast Guard, including the 3 stations located in my congressional district, with the resources it needs to meet an ever-increasing workload—from search and rescue and terrorism protection to fisheries law enforcement and oil spill cleanup.

I also want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR for including the amendment I submitted to the Rules Committee within his manager's amendment.

My amendment would require the Coast Guard to report to Congress on the most frequent sources of human error that have led to oil spills from vessels, as well as on the most significant types of "near miss" incidents.

The amendment would also require the Coast Guard to use these findings to take appropriate action domestically and at the International Maritime Organization to reduce the risk of oil spills due to human error.

The consideration of this amendment, Madam Chair, could not be more timely.

Earlier this week we learned that more than 18,000 gallons of fuel oil spilled when two ships collided in the Gulf of Mexico.

By yesterday morning oil covered an area two miles long and a mile and a half wide.

This troubling incident reminds us that our fragile marine resources are still susceptible to disaster.

While efforts by the Coast Guard, states, and industry have reduced spills over the last two decades, accidents still occur and most are the result of human error.

Unfortunately, we currently lack the data and analysis we need to determine the causes of human errors and the ways to prevent them.

My amendment would begin filling in that gap so we can learn from the mistakes that have been made in the past and take action to avoid similar incidents in the future.

Madam Chair, with billions of gallons of oil passing through our nation's coastal waters every year, we must strengthen our oil spill safety programs.

And we must do everything we can to prevent future accidents like this week's collision in the Gulf of Mexico and the resulting spill.

I urge my colleagues to support the manager's amendment which takes appropriate action to reduce the risk of oil spilled because of human error.

HONORING THE SORGE FAMILY OF  
SORGE'S RESTAURANT IN COR-  
NING, NY**HON. ERIC J.J. MASSA**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. MASSA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a landmark in New York's 29th Congressional District and its proprietors, the Sorge Family of Sorge's Restaurant. Renato and his brother Remo Sorge came to the United States from Italy in 1936 and through hard work and determination realized the American Dream.

On June 5, 1951, Renato and Loretta Sorge opened Sorge's Restaurant at 68 W. Market St. in Corning, NY and it quickly became an area favorite. From its humble beginnings with a counter and 11 booths, the restaurant eventually grew, and expanded to the adjacent building and a seating capacity of 225 persons. Offering quality food and a welcoming atmosphere, it is easy to see how the restaurant became a Corning institution.

A true family business, Renato's sons, Joseph and Michael, followed in their parents' footsteps working in the restaurant part-time while growing up. They both eventually pursued restaurant management degrees at Cornell and SUNY Cobleskill, respectfully. Upon graduation, Joseph and Michael returned to Corning to carry on the Sorge Family tradition of providing the finest Italian/American food, and quality service at reasonable prices.

An unfortunate fire in December 2008 burned the original Sorge Restaurant; yet, this setback has not dampened the Sorge's spirits. Instead it serves as a testament to the Sorge Family commitment to the District as they have chosen to stay and rebuild this community institution. The site is now recognized as an historic landmark.

As friends and family gather in Corning today to celebrate a new beginning at 68 W. Market St., it is my honor to recognize the Sorge Family and Sorge's Restaurant on behalf of the United States Congress.

HONORING THE FISHER HOUSE &  
THE REPUBLICAN CLUB OF WEST  
PASCO COUNTY, FLORIDA**HON. GINNY BROWN-WAITE**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Republican Club of West Pasco County for their support of the Fisher House at the James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital in Tampa, Florida.

Military families are the first line of support for our servicemen and women: They sit up at night waiting for their phone call and they send them comforts from home to sustain them while they fight for our freedom a half a world away.

Some families are called on to support and encourage their loved ones long after they've returned from the battles of war. For them, the Fisher House often becomes their "home away from home".

Since it opened its doors in 2007, the Fisher House in Tampa has hosted more than 1,200

people. The 16,000-square-foot house can accommodate up to 21 families at a time, and averages 35 guests per night. The average length of stay is two months, but two families have been there since the house opened.

Nationwide, the Fisher House program has made available nearly three million days of lodging since the program originated in 1990. They are operated by the Department of Veterans Affairs and rely on donations to the Fisher House Foundation so that no family has to pay to stay at any Fisher House.

The Republican Club of West Pasco County continually supports the Fisher House Foundation and our military men and women. This weekend, they will host the 2nd biennial event, "A Night For Heroes" in support of the Fisher House Foundation.

Madam Speaker, just as our military men and women believe it is their duty to serve our nation; it is our duty to support them. The Republican Club of West Pasco County has truly answered the call. On behalf of this Congress, I thank them for their unyielding commitment to this most important cause.

## HONORING DR. HO LUONG TRAN

**HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Ho Luong Tran, President and CEO of the Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum (APIAHF) on the occasion of her retirement from the Forum to pursue new advocacy opportunities.

Dr. Tran has spent 7 years working with sincere, focused dedication to build APIAHF into a leading policy. Dr. Tran has been leading innovative legislative, policy, and community initiatives with an outstanding ability to establish coalitions among the public, private and community sectors for more than 20 years.

Under Dr. Tran's leadership, APIAHF has partnered with the W.K. Kellogg Foundation on a groundbreaking initiative, Health Through Action, to provide local communities with funding, training, and technical assistance to address health issues and strengthen a national network of advocates to create a broader health movement. During her tenure as the President and CEO of APIAHF, Dr. Tran has helped create the Native Hawaiian & Pacific Islander Alliance and the National Council of API Physicians.

Furthermore, she led the development of a national policy blueprint for Asian American, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islander health and enhanced the organization's national presence and reach in Washington D.C.

She has worked in health care since earning her degree at the University of Saigon in 1972. Her family fled Vietnam as refugees in 1978, an experience which has shaped and deepened her commitment to the health of her community. I have worked with Dr. Tran and the APIAHF since I was elected to Congress. Her leadership and the excellent work of the Health Forum have enabled the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, and Congressional Black Caucus to help significantly positively impact health policy and the conversation around health disparities.

Her leadership has been critical in the fight for greater understanding of the challenges facing the Asian American and Pacific Islander communities. I know the APIAHF will carry on her legacy of excellence and thank her for her unfailing commitment to improving the health of all Americans.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION  
ACT OF 2010

SPEECH OF

**HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 22, 2009*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration of the bill (H.R. 3619) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 3619, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2009, which directs the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to conduct a study and submit a report to Congress examining the Coast Guard's ability to respond to the effects of possible changes to U.S. immigration policies toward Haiti.

While it is certainly responsible to examine a worst-case scenario, my amendment also asks that the study look at what has happened in past experiences as we discuss the anticipated repercussions of changes in our immigration policy.

Changes in policies affecting Haiti are nothing new. In fact, it was just over 10 years ago that we here in Congress passed the Haitian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act, which affected far more Haitian nationals than any of the currently proposed policies would affect.

I firmly believe that what happened then and our current relations with the Haitian government will result in little change, if not a decrease, in Haitian interdictions.

However, my assurances are not enough.

Those who are critical or skeptical of Temporary Protected Status for Haitians often claim that any change could result in a massive surge, or might completely overwhelm the Coast Guard.

This is in spite of the fact that when we last adjusted the status of thousands of Haitian immigrants, we actually saw a decrease in interdictions, and despite the assurances from the Haitian government that they will do their part to ensure their citizens are aware that no new immigrants would qualify.

However, as of now, we have little more than speculation to ascertain what the results would be.

My amendment will help provide us with an objective perspective on the Coast Guard's expectations and their ability to continue to effectively guard our maritime borders.

TPS, or some other comparable relief, for our Haitian neighbors is long overdue and this administration has been stalling for far too long.

This study will hopefully help us show that our government has rationally and realistically examined all possible scenarios and we are well equipped to contend with any possible effects.

Mr. Chair, my amendment furthers this bill's commitment to ensuring the safety of those

traveling on the high seas and protecting our national security, and I respectfully urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, yesterday I missed the final three rollcall votes of the day. Unfortunately I missed these votes because I had to return to my district.

Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 809, On Ordering the Previous Question—H. Res. 853—Providing for consideration of H.R. 3619, Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010.

Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 810, On Agreeing to the Resolution—H. Res. 853—Providing for consideration of H.R. 3619, Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010.

Lastly, had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 811, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree—H. Res. 836—Expressing support for Teen Read Week.

HONORING SANDOR KIRSCHKE

**HON. MIKE QUIGLEY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Sandor Kirsche. Mr. Kirsche was born in Czechoslovakia in 1926 and arrived in Chicago after surviving Nazi persecution in concentration camps at both Auschwitz and Bundenwald. Sandor overcame his personal struggles, including the deaths of his brother and father, and dedicated his life to making the lives of Jewish Americans easier. To that end, he opened the first full-service kosher supermarket in the Chicago area and gave back to the community with a life's worth of charity and philanthropy.

In 1971, Sandor opened a kosher butcher shop, which initially lost money. But through his hard work, long hours, and perseverance, he expanded the store to include kosher fish and packaged goods. The existence of a kosher supermarket was invaluable to the Jewish community, who now had a place where people could purchase kosher goods. Today, the store is known as Hungarian Kosher Foods and is still family owned.

Anyone who met Sandor knew he was much more than a businessman, and understandably, everybody knew him. At his stores, he never just sold meats and canned goods. He was always ready with a smile and a story, and a piece of candy for his younger patrons. He kept up on issues in the community, history, politics, and spoke seven different languages. He fought tirelessly to bring his sisters to the United States, and after twenty years of never giving up, he was successful in bringing them here from Soviet Russia in 1972.

I am honored to recognize and remember Sandor Kirsche today. He exemplified family

and community values even after overcoming great hardship. His uniquely American story is an example to not only the Chicago and Jewish communities, but to everyone who has ever faced long odds.

HONORING JACK E. ATCHISON,  
HERNANDO COUNTY, FLORIDA

**HON. GINNY BROWN-WAITE**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an American Hero and Purple Heart recipient, Jack E. Atchison of Spring Hill, Florida. Wounded during an enemy attack in Vietnam, Sgt. Atchison's service to our nation will forever be remembered by this Congress.

Born in Oskaloosa, Iowa on March 11, 1934, Jack attended Park College in Missouri where he studied Hospital Administration. Following his schooling, he courageously served 21 years in our nations military.

In December of 1965, Sgt. Atchison bravely participated in an attack to repel enemy forces from a strategic location. During the battle, a bomb exploded in close proximity to Mr. Atchison, causing shrapnel wounds to his legs. In a genuine act of valor, despite his injuries, Mr. Atchison remained with his fellow wounded soldiers, and prepared them for transport via helicopter back to Flagon Embassy Hospital. Fortunately none of the 17 wounded American soldiers perished from this attack. The professional skill and personal devotion displayed by Sgt. Atchison reflect his immense commitment and sacrifice.

In addition to his Purple Heart, Sgt. Atchison was awarded the Bronze Star Medal, the Air Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, the Good Conduct Medal Bronze Clasp with 5 Loops, the National Defense Service Medal with OLC, the Korean Service Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal, the United Nations Service Medal, the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal with Device 1960, the Honor Medal 2nd Class (Vietnam), the Parachutist Badge, and the Combat Medical Badge.

Following his service in the military Jack went on to a successful career as the President of the South Georgia Real Estate Association. Jack has been married to his wife, Virginia, for 56 years and they have 5 children, Jackie, Katie, Cindy, Jack Jr., and Donna.

Madam Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Jack E. Atchison. He is a beloved American hero. On behalf of a grateful nation, this Congress, his family and friends, I thank him for his service and sacrifice to our country.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION  
ACT OF 2010

SPEECH OF

**HON. JAMES A. HIMES**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 22, 2009*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration of the bill (H.R. 3619) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Chair, I rise today in favor of the Cruise Vessel Security and Safety Act which has been included in the base bill of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2009.

It is expected that more than 12 million Americans will take a cruise vacation in 2009 alone. Passengers on cruises have an inadequate understanding of their potential vulnerability to crime, and those who may be victimized lack the information they need to understand their legal rights or to know who to contact for help in the immediate aftermath of a crime.

Cruise ships, which operate under foreign flags of convenience, are not required under U.S. law to report crimes that occur outside of U.S. territorial waters.

Travelers on water deserve the same protections as travelers on land, and taking a few extra measures to protect passengers will lead to more enjoyable, safer trips and better results for victims of crimes.

To enhance the safety of cruise passengers, the owners of cruise vessels need to upgrade, modernize, and retrofit the safety and security infrastructure on their vessels. They need to install peep holes in passenger doors, raise standard ship railings, install security video cameras and limit access to passenger rooms.

In addition, passenger vessel crew members must be trained on the appropriate methods for prevention, detection, evidence preservation, and reporting of criminal activities. In the event that a crime should occur, it is of utmost importance that the crime scene or any potential evidence is not tampered with before the FBI can begin its investigation.

I would be remiss if I did not take a moment to mention my predecessor, the Honorable CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, and the fight he began to improve safety on cruise ships and protect cruise ship passengers years ago. Congressman SHAYS took on this charge after one of our constituents, George Smith, was the victim of a crime in international waters while on his honeymoon in 2005. The investigation surrounding Mr. Smith's disappearance remains open to this day. Had the safety improvements and post-incident regulations mandated by the Cruise Vessel Security and Safety Act been in place in 2005, this horrible tragedy might have been prevented. I proudly stand alongside the Smith family and the Cruise Victims Association as they continue their fight for justice every day. Together, we work to honor Mr. Smith's death so no family will ever have to suffer again from this type of tragic crime.

RESOLUTION HONORING THE SERVICE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF WOMEN OF THE ARMED SERVICES AND FEMALE VETERANS

**HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution honoring the service and achievements of women in the Armed Forces and female veterans.

Every time I visit military installations, both at home and abroad, I am constantly im-

pressed by the tremendous job our service members are doing.

And I am always particularly struck by the essential and natural role our brave servicewomen play in so many parts of our Armed Services.

There are close to 350,000 American women currently serving in our Armed Forces.

And it's hard to believe they were only granted permanent status in the regular and Reserve Armed Forces in 1948—because women were certainly making their mark well before then.

Women have voluntarily served in every military conflict in our country's history since the Revolutionary War.

They have been on the frontlines as nurses, waterbearers, and even saboteurs.

For years, dedicated women had to disguise themselves as men in order to enlist in our military.

Today, that's not the case—our servicewomen play an increasingly important role in America's military forces, and our country is the better for it.

Women are flying helicopters and fighter aircrafts; they are saving lives as nurses and doctors; they are driving support vehicles and policing perimeters.

They do not seek special recognition, but I believe it is important to understand and recognize the additional burdens that are inherent in the many roles they play outside of work—as wives, mothers, and caretakers.

The resolution recognizes the sacrifices our servicewomen and their families make to keep our country safe.

As Chair of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Co-Chair of the Women's Caucus Task Force on Women in the Military and Veterans, I am privileged to honor the legacy of servicewomen in the past, the courage with which women serve today, and the enthusiasm of the young women who dream of serving this great nation in the future.

Madam Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to introduce this resolution today.

TOM CONNELLY MARKS THIRTY YEARS AS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF MASSACHUSETTS CHAPTER OF NAHRO

**HON. BARNEY FRANK**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, on October 9th of this year, one of the leaders in increasing the supply of affordable housing in the State of Massachusetts, Tom Connelly, marked his 30th anniversary as the Executive Director of the Massachusetts Chapter of the National Association of Housing & Redevelopment Officials (MassNAHRO). I have benefitted enormously in my work on housing in the Committee on Financial Services from Mr. Connelly's good judgment, his broad and deep knowledge of all aspects of housing matters, and his passion for helping this become a fairer society.

NAHRO nationally has been a great partner for those of us trying to improve the housing

situation for many in this country. One of the strong aspects of NAHRO's work is their continued recognition that for many low-income people, the answer for their housing needs is not homeownership but decent rental housing, and a failure to understand this is one of the contributing factors to the housing crisis that led to our current recession. NAHRO, MassNAHRO and Tom Connelly in particular have been supportive of appropriate efforts to promote homeownership, but they have also understood the importance for a very large number of low-income people of affordable rental housing, so they are not pushed into inappropriate home mortgages.

Madam Speaker, in his thirty years as Executive Director, Tom Connelly has set a high standard for organizational leadership and for housing policy. And I should add that among the contributions he has made to the field of housing is his daughter, Meredith, who works on housing matters for the Committee on Financial Services and carries on her father's tradition of doing excellent work for the housing needs of low-income people.

Madam Speaker, I submit this statement for the RECORD because I hope that people will look at the work that Tom Connelly has done and that it will serve as a model for those interested in helping with housing issues.

CONGRATULATING IVAN "IKE" ACKERMAN

**HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ivan "Ike" Ackerman on his retirement as Mayor of the city of Waverly. At the end of the year, Ike Ackerman will be retiring after serving 12 years as Mayor.

Over the past 12 years, Mayor Ackerman has been a proven leader in moving the city of Waverly forward and bringing the community together. With Mayor Ackerman's command, the city of Waverly has seen successes from economic development to upgrading the city's wellness opportunities.

Waverly is one of northeast Iowa's fastest growing communities with a highly diversified economic base. Mayor Ackerman has focused on bringing new life to old Waverly through downtown revitalization, economic development and new recreational facilities.

During Mayor Ackerman's tenure the city of Waverly experienced the worst flooding the city had seen in decades. In June of 2008, the Cedar River reached a record high and 25 percent of the community was impacted by the dangerous waters. The city suffered millions of dollars in damages. With Mayor Ackerman's leadership the city is rebuilding, putting in place future mitigation plans, and revitalizing the community one day at a time.

With Mayor Ackerman's retirement we are losing years of institutional knowledge and a champion for the needs of Waverly residents. I am proud to represent Mayor Ackerman and the city of Waverly in Congress. I wish him the best in all his endeavors.

HONORING RICHARD H. BENNETT,  
PASCO, FLORIDA

**HON. GINNY BROWN-WAITE**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an American hero and Purple Heart recipient, Mr. Richard H. Bennett of Shady Hills, FL. A proud member of our Nation's military during Vietnam, Mr. Bennett honorably defended the freedoms that all Americans hold dear.

Born on August 10, 1949 to Harry and Claire Bennett in Canandaigua, New York, Richard began his service to the Army in June of 1969. Shortly thereafter he was deployed to Vietnam where he fought courageously, putting his life on the line every day. During his tour he suffered shrapnel in his back on account of gunfire, wounds to his left arm and left leg due to an ambush firefight in the jungle, and was exposed to Agent Orange. Along with his Purple Heart Medal, Mr. Bennett is a recipient of the Vietnam Service Medal, the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, and the Combat Infantryman's Badge.

Following Mr. Bennett's service in the Army, he worked with "Somebody Loves You Ministries" helping the less fortunate improve their lives.

Madam Speaker, it is important to recognize Americans like Richard H. Bennett for their service to our Nation and for their commitment and sacrifices in battle. Our Nation, this Congress, and Mr. Bennett's family and friends, will always remember his bravery and dedication.

HONORING ELEANOR CAINES 100TH  
BIRTHDAY

**HON. JOHN L. MICA**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the life of a wonderful American and personal friend, Eleanor Caines, as she celebrates her 100th Birthday.

I know that I join family and friends in extending our best wishes as she reaches this special life milestone.

It has been my privilege to know Eleanor for more than three decades as we attended Maitland's Episcopal Church of the Good Shepherd.

Nearly always several pews in front of the Mica family, Eleanor has been one of the most faithful parishioners of the congregation.

Her special smile, warm greeting and positive glow have brightened both the day and the path of those she meets!

A native of Asheville, North Carolina, whose family hailed from Massachusetts, Eleanor honorably served in the WACS during World War II. She and her late husband, Basil, who passed in 1982, resided in Central Florida.

Active in Church and community affairs, the Boston University graduate has faithfully been a strong supporter of veterans and university alumni affairs.

It is wonderful people like Eleanor Caines who every day of their lives have worked and

contributed to make this a great nation. I know that I join her niece and nephew, Charlotte and David Hunt, family and friends at Mayflower and fellow parishioners at the Church of the Good Shepherd in extending our best wishes to Eleanor Caines as she celebrates this special birthday. I know my colleagues also join in saying thank you to a special American, Eleanor Caines!

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. XAVIER BECERRA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained yesterday and missed roll-call No. 804. If present, I would have voted "yea."

RECOGNIZING NEW YORK CITY  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 2166 IN  
SUPPORT OF H.R. 22 AND 658

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Council of the city of New York's Resolution No. 2166, calling upon the U.S. House to pass H.R. 658—the Access to Postal Services Act. Thanks to our work in Congress, H.R. 22—the U.S. Postal Service Financial Relief Act, has passed the House and similar legislation has cleared the Senate. This great legislation assists the U.S. Postal Service with financial expenses and stops the unnecessary closure of neighborhood post offices, increasing community input as the Postal Service reorganizes its branches throughout the city of New York.

If we do not follow-up with the speedy passage of H.R. 658, the Postal Service will be forced to close over 700 locations throughout the United States, including 53 locations in New York city alone. In addition to the borough of Queens, Manhattan will be adversely affected with the closure of 25 locations, which includes my Harlem community.

In my own district, the Tejada Post Office was almost a victim to these closures. The well-regarded institution was named after a member of the 3rd Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment who was killed during combat operations in Baghdad, Iraq on April 11, 2003. He died at the tender age of 26. But thanks to the help of people like District Leader Maria Luna, City Councilman Robert Jackson and Assemblyman Denny Farrell and Adriano Espailat, as well as Councilmember-Elect Ydanis Rodriguez, Community Board 12, and the Northern Manhattan Improvement Corporation, a grassroots coalition came together and demanded that it remain open.

We ought to work to make sure that nothing of the sort happens in communities across this great nation. Both these bills will assist people in staying connected with the world, while not hoisting greater financial burdens on New Yorkers or other Americans who rely on these nearby post offices. Senior citizens and low-income Americans would be most vulnerable to

these shutdowns, and as Americans, we ought to look after the most vulnerable in our society. May the Congress work as quickly as it can to alleviate this problem and ensure that these post offices remain open.

RECOGNIZING THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF JONESBOROUGH VETERANS PARK

**HON. DAVID P. ROE**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I am so proud to recognize and commend the town of Jonesborough and Washington County for its 10th year anniversary of the Jonesborough Veterans Park. In 1999, Washington County celebrated this park at the groundbreaking ceremony, and on Memorial Day of 2000, the Jonesborough Veterans' Park construction was completed.

Memorial Day of 2000 was extra special for veterans all throughout Washington County because of the Jonesborough Veterans Park.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced a Resolution, congratulating the Jonesborough Veterans Park for their 10th anniversary and for a decade of successful management and preservation of the park land. This will be a reminder that we in the First District are committed to honoring our veterans.

I want to thank the volunteers in Washington County who worked on this park and who remain dedicated to honoring our veterans.

CHAIRMAN SEUNG YOUN KIM'S  
MESSAGE OF SUPPORT TO THE  
PEOPLE OF AMERICAN SAMOA IN  
AFTERMATH OF DEVASTATING  
TSUNAMI

**HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMVAEGA**

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 23, 2009*

Mr. FALEOMVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I submit the following message of support from Seung Youn Kim, Chairman of the Hanwha Group, in response to the massive tsunami that struck American Samoa on Tuesday, September 29, 2009.

OCTOBER 1, 2009.

Hon. ENI FALEOMVAEGA,  
*Rayburn House Office Building,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FALEOMVAEGA: I would like to offer my deepest condolences to you and the people of Samoa for the losses and sufferings caused by the natural disaster yesterday.

Everyone in my family was shocked by seeing the devastated sites of Pago Pago and Leone through the media, I am greatly concerned on the tragic news, not as a bystander but a personal friend of yours.

I can only imagine the grief that you must feel and the immensity of the tasks you face, but I also know that you are a man of undefeatable courage who will once again lead the way out from this disaster. It is slightly relieving to me that acts of courage and kindness surfaced and that the U.S. government and the international society take

the matter seriously moving quickly in aiding the region.

I heard that you have already flown out to Samoa, and I only wish I could come to the area and join you in person to help. I am personally committed to supporting you, pondering over how I could help you on the efforts for the recovery of Samoa and its people.

Once again, my heart and thoughts are with you and the people of Samoa wishing safety and hope for all those who have been affected.

Truly yours,

SEUNG YOUN KIM.

RECOGNIZING BETH SHOLOM  
AHAVAS ACHIM SYNAGOGUE

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 23, 2009

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Beth Sholom Ahavas Achim Synagogue in Chicago. On October 25, 2009, the congregation will celebrate its 50th anniversary with a special dinner and ceremony. I commend the entire congregation for its dedicated service to the Hollywood Park neighborhood and the surrounding communities. I would also like to recognize the contributions of Beth Sholom's spiritual leader, Rabbi Moshe Soloveichik. Rabbi Soloveichik is one of the most respected rabbis in the country and has been instrumental in the growth of Beth Sholom.

The Beth Sholom synagogue is a wonderful example of an active faith community whose members work to better themselves and those around them. The Orthodox Jewish faith is rich with tradition and an important part of both our diversity in Chicago and across the country. The congregation of Beth Sholom continues to enrich that tradition and pass it along to future generations.

The 50th anniversary celebration also honors an outstanding member of the congregation who passed away two years ago. Sandor Kirsche, a Holocaust survivor, opened Hungarian Kosher Foods, the first full-service kosher supermarket in the Chicago area, and was a member of Beth Sholom until his death. His service to the congregation and all of Chicago is greatly appreciated. Although he is missed, he will always be remembered.

I am honored to recognize Beth Sholom Ahavas Achim and Rabbi Soloveichik, and I am proud to have such active, thoughtful, and faithful men and women in my district.

CONGRATULATING TIM HURLEY

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 23, 2009

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Tim Hurley on his retirement as Mayor of the city of Waterloo. At the end of the year, Tim Hurley will be retiring after serving three terms as Mayor.

Over the past 6 years, Mayor Hurley has been a proven leader in moving the city of Waterloo forward and bringing the community together. With Mayor Hurley's command, the

city of Waterloo has seen successes from economic development to upgrading the city's recreational opportunities.

Mayor Hurley has been focused on four key initiatives: economic development, improved financial health of city government, improved delivery of government services and an improved city image. These are no small tasks, but Mayor Hurley has managed to turn them into a reality.

During Mayor Hurley's tenure, the city of Waterloo experienced the worst flooding the city had seen in decades. In June of 2008, the Cedar River reached a record high of 25.39 ft, 13.39 ft above flood stage and the city suffered millions of dollars in damages. With Mayor Hurley's leadership the city is rebuilding, putting in place future mitigation plans, and revitalizing the community one day at a time.

With Mayor Hurley's retirement we are losing a chief advocate for the needs of Waterloo residents. I am proud to represent Mayor Hurley and the city of Waterloo in Congress. I wish him the best in all his endeavors.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION  
ACT OF 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 22, 2009

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration of the bill (H.R. 3619) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes:

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I rise today to commend Chairman OBERSTAR and Subcommittee Chairman CUMMINGS for their hard work on this legislation. I believe H.R. 3619 will go far towards ensuring that the U.S. Coast Guard has the financial resources and management structure in place to do their job efficiently and effectively.

More importantly I want to thank both gentlemen for helping to address my concerns regarding the bridge permitting process for the Ambassador Bridge Enhancement Project led by the U.S. Coast Guard.

Ultimately the U.S. Coast Guard found that the owner of the Ambassador Bridge had not provided the relevant information necessary to make a decision on a permit at this time; an outcome I commend, as I believe that while the Ambassador Bridge Enhancement Project may ultimately be a worthy undertaking, the owner of the bridge must go through the proper channels of federal permitting, abiding by federal law and regulation, and including all relevant environmental, safety and structural information as requested and as all other public operators do.

However, at the same time the U.S. Coast Guard was conducting their process, Federal Highway Administration was conducting a separate permitting process for a new public span, the Detroit River International Crossing.

The differences in these two processes, as well as differences in the level of community engagement and state government engagement, is of concern to me and many in Southeast Michigan.

The report language makes clear that there is a requirement that the Commandant of the

USCG, with the Secretaries of Transportation and Homeland Security have to submit a report to the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and other relevant committees regarding the existing coordination protocols for joint infrastructure responsibilities as well as recommended improvements to these protocols.

It is my hope that this will help to guide early coordination on the bridge permitting process and all other infrastructure projects, between the United States Coast Guard, U.S. Department of Transportation, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, as well as the relevant State agencies.

I have long believed that the end result of the legislative process, the NEPA process, or in this instance the bridge permitting process, is drastically improved by working with all relevant stakeholders. Such processes always benefit from thoughtful, careful, informed deliberation in compliance with all relative federal law and regulation.

Again, I thank Chairman OBERSTAR and Chairman CUMMINGS for their support and their work on this matter.

HONORING PAULA WELENC AND  
THE TAMPA FISHER HOUSE

HON. GINNY BROWN-WAITE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 23, 2009

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Paula Welenc and the Fisher House at the James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital in Tampa, Florida.

Military families are the first line of support for our servicemen and women. Some families are called on to support and encourage their loved ones long after they've returned from the battles of war. For them, the Fisher House often becomes their "home away from home." At the Fisher House in Tampa, Florida, Paula Welenc is there to welcome them with open arms.

Paula is the manager of the Fisher House at the James A. Haley Veterans' Hospital in Tampa. She has been with the facility since it opened in July of 2007. A clinical social worker by profession, she spent twenty years on active duty in the United States Air Force. In 2004, after retiring from the Air Force, she and her family moved to Spring Hill, Florida where Paula was hired as the Department of Defense's Domestic Violence Victims Advocate at MacDill Air Force Base.

Paula's military and civilian backgrounds give her a unique understanding of the issues facing our military families who are dealing with the illness or injury of their loved one.

In a recent newspaper article about the Fisher House in Tampa, Paula remarked, "We strive so hard to have this calm, relaxing, very comfortable setting for them while they're going through what might well be one of the most traumatic things that has ever happened in their life."

Since it opened its doors, the Fisher House in Tampa has hosted more than 1,200 people. The 16,000-square-foot house can accommodate up to 21 families at a time, and averages 35 guests per night. The average length of stay is two months, but two families have been there since the house opened.



Nationwide, The Fisher House Program has made available nearly three million days of lodging since the program originated in 1990. They are operated by the Department of Veterans Affairs and rely on donations to the Fisher House Foundation so that no family has to pay to stay at any Fisher House. Madam Speaker, just as our military men and women believe it is their duty to serve our Nation; it is our duty to support them. Paula has truly answered the call. On behalf of this Congress and the families that have benefited from this program, I thank her for her unyielding commitment to this most important cause.

# Daily Digest

## Senate

### Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. It will next meet at 2 p.m., on Monday, October 26, 2009.

### Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

---

## House of Representatives

### Chamber Action

**Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced:** 5 public bills, H.R. 3919–3923; and 8 resolutions, H. Res. 862–869 were introduced. **Pages H11739–40**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Page H11740**

**Reports Filed:** A report was filed today as follows: H.R. 1612, to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service-learning opportunities on public lands, help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, and scenic resources, train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts, and promote the value of public service (H. Rept. 111–312, Pt. 1);

H.R. 2868, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to extend, modify, and recodify the authority of the Secretary of Homeland Security to enhance security and protect against acts of terrorism against chemical facilities, with an amendment (H. Rept. 111–205, Pt. 2); and

H.R. 3258, to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to enhance the security of the public water systems of the United States, with an amendment (H. Rept. 111–313). **Page H11739**

**Chaplain:** The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rev. Dr. Barry C. Black, Chaplain, United States Senate. **Page H11715**

**Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010:** The House passed H.R. 3619, to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2010, by a ye-

and-nay vote of 385 yeas to 11 nays, Roll No. 813. Consideration of the measure began on Thursday, October 22nd. **Pages H11717–24**

Agreed to:

Flake amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 111–311) that prohibits earmarking the Fishing Safety Training Grants Program; **Pages H11717–18**

Flake amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 111–311) that prohibits earmarking the Fishing Safety Research Training Grants Program; **Page H11718**

Kirkpatrick (AZ) amendment (No. 9 printed in H. Rept. 111–311) that requires that the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to develop a comprehensive strategy to combat the illicit flow of narcotics, weapons, bulk cash, and other contraband through the use of submersible and semi-submersible vessels; **Pages H11718–19**

Nye amendment (No. 11 printed in H. Rept. 111–311) that states that the marine safety provisions of the bill shall not impair the Coast Guard's homeland security missions; **Pages H11720–21**

Oberstar amendment (No. 12 printed in H. Rept. 111–311) that requires the Coast Guard to modify the 2004 Agreement for Outgoing Loans with Presque Isle Township, Michigan, in order to provide for the return of the Historic Fresnel Lens to the lantern room atop the Presque Isle Light Station Lighthouse, Michigan; **Page H11721**

LoBiondo amendment (No. 13 printed in H. Rept. 111–311) that grants limits on liability for actions taken by an owner, operator, time charterer, master or mariner to defend a flagged vessel against attack by pirates. It also requires the secretary to

work through the International Maritime Organization to establish agreements to promote coordinated action among flag-and port-states to protect against piracy; and

**Pages H7721–23**

Kratovil amendment (No. 10 printed in H. Rept. 111–311) that requires the Coast Guard to study the facility infrastructure requirements needed to fulfill the Coast Guard's missions and capabilities, and ensure that the department in which the Coast Guard is operating maintains the ability to utilize the latest technologies (by a recorded vote of 398 ayes with none voting "no", Roll No. 812).

**Pages H11719–20, H11723**

Agreed that the Clerk be authorized to make technical and conforming changes to reflect the actions of the House.

**Page H11724**

H. Res. 853, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to on Thursday, October 22nd.

**Meeting Hour:** Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, October 26 for morning-hour debate, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, October 27, for morning-hour debate.

**Page H11728**

**Quorum Calls Votes:** One yea-and-nay vote and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H11723, H11724. There were no quorum calls.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 12:47 p.m.

## Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

---

## CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of October 26 through October 31, 2009

### Senate Chamber

On *Tuesday*, following a period of morning business, Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Irene Cornelia Berger, and after a period of debate, vote on confirmation of the nomination at 2:15 p.m.; following which, Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 3548, Unemployment Compensation Extension Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at 2:30 p.m.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

## Senate Committees

*(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)*

**Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:** October 27, Subcommittee on Domestic and Foreign Marketing, Inspection, and Plant and Animal Health, with the Subcommittee on Production, Income Protection and Price Support, to hold joint hearings to examine low dairy prices, focusing on exploring avenues for federal action, 2:30 p.m., SH–216.

**Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:** October 28, Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance and Investment, to hold hearings to examine dark pools, flash orders, high frequency trading, and other market structure issues, 10 a.m., SD–538.

October 29, Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation and Community Development, to hold hearings to examine modernizing affordable housing for seniors and people with disabilities, 10:30 a.m., SD–538.

**Committee on the Budget:** October 29, to hold hearings to examine performance-informed budgeting, focusing on opportunities to reduce cost and improve service, 10 a.m., SD–608.

**Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:** October 27, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the broadband stimulus programs in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

October 28, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine combating distracted driving, focusing on managing behavioral and technological risks, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

October 29, Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security, to hold hearings to examine reauthorization of the National Transportation Safety Board, 10 a.m., SR–253.

**Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:** October 28, to hold hearings to examine the role of natural gas in mitigating climate change, 10 a.m., SD–366.

October 28, Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine current and expected impacts of climate change on units of the National Park System, 2 p.m., SD–366.

October 29, Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests, to hold hearings to examine S. 555, to provide for the exchange of certain land located in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests in the State of Colorado, S. 607, to amend the National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986 to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture regarding additional recreational uses of National Forest System land that are subject to ski area permits, S. 721, to expand the Alpine Lakes Wilderness in the State of Washington, to designate the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River and Pratt River as wild and scenic rivers, S. 1122, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with State foresters authorizing State foresters to provide certain forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration and protection services, S. 1328 and H.R. 689, bills to provide for the exchange of administrative jurisdiction over certain Federal land between the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, S. 1442, to

amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service-learning opportunities on public lands, establish a grant program for Indian Youth Service Corps, help restore the Nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, and scenic resources, train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts, and promote the value of public service, and H.R. 129, to authorize the conveyance of certain National Forest System lands in the Los Padres National Forest in California, 2:30 p.m., SD-366.

*Committee on Environment and Public Works:* October 27, to hold hearings to examine S. 1733, to create clean energy jobs, promote energy independence, reduce global warming pollution, and transition to a clean energy economy, 9:30 a.m., SD-406.

October 28, Full Committee, to continue hearings to examine S. 1733, to create clean energy jobs, promote energy independence, reduce global warming pollution, and transition to a clean energy economy, 9:30 a.m., SD-406.

October 29, Full Committee, to continue hearings to examine S. 1733, to create clean energy jobs, promote energy independence, reduce global warming pollution, and transition to a clean energy economy, 9:30 a.m., SD-406.

*Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:* October 29, to hold hearings to examine helping workers preserve retirement security through a recession, 10 a.m., SD-430.

*Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:* October 28, Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Contracting Oversight, to hold hearings to examine new Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance to combat waste, inefficiency, and misuse in federal government contracting, 2:30 p.m., SD-342.

October 29, Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine Federal cyber defense, 2:30 p.m., SD-342.

*Committee on the Judiciary:* October 28, to hold hearings to examine effective strategies for preventing health care fraud, 10 a.m., SD-226.

October 29, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 448 and H.R. 985, bills to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media, S. 714, to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission, S. 1490, to prevent and mitigate identity theft, to ensure privacy, to provide notice of security breaches, and to enhance criminal penalties, law enforcement assistance, and other protections against security breaches, fraudulent access, and misuse of personally identifiable information, S. 139, to require Federal agencies, and persons engaged in interstate commerce, in possession of data containing sensitive personally identifiable information, to disclose any breach of such information, and the nominations of Barbara Milano Keenan, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, Carmen Milagros Ortiz, to be United States Attorney for the District of Massachusetts, and Edward J. Tarver, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Georgia, both of the

Department of Justice, and Ketanji Brown Jackson, of Maryland, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission, 10 a.m., SD-226.

*Select Committee on Intelligence:* October 27, to hold closed hearings to consider certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., S-407, Capitol.

October 29, Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community, 2:30 p.m., S-407, Capitol.

*Special Committee on Aging:* October 28, to hold hearings to examine 401(k) target date funds, 2 p.m., SD-562.

## House Committees

*Committee on Agriculture,* October 28, Subcommittee on Horticulture and Organic Agriculture, hearing to review the implementation of the Horticulture and Organic Agriculture Title of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

October 29, Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, Energy, and Research, hearing to review the future of next generation biofuels, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth,

*Committee on Armed Services,* October 29, Defense Acquisition Reform Panel, hearing on Can DOD Improve Innovation and Competition in Acquisition by Better Utilizing Small Business? 8 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

October 29, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Defeating the Improvised Explosive Device (IED) and Other Asymmetric Threats: Reviewing the Performance and Oversight of the Joint IED Defeat Organization (JIEDDO), 10 a.m., 210 HVC.

*Committee on Education and Labor,* October 29, hearing on Nevada's Workplace Health and Safety Enforcement Program: OSHA's Finding and Recommendations, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

*Committee on Energy and Commerce,* October 27, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing entitled "Protecting the Electric Grid: H.R. 2165, Bulk Power System Protection Act of 2009, and H.R. 2195, To amend the Federal Power Act to provide additional authorities to adequately protect the critical electric infrastructure against cyber attack," 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

*Committee on Financial Services,* October 27, to consider the following measures: October 1, 2009 Discussion Draft of the Private Fund Investment Advisers Registration Act of 2009 (to be reported as H.R. 3818, To amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to require advisers of certain unregistered investment companies to register with and provide information to the Securities and Exchange Commission); October 1, 2009 Discussion Draft of the Investor Protection Act of 2009 (to be reported as H.R. 3817, To provide the Securities and Exchange Commission with additional authorities to protect investors from violations of the securities laws); Amendment in the nature of a substitute October 16 to H.R. 2609, Insurance Information Act of 2009; and Discussion Draft (revised) of October 16, 2009 of the Accountability and Transparency in Rating Agencies Act, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

October 29, hearing entitled "Systemic Regulation, Prudential Matters, Resolution Authority and Securitization," 9:30 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

October 30, hearing entitled “The Overdraft Protection Act of 2009,” 9:30 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

*Committee on Foreign Affairs*, October 27, Subcommittees on the Western Hemisphere, the Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia and the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade, joint hearing on Iran in the Western Hemisphere, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

October 28, full Committee, to mark up H.R. 2194, Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act of 2009, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

October 28, Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, hearing on A Regional Overview of the Middle East, 1 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

October 29, Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health, hearing on A Call to Action on Food Security: A Progress Report on the Administration’s Global Strategy, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

October 29, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade, hearing on Flag on the Bag?: Foreign Assistance and the Struggle Against Terrorism, 10 a.m., 2200 Rayburn.

*Committee on Homeland Security*, October 27, Subcommittee on Emergency Communications, Preparedness and Response, hearing entitled “Preparedness: What has \$29 billion in homeland security grants bought and how do we know?” 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

October 27, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity and Science, and Technology, hearing entitled “Real-Time Assessment of the Federal Response to Pandemic Influenza,” 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

October 29, Subcommittee on Management, Investigations and Oversight, hearing entitled “Creating ‘One DHS’ Part I: Standardizing Department of Homeland Security Financial Management,” 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

*Committee on the Judiciary*, October 27, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing on the Legal Services Corporation, 11 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

October 27, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, hearing on Access to Justice Denied: *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 2:30 p.m., 2237 Rayburn.

October 28, full Committee, hearing on Legal Issues Relating to Football Head Injuries, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

October 29, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing on Racial Disparities in the Criminal Justice System, 9:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

*Committee on Natural Resources*, October 27, Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, Oceans and Wildlife, oversight hearing on Implementation of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

October 27, Subcommittee on Water and Power, oversight hearing entitled “Water Management and Climate Variability: Information Support at the USGS and Bureau of Reclamation,” 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

October 28, full Committee, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 2213, To reauthorize the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act; H.R. 2888, Devils’s Staircase Wilderness Act of 2009; H.R. 2781, To amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the

Molalla River in Oregon, as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; H.R. 86, To eliminate an unused lighthouse reservation, provide management consistency by bringing the rocks and small islands along the coast of Orange County, California, and meet the original Congressional intent of preserving Orange County’s rocks and small islands; and H.R. 118, To authorize the addition of 100 acres to Morristown National Historical Park, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

*Committee on Oversight and Government Reform*, October 27, Subcommittee on Government Management, Organization and Procurement, hearing entitled “IT Procurement and Disposal: Application of the Federal Government’s Green Policies in the Life Cycle Management of its IT Assets,” 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

October 28, full Committee, hearing entitled “Executive Compensation: How Much is Too Much?” 11 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

*Committee on Science and Technology*, October 27, Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation, hearing on Developing Research Priorities at DHS’s Science and Technology Directorate, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

October 29, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing on the Next Generation of Fusion Energy Research, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

*Committee on Small Business*, October 28, hearing entitled “The Recovery Act and Broad Evaluation of Broadband Investments on Small Businesses and Job Creation,” 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure*, October 27, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management, hearing on Recovery Tracking Following the Dollars to the Jobs, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

October 28, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing on NEXTGEN: A Review of the RTCA Mid-Term Implementation Task Force Report, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

October 29, Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, hearing on Addressing the Problem of Distracted Driving, 9:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

*Committee on Veterans’ Affairs*, October 28, to mark up pending business, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

*Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence*, October 27, executive, briefing on National Security Council Review, 3:30 p.m., 304 HVC.

October 27, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, and the Subcommittee on Intelligence Community Management, joint hearing regarding the Congressional Notifications: Intelligence Community Policies, Practices, and Procedures, 10 a.m., 304 HVC.

October 28, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, executive, hearing on Peru Update, 2 p.m., 304 HVC.

October 28, Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence, executive, briefing on Overhead Architecture, 4 p.m., 304 HVC.

October 29, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence, executive, briefing on Hot Spots, 11 a.m., 304 HVC.

*Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming*, October 29, hearing entitled “Fraudulent Letters Opposing Clean Energy Legislation,” 9:30 a.m., room to be announced.

### Joint Meetings

*Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe*: October 28, to hold hearings to examine advancing United States

interests in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) region, 2 p.m., SVC-212/210.

*Joint Economic Committee*: October 29, to hold hearings to examine the impact of the Recovery Act on economic growth, 10 a.m., 2237, Rayburn Building.



Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, October 26

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:30 p.m., Monday, October 26

Senate Chamber

House Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will be in a period of morning business.

Program for Monday: To be announced.

## Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

### HOUSE

Becerra, Xavier, Calif., E2626  
 Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E2619  
 Braley, Bruce L., Iowa, E2625, E2627  
 Brown-Waite, Ginny, Fla., E2621, E2622, E2623, E2624, E2626, E2627  
 Capps, Lois, Calif., E2623  
 Cardoza, Dennis A., Calif., E2622  
 Courtney, Joe, Conn., E2621  
 Davis, Geoff, Ky., E2620

Davis, Susan A., Calif., E2625  
 Dingell, John D., Mich., E2627  
 Faleomavaega, Eni F.H., American Samoa, E2626  
 Fattah, Chaka, Pa., E2619  
 Fox, Virginia, N.C., E2622  
 Frank, Barney, Mass., E2625  
 Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E2624  
 Himes, James A., Conn., E2624  
 Honda, Michael M., Calif., E2623  
 Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E2620  
 Massa, Eric J.J., N.Y., E2623

Mica, John L., Fla., E2626  
 Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E2624  
 Quigley, Mike, Ill., E2624, E2627  
 Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E2626  
 Roe, David P., Tenn., E2626  
 Roskam, Peter J., Ill., E2619  
 Scalise, Steve, La., E2620  
 Shimkus, John, Ill., E2620  
 Wu, David, Ore., E2622



# 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](http://www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess). Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at [swais.access.gpo.gov](http://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](mailto: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](http://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.