United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2011 No. 25

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 16, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ALAN NUNNELEE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

TYRANT FROM THE DESERT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the aftershocks of the Egyptian revolution are being felt throughout the Middle East. The hunger for freedom has gone viral and reenergized the movement for freedom in the country of Iran. No country in that region presents more of a threat to the national security of the United States, Israel, and the world than the ''tyrant from the desert'' and his regime in Iran, Ahmadinejad.

Ahmadinejad says that his first nuclear missile will be sent to Tel Aviv, Israel. He hates the United States; he hates Israel, and he has been determined to destroy the both of us. We must believe his words are more than just rhetoric. For decades, the regime has managed to quash but not eliminate a vibrant opposition movement.

In 2009, that frustration erupted for the whole world to see. Thousands of people, mainly young people, marched defiantly in the streets, protesting the fraudulent election of Ahmadinejad. The ''little tyrant'' is a rogue President and an illegitimate President, and the response from the regime was brutal. Police on motorbikes ran over protestors, fired tear gas, beat them with batons, tortured them, shot them, and over a hundred protestors were murdered in the 2 weeks that followed the election. But to the surprise of the world and the little tyrant from the desert, the flame of freedom was not quashed in Iran.

During that fight for self-determination, our administration was somewhat passive, believing we could work with that tyrant. But Ahmadinejad does not want peace. He's already declared war on his own people and wants war with the West. In Iran there's no freedom of expression and association, no freedom from arrest, detention or torture, and women are denied basic human rights. But there's a remarkable thing, Mr. Speaker, about repression: The more a tyrant tries to hold on to power by cracking down on the people, the faster he loses grip on that society.

So, inspired by the events in Egypt, tens of thousands of young people once again took to the streets in Iran on Monday to protest the rogue government. But the dictator is fighting back, and he will continue to do so. But the protestors want freedom in their country. Communication has been cut. However, we are seeing communication from Iran through videos and YouTube and tweets from those Iranian people. The judiciary in Iran has already arrested 1,500 people. Two nonviolent protestors have been murdered, and the rogue parliament, along with the henchman Ahmadinejad has called for the hanging of corrupt opposition leaders. But the people of Iran still continue to protest.

The Iranian people—the Iranian resistance movement—is here to stay, whether Ahmadinejad likes it or not, and they deserve the same chance as every other freedom-loving people to rule their own country. The Iranians are freedom-loving people, and they deserve that basic human right that all peoples have of self-determination.

Today, we support—I support—the Iranians in Iran to take over their own country and to remove the dictator that is oppressing them. This fight will be difficult, but we hear the cries of the Iranian people. And those of us in Congress that support them, we are not going away any more than the Iranian people are going away, because they have the basic right of self-determination in their country.

And that's just the way it is.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. If our country continues on a course of fiscal irresponsibility and continues to pile debt on our children, we will all feel the consequences, no matter our party. It is vital that our two parties work together, Mr. Speaker, to put our fiscal house in order. So when I tell the House how disappointed I am in the proposal that is on the floor on spending for the rest of the fiscal year, I'm coming from a perspective of real worry about our debt, a defining challenge that must be seriously met. Sadly, that's not the seriousness we see in the Republicans' spending bills for the rest of this fiscal year.

Printed on recycled paper.

Republicans began the new Congress by passing a rules package that paves the way to add nearly $5 trillion to the deficit. Why do I say that? Because the Republican rules provide for $4.7 trillion, to be exact, in additional spending that is not paid for over the next 10 years, while at the same time suggesting reductions in spending, which I think we need to effect. I may disagree with the specifics, but we need to effect reductions in spending. However, if you project $1 trillion in reduced spending and $5 trillion in additional unpaid-for expenditure, it doesn't take much of a mathematician to get you to $4 trillion of additional deficits. This is in the context of the $5 trillion they've authorized themselves to borrow from our children and in the context of the Republican record of fiscal irresponsibility in the past where, as I pointed out, every Republican administration with which I've served has run over a trillion dollars of deficit—$1.4 trillion for Mr. Reagan, about $1.1 trillion for the first President Bush, and $3.6 trillion or $3.7 trillion for the second President Bush—as contrasted with a $62.9 billion surplus under the Clinton administration.

Time and again, Republicans have used the rhetoric of spending cuts as a cover for massive borrowing, for record surplus to turn into record deficits—a $5.6 trillion projected surplus in 2001 turned into about a $5 trillion projected deficit in the following 8 years under President Bush—and for budgets that year after year did far more fiscal damage than they promised. This time, unfortunately, is no different.

But let's look at the actual cuts proposed in this spending bill. They're shortsighted and indiscriminate. Even as they fail to change our long-term fiscal picture for the better, these cuts recklessly damage programs essential to America's competitive edge. I agree that reducing spending is and must be a part of the fiscal solution, but let's reduce spending wisely instead of doing it in such a way that costs America jobs.

When we talk about cutting investments in education, in innovation, and in infrastructure, we are talking about cutting tomorrow's jobs, because those are exactly the investments that will build the technologies and industries of the future and help American workers stay competitive in a global economy. The Association of General Contractors said that just yesterday in USA Today.

The spending bill on the floor today would make it harder for deserving students to afford college, meaning a less educated, less competitive workforce. Every businessperson that I've talked to says that's not the way to go.

□ 1010

It would cut 20,000 researchers supported by the National Science Foundation and $2.5 billion in cancer and other disease research at the National Institutes of Health, meaning an America in danger of losing its place as the world's innovation leader. If we do that, we will not be the kind of country Americans want to be.

It would lead to the loss of 25,000 construction jobs and leave our air traffic control system stuck in the last century, meaning an America with an infrastructure falling further and further behind our competitors.

We need spending discipline. Everyone in America knows that, and everyone in this House knows that—but not at the cost of our future and our jobs. I suggest to you that the rules adopted in this House not only did not effect discipline; they ignored and threw out the door discipline, and said that they could borrow $4.7 trillion and not pay for it.

I can't sum up the central issue any better than Jack Lew, our Director of OMB, who said this: ''We must take care to avoid indiscriminate cuts in areas critical to long-term growth, like education, innovation, and infrastructure, cuts that would stifle the economy just as it begins to recover.'' Now, who was making a similar statement like that? Richard Trumka, the president of the AFL–CIO. Who was he doing it with? Mr. Tom Donohue, the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. ''That, in turn, would deprive us of one of the most powerful drivers of deficit reduction, a growing economy,'' concluded Jack Lew.

The President's bipartisan fiscal commission agrees. It found that indiscriminate cuts to investments in growth would ''interfere with the ongoing economic recovery.'' Both commissions concluded that short-term substantial cuts in research, education, and innovation would be harmful to bringing this economy back to where we want it to be.

Therefore, I urge my Republicans friends: Listen to the economic and business leaders who understand the value of public investment, not as a replacement for the private sector, but in partnership with the private sector. That's the partnership that Democrats are striving for with our Make It in America agenda. ''Make it in America,'' of course, means two things:

Number one, you're going to make it. You're going to succeed. You're going to have the opportunity to get opportunities. Of course, ''make it in America'' also means that we are going to make ''it'' in America. We are going to manufacture and grow it in America and sell it here and around the world. The President wants to double our exports over the next 5 years. We can do that; we should do that, and Americans believe that, if we do that, we will remain the great economic engine that they believe our country needs to be.

We have a set of bills that helps create an environment for American companies to create jobs here and to manufacture more goods here in America so that more middle class families will be able to make it in America. Let's cut needless spending but preserve our investments in growth, and let's work together to build the bipartisan support that is essential to the hard choices our long-term fiscal problems demand.

I tell my friends on the other side of the aisle, when you look at your rules package and when you contemplate the fact that you have provided for an additional $4.7 trillion of spending without paying for it and at the same time you project a $100 billion cut per year over 10 years, $1 trillion, it is quite obvious that there is a $4 trillion hole that you have created.

Reforming the Tax Code to grow our economy and reduce the deficit is absolutely essential, in my view, eliminating wasteful defense spending that doesn't keep us safer, and keeping our entitlement programs solvent for generations to come.

Those are the challenges that both Republicans and Democrats need to face together: to cooperate, to make common cause, to make sure that our children and grandchildren inherit a fiscally sound Nation and not a Nation deeply mired in debt, not a Nation that has $4.7 trillion in expenditures without paying for them, as the Republican rules suggest.

THE COURAGE TO CONTROL GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND RETURN POWER TO THE PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HAYWORTH) for 5 minutes.

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, I received a letter from Jeremy Vaitas, who lives in Middletown, New York.

He wrote: ''As a 13-year-old boy in seventh grade, I am concerned about my future. Currently, the national debt is 14 trillion, 16 billion, 110 million, 552 thousand, 952 dollars, and five cents. Myself and every other citizen will have to pay $45,241.77 to eliminate this debt. My parents struggle with money, and I'm afraid that I will struggle even more and not be able to own a home, buy a car, or provide for a family someday.

''I feel the only way to reduce the national debt is to reduce the amount of money the government is spending. There are many ways to do this, but I believe increasing taxes is not one of them. To reduce the national debt, I would like to see you vote against any further bailouts or any other wasteful spending programs that give money to people or businesses that make bad decisions. Furthermore, I think you should concentrate on fraud and misuse of government funds.''

Here is a 13-year-old who has the common sense to recognize that our Federal Government has been committing intergenerational theft and to call for it to stop. Our national debt is increasing at a rate of more than $4 billion per day.

We are hearing a lot about the people who would be deprived of some form of benefit through spending cuts, but

Jeremy's voice reminds us that Americans everywhere, and especially those who are most vulnerable by virtue of their youth, are being deprived of opportunity by the government's profligacy. We can help them best by returning taxpayer dollars to American pockets to buy, build, invest, and hire.

That is our most urgent task.

Jeremy Vaitas is only 13, but he gets it.

He needs us in Congress to be adults, to accept that we must say ''no'' to what has been all too easy to do in the past—to spend taxpayer dollars to grow the Federal Government far beyond its constitutional bounds. We must say ''no'' in order to say ''yes'' to the opportunity and prosperity that come only with American enterprise, entrepreneurship, and ingenuity. We must say ''yes'' to the future that Jeremy and all of the members of his generation and of generations to come deserve as the heirs to the American Dream.

Our Nation is exceptional in all of history and in all the world. It has always taken courage to defend it. The continuing resolution we will pass this week must show that we have the courage to take control of our government's spending and return power to the people.

THE FIGHT OF AMERICA'S VETERANS FOR ECONOMIC SECURITY HERE AT HOME

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with all of this talk about the CR and where money is being spent and where taxpayer dollars should be spent, I want to remind Americans that there are 1.4 million Americans on active duty in our U.S. military. Another 718,000 civilian personnel support our men and women in uniform, and 1.1 million are in the Reserves or in the National Guard.

The military is our Nation's largest employer, and it is honorable work. Our fighting men and women are the best and the brightest, the bravest and the most battle-tested. They serve with distinction whether they are on bases here at home or in combat abroad, whether they are in the infantry or in military information technology.

But once our soldiers, airmen, sailors, and marines leave the service, shouldn't they be assured of jobs right here in America? Is that too much to ask of Congress? Is it too much to ask of America? Shouldn't their families know that they will have roofs over their heads, food on their tables, and clothes on their backs? That's the least we can do for our veterans, but for too many veterans, unemployment and economic insecurity is what they are finding in civilian life.

□ 1020

Recently, I asked unemployed veterans to send me their resumes and their stories so that I can submit them for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to put their struggles front and center before our government. I heard from a number of veterans who sent their resumes to me at Resumes From Veterans @mail. house. gov.

I heard from Charles Diver of Plantation, Florida, who served for 4 years in the U.S. Coast Guard. He wrote that, ''In addition to being unemployed, many of us feel the government has been less than forthcoming about the scope of the problem.''

I couldn't agree more. Mr. Diver has been unemployed since June of 2009. I think we owe him more than that for the service that he's given to our country.

Vincent Torrez of Las Vegas, Nevada, told me, ''It has been a year since I have been discharged from the Army, and it has virtually been impossible for me to find work that matches my skillset in the civilian market. I believe within the next few years unemployed veterans will be a bigger problem than it is now with the wars coming to a close.''

Mr. Torrez last served in the Army's 1st Airborne Division, 509th Infantry Regiment Opposing Force. We should see to it that veterans like him can find meaningful work when they're back at home.

I heard from Mr. Jay Magan of Taylorsville, Kentucky, who wrote simply and poignantly, ''Out of work for 1½ years. Desperate for a job.'' He signed that short e-mail, ''Respectfully, Jay G. Magan.''

We owe him more respect than unemployment for his 20 years of service in the United States Navy.

I heard from Evelyn Thomas. She is a veteran of the Army National Guard and the Marine Corps and lives in Carlsbad, California. She enlisted in the military on the Montgomery G.I. Bill in order to earn money for college. She then obtained a master's degree in teaching, learning, and leadership. She told me, ''We need to create jobs. We need to provide avenues and opportunities for manufacturing and production companies to exist in this global economy. Now I am at a crossroads, in which I must utilize my activism work to create a job. I must work to support my family. I want to work. Surely, there is a position for a honorably discharged veteran with a master's degree.''

Indeed, there should be.

But then, Mr. Speaker, I received what I think is the most striking e-mail. It was from Tonya Batson, the wife of a 12-year Navy veteran named Billy Batson. She didn't write much, just that Mr. Batson had been out of work since December of 2009, over a year, after his military service ended. But imagine the anguish that Mr. and Mrs. Batson must be feeling. Imagine the uncertainty. I refuse to accept that any military spouse should feel that. No husband or wife, who after supporting their partner through military service, deployment, travel, and battle, should feel like they have to fight another battle right here at home to find a job, to provide for their family, to be financially secure.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. We can create an economy that employs all of our veterans. We need a jobs program that will put Americans back to work doing productive things for society—teachers aides in classrooms across the country, health clinic workers, home energy technicians, food pantry workers. We can create jobs that pay benefits to workers and the country without the kind of overhead of infrastructure and other projects.

But, Mr. Speaker, we can do even better than creating jobs. We can eliminate unemployment as a factor in American life. In order to do that, I need to hear more stories like those of Mr. Diver, Mr. Torrez, Mr. Magan, Ms. Thomas, and Mr. and Mrs. Batson. I know they are out there, so I'm calling on unemployed veterans to send me their resumes and stories to Resumes From Veterans @mail. house. gov.

As I've said before, sending me your resume will not get you a job, or put you into consideration for a job. But it can help keep the unemployed problem front and center here in Washington.

We need to do something, Mr. Speaker, so that all Americans, veterans and nonveterans alike, have work. We can do so much better.

VETERAN'S RESUME FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

From: Chuck Diver [chuckdiver@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2011 8:25 AM
To: Veterans, Resumes from

DEAR REP. JESSE JACKSON JR.: Thank you for your work. Providing veterans with recognition is an important contribution, because in addition to being unemployed, many of us feel the government has been less than forthcoming about the scope of the problem. I served four years in the U.S. Coast Guard.

RESPECTFULLY, CHARLES E. DIVER.

CHARLES E. DIVER

AIRCRAFT DISPATCHER

Nine years experience dispatching aircraft under Part 121 and Part 135 operations both domestically and internationally, of which the last one and one half years were as the manager of the flight control department.

Professional Strengths

Use of aviation software programs; attention to detail while multitasking; composure in stressful situations; excellent communications skills; respectful of cultural diversity; ability to prioritize dynamically; ability to teach and supervise; management experience; private pilot (SEL).

Key Achievements

Los prevention by audit control of APIS and E–APIS reports and required passenger travel documentation.

Designated as dispatch ground instructor.

Contributed to and assisted with GOM and OPSPEC revisions.

Poit of contact for U.S. Customs, Immigration, TSA and FAA Inspectors.

Professional Experience

Manager of Flight Control Lynx Air International—11–2007 to 6–2009

Disatched company aircraft on charters and scheduled domestic and international flights.

Responsible for all dispatch operations, reporting directly to the DO and the President of Administration.

Adjusted master crew schedule as necessary for operational requirements.

Coordinated operational requirements for charter, cargo, and passenger service departments.

Managed logistical considerations for all flights including over-flight permits and fuel cost and availability.

Interviewed, hired and trained new dispatch personnel, including recurrent training.

Maintained records archives and updated all dispatch records and required manuals, including operational expense reports, aircraft and crew flight times, maintenance status of aircraft and Twelve-five security protocol documents.

Aircraft Dispatcher Lynx Air International—8–2005 to 11–2007

Dispatched Fairchild Metroliner III (SA227–AC) on charters and to the Bahamas, Haiti and Guantanamo (GITMO) Cuba using Flitesoft Commercial Flight Calculator and Flight View. All releases done manually for each flight and filed or updated all flight plans.

Assisted the flight control manager as possible in the completion of his responsibilities.

Interacted with cargo department, reservations and ticket counter personnel for each flight as necessary.

Assisted other departments as circumstances required when not the dispatcher on duty.

Flight Follower, Custom Air Transport 2–2005 to 8–2005

Monitored scheduled and on demand cargo flights of Boeing 727–200 aircraft domestically and internationally using Navtech flight planning software and Flight Explorer for flight following.

Interacted with company supervisors and customer service representatives, especially during delayed flights or IROPS.

Aircraft Dispatcher Lynx Air International—12–2003 to 2–2005

Dispatched Fairchild Metroliner III (SA227–AC) on charters and to the Bahamas, Haiti and Guantanamo (GITMO) Cuba using Flitesoft Commercial Flight Calculator and Flight View. All releases done manually for each flight and filed or updated all flight plans.

Assisted the flight control manager as possible in the completion of his responsibilities.

Interacted with cargo department, reservations and ticket counter personnel for each flight as necessary.

Assisted other departments as circumstances required when not the dispatcher on duty.

Aircraft Dispatcher Atlantic Southeast Airlines—11–2000 to 9–2002

Dispatched CRJ's, ATR–72's and E–120's domestically and internationally using Eagle Dispatch Monitor, Flight Explorer, Flight Trac Plot, Storm Century PC and the ''Delta Term'' system of flight information management.

Aircraft Dispatcher Chalks Ocean Airways—8–2000 to 11–2000

Dispatched Grumman Mallard seaplanes to the Bahamas.

Interacted with station agents to coordinate passenger services.

Health Care Educator Behavioral Medicine and Biofeedback Consultants—3–1993 to 12–1999

Taught behavior modification under the supervision of a licensed psychologist in his private practice and at North Broward Medical Center (NBMC), utilizing biofeedback assisted stress management and relaxation techniques to patients with stress symptoms and work related injuries. Provided classroom instruction and public lectures at NBMC for the management of diabetes, and conducted group sessions for the use of behavioral strategies to improve coping skills for diabetes, pain control and related conditions for stroke survivors.

Education

Sheffield School of Aeronautics—Aircraft Dispatcher Certification (Certificate Number 2636673); Graduated 8–2000.

Sea School—U.S. Merchant Marine Officer License (Serial Number 605571); Graduated 6–1984.

University of North Florida—Master of Science in Allied Health Services (GPA 4.00); Graduated 3–1979.

University of North Florida—Bachelor of Arts in Psychology (GPA 3.30); Graduated 12–1977.

Military

U.S. Coast Guard—Rate/Rank: Quartermaster / E–5; Enlisted 8–31–1970.

National Defense Service Medal; Small Boat Coxswain Insignia; Secret Clearance, Honorable Discharge 8–30–1974.

RESUME FOR CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

From: Vince Torrez [vince.torrez@hotmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2011 3:11 AM

To: Veterans, Resumes from

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: I recently read an article in the Army Times that unemployed Veteran's resumes were being published in the Congressional Record for debate on the floor. As an unemployed Veteran of the Iraq War I would like my resume published into record. It has been a year since I have been discharged from the Army, and it has virtually been impossible for me to fmd a job that matches my skill set in the civilian market. I believe within the next few years unemployed Veterans will be a bigger problem than it is now with the wars coming to a close. Furthermore, with the reduction of military force this will only increase, and possibility lead to unrest among Veterans and their families.

Thank you,

VINCENT TORREZ.

VINCENT TORREZ JR.

Objective

A dedicated and loyal Veteran with a plethora of diverse talent seeking to obtain a position with the Secret Service as a Special Agent

Professional Experience

Company: Active Army Component, 1st Airborne 509th Infantry Regiment Opposing Force, Joint Readiness Training Center and Fort Polk, Louisiana

Employment Dates: August 2008–April 2010

Supervisor: 1 SG David Crosson, May Contact

Salary: $35,000 per year, 40–50 Hours Per Week, Pay Grade E–5

Position: Lead Company Program Administrator

Duties:

Manage accountability and adjustment of over $1.5 million worth of assigned equipment.

Development and implementation of standardize training in clerical data.

Brief senior leadership on work conditions and climate.

Ensure the workplace is in compliance with policies and regulations.

Accountable for official administrative actions of one-hundred seventy employees to include separations, retirements, awards, and leave.

Director of company retention and professional development program for approximately one-hundred sixty-five employees.

Strong clerical skills with ability to type forty words per minute.

Possession of superb written and interpersonal skills.

Processing of legal documents Absence Without Leave, Chapter Discharge packets, and Company level Uniform Code of Military Justice proceedings.

Created an internal guidelines for processing employees more efficiently.

Monitored coordinating and supporting of reports to meet objectives and deadlines daily, monthly, and quarterly basis.

Orally administrated numerous operational directives.

Assisted in unit operations center (C2 Command and control).

Company: Active Army Component, 1st Battalion 26th Infantry Regiment, Schweinfurt, Germany

Employment Dates: April 2005–August 2008

Supervisor: Major Andrew Jasso, May Contact

Salary: $28,000 per year, 40–50 Hours Per Week, Pay Grade E–4 to E–5

Position: Team Leader

Duties:

Outstanding ability briefing senior leadership.

Skillful in research and analysis in security protection programs.

Highly organized and attentive in the construction of emergency response programs.

Active Department of Defense secret clearance.

Extensive experience as a Team Leader in a personnel security team; maintaining static and roving security posture, preventing of unauthorized trespassing of controlled access points, and provided physical body protection for Army Officers, Army civilian employees, and Army contractors while in Baghdad, Iraq.

Familiarized in remaining composed and disciplined under duress.

Expertise with American small arms weapons systems; 9MM, M203, 240B, 240C, M–4, M–16, 50 Cal., and M–14 rifle.

Participated in conducting surveillance, search warrants, and arrests on criminal targets for the purpose of testifying in Iraqi court to the events witnessed.

Seized numerous devices as evidence while conducting preliminary intelligence gathering such as weapons, ammunitions, and bomb making materials.

Conducted primarily field interviews of suspected criminals during search warrants.

Development and implementation of standardize training.

An earned reputation for continued consummate team player with ability to communicate effectively with internal and external agencies.

Achievements

Participated in Operation Iraqi Freedom Fiscal Years 2006–2008.

Awarded the Iraqi Campaign Medal with Campaign Star.

Awarded the Combat Infantryman Badge.

Awarded the Army Commendation Medal for Actions in Combat.

Received commendable evaluation for pioneering overhaul on Company Retention Program.

Company: Oreck Corporation, 2047 West Bullard Avenue, Fresno, CA 93711

Employment Dates: March 2000–April 2005

Supervisor: Martin Lopez, May Contact

Wage: $9.00 per hour plus commission, 30 Hours Per Week

Position: Manager

Duties:

Administer daily operations: including accounts, security deposits, customer service, and sales.

Planning and coordinating business itineraries for management.

Oversight on protection of store assets and investigation of loss assets.

Education and Specialized Training

Specialized Training:

Drivers Training Course: Ft. Polk, Louisiana 2009. Curriculum focuses on laws of the road 40 hours, and 20 hours of on and off road vehicle driving of military and civilian wheeled vehicles.

Advance Leaders Course: Schweinfurt, Germany 2008. A focus on planning and conducting operation orders, combat leadership skills, and becoming subject matter experts on small arms proficiency. Fundamental characteristics of ballistic trajectory.

Warriors Leaders Course: Grafenwohr, Germany 2008. Primary focus on developmental leadership skills. A breadth of military subjects to include leadership in combat, land navigation, individual skill training, and physical fitness.

Combat Life-Saver Course: Schweinfurt, Germany 2006. Highly developed lifesaving procedures beyond the level of basic first aid. Combat methodologies on intravenous injections, cardiopulmonary resuscitation, trauma management, and medical evaluation.

Bachelor of Arts in History with an emphasis in U.S. History, May 2004; California State University, Fresno: Fresno, CA 93740

Related Course Work:

Political Science: Acquired a strong foundation of American politics, domestic and foreign policy. Composed written assignments on U.S. and North Korean Relations.

Computer Aptitude:

Military Systems: Force Battlefield Command Bridge and Below, Blue Force Tracker System

Operating Systems: Windows XP, Vista

Software Applications: Microsoft Power Point, Word, Excel, Access

General Education Diploma, June 1997; Sanger High School: Sanger, CA 93657

References

Available upon request.

URGENT NEED TO CUT GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND REDUCE GOVERNMENT DEBT

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

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the urgent need to cut government spending and reduce government debt.

Last year, our President and our Congress failed to enact a budget. This fundamental failure of leadership has put our country on a path of skyrocketing debt, growing deficits, and unacceptably high unemployment.

This week, the President submitted to this new Congress a new budget proposal. Instead of recognizing the urgent need to reduce spending and reduce our debt, the President's budget proposal amounts to, yet again, failure of leadership. It is a budget predicated on unsustainable deficit spending and insurmountable debt that will be passed on to our children and to our grandchildren.

Our deficit is projected to reach an all-time high of $1.6 trillion, and our national debt is projected to equal the size of the entire U.S. economy, reaching over $15 trillion by September 30 of this year. And for 21 straight months, our national unemployment rate has been at 9 percent or higher, the country's longest jobless streak since the Great Depression.

The people of my district, Virginia's Fifth District, and the people of our Nation know this course is unsustainable and that it must stop. Enough is enough. It is time to chart a new course of fiscal discipline and restraint. It is time to act on the urgent message sent by the people in November that we must put an end to Washington's reckless spending.

No longer should the people of the Fifth District be stuck to foot the bill for a growing and intrusive Federal Government. No longer should families and businesses in central and southside Virginia be the ones making the tough choices to live within their means while the Federal Government borrows 40 cents on every dollar it spends.

By making tough choices and by reducing government spending, we are taking the first step in tackling our unsustainable debt and of preserving our economic strength for future generations. By reducing spending, we are restoring a sense of certainty and confidence to the marketplace that will create a better environment for job creation. By reducing spending, we are reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government and are empowering our true job creators to hire, innovate, and expand.

The decisions we face are not easy, but we have not been given an easy task. Now is the time to act and to act boldly if we are serious about leaving a better America for our children and our grandchildren.

THE 2011 CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the reckless spending plan in H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 43 days since I joined the new Congress, and my colleagues across the aisle have not offered one job, let alone offered a jobs plan to put Americans back to work. While hardworking Americans struggle to keep a roof over their head, food on the table, and the heat turned on, my colleagues have not taken one single action to create jobs for the unemployed. They have completely abandoned the number one issue for the American people right now—jobs and the unemployment rate—and in fact, they are blatantly destroying, instead of creating, good jobs.

In fact, the Speaker recently said, ''Over the last 2 years since President Obama has taken office, the Federal Government has added 200,000 new Federal jobs,'' greatly exaggerating, citing a number 10 times greater than what has actually been reported. He said, ''If some of those jobs are lost in the spending cuts, so be it.''

Mr. Speaker, under the Republican plan, jobs are the target of the cuts. For example, the largest cuts ever in history for education programs under H.R. 1 would result in more than 26,000 K–12 teachers and support staff, 14,000 Head Start teachers, and 7,000 special ed teachers all losing their jobs. This is just the education budget alone.

According to the nonpartisan Economic Policy Institute, the Republican continuing resolution would cost the Nation almost 1 million jobs. Included on the majority party cut list are 25,000 new construction jobs from infrastructure projects, 1,300 police officers by eliminating the COPS program, 2,400 firefighters by terminating SAFER grants, and 16,000 private sector construction jobs lost from cutting $1.7 billion to the Federal Buildings Fund.

The spending plan would also slash in half all job training funds—dollars used to help workers obtain the skills they need to compete in the global economy.

Mr. Speaker, reducing the unemployment rate is the most important challenge facing this country. The most promising new source of economic growth and job creation is in our public infrastructure system, from roads and bridges to broadband and air traffic control systems to a new energy grid. I commend President Obama for his leadership in crafting a budget proposal for fiscal year 2012, for his leadership in crafting this budget proposal that focuses Federal dollars on rebuilding America's infrastructure, which USA Today describes as ''a massive job creation engine, with plans to generate millions of jobs by repairing and expanding highways, bridges, and railways.''

Mr. Speaker, the President's budget addresses the real sources of our deficit and makes tough but careful choices needed to reduce the deficit. With cuts of $78 billion, President Obama has taken the first step in curbing the massive defense budget, and I want to work with my colleagues and the President to find additional savings in the defense budget by closing permanent bases overseas that no longer serve a strategic value.

□ 1030

For example, I believe we need to examine why we still have over 200 military bases in Germany 65 years after World War II and many years after the fall of the Berlin Wall. The President also makes necessary sacrifices to sustain the maximum Pell Grant award for all students by eliminating the summer Pell Grant program. These are hard cuts to swallow but are necessary.

The Republican bill, on the other hand, prefers to arbitrarily make shortsighted cuts; for example, cutting funding from programs that affect

women and their children, like $758 million from the WIC program and $1 billion from Head Start. The long-term impact of these cuts is clear: prohibiting access to family planning services. So guess what happens? Then denying food for the child and denying access to preschool.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 recklessly cuts spending at the expense of our economic recovery and job creation; nor does the Republican plan put us on a sustainable path to deficit reduction.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this job-cutting, fiscally irresponsible spending bill.

WE ALL NEED TO GET INTO THE BOAT TOGETHER

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to congratulate President Obama for what I believe were the most important words that came from his press conference that he delivered yesterday when he said we all need to get into the boat together. Now, he was referring, of course, to the challenge of entitlement spending.

I listened to my California colleague talk about her priorities when it comes to dealing with budget issues. We are in the midst of a debate right now that will take place later today, and obviously it went into early this morning, on the continuing resolution and the challenges we face there. We are looking at making cuts that are important and need to take place. But, Mr. Speaker, they pale in comparison to the challenge that we face of dealing with entitlement spending.

When the President said we all need to get into that boat together, what he meant was, it was very clear, we need to work together in a bipartisan way. And there are all kinds of challenges that have been put before us and horror stories as it relates to entitlement spending. And there is a tendency on both sides of the aisle, when it comes to dealing with the issue of entitlement spending, to point the finger of blame at the other party. That's why I was particularly pleased that just recently the former chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, our colleague Pete Domenici, along with the former Director of the Congressional Budget Office, Alice Rivlin, have been meeting with leaders of both political parties, talking about the imperative of dealing with the issue of entitlement reform.

As we look at the debate that's taking place right now, Mr. Speaker, on the discretionary spending that is before us and juxtapose that to the massive, massive spending as we look as far as the eye can see when it comes to Social Security, Medicare, and other entitlement spending, I believe that if we can deal with entitlement spending, we will be able to have resources to address priorities that I know my California colleague and other colleagues on both sides of the aisle share. So that's why I think that it's important for both the left and the right to come together and recognize that the problems that exist with entitlement spending need to be addressed in a bipartisan way. They can be addressed in a bipartisan way. And in so doing, we will be ensuring that future generations are not going to face this tremendous debt burden.

We'll be addressing the issue that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, has said is our number one national security threat, and that is the looming national debt. I believe that we will be able to let the American people know that we do have, as a priority, a desire to work together to resolve the very important problems that lie ahead.

A HUMAN AND CIVIL RIGHTS CRISIS

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I rise today to bring the urgent attention of the U.S. House of Representatives to a human rights and civil rights crisis. I want to talk to you today about a part of the world where the rights of citizens of all walks of life to protest and speak their minds is being denied with clubs and pepper spray; a part of the world where a student strike led the university to ban student protests anywhere, anytime on campus; and where, when the students protested the crackdown on free speech, they were violently attacked by heavily armed riot police; a place where a newspaper editorial stated, ''The indiscriminate aggression of police riot squads against students who are exercising their constitutional rights in public areas is a gross violation of their rights and an act comparable only to the acts of the dictatorships we all denounce and reject''; a place where the government has closed public access to some legislative sessions just like this one.

I ask this Congress to look at a part of the world where the Bar Association has been dismantled by the legislature and its leader has been jailed for fighting a politically motivated lawsuit. And where is this part of the world? Egypt? No. Protesters exercising freedom of speech brought down a dictator in Cairo last week. What far away land has seen student protests banned, union protesters beaten, and free speech advocates jailed? The United States of America's colony of Puerto Rico. Sound outrageous? It is. But true, and well documented.

I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to turn their eyes to Puerto Rico. The doors of the U.S. Congress are open. Our proceedings are public. In fact, the public is our boss, and that's how it works in a democracy. Across America today, I am sure there will be protests at college campuses. Across America, workers will go on strike, and there will be marches and protests against mayors and Governors and derogatory things said, even about President Obama.

In Madison, Wisconsin, as we speak, protests over employment policies and budget cuts at the University of Wisconsin are taking place. College and even high school students have been joined by union members and their allies in peaceful protests on the streets across the State of Wisconsin. Will we see pepper spray and beatings? Not likely. The protesters will be protected by the First Amendment to our Constitution. And that's the way it works in a democracy. It is their right to say whatever they want and say it without fear of pepper spray or clubs or a legislature that limits and restricts the people's rights.

In the 50 States, we have lots of organizations not unlike the Puerto Rican Bar Association, an organization under attack by the government, and we don't tolerate its leaders being sent to jail because they exercise their rights and they stand up for what they believe in. But that's not the reality in Puerto Rico.

Just last week, Judge Fuste, a Federal judge with close ties to the ruling party and a personal history of opposing the Puerto Rican Bar Association, this Federal judge whose salary is paid for by the taxpayers of America, ordered Osvaldo Toledo, the president of the Puerto Rican Bar Association, to jail. And what was Mr. Toledo's crime? Educating his members on how to opt out of a politically motivated lawsuit designed to destroy the Bar Association. For me, this attack was the final straw that brought me to the floor to speak out today.

So, in solidarity with Osvaldo Toledo, jailed for doing his job as the leader of the Puerto Rican Bar Association, I will enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today the instructions for his members on how to opt out of the class action lawsuit that is threatening the viability of the Bar Association.

I will say to those who would pass laws to stifle public protest, to those who would authorize the use of force against peaceful protesters, and to stifle the words and actions of their enemies, attacking free speech has no place in a democracy, and a Federal judge like Fuste should know better.

Here is a fact that most of us learned a long time ago: Brutal laws, secret meetings, armed enforcers don't extinguish the flame of justice; they are the spark that makes it burn even brighter. You may, with your armed guards and your restrictive laws, try to slow down the protests of the people of Puerto Rico. You may harass the Puerto Rican Bar Association and make their life uncomfortable for a while. And every time you turn police on students and jail an opponent, you guarantee that the good people of Puerto Rico and this Congress will speak out.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the people of Puerto Rico, there are some places

that this crusade to end free speech cannot reach, not today, not ever. I stand with you.

February ____, 2011
Brown vs. Colegio de Abogados Administrator
PO Box 2439 Faribault, MN 55021–9139.
Re: Request for Exclusion
To Whom It May Concern:
I do not want to be part of the Damages Class in Brown v. Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico, CV 06–1645 (JP).
No quiero ser parte de la Clase con Derecho a Resarcimiento en Brown v. Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico, CV 06–1645 (JP).
Regards, _____ (firma)
Name/Nombre _____
(print)(letra de molde)
Address/Dirección: _____
Phone Numbers/Teléfonos: ( ) _____
( ) _____

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO

Herbert W. Brown, III, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico, Defendant.
Civil No: 06–1645 (JP).
Class Action.

NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT

Please read this notice carefully. It explains that you are entitled to a judgment against the Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico. This is not a notice of a lawsuit against you.

I. Summary of Important Points

Liability has been established in a federal class action lawsuit in which you were identified as a class member. You are automatically entitled to a judgment in your favor, unless you choose to exclude yourself from the judgment.

You do not need to do anything to have the judgment entered in your favor.

If your address has changed, you should complete the enclosed Change of Address form and submit it to the address indicated on the form so that any payment to you can be sent to your current address. Please note the following important dates:

February 26, 2011 Deadline for submitting Change of Address form (see enclosed form).

February 26, 2011 Deadline to exclude yourself from the judgment (see procedures below).

For more detailed information relating to this class action, please refer to the information set forth below.

II. Why did I get this notice?

This is a notice of a class action lawsuit wherein the Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico (''Colegio'') was found liable for impermissibly collecting dues from its members from October 2002 to December 2006 which were utilized for a mandatory life insurance program. You have received this notice because records indicate that you were an attorney practicing in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico local courts from 2002–2006, who was obligated to pay the Colegio the annual membership renewal fee in order to practice law in this jurisdiction. Your legal rights will be affected by the judgment to be entered in this lawsuit.

Please read this notice carefully. It explains the lawsuit, the finding of liability, and your legal rights.

III. What is this lawsuit about?

This lawsuit was filed on June 27, 2006, in the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico and assigned case number CV 06–1645 (JP), Plaintiffs Herbert W. Brown, III, José L. Ubarri, and David W. Román claimed that they were required to purchase a compulsory life insurance policy as a precondition to their ability to practice law in Puerto Rico in violation of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. §1983.

Plaintiffs' claims were that the Colegio's compulsory life insurance program was not germane to the purposes that justify an integrated bar association, and therefore violated the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

On September 26, 2008, the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico granted summary judgment in favor of Plaintiffs and found the Colegio liable for ''damages to compensate the members of the Colegio whose dues were allocated to the compulsory life insurance program from the entry of the Romero decision in 2002 until the present . . .'' *Brown v. Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico*, 579 F. Supp. 2d 211, 222 (D.P.R. 2008).

On April 27, 2009, the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico entered an Amended Final Judgment In favor of Plaintiffs.

On July 23, 2010, the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit affirmed the District Court's finding of liability against Colegio. Also, the First Circuit vacated the District Court's judgment insofar as it determined the amount of damages and remanded the case to allow notice to be given to Class Members including their right to opt out of the Class. The First Circuit determined that, after the expiration of the notice period, the District Court should reinstate the damage award as calculated before but this time excluding damages otherwise attributable to those who opted out of the Class. *Brown v. Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico*, 613 F.3d 44 (1st Cir. 2010).

IV. Why is this a class action?

In a class action, one or more persons, called ''Class Representatives'' (in this case Herbert W. Brown, III, José L. Ubarri, and David W. Román) sue on behalf of people who have similar claims. All of these people together are a ''Class'' or ''Class Members.'' The Court resolves the issues for all Class Members, except for those who exclude themselves from the Class.

V. Who are Class Members?

You received this notice because the Colegio's records identified you as a Class Member entitled to damages. That means that you fit the description of the Damages Class, which the Court has certified. The certified. Damages Class consists of all attorneys practicing in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico local courts from 2002–2006, who were obligated to pay the Colegio de Abogados their yearly annual membership renewal fee in order to practice law in this jurisdiction.

VI. What will the judgment provide?

Judgment will be entered against the Colegio for damages based on the amount of the individual membership fees paid by Class Members to the Colegio from 2002–2006 which were impermissibly attributed to the compulsory life insurance program. This amount may total up to four million one hundred fifty six thousand nine hundred eighty eight dollars and seventy cents ($4,156,988.70). Judgment will also be entered for interest, costs and attorney's fees, in an amount in addition to the damage figure. No attorney's fees will be deducted from the Damages Class' judgment or recovery.

The Court has also issued a permanent injunction as follows: Defendant Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico is hereby prohibited from collecting from its members that portion of their future annual dues attributable to the Colegio's mandatory group life insurance program. Failure to comply with this Judgment will result in an immediate reimbursement of the funds allocated for compulsory life insurance, or an Order of Execution against the property and assets of the Colegio.

VII. How much will my judgment be?

If you do not opt out of the Damages Class, judgment will be entered in your favor in the amount of the membership dues you actually paid to the Colegio from 2002–2006 which were impermissibly attributed to the compulsory life insurance program. Those amounts impermissibly attributed to the compulsory life insurance program on an annual basis are as follows: 2002: $2210, 2003: $83.79, 2004: $79.20, 2005: $78.69, 2006: $78.00.

If you paid the membership dues for multiple years from 2002–2006, you are entitled to the sum of the amounts impermissibly attributed to the compulsory life insurance program from each of the years that you paid the membership dues.

VIII. How are the damages determined?

The damage figures represent all funds impermissibly attributed to the compulsory life insurance program from October 2002 until December 2006, when the compulsory life insurance program was discontinued.

IX. What will happen if I do nothing?

You have already been identified as a Class Member and are entitled to a judgment in your favor in the amount of the membership dues paid by you to the Colegio from October 2002–December 2006 which were impermissibly attributed to the compulsory life insurance program. If you take no action, a judgment in that amount will be entered In your favor. Judgment in your favor means the Colegio will legally owe you a payment in that amount, plus interest.

Counsel representing the Class will pursue a collection effort on your behalf to satisfy the Judgment by the Colegio making a payment to you in the amount owed.

X. Am I giving up any rights if judgment ls entered in my favor?

Unless you exclude yourself from the judgment, you will be considered a member of the Damages class, which means you give up your right to sue or continue a lawsuit against the Colegio regarding the legal issues that were raised or could have been raised In this case. Regarding the possibility of recovering additional damages, the First Circuit Ccirt of Appeals has clearly stated that the damages award already established in this case is ''seemingly the best relief Imaginable.''

Xl. Can I exclude myself from the judgment?

You may exclude yourself from the judgment. If you exclude yourself from the judgment, you will not have judgment entered in your favor, you will not receive any money from this class action lawsuit, but you will retain the right to sue the Colegio separately, at your own expense, for any claims you might have.

XII. How do I exclude myself from the judgment?

If you wish to be excluded, you must mail a written request for exclusion to Brown v. Colegio de Abogados Administrator at: Brown v. Colegio de Abogados Administrator, P.O. Box 2439, Faribault, MN 55021–9139.

Your request for exclusion must be in writing and postmarked on or before February 26. 2011. The request must state: ''I do not want to be part of the Damages Class in Brown v. Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico, CV 06–1645 (JP).'' The request should be signed, with your name, address, and telephone number printed below your signature. The address you use should be the address to which this notice was mailed, so that you can be properly identified. You will be a

member of the Damages Class entitled to entry of judgment if a request for exclusion is not timely postmarked.

If prior to the issuance of this notice you have filed an anticipatory notice of intent to opt out with the Clerk of the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico, with the Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico or through CM–ECF directly, you must still reaffirm your opt out decision by following the procedures for opting out set out In this notice.

XIII. What additional rights do I have?

You, as a Class Member, may enter an appearance in this case though an attorney if you so desire.

XIV. Who represents the Class?

The attorneys who have been appointed by the Court to represent the Damages Class are: David C. Indian, Esq., Seth A. Erbe, Esq., Indiano & Williams, P.S.C., 207 Del Parque; 3rd Floor, San Juan, PR 00912, Tel: (787) 641–4545, Fax: (787) 641–4544; Andres W. Lopez, Esq., The Law Offices of Andres W. Lopez, P.S.C., 207 del Parque St., 3rd floor, San Juan, PR 00912, Tel: (787) 641–4541, Fax: (787) 641–4544.

XV. Where can I get additional information?

This notice is only a summary of the issues related to the issuance of the judgment in this case. All pleadings and documents filed in Court, may be reviewed or copied at the Clerk of Court, United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico and United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit. Additionally, the following opinions have been published: Brown v. Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico, 579 F. Supp, 2d 211 (D.P.R. 2008); Brown v. Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico, 613 F.3d 44 (1st Cir. 2010).

An automated telephone system has also been established to provide Information regarding this notice and can be reached at 1–866–329–4703.

For information visit www.colegioalitigation.com.

Please do not call the Court about this case. Neither the Judge, nor the Clerk of Court, will be able to give you advice about this case.

Dated: 01/26/2011.

Clerk of Court, United States District Court, For the District of Puerto Rico.

□ 1040

PROPOSED CUTS TO FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I've come to the well today to talk about what I call the insensitivity of the Republican majority as they seek to cut important domestic spending that will affect low-income and working class families in America.

Every Member of this Body, Mr. Speaker, understands that we must reduce the deficit. We understand that. We must put America on the path of fiscal responsibility. And so we don't need lectures from the Republican majority. We don't need partisanship. What we need, as the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee said a few moments ago, we need a bipartisan solution to these great problems.

While some of the Republican solutions in H.R. 1 will certainly eliminate ineffective programs, these cuts cannot be made arbitrarily, and they should not be made simply to make good on a political campaign promise. Many of the proposed cuts will only cost us more in the long run.

One glaring example, Mr. Speaker: Republicans want to cut $1.3 billion from community health centers. Republicans ignore the fact that, since the start of the recession, 4 million additional Americans have lost their health insurance, which means that more and more people rely on community health centers.

When the uninsured get sick, they do one of three things. They stay home and get sicker and lose productivity, or they will go to the emergency room and leave a bill that all of us will end up paying for and the insurance companies will pay for. Or, Mr. Speaker, they can go to a community health center to receive medical care.

Under their proposal, Republicans seek to eliminate funding for 127 clinics in underserved districts across 39 states and reduce services at another 1,096 community health centers nationwide. That is absolutely awful.

This cut would have devastating effects on the communities and patients who most need access to care: Patients with diabetes, and heart disease, and HIV/AIDS; pregnant women; and children, leaving them nowhere to turn for health care.

Under these cuts, more than 2.8 million people would likely lose access to their current primary care provider, and over 5,000 health center staff could lose their jobs.

The President's 2012 budget proposal, by contrast, builds on the health care reform law by boosting investment in health centers. The budget includes $3.3 billion for the health centers program, including $1.2 billion in mandatory funding provided through the Affordable Care Community Health Center Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I represent many poor rural communities in eastern North Carolina with many constituents who depend on community health centers, and I know how deeply these cuts will be felt. As we struggle with this difficult economy and struggle with difficult fiscal issues, we have an even greater responsibility, to protect our most vulnerable citizens, especially when it comes to access to health care.

Community health centers are cutting costs. They are continuing to serve our communities extremely well, and they need and they deserve congressional support.

I urge my colleagues to support worthwhile investment in community health centers and reject the unwise cuts in H.R. 1.

REPUBLICANS' IRRESPONSIBLE SPENDING BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican spending bill currently before this House. This bill fails to create jobs, deeply hurts our families and seniors, and responds with extremes at a time when our fragile economy can least afford it.

I am committed to a budget that lives within our means while investing in the future and cutting our deficit. However, this irresponsible Republican spending bill hampers job creation and jeopardizes investments in American innovation, American education, and American infrastructure.

That is why President Obama vowed today to veto the irresponsible Republican spending bill because it undermines critical priorities for national security and curtails the drivers of long-term economic growth and job creation.

We must do more to focus on jobs, grow the economy, and protect our middle class, certainly, while responsibly tackling our Nation's debt and deficit. That is why I've offered 8 amendments to this bill which will protect seniors, protect energy innovation, strengthen our children's education, and most importantly, will protect and grow jobs as the fragile economy slowly recovers. We simply cannot afford to pull the rug out from underneath progress, not now, not when we are finally rebounding from the Bush recession, not with the extreme spending bill this represents.

I refuse to take America back to the failed policies that sunk our economy. My first two amendments would restore funding from the cuts to the Social Security Administration to prevent its shutdown. The cuts that the irresponsible Republican spending bill propose in this section alone would raid $625 million from the Social Security Administration. This would affect the 53 million Americans who are collecting Social Security by furloughing every employee and closing the doors for a month or more. An estimated 400,000 people, mostly seniors, would not have their claims processed this year, creating a huge backlog and threatening the timely payment of benefits.

My amendments would restore this funding because I do not believe we should use our Nation's seniors that have worked hard and played by the rules their whole lives to somehow painfully balance our budget. This is simply extreme and, again, painfully irresponsible.

The Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, or LIHEAP, is also cut in this irresponsible Republican spending plan by some nearly $400 million. Those are cuts that are made on the backs of the low-income residents, seniors, the disabled, and those with children like those I represent in the now cold and snowy Capital region of New York, who struggle to pay to keep the thermostat set at a livable level. LIHEAP keeps those receiving help

from having to make the heartbreaking decision about whether to pay to keep the heat on or to pay for food and prescription drugs. To pull the rug out from underneath our Nation's most vulnerable is both simply extreme and painfully irresponsible.

My fourth amendment would maintain funding for the Weatherization Assistance Program and the State Energy Program. It is amendment number 4 and is set up for a recorded vote today. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill. The State Energy Program yields $7.22 in annual energy savings for every $1 invested in it while renovating our 13,000 buildings per year.

The Weatherization Assistance Program helps low-income and elderly save over $437 on their annual utility bill, and decreases oil consumption by the equivalent of 24.1 million barrels annually. To cut these jobs-producing, energy savings programs that clearly work is both simply extreme and painfully irresponsible.

I have also offered two amendments that would protect the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act from being jeopardized under the irresponsible Republican spending plan. The Clean Air Act protects public health and safety and has saved hundreds of thousands of lives since 1970 by reducing air pollution by 60 percent, while the economy has grown by 200 percent.

The Clean Water Act protects drinking water for 117 million Americans and safeguards 20 million acres of wetlands and wildlife habitats from big polluters. Seeking to inappropriately legislate against these programs in a spending bill, the continuing resolution would threaten the air our children breathe and the water we drink. This is simply extreme and painfully irresponsible.

My seventh amendment removes unobligated funding from Fossil Energy Research and Development and transfers these funds to the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. This would prioritize our investments from dirty oil and dirty fossil fuel sources of the past to the energy of today and tomorrow, clean energy that would create jobs and make us competitive in a global market. Choosing to go sit out the clean energy race of today for the outdated energy sources of yesterday is simply extreme and painfully irresponsible.

□ 1050

My eighth amendment would restore funding for education and special ed to ensure our children and the future of our country have the resources they desperately need to compete in a global marketplace for generations to come. It prevents thousands of teacher layoffs.

The irresponsible Republican spending bill cuts over $1.25 billion in education funding that goes directly to States at a time when we can least afford it. Balancing the budget on the backs of our children and their education is simply extreme and painfully irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the current irresponsible Republican spending bill before the House. It threatens to undermine our recovery economy and job growth.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my Republican colleagues to stop their attack on women. Family planning is between women, their doctors, and their family. Republicans have no business being in that discussion.

The anti-choice, anti-women Republican majority in the House has made eliminating critical health services for women a top priority. Apparently, protection begins at conception and ends at birth.

Republicans want to gut all reproductive health care in the country and are trying to shut down Planned Parenthood. What an amazingly immoral thing to do. It is utterly disingenuous of the Republicans to go after Planned Parenthood in their inhuman crusade. Radical Republicans are catering to their most extreme base at the expense of 150 million women in this country, and they should be ashamed. But they won't.

The Republicans are also at war with the poor, again, leaving millions of low-income women and women of color with no access to basic health care.

Let's not forget, the American people sent us here to solve problems that face everyone. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership is laser-focused not on jobs or the economy or the national security, but on attacking women and children in this bill, waging a culture war to get campaign contributions from the extremists in this country.

In their rush to appease religious conservatives and undermine the health care law, Republicans have gone from pro-life to pro-government intrusion in the extreme. Republican government is about silencing you as you talk to your doctor.

Republicans love to silence Americans and anyone else they can get to on their moral crusade. Only a real Republican could love a law that says it has a gag rule.

Let me be clear. The so-called pro-life agenda set by the Republicans is the most unprecedented form of government intervention on reproductive rights in decades.

I remember the seventies and the sixties. The Republicans are defining what constitutes forcible rape and penalizing private businesses that choose comprehensive insurance coverage. If that's not government intervention, I don't know what is.

Women are the victims in several major bills and amendments that the Republican leadership is pushing at a mind-boggling speed. These radical anti-choice bills all seek to fundamentally erode the right of all women to health care. More importantly, they don't reflect the will of the American people.

A recent national survey conducted by the Lombardo Consulting Group found that more than 60 percent of the voters support family planning. How is attacking women helping the economy or creating jobs or helping our national security?

We have been in the House for a month now and we have seen lots of talks about how we're going to slice the deficit, but not one single discussion, serious discussion, about how to get there. It is irresponsible to allow these narrowly driven ideological debates about women's health to dominate the House calendar when we have a budget to work out and almost 15 million unemployed.

I urge my colleagues to abandon this vicious attack on women and to focus on issues the American people actually sent us here to solve: Looking for jobs. And I urge my Republican colleagues to get out of the doctor's office and leave women and families and doctors alone.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Joel Connelly of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer that talks about the duplicitous and dangerous agenda set by the House Republicans to severely restrict the rights of women, children, and low-income families.

[From www.seattlepi.com, Feb. 13, 2011]

HOUSE GOP AGENDA: CURTAILING ABORTION, CUTTING KIDS

(By Joel Connelly)

The new ''pro-life'' Republican majority in the U.S. House of Representatives seems dedicated to a curious proposition: The protection of life begins at conception, and ends at birth.

The leadership is pushing a Protect Life Act that would prohibit any subsidies for abortion in any component of the 2010 Affordable Health Care act. It is moving to end any U.S. government support for abortion providers—anywhere.

''We need to protect human life from the unborn to the elderly,'' Rep. Joe Pitts, R-Penn., chairman of the Health Subcommittee of the powerful House Energy and Commerce Committee, said recently. Pitts has headed the Values Action Team, a House caucus concerned with pro-life and pro-family issues.

When it comes to spending on children and health and the elderly, however, House Republicans' new budget is The Pitts.

The budget axe is about to fall on, to use Ronald Reagan's line stating his opposition to abortion, ''those who have already been born.''

Women, Infants and Children was the one new, bipartisan social program passed by Congress and signed into law by President Reagan. (Then-Rep. Mike Lowry of Seattle was a lead sponsor.) House GOP budget writers have targeted it for a $758 million cut.

WIC provides federal money to States for supplemental foods, health care referrals and nutrition education for low income women, and to infants and kids under 5 who are at nutritional risk.

The budget axe in Congress' lower chamber will also fall—to the tune of $1.3 billion in cuts—on Community Health Centers. The program supports community health, migrant health centers, health care for the homeless, and primary care programs in public housing.

Maternal and Child Health Block Grants to States have been targeted for a $210 million reduction. The program helps train providers and support services for children with special health needs, screening of newborns, injury and lead poisoning prevention.

The cuts continue through stages of life, and programs that sustain and enhance life.

AmeriCorps, the Clinton-era program in which young people do public service work in exchange for college tuition, is marked for elimination. Job training is targeted for a $2 billion cut.

LIHEAP, the program that provides winter heating assistance to low-income families, is to be hit with a $400 million reduction—despite the growing need for it as America goes through the Great Recession.

The National Institutes for Health would see a $1 billion reduction. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention would see a $755 million reduction, or 12 percent.

Nor do cuts stop at the water's edge. A total of $544 million would be axed from international food aid grants to such organizations as World Vision and Catholic Relief Services.

The House members championing such cuts are the very people who profess to be advocates for the unborn and defenders of life. Yet, their policies hit at society's poor and vulnerable, and at the ability to pursue the American dream.

How could anyone, in good conscience, proclaim himself/herself ''pro-life'' while axing a child nutrition program? Check that. The late Sen. Jesse Helms, R–North Carolina, managed it for 30 years.

The new majority seems proud of its handiwork: Rookie Tea Party lawmakers have forced even deeper cuts on the House Republican leadership.

''Remember, this is historic: The level of cuts here have not taken place in Congress since World War II,'' House Majority Leader Eric Cantor boasted Friday.

But we should remember another moment in history: Just before Christmas, Congress and the White House extended tax cuts to the wealthiest two percent of Americans.

Jim Wallis, editor of the Christian publication Sojourners, has suggested posing a question to the ''peoples' house'' of Congress. It's a variation on the familiar What-Would-Jesus-Do slogan used by some Christian believers.

What would Jesus cut?

REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, we are involved in probably the most important thing that this body does on a year-to-year basis—figuring out how to spend taxpayers' money.

The budget process is more than taking dollars from one place and spending them in another. It's a statement of our values, a statement of our values as representatives who are trusted by our constituents to do the right thing, and a statement of our values as a Nation.

I think it is pretty clear, from what we have seen in H.R. 1, the Republican version of the continuing resolution proposal, that we have a very distinct difference in our values. At a time when millions and millions and millions of Americans, hundreds of thousands of Kentuckians are suffering, the Republican continuing resolution would take money and would put the burden of these very, very serious economic times on the people least able to afford them. At the same time, we're taking money away from incredibly important investments that this Nation has to make if it wants to remain competitive in this global economy a generation from now and two generations from now.

Instead, the Republicans would slash money from police departments, slash money from fire departments, slash money from our education system, deal a very serious blow to Head Start, all of the things that we need to fulfill our basic obligation as a government. One is to provide opportunity, one is to protect our citizens.

And then the final thing they would slash is important investments in infrastructure, which we know, if we review history, is one of the most important investments that we can make in terms of long-term economic vitality.

The Republican budget, slashing money from infrastructure, from transportation projects, would cost this economy, according to one estimate, 300,000 private-sector jobs.

Now we are fighting as hard as we can to create jobs. As a matter of fact, for the last entire Congress the Republicans kept saying on this very floor, Where are the jobs? Where are the jobs? Now, after 6 weeks of their majority rule in the House, we haven't seen one proposal to create a job. But what we've seen is a budget that is so draconian in its cuts that it would actually destroy American jobs.

This is not the type of values that the American people want to see coming out of this body. All of us agree that we have a serious long-term financial picture in this country. We do need to deal with our deficits and with our national debt. We do need to make some long-term changes.

But if you are a family and you have got a lot of people in your family and are overweight, you don't just say, ''Okay, we're just going to stop eating today. We're just not going to eat.'' No. You say, ''We're going to go on a program, we're going to reduce our calories, we're going to exercise.'' But we still have to do some important things. We have to eat, we have to pay for that roof over our head. We've got kids who are college age. We want to send them to college so they can have a brighter future. We do want to make those investments, even if we have to borrow money. We just don't stop. We can't stand in place, because the rest of the world is not standing in place.

So as we move forward in these few days considering the continuing resolution, H.R. 1, let's remain mindful of what our values as a country are. This is a country that has always made investments, has always looked to the future, has always said, yeah, in a capitalistic society some people are not going to do as well or are not going to have as good of luck or are going to be downfallen, and we've got to lift them up. We've got to help them out.

Over the last 25 years, the percentage of wealth or the amount of wealth owned by the top 5 percent in this country has gone from $8 trillion to $40 trillion, according to David Stockman. He is the former budget director under the Reagan administration.

□ 1100

That is an enormous amount of wealth. That increase in wealth alone, for the top 5 percent of this country over the last 25 years, is more than the entire wealth of the world prior to 1985. So the people at the top have done very well, enhanced and encouraged by tax policies that Republicans have put in place. But, meanwhile, we have got to make sure that those other 95 percent of the American people do well too, and we have got to make sure that the policies we enact, the budgets that we approve in this body, reflect those values.

OPPOSITION TO CUTTING FUNDING TO FEMA

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 1. First of all, I want to begin my comments by talking about last night, a couple issues that were so important to many of us. Number one, COPS grant funding, and also CDBG, which stands for Community Development Block Grants.

Now, I don't know about many of you, but I started my legislative career in local government, and, for most of us, we know that COPS grant funding is what actually puts the police officers on the streets, in the neighborhoods, that can help protect the communities. Now, I would ask you, do you want to take two police officers out of your neighborhood? I don't think so.

I would ask the question, why are we willing to support police officers in Iraq and Afghanistan and to do nation building there, and yet we are not willing to do nation building in our own country? Something is wrong with this proposal today. We don't have the right priorities, and that is why I stand in opposition.

Community Development Block Grants. When I was on the city council, what did that fund? Parks, housing, to help businesses. Do we want to say no to that? Is that what really this budget is about? Is that where the abuses have been, in the neighborhoods? I wouldn't say yes to that.

So let me end with my last comments, which I am going to focus on, which is the committee of jurisdiction

on which I serve. I am the ranking member of the Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response Subcommittee. I stand in opposition to Sections 1628 through 1634 and 1648 of this bill, which cut funding to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, also known as FEMA. I oppose these provisions because they are unwise, irresponsible, and they undermine what our Nation learned.

Do we want to go back? How many of us remember watching on television when we looked at 9/11. How many of us remember Hurricane Katrina. It wasn't that long ago, and I know I don't want to go back.

This bill that the Republicans have brought to the floor is reckless. It is not only reckless to our economy, it is reckless to the American workers, and, above all, it puts our national security in harm's way.

The terrorist acts of September 11 revealed the catastrophic consequences of our inability to communicate. Have we forgotten? We just got interoperable radios in my district in Signal Hill just last year. They are not all connected, and it is a huge vulnerability for all of us. Communication glitches also occurred during the response to Hurricane Katrina, yet the Republicans want to step back and terminate those grants for interoperable emergency communications.

Have we not learned anything? These draconian cuts will put our first responders at risk and slow down the response to terrorist attacks and natural disasters. I cannot in good conscience, and I don't think any of you can as well, accept these cuts to such vital pieces of emergency equipment that we all need and we depend upon.

Further, this shortsighted Republican plan also puts our Nation's firefighting ability at risk. Now, I am from California. We know about fires. We know about the need for firefighters. This bill would eliminate the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response Grants program. You tell the resident who has lost their home that, oh, we will deal with this next year. Fires aren't something you plan. They are an emergency that has to be responded to.

So when we call upon our firefighters, the International Association of Firefighters, they are opposed to this. Why? Not because they are not being fiscally responsible, but because this bill would cut jobs, 5,200 jobs on top of the 5,000 firefighters we have already lost. Is your community willing to lose more firefighters? I don't think so.

The city of Compton in my district is the future home to an emergency operations communications center operated by FEMA. My district is home to several major oil refineries, gas treatment facilities, petrochemical facilities, and, of course, the challenges and opportunities of two ports, of both the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. These centralized major business economic engines thrive. But we also have problems sometimes, and that is why we need the appropriate support of fire and communications to protect them.

This Republican bill seeks to destroy jobs, to end operation centers, all of the things that we have learned from the past. I can't support depriving first responders of the equipment they need to do their jobs. I can't support this bill and hurt our firefighters, our police officers and those who choose to serve us.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, and I urge my colleagues to really look at this bill closely and make sure that our communities aren't paying. But the real abuses that got us here, that is where the cuts should begin.

CALLING FOR A PEACEFUL SOLUTION TO THE EASTER ISLAND CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. Faleomavaega) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I'm not wanting to detract from today's spirited discussion or debate on H.R. 1, which I will discuss at a later point of time in the day, but I want to discuss with my colleagues and the American people the current crisis now happening between the government of Chile and the people of Easter Island, also known as Rapa Nui among its native people.

Easter Island was settled by Polynesian voyagers about 700 AD. The island is famous for some 887 monumental statues carved out of stones weighing tens of tons. These statues are known throughout the world for their archeological wonder and mystery in terms of how these ancient Polynesians were able to carve and move these tremendous statues to different locations on the island. Less well-known is that Easter Island is home to roughly 2,500 indigenous people, known as the Rapa Nui Nation. The people of Easter Island carry a vibrant culture dating back centuries before the arrival of Europeans.

Like many other islands in the Pacific, Easter Island has had its sovereignty determined by more powerful outside influences. In 1888, the Rapa Nui Nation entered into a disputed treaty with the government of Chile. The Chilean government used the treaty as a license to treat the island and the indigenous people as property of the State. Chile confined the people to a small area, about 1 square mile, believe this, Mr. Speaker, today known as Hanga Roa. To this day, the validity of the 1888 agreement is contested by most of the Rapa Nui people.

Chile then annexed Easter Island in 1933 without the consent of or even consultation with the Rapa Nui people. The government of Chile unilaterally leased the majority of the island to private sheepherding enterprises, without the Rapa Nui Nation's consent.

The lands that were wrongfully taken from the Rapa Nui people have not been restored. Instead of returning the lands to their rightful owners, the Chilean government continues to favor private enterprises interested in exploiting the Rapa Nui culture for private gain.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to the serious land rights disputes, several other issues threaten the livelihood of the people of Rapa Nui. For example, roughly 50,000 tourists each year flock to Easter Island to view these huge Moai statues. Yet the Chilean policies prevent the Rapa Nui people from benefiting from the tourism industry. Non-indigenous individuals and corporations possess most of the land, while jobs related to tourism often go to continental Chileans. Uncontrolled migration to the island has caused widespread unemployment among the native people, exploitation of natural resources and increased pollution.

Within this context, Mr. Speaker, the Rapa Nui Nation began taking a stand. In July and August of last year, the Rapa Nui people wrote several letters to the President of Chile, Sebastian Pinera, to negotiate a peaceful solution to the underlying problems of Chile's relationship with the people of Easter Island. The Rapa Nui people also began to peacefully reoccupy their ancestral lands, including the Hotel Hanga Roa, a five-star hotel supposedly being built by the Schiess family, a non-indigenous family, on ancestral Rapa Nui lands.

□ 1110

Mr. Speaker, while the Government of Chile attempted to initiate a dialogue with Rapa Nui individuals, the problem is that the Chilean Government also sent military police to this little island which is 2,300 miles from Chile. I can't believe, Mr. Speaker—we have 17 million people, good people, living in Chile—sending police forces to take control of this little island with some 2,500 Rapa Nuians and they have not even been given any consultation or even an opportunity to conduct consultations, serious consultations, with the Government of Chile.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the Government of Chile can begin a dialogue for ways to help the Rapa Nui people achieve a greater sense of self-determination and self-governance in their lands. I ask President Pinera to advocate for a more positive approach for partnership and dialogue with the indigenous people of Easter Island. It is my honest belief that the indigenous people of Easter Island do not wish any harm to the good people of Chile. Nor is there a possibility that the people of Easter Island will ever pose a threat to the military and strategic or national security interests of the people and the Government of Chile.

Mr. Speaker, I also hope that the White House and the State Department and Assistant Secretary Valenzuela will take a stand against these violent

evictions and express solidarity with the Rapa Nui nation, especially in light of President Obama's planned visit to Chile next month and Assistant Secretary Valenzuela's recent testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday. I sincerely hope that even our international community will build pressure on President Pinera and the Government of Chile. Let's treat these poor people with justice and give them an opportunity to live in peace in this area. I ask that the good people of America make this appeal and that the Government of Chile be responsive to this request.

REGARDING THE REPUBLICAN CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this continuing resolution, a continuing resolution that I call the silly, the dangerous and the hypocritical. Budgets are more than just numbers. They are a statement of our values as a Nation.

As a Congress, we are faced with several serious challenges: growing our economy, putting people back to work, investing in the future, reducing the deficit, and ensuring the most vulnerable in our society are protected. Judging on that criteria alone, this CR doesn't pass the laugh test.

It would cut 300,000 private sector transportation jobs, ensuring our construction workers are receiving unemployment checks instead of paychecks. It would stifle our competition. It would stifle competitiveness by making Pell Grants less accessible to students and families. And it would run roughshod over women, children and the environment. With such an extreme proposal, I assume my good friends on the Republican side would be coming forward with ideas to improve it. But what we've gotten this week is a combination of the silly, the dangerous, and the hypocritical.

In the silly department, we have an amendment preventing funds from being used to repair the White House. Now ironically right now, going on in the Rayburn Building, are remodeling of hearing rooms that I guess the chairmen of these committees have found no need to halt. How much money is being spent there?

Or how about the amendment preventing funds from being used for President Obama's teleprompter. Oh, right. We're going to cut $3,000 from the budget. That's really going to help us. I would expect this sort of hyperpartisanship on cable TV, but not in a budget debate.

Under dangerous, we have: several provisions gutting environmental protection, rolling back EPA regulations on clean air and clean water, and reducing our investment in clean energy, making America even more dependent on foreign oil. How many more solar panels do we want manufactured in China?

How about the amendment undermining a third party testing requirement at the Consumer Product Safety Commission? Great. So let's have Chinese companies pour in more tainted toys, more lead- and cadmium-filled toys for our kids.

How about the reduction in funding for our first responders, meaning there will be less cops and less firefighters in every single neighborhood in this country?

Or how about the amendment preventing funding for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, meaning big banks can call the shots again? Have we learned nothing from the financial meltdown over the last 3 years?

Or how about the unprecedented attack on women's reproductive health which will result in more unplanned pregnancies and more abortions; not less.

And finally, the category my colleagues on the Republican side seem to relish the most—hypocritical. The party that ran on jobs has authored a budget that would increase the unemployment rolls. Asked about likely job losses in the CR, Speaker BOEHNER said, ''Well, so be it.'' It's like Marie Antoinette saying, ''Let them eat cake.''

The party that ran on cutting spending didn't take a scalpel to the defense budget; they took a toothpick. In fact, there's another $2.2 billion in the budget for the V–22 Osprey, which is basically obsolete; $495 million for nine Joint Strike Fighters; and $450 for a second engine that the military defense budget doesn't want.

And the party that ran on fiscal responsibility has offered a budget that will balloon the deficit by continuing tax cuts for the millionaires and billionaires that don't need them.

I agree with President Obama, that we must out-innovate, out-educate and out-build the rest of the world. While not perfect, the budget he released this week will take an important step in that direction. As for the silly, the dangerous and the hypocritical CR we are considering today, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Budgeting is a serious process, and what we're doing this week is unserious at least.

IMPARTIALITY AND THE SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) for 3 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on a day that we're talking about the continuing resolution, I want to talk about a body that may someday be judging the continuing resolution—the Supreme Court. There is perhaps nothing more important to the preservation of our democracy than the continued guaranteed impartiality of our Supreme Court. It's a uniquely American institution; it's been given enormous power to invalidate American laws; and it needs to be dispensed with complete blind justice, blind to outside influence.

However, this Nation's confidence in the blind justice of the Supreme Court has been badly shaken recently by a series of revelations regarding possible conflicts of interest by Justice Scalia and Justice Thomas in the Citizens United case. This landmark 5–4 decision overturned restrictions on corporate funding in elections that had been in place since 1947, and immediately thereafter, millions and millions of dollars in shadowy special interest group donations flowed into American campaigns. Two of the main benefactors of these groups were Charles and David Koch, billionaire brothers who operate a Kansas-based energy business. They spent about $2.6 billion that we know about in the 2010 election cycle and likely a lot more in anonymous donations.

In addition to funding these outside groups, they also organize a lot of conferences in which they gather people of like mind to discuss their radical views and plot strategies to benefit their interests. Now if I were to ask somebody on a main street in my district if they would be comfortable with a Supreme Court justice attending a conference like this, having their plane flight and the hotel all paid for by the special interests, I know what their answer would be. They'd say, no way. Yet Justice Scalia and Justice Thomas did just that and they thought it was just fine. They didn't recuse themselves from the Citizens United decision at all.

But here's the real problem. This could be just an isolated problem to the Citizens United case. Or it could be much more widespread, with justices conflicted on several fronts, refusing to disclose their conflicts or recuse themselves when they have actual conflicts of interest. But we have no idea, because right now there is no law requiring Supreme Court justices to disclose their conflicts of interest as is required of all other Federal justices.

□ 1120

I don't believe we should be meddling in the day-to-day business of the Supreme Court. I get why there is great wisdom in separating legislative and judicial functions. But there's no undue burden in just requiring sunlight on Supreme Court proceedings.

So when we return to Washington after the recess, I will be introducing legislation to do just that, to implement a few reasonable reforms to add greater transparency and disclosure requirements on the Supreme Court. I hope my colleagues will join me.

My legislation will apply the Judicial Conference's Code of Conduct to the Supreme Court, which now applies to all other Federal judges. It will require the Justices to simply publicly disclose why they've recused themselves from a

particular case. And it will ask the Court to develop a simple process so that the parties to a case can request the Court to decide whether a particular Justice has a conflict of interest.

I think this is an important step forward for transparency of our democracy and of the Supreme Court, and I ask my colleagues to join me in this important legislation.

INTRODUCTION OF NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for 2 minutes.

Ms. CHU. This Saturday, Japanese Americans will take a moment to remember the tragic events that imprisoned their community 69 years ago.

In 1942, President Roosevelt signed one of the strongest acts against American citizens, Executive Order 9066, imprisoning 120,000 Japanese Americans with the stroke of a pen. Half of those incarcerated were children posing no threat to our national security. But these concentration camps were labeled a military necessity, and so they, too, were rounded up and forced to live their childhood in bleak, remote camps surrounded by barbed wire and armed guards. Families were forced out of their homes, made to leave their jobs and abandon their positions. Families were torn apart.

This unconstitutional act was a blatant violation of Americans' civil rights. And all of this occurred at the hands of our government oppressing individual freedom for years without any factual basis and without due process. That is why I plan to introduce a bill tomorrow to institute a National Day of Remembrance to annually observe the signing of Executive Order 9066.

This brings back painful memories of a period in American history, but it is important for us to remember because it also provides an ongoing reminder about the value of protecting the civil rights of all people. The Day of Remembrance also honors all who fought and continued to fight for freedom and equality among all people.

So this Saturday, I will take a moment also to remember this time and to hope for a better future.

H.R. 1

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) for 2 minutes.

Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.R. 1.

Access to an affordable, quality education is part of the American Dream. In our competitive global economy, a college degree is more important than ever. With annual tuition hikes outpacing inflation, the cost of attending college is increasing just as quickly as the importance of attending. Making college more affordable has been one of my top priorities and should be a top priority for this Congress. Unfortunately, this bill sends the opposite message.

This bill threatens to cut Pell Grants by over $5.6 billion, denying millions of Americans, including over 20,000 students in my district, the chance to attend and graduate from college. The number of my constituents receiving Pell Grants has increased by over 6,000 people over the last school year. This is possible, in large part, by efforts that have been supported in Congress to make college more affordable and provide our students with the skills needed to compete in a 21st century global economy.

Access to Pell Grants is often the deciding factor for a family when contemplating whether they can afford to send their son or daughter to college. It is often the deciding factor on whether or not a displaced worker can afford to go back to school to get retrained. It is often a deciding factor on whether or not a potential student will have access to the world of opportunities that come with a college education.

We need to do fiscal belt-tightening, but cutting over $5.6 billion in financial aid for Americans seeking higher education so that they may better equip themselves for the jobs of tomorrow is a self-destructive act. Simply put, investing in education is an investment in our future. Cutting Pell Grants is detrimental to that future.

We need to stand up for America and make good financial decisions. We need to tighten our budgets, but Pell Grants should not be one of them.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Rev. Bill Shuler, Capital Life Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we bow our heads to worship You, for You are an awesome and personal God. Make us ever mindful of the words engraved over the Speaker's chair, ''In God We Trust.'' We place our trust not in man or in political parties or in our own strength. It is in You we trust. You are the God who founded our Nation, the God who gave us liberty, and it is by turning to You that we are blessed.

Guide each Member of Congress by Your hand. Protect them. Refresh them in body, mind, and spirit. Help them to love their families well, to serve their constituents with excellence, and to strengthen our Nation by their decisions.

We pray these things in the name of the one who taught us the true priorities of life when He called us to ''seek first the kingdom of God, and all these things will be added to us.''

In Jesus' name, amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. POE of Texas 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.

WELCOMING REV. BILL SHULER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Rev. Bill Shuler, who delivered this morning's invocation. He is the senior pastor of Capital Life Church in Arlington, Virginia.

He and his family moved to the Washington metropolitan area on September 1, 2001, just days before 9/11. And in response to the tragic events of 9/11, Rev. Shuler launched a prayer center near the Capitol out of which formed the Capital Life Church. He is the seventh generation in an unbroken line of ministers in the Shuler family. I think it might be interesting for the Members to know that Rev. Shuler has preached in 30 nations of the world. He served for 8 years as a university chaplain and a dean of spiritual affairs at Oral Roberts University in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Dr. Billy Graham recently expressed his appreciation for the ''godly heritage that continues through the Shuler family.'' In fact, Dr. Graham's biographer said that Rev. Shuler's father, evangelist Jack Shuler, was ''at least as popular as Billy Graham'' during the 1940s and 1950s. And, in fact, Rev. Shuler's grandfather, Robert Shuler, was the first of the great radio preachers. He was called Fighting Bob Shuler. He pastored the famous Trinity Methodist Church in the heart of Los Angeles, California.

He is joined today by a number of congregants as well as his three lovely daughters and beautiful wife.

We thank Rev. Shuler for gracing this House with our invocation today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia). The Chair will entertain up to five further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ANOTHER CASUALTY OF MURDER IN MEXICO, ICE AGENT JAIME ZAPATA

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, David Hartley, Lesley Enriquez, Arthur Redelfs, Nancy Davis, Carlos Mario Gonzalez Bermudez, Juan Carlos Echeverri, and now ICE agent Jaime Zapata. These are all American victims of the border war, the third front, all murdered in Mexico.

Yesterday, ICE agent Jaime Zapata was ambushed and murdered and another agent was wounded when they were gunned down at a fake ''checkpoint'' between Mexico City and Monterrey. None of the assassins or perpetrators of any of these homicides have ever been captured. I suspect, based upon Mexico's lax enforcement of the rule of law, no one will ever be held accountable.

Agent Zapata's murder will be news for a few days, then the country will move on to other matters. But the border war continues against the vicious drug cartels and it is time we acknowledge that this war is not going away. The drug bandits have operational control of portions of the southern border. Drugs and people are smuggled north. Money and guns are smuggled south.

We should help our neighbors restore the rule of law in Mexico and hold the lawless accountable for murdering Mexicans and Americans. Otherwise, there will be more murders like the one against Agent Zapata.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL ROGER BRAUTIGAN

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a truly great American, Major General Roger Brautigan. He is a 33-year Army veteran who has earned the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, and the Bronze Star.

Following his military service, Roger Brautigan joined the California Department of Veterans Affairs and was appointed as its secretary in 2009. Under his leadership, the department implemented California's Operation Welcome Home, a groundbreaking program that matches veterans with the services and assistance they've earned and need. General Brautigan, who recently retired from the California Department of Veterans Affairs, envisions Operation Welcome Home expanding nationwide so that all veterans may benefit from this important and effective program.

Throughout both his military service and civilian career, General Brautigan proved himself to be an exemplary leader. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Major General Roger Brautigan for his tireless service to our veterans, to the State of California, and to our great Nation.

THE PROPOSED BUDGET HURTS SMALL BUSINESSES

(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, on Monday, the proposed budget for next year was released by the current administration. This budget fails to address the issue of Washington's 4-year spending excess.

The proposed budget freezes will not work. They will not provide a path to fundamental reform. The proposed budget destroys jobs by adding $1.3 trillion to the national debt. Bill Miller of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce reports that the budget leads to $175 billion in new tax increases. It cripples job creation by spending too much, taxing too much, and borrowing too much. Excessive borrowing by the government competes unfairly with small businesses.

I support fundamental cuts that will promote private sector job creation. We cannot expect to borrow the way to prosperity. House Republicans are committed to combining sound policy with practical solutions to create jobs. We need to cut spending, reduce borrowing, keep taxes low, and provide the necessary tools to jump-start job creation.

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

REPUBLICAN SPENDING PLAN

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

Mr. BACA. President Obama understands that it's a very difficult time for the American people. Our economy is improving, but unemployment remains around 9 percent across the Nation and is close to 14 percent in California's Inland Empire.

Right now we should be working on a plan that creates jobs and makes intelligent cuts to the budget. But instead, the Republicans have introduced a spending bill that will undermine the future of the American children.

The Republican CR is another attempt to play politics with the well-being of every American. There will be 200,000 children kicked out of Head Start while Republicans still live in their offices. Over $700 million will be cut from WIC. Pell Grants will be reduced, making college unaffordable to tens of thousands, and thousands more teachers will be receiving pink slips.

Scripture tells us, ''Love thy neighbor as thyself,'' but apparently, for Republicans, it's about ''me, myself, and Irene.''

□ 1210

LIBERATION OF DR. FAN YAFENG

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, once again the Chinese government has targeted a human rights proponent for persecution, Dr. Fan Yafeng, head of the Christian Human Rights Lawyers of China.

Dr. Yafeng was granted an interview last October with National Public Radio regarding the absence of the Chinese delegation at the Lausanne Congress, which is an international gathering of evangelicals.

The government's response to the interview was systematic interrogation, search and seizure, and torture. He is currently under house arrest, guarded by police in Beijing and cut off from the outside world. Those attempting to contact him through family have also endured police brutality.

I call upon the State Department and our Embassy in Beijing to reach out to Dr. Yafeng to verify his condition and apply pressure on the Chinese government to ensure his release. The Chinese government's continued persecution of human rights advocates, harassment, brutality, and house arrest must not be tolerated. I hope that we will stand up for Dr. Yafeng and support his peaceful work to bring freedom and dignity to the Chinese people.

SUPPORT FUNDING OF NOAA

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the NOAA budget cuts in the continuing resolution before us in the House today.

Slashing NOAA's funding by 22 percent will put lives, property, and critical infrastructure in jeopardy by diminishing our ability to respond to disasters like the gulf oil spill and to conduct safe evacuations in advance of weather emergencies.

Also, marine sanctuaries would be inevitably cut, and those sanctuaries are so essential to a healthy coastal environment, and to the fishermen and to the tourism economies along our coasts.

Cutting NOAA funding will also sacrifice the science and technology investments that we need to win the future and to maintain robust funding for this vital agency.

REPUBLICANS' RECKLESS SPENDING BILL

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the misguided spending bill on the floor. Instead of creating jobs, this troubling bill slashes higher education funding.

How can we expect our students to compete globally when we don't invest in the resources to allow them to succeed?

Under this bill over 1 million college students in California alone will have their Pell Grant cut by $675. These students probably won't be able to take classes next semester or buy textbooks. It doesn't make sense.

America's businesses need a well-trained, highly skilled workforce. If we want our country to out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build the rest of the world we need to start with adequate funding for higher education.

This bill is a direct attack on our future workforce and economic stability. I urge my colleagues to oppose it. Our students deserve better, our country deserves better.

Vote ''no'' on the reckless Republican omnibus spending bill.

PLAYING POLITICS WITH OUR FUTURE

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, President Obama challenged us to out-innovate, out-educate and out-build the rest of the world in order to compete globally. We can and must educate our way to a more prosperous future.

Through the continuing resolution, congressional Republicans are handicapping our kids by recklessly slashing education funding. Instead of equipping our kids to out-innovate, out-educate and out-build, this resolution prepares kids to under-perform, under-whelm and under-achieve.

Across America, over 127,000 preschoolers will be kicked out of Head Start. Instead of setting up kids for success, this continuing resolution dooms them for failure.

Over 131,000 students will see their after-school programs reduced or eliminated, even though after-school programs improve academic success.

Over 1.4 million college students will see their Pell Grants cut, even though education is the best way to escape poverty.

This resolution plays politics with our children's futures, and our children will lose.

Mr. Speaker, I will say that this continuing resolution is a train wreck for Louisiana and a train wreck for this country.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 514, EXTENDING COUNTERTERRORISM AUTHORITIES

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 93 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 93

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 514) to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 relating to access to business records, individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers, and roving wiretaps until December 8, 2011, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend and thoughtful Rules Committee colleague, the gentleman from Boulder, Mr. POLIS, pending which I yield myself such time as I my consume.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, by a vote of 274–144, the House passed a temporary 10-month extension to the Patriot Act, the three provisions that are scheduled to expire within one legislative day from now. One legislative day from now. We all know that we're going to be going into a district work period beginning tomorrow afternoon, so we have one legislative day left to deal with this issue.

And yesterday, by a vote of 86–12, our colleagues in the Senate chose to take the 10-month extension that we had and turn that into a 90-day extension.

Now, I think there's bipartisan consensus that we need to have Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LUNGREN, other members of the Judiciary Committee, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and others involved in this take a very close look at the need to deal with both the national security implications as well as the civil liberties implications of the extension of the Patriot Act.

I just had a meeting with Mr. SENSENBRENNER in which we were talking about the fact that when we first put the Patriot Act into effect, he and I were together in saying there needed to be sunset provisions because we didn't want to legislate through the prism of September 11 without ensuring that this House and the other body would expend the time and energy and effort looking at all of the ramifications of the Patriot Act, because it was unprecedented. But I believe that as we look at where we are today, the Patriot Act has been a very, very important tool in ensuring that we have not seen what so many people expected would happen after September 11, and that is repeated attacks on our country. We have had attempts, we all know that. But we all thank God that we have been able to successfully prevent those attempts to attack us from coming to fruition. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the existence of the Patriot Act has played a role in that.

Having said that, I am a self-described small L libertarian Republican. I believe in recognizing the civil liberties of every American, and I think that that's a priority that does need to be addressed. And I also recognize that sacrifices have to be made when you're dealing with the kinds of threats that we face. And so striking that balance is not an easy thing to do, and Messrs. SENSENBRENNER and LUNGREN and others, Mr. SMITH, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I believe, are going to, in the next 90 days, do a lot of work in ensuring that the concerns that have been put before us are addressed.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in ensuring that we don't see the expiration of these very important three provisions of the Patriot Act, I'm going to urge my colleagues to support this rule that will allow us to simply accept the language that the Senate has passed with a 90-day extension, and move ahead just as expeditiously as possible so that our colleagues will be able to get to work in addressing the concerns that are out there.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, it's important to talk about what this bill would do and how the Patriot Act really cuts to the heart of what it means to be American, that sensitive balance that we have between protecting what makes it special to be an American, our rights as individuals, our civil liberties, balancing that with the need for national security.

□ 1220

I am opposed to the rule and the bill. We need to have law enforcement make sure that it has the provisions it needs to combat the very real threat of terrorism. However, the Patriot Act strikes that balance in the wrong way. But rather than actually debating the merits of the provisions and coming up with solutions that I think we can agree on with both sides of the aisle, as we have done in the past, the Republican leadership is forcing this through without the proper debate or transparency. In spite of their plethora of

promises to change the culture of Congress, here we are without a single hearing on this topic, without a classified briefing for Members so we know what has and hasn't been done under the Patriot Act.

Specifically, we are discussing the continuation of three provisions of the Patriot Act. We have the lone wolf provision, which relates to foreign nationals in our country that are not specifically connected to a foreign terrorist network or foreign government or represent a security threat. We have the roving wiretap provision, again particularly problematic in how it's been designated where you don't have to even designate whose phone you are tapping or the area in which the phone is being tapped. All that has to be shown is that it might be a phone that is used by somebody who might be considered a suspect by someone without any oversight with regard to that matter. There's nothing to restrict it from being used to tap the phones of an entire neighborhood, an entire block, an entire city.

Has it been used for that? I don't know, because we haven't had yet a classified briefing on this matter. I certainly hope, and it's been stated in our prior debate on this, that it was the intention of our colleagues on the other side to hold hearings and a classified briefing prior to the 90-day period in which this expires.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. One question I would have is February 25 of last year is when the 12-month extension was put into place. How many hearings or classified briefings were held for Members during the past 12 months before this February 25 expiration?

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, again, I would hope and I know that the gentleman and the chair of the Rules Committee's intentions and goals, as are the Speaker's, are more transparency in this Congress. And I don't think it's particularly helpful to cite what may be a failure of the Democrats to deliver on reforming the Patriot Act and say, therefore, we don't have to succeed either in reforming the Patriot Act.

I want to discuss the importance of this vote. We all agree that this affects our national security and the civil liberties of Americans. And yet, unfortunately, from a process perspective, we have reverted back to getting this through first on a suspension vote, then on a long-term extension, and now on a short-term extension.

Again, there is no doubt that the short-term extension is favorable to a long-term extension from those of us who have legitimate concerns, and I think there is even a bipartisan consensus that these concerns are legitimate about the overreach of the Patriot Act. We will have, as a result of this, a 90-day period to try to work through, in a bipartisan, way some of our concerns and make sure that we protect what is special about being Americans. We had an emergency meeting of the Rules Committee late last night, which was the second emergency meeting for this bill alone. Again, I think we all knew coming into this Congress that these provisions were set to expire. There would have been time for the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings and even a markup with regard to this bill, because they have held hearings with regard to other bills. They were constituted. They held hearings on immigration, on abortion, on other topics. And I think that, regardless of where one stands on this bill, it rises to the level of importance for American citizens that we do strike the right balance between security and protection of civil liberty.

If House Republicans are going to honor the promise of openness and transparency, we must make sure that they do schedule the hearings and markups that are necessary to have a proper debate of this bill. Now, this new version before us today, the short-term CR, provides a window for that; and I am hopeful that the chairs of the respective committees of jurisdiction and subcommittees will be able to offer some assurances to members of both parties that are concerned that this 90-day period will be used to improve upon the bill, to hold hearings on the bill, and offer classified briefings for Members so we can determine exactly how these authorities have been used. Only after the initial effort to push this bill through under suspension failed did Republican leadership bring it to the floor under a closed rule. New Members have not even had a classified briefing, nor have I, the Members from last session, so it's hard for us to understand exactly how these authorities that are delegated are being used.

It is clear that there's bipartisan support to improve this law. In fact, even as we speak, the Senate is debating several versions of the long-term reauthorization bill, and I think there's a very legitimate and important security concern in support of long-term reauthorization so law enforcement can plan accordingly and have long-term planning with regard to exactly what powers and the balances they have with protecting civil liberties they will have.

I think we can all agree a 90-day extension is not the right answer. It's not the right answer for law enforcement. It's not the right answer for protecting our civil liberties. It may be an answer that affords us a chance to get it right, and I would call upon members of both parties to work hard to do that.

Apart from the procedural flaws with the process, the Patriot Act is a bill that really has been plagued with abuse since it was first passed. After 10 years of public record, there are some clear sections of the law that need to be improved. And yet here we are again. Instead of debating those sections of the law and finding solutions we can agree on, we are facing an up-or-down vote on this bill with very little debate.

This reauthorization fails to provide the administration with the tools and predictability it needs to fully protect and defend our Nation. The administration supports a permanent reauthorization and has asked for a real one, and I think they are willing to work with us in this body on improving the Patriot Act.

So this bill fails both to please the advocates pushing to reform the Patriot Act and also fails to provide for the administration, whose job it is to protect our country.

Again, we ask why is the Republican Party jamming this bill through here, today, instead of debating a real bill that would improve our national security.

This bill before us today specifically reauthorizes three provisions of the Patriot Act. Section 215 allows the government to capture any tangible thing, any business record that might be relevant to a terrorist investigation. That can include medical records, a diary, even, in one case, books that have been checked out of a library. There was a library where somebody checked out a book about Osama bin Laden, and who that person was was reported on.

In the past, these orders were limited to certain classes of businesses and records and also required that we show specific facts that pertain to an agent of a foreign power. And if the Patriot Act is stripped away of those basic requirements, that's something I think that every American who values privacy should be concerned about.

This section 215 goes against the basic constitutional notions of search and seizure. We began this session of Congress by reading the Constitution on the floor of the House, and this really comes at the very core identity of what it means to be an American.

The government, under our Constitution, is required to show reasonable suspicion or probable cause before they can infringe upon an American's privacy. We should seriously consider making changes to this section instead of blindly giving the government the ability to secretly spy on its citizens.

Section 206, the second provision of the bill, allows the government to conduct the roving wiretaps. These allow the government to obtain surveillance warrants that don't even specify a certain person or an object that's going to be tapped. Another problem with this is the Fourth Amendment of our Constitution, which again I'm sure all my colleagues are familiar with, having read it on the floor of the House. It states that warrants must specify the person and places to be seized and searched with particularity. This is to make sure the executive branch doesn't have unfettered power to decide single-handedly who and how to search private citizens and seize their property.

The Founding Fathers were concerned and worried about the possibility of a central government authority issuing general warrants that would give it far-reaching power to spy on its citizens and intervene in their private lives. That's an American value that we share today, and I think it's critical to craft protections for our privacy as Americans that can be consistent with the need to secure our country before authorizing the government such overwhelming power.

The final section would be the lone wolf provision, which allows secret surveillance of noncitizens in the U.S. These are foreign citizens who are here legally, even if they are not connected to a terrorist group or foreign power. So, again, this authority is only granted in a secret court.

So from our perspective in Congress, without having had the benefit of a classified briefing, it's very difficult for us to exercise any meaningful oversight on a provision when we're not aware of how or if it's been used.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have said in numerous debates that they are worried about the growth of government. Yet, in spite of the recent rhetoric about how the government is trying to take control over our lives, this bill, their fifth bill under rules since taking control of the House, actually gives the government the ability to spy on innocent Americans.

□ 1230

No wonder so many Republicans joined Democrats in voting against this bill earlier this week. I encourage my colleagues to continue standing strong for civil liberties.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I just was talking to our first-rate staff here saying that the last statement my friend just made is just plain wrong. This bill does not allow the government to spy on innocent Americans.

I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the distinguished chair of the Crime Subcommittee, that the notion of claiming that we could have had full hearings before we dealt with this expiration is preposterous. The Judiciary Committee organized about 2 weeks ago, and the expiration date, the 1-year expiration date that was established last February 25 provided that entire year, and there was not a single hearing.

I wasn't being critical of the majority. But what I am being critical of is to come here and now point the finger at us and saying, why haven't hearings and briefings been held on this issue before we deal with the extension? The extension is set to come to pass in one legislative day. We are going to deal with a 90-day extension that is before us that the Senate passed by that 86–12 number, and I think it is very clear that we have to do our work.

The person who is going to lead this effort is the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, my friend from Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin, who is ready in the next 90 days to take this measure on with great enthusiasm. I would like to yield him 3 minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from San Dimas, and I just want to reiterate the point that my friend from Colorado is so, so wrong. We have heard most of these arguments in the three times this bill has been on the floor in the last 9 days.

I want to say again, first of all, the Judiciary Committee under my chairmanship reported out a Patriot Act unanimously in October of 2001, and that ranged from people like MAXINE WATERS on the left to Bob Barr on the right. We did reform the Patriot Act in 2005 when it came up for renewal last time, and I fulfilled my promise, number one, to oppose a premature elimination of the sunset, and, number two, to have hearings on each of the then 17 expanded provisions of law enforcement that were sunsetted at that time.

Fourteen out of the 17, there was no complaint about. Even the American Civil Liberties Union testified on behalf of the fact that there were no abuses whatsoever in those 14. There was concern about the three that are in the underlying bill today, and at the insistence of the gentleman from California, Mr. LUNGREN, we put a sunset on it. That expired in 2009, and there have been two extensions that were voted on by the then-Democrat Congress, but they really didn't get at what the complaints of the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. POLIS, have been.

This bill has been used by its opponents as a way of expressing frustration with the FBI and other law enforcement agencies that have nothing to do with the Patriot Act, and it is kind of like a bait and switch or putting up a straw man and then attacking the straw man, because they really can't attack the real man, which is the Patriot Act and what is up for extension.

None of these three provisions have been held unconstitutional by a court. There hasn't even been a challenge to the roving wiretaps, and there hasn't been a challenge to the lone wolf provision that is also up for renewal. When there was a challenge to section 215, business records, or for that matter library records, the reforms that I wrote and which we passed in 2005 corrected them to the extent that those who were filing the constitutional challenge against it withdrew their complaint after we fixed what they were complaining about.

Now the gentleman from Colorado and the other opponents of the Patriot Act are complaining for the sake of complaining. They are saying that there has been a violation of civil liberties. There hasn't been. No court has found that there has been a violation of civil liberties.

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. On none of these provisions that are up for renewal has there really been any meritorious complaint. There has been this great big fear that civil liberties have been violated, but when you get down to the facts, no court has found that civil liberties have been violated.

I really would hope that we could debate these issues without all of the smokescreen of the other sins, real or imagined, by law enforcement, and particularly by the FBI, and maybe we could get to a rational debate on what this bill does. But the arguments I have heard from the gentleman from Colorado and other opponents of this rule and this bill simply miss the mark. You are now up to strike four, I would say to the gentleman from Colorado. Let's retire the side.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to respond. Absolutely the Patriot Act can be used to investigate and find out private records from innocent Americans, and we say that because section 215 can be used for any information relevant to an investigation. It doesn't need to be from the subject of an investigation. It can be Internet records, what they buy at a bookstore, what they get at a library.

The Judiciary Committee has had time to have 10 hearings this year. It is just none of them have happened to be on this particular topic. Apparently it is not important enough to discuss. How are we to know whether violations have occurred if we don't have the benefit of a classified briefing before making this vote?

Saying no court has found or there haven't been reported violations, well, that is because all of this is hush-hush and secret, as some of it needs to be, and I would agree. But for us to execute our oversight function, you can't just simply say there haven't been abuses because we don't know about them. We have to find out about what has been going on under this law and execute our judgment as an elected body representing our country to decide whether there have or haven't been abuses.

I am honored to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman.

I first want to respond to some of the things that I just heard before I give my statement, if I may. The majority has promised that after we vote on this, we will have some hearings. We are told they are going to be rigorous and fair, and we are reminded of the many hearings held by Mr. SENSENBRENNER during the 2005 reauthorization.

Well, first, in the 111th Congress we held the hearings before we marked up the Patriot Act, before we asked Members to vote on the bill, not after. We

have new Members in the body who have never voted on the Patriot Act, have never been briefed on how these authorities are used. It is simply not responsible to make them vote when they don't know what they are voting on.

Second, the majority's nostalgia for 2005 has colored their memories a bit. While they remember a careful and thorough process, I remember being forced to hold minority hearings so all perspectives could be heard. I remember hearings being gaveled to a close before they were over. I remember a subcommittee chairman walking out of the hearing while Members were raising points of order. I remember microphones being turned off on Democrat members, including one of my fellow Members from New York, while they were speaking. I remember being forced to convene a hearing on something like 2 days' notice as the power to schedule the committee was abused. So I don't know how to take these current promises of openness and a fair procedure.

Third, while there has been so much talk today on the floor about using the coming hearings to reform the Patriot Act, we know that is simply not what is going to happen. My friends in the majority have already stated their views on the question. Last Congress, Chairman SMITH proposed a 10-year extension with no changes or reforms to the underlying law. In 2005, Mr. SENSENBRENNER proposed a permanent extension, and they have a bill for that right now in the Senate.

Indeed, if there were any will in the majority party to reform these provisions, that would have happened in the last Congress. The Democrat majority worked for months to forge a compromise but got no Republican support. So I don't expect the coming hearings to be part of any kind of reform process. I expect them to be heavy on political theater designed to make these powers permanent. That, no doubt, is why this extension is timed to force the next vote into the presidential primary season; to raise the political stakes.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons the 16 provisions were set to expire in 5 years is because they were deemed too invasive of our civil liberties, possibly invasive enough to be used to violate the very freedoms that our young men and women in uniform too often die protecting. These provisions provide the government with exceptional powers of search, seizure, and surveillance, often without the due process that our Constitution guarantees us.

□ 1240

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman 2 additional minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Nearly 10 years later, we continue to reauthorize these provisions without a blink of the eye. The idea of these measures always was that they would be temporary. And yet to see the process under which we deliberate them, it seems they would last forever. Seeking no input or deliberation of any point in this bill's consideration and instead choosing to blindly move forward is a rather sad testament to the majority's view of an open process.

Ultimately, this is no way to consider a piece of legislation that has such far-reaching and profound implications for our civil liberties as this does. Yet the majority seeks to simply kick the can down the road, all the while stifling the rigorous debate with which these deserve and need to be scrutinized.

We would do well to remember that these provisions were passed into law in the frantic weeks after September 11, 2001, without our understanding of their potential impact and benefit. And that is why we created a sunset review in the first place and why we need thorough review as long as we keep these incredible powers in place.

Make no mistake, they are incredible powers. We're not patching a run-of-the-mill program here. These are powers that will allow the government to continue to access business records, conduct roving wiretaps, and monitor American citizens. The intrusive nature of these provisions that the majority seeks to whisk through would leave our Founding Fathers aghast at the willful erosion of the civil liberties they enshrined for us. Our swearing into office is an oath to protect and defend the Constitution. However, many Members of the House voted against the Constitution when this came on the floor last week. This process, lacking a serious review of far-reaching and invasive provisions, does not live up to that standard.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule and against the underlying measure.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my hard-working colleague, the gentleman from Gold River, California (Mr. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether we're in an episode of ''Alice in Wonderland'' here or not. Just because you say something is true doesn't make it true.

The gentlelady just spoke a moment ago and said we need to look at this; we need to scrub this. And yet she is asking her colleagues to vote against the rule to not even allow this to be brought up. What's the conclusion of that? What's the intimation of that? That we should allow these provisions to expire. Not that we would have time to look at it, but they would expire, one legislative day left.

There are three major provisions in our effort to fight against terrorists. These are the provisions that initially were put under a sunset by the gentleman from Wisconsin when he was chairman of the committee. And then later on when we redid, reviewed, and reformed provisions of this, I authored and brought forward the extension with the sunsets on these three provisions. So I find it interesting to have my friends on the other side of the aisle tell us what we were doing and tell us now that there has been a proven unconstitutionality or unconstitutional basis for these three provisions.

Interestingly enough, they refer to the lone wolf provision. That was known when it was first passed as the Schumer-Kyl provision. Now, some people may not be aware that those are two Senators, Members of the other body, I would say probably extending from the left to the right. Why did they put that in? Because we believe that we were actually burdening ourselves in a way that would not allow us to find out about terrorism before it was actually carried out.

The lone wolf provision recognizes that the greatest threat we have today are, as was said by the two cochairs of the 9/11 Commission, less consequential attacks; meaning attacks on a smaller scale than that we saw on 9/11, still meant to do grievous harm to Americans, to cause us to see the loss of life, to do tremendous fiscal damage to this country, yet with smaller cells or even from individuals.

Do we have to be reminded of what happened on that Christmas Day a couple of years ago? That was a lone wolf, even though these provisions wouldn't apply because he's an American citizen. Major Hasan was a lone wolf. Just to prove the point that we have to be concerned about lone wolves.

The other two provisions, the business records and the roving wiretaps, I'd like to talk about those because there's been so much misunderstanding, misstatements.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I actually observed a Member of the other body this morning on television saying the reason that he voted against these extensions was that under the Constitution he believes that one ought to have a warrant so there's intervention of a third party that is a judicial officer. Well, these two provisions, the business records provision and the roving wiretap provisions, require the government to go to the FISA court to get permission to carry out those elements directed at any individual.

And so let's just make sure we know what we're talking about here. We're talking about two provisions that require the government to go before the FISA court to get permission to utilize those provisions in their investigation. And the third part deals with the lone wolf definition, and the lone wolf requirement is needed now more than it was when it first passed because of the difference in the threat to us that has

been recognized by our intelligence agencies and by the 9/11 Commission and, most recently, by Secretary Napolitano.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the new majority in the House has told us that their decisions are guided by two principles: first, loyalty to the Constitution; and, second, a belief that the government is too large and too intrusive. Well, here's their chance to act on these principles, because the Patriot Act provisions we are voting on today represent Big Brother at its creepiest and most invasive. They are a clear violation of the Fourth Amendment, ''The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures.''

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WOOLSEY. No, sir.

Mr. Speaker, for close to a decade now we've been told that our civil liberties must be shredded in the name of a so-called war on terrorism. We've been told that the national security imperatives of the moment are so great and so different than any we face in our history that we must submit to roving wiretaps and that we must empower the government to retain ''any tangible thing'' related to a terrorism investigation. ''Any tangible thing''—that gives the government pretty broad discretion to ferret out just about whatever they want. It is an invitation to overreach and abuse. I believe it has stifled freedom more than it has advanced it.

There is a real incoherence to an approach that says we have to do violence to our Nation's values in order to protect them. Benjamin Franklin's words are just as powerful today as they were more than 200 years ago when he said, ''Any society that would give up a little liberty to gain a little security will deserve neither and lose both.''

I believe we must let these provisions expire. And let's not stop there. Let's move toward a fuller debate about civil liberties and national security, a debate that revises and ultimately repeals the Patriot Act.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I was sorry that my friend would not yield to the distinguished chair of the subcommittee. He was simply going to ask her what provisions of the Patriot Act have been determined to be unconstitutional. The answer is: Not one.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I want my friend from Wisconsin to know that I don't denigrate his service on this. We have a different way of looking at this.

I believe the Patriot Act represents the cracked domestic crown jewel of a disastrous global war on terror which led us to attack Iraq based on lies, invade Afghanistan based on a misreading of history, indulge in occupations which having fueled insurgencies, expand war to Pakistan and other countries, demonstrating a total lack of common sense. So the Patriot Act issues from a pestiferous soil laced with lies and distortions.

□ 1250

We've created a national security state which threatens our Constitution and weakens our basic liberties. This is not about whether you're Democrat or Republican, liberal or conservative, but whether we can actually realize that we have been sold a bill of goods, lies about WMDs, and questions about the nature of an anthrax attack, which caused us all too willingly to limit our civil liberties.

I joined other Members of Congress in approving the United States in its launching of attacks on the training camps after 9/11 because we have a right to respond and defend ourselves. We also have an obligation to defend the Constitution. We have an obligation to defend the truth. Freedom isn't free, and we shouldn't freely give our freedoms away.

Francis Scott Key wrote the Star-Spangled Banner. Remember these words: ''O say, does that star-spangled banner yet wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?'' He connected freedom and democracy.

We have to be courageous to stand up for this Constitution. I believe my colleagues on the Republican side are courageous Americans and are good Americans, but I want to say we have to look at the context in which the Patriot Act was passed, and we have to, from that context, challenge the Patriot Act.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman of California (Ms. CHU), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. CHU. I rise today to oppose this rule. The underlying bill will extend provisions of the Patriot Act that continue to deny Americans their civil liberties.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be extending these provisions. We should be fixing them. A delay even of 3 months will only incur more violations of the civil rights of American citizens.

Take the so-called ''roving wiretaps,'' which allow our government to spy on a nebulous array of people and technology. If the FBI wants to wiretap a phone, they don't even have to know who they're listening to. They don't even have to get a court's permission to tap a phone before they start listening.

Now, last year, I voted on a bill that would at a minimum require the government to name the place or person they want to listen to. But does this bill include that simple protection? No.

These provisions, including the provision to allow the FBI to access your private information, even the books that you read, make a mockery of our civil liberties—letting the government spy on whomever they want for any reason without letting Americans know or without giving them a chance to challenge that order in court.

It has been a full decade since these overly broad provisions were passed, and I don't think we should extend them without commonsense changes. We need to fix them and fix them now and protect American privacy and personal information from government overreach.

So I urge the other side to come back to the table and work with us on a bill that protects our national security without undermining Americans' civil liberties and constitutional rights. And if they can't find a way to work with us on a bipartisan basis to protect the American people, then all of my colleagues should oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this Patriot Act really speaks to our very core identity as Americans.

How do we balance what makes it special to be an American—with our unprecedented levels of rights that we enjoy, our privacy as individuals, our civil liberties—and reconcile that with staying safe in an incredibly complex world?

I think it is critical for any of us who are concerned about the unchecked growth of this state, those of us who seriously believe in protecting the rights and liberties of Americans, to seriously look at these issues and debate them. A ''no'' vote on the rule and the bill is the first step towards accomplishing that.

The House was in session late into the night, as it likely will be again tonight, on a very important topic: cutting spending. I've put several suggestions forward. I appreciate this process which has enabled Members to come up with how we are going to cut. There have been a lot of great ideas that have been submitted through amendments. I would submit that this Patriot Act and balancing our civil liberties with our security is as important a topic with regard to what it means to be an American as is making cuts in our budget.

I voted against the adjournment resolution yesterday. I think that, if we were in session next week and put the time into solving the issues under the Patriot Act that we're putting into making budget cuts, we would be able to come to a consensus that protects our civil liberties and that also keeps Americans safe from the threat of terrorism.

The majority argues that we must pass this extension now without any process. It has also been alluded to that there were not hearings in the last Congress. There actually were. The Judiciary Committee held two hearings on the Patriot Act in 2009. It has been said, Oh, there hasn't been time to hold hearings in this Congress because the Judiciary Committee just constituted itself. Well, they found time to hold 10 hearings on items that have not even come to the floor. So surely there would have been time for one hearing on an item that everybody knew was going to expire and needed to be dealt with.

Those of us who joined Congress in the last session as well as our new Members this session, many of whom are on the other side of the aisle, have not had any classified briefings on how this authority that has been given to the Federal Government has been used.

How can we exercise meaningful oversight with regard to these three provisions of the Patriot Act, and the Patriot Act in general, if we are not given the benefit of finding out exactly how these broad powers that have been given to the Federal Government have been used?

If this passes today—and I expect it might—it is critical that we take the next 90 days to make sure that Congress can properly execute its oversight upon the next need for renewing the necessary provisions of the Patriot Act. There is a window of time that will afford the Judiciary Committee to do its work in a bipartisan way, which is to include other Members through a classified briefing to find out how and when the powers under the Patriot Act have been used, so that Members of this body can make an informed decision, an informed decision about how to move forward in 90 days in protecting our rights as Americans and in protecting our security as Americans. The two are not irreconcilable, and we cannot sacrifice what makes it special to be an American in the name of security—or the terrorists will have won.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule and the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the RECORD on H. Res. 93.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we are where we are. The Senate took our 10-month extension that we passed by a vote of 274–144, and decided to offer a 90-day extension, which passed by an 86–12 vote.

Even before we saw this extension, the gentleman from Menomonee Falls, the chairman of the Crime Subcommittee and the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, had made a commitment that he will proceed very vigorously in the next 90 days to deal with the questions that my friend has raised.

I think that many of the questions that have been raised are valid. That's why it is that we need to have this extension, which is scheduled to expire in one legislative day if we take no action, because I think everyone can acknowledge that the Patriot Act has played a role in keeping the United States of America safe.

My two colleagues and I have joined from the get-go in saying that they should not have made this measure permanent, because we were legislating through the prism of September 11 at the outset. We felt very strongly that recognizing the civil liberties of every single American has to continue to be a very, very top priority while we look at what, I think, are the five most important words in the middle of the preamble of the U.S. Constitution, which are ''providing for the common defense.''

In his first inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson made it very clear when he said that a wise and true government shall restrain men from injuring one another.

That is why our security has to be of paramount importance, but it doesn't mean it is done at the expense of civil liberties and the rights of every American.

Well, guess what, Mr. Speaker? The gentleman who chairs the Crime Subcommittee is absolutely dedicated within the next 90 days of pursuing that as vigorously as possible.

□ 1300

I will say that when this extension that we're faced with right now was passed, last February 25, 1 year ago, that brought to an end any discussion, any hearings. That brought to an end any hearings through the entire rest of that Congress once the extension was put into place.

I will say that any Member who wants a classified briefing can request it, and so the opportunity for classified briefings on the Patriot Act or any other measure is there for Members of this body.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's clear to me, we have a 90-day extension that has come back from the Senate. It will expire in one legislative day. We want Mr. SENSENBRENNER to begin working with Mr. LUNGREN and others who have spent so much time and energy in dealing with the questions of the lone wolf and roving wiretaps and all that. We need to have that addressed as quickly possible.

So let's do it, let's do it now, let's pass this thing in a bipartisan way and get it done.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. POLIS. 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 254, nays 176, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—254

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland

Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—176

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—3

Giffords
Markey
Speier

□ 1329

Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois, WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. BASS of California, Messrs. BACA, LABRADOR, BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. LOWEY, Messrs. COURTNEY and MURPHY of Connecticut changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. ADERHOLT, DUNCAN of Tennessee, BILBRAY, LoBIONDO, BARTLETT, MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Messrs. CARDOZA, HELLER, JONES, BARLETTA, CRAVAACK, ROGERS of Alabama, RAHALL, BUCSHON, BILIRAKIS, GRIMM, FRELINGHUYSEN and YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY of Georgia). Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a) and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy:

Mr. SHIMKUS, Illinois.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 92 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. 1.

□ 1330

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. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, with Mr. PRICE of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 223, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 263, line 9.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

Amendment No. 95 by Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 237 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 97 by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

Amendment No. 153 by Mr. MICHAUD of Maine.

Amendment No. 368 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 260 by Mr. LATTA of Ohio.

Amendment No. 125, as modified, by Mr. WEINER of New York.

Amendment No. 110 by Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 192 by Mrs. BIGGERT of Illinois.

Amendment No. 395 by Mr. INSLEE of Washington.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. TONKO of New York.

Amendment No. 259 by Mr. LATTA of Ohio.

Amendment No. 98 by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

Amendment No. 223 by Mr. PASCRELL of New Jersey.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes 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 233, noes 198, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

AYES—233

Ackerman
Adams
Altmire
Amash
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Butterfield
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Cicilline
Clay
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Flores
Frank (MA)
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Hall
Hanabusa
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kind
King (NY)
Labrador
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McKinley
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter

Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Quayle
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Ribble
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ross (AR)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Sires
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Sullivan
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Towns
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Waters
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yoder

NOES—198

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Brooks
Bucshon
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Cantor
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costello
Cravaack
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Davis (KY)
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Emerson
Engel
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heller
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinchey
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Manzullo
Marino
Markey
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pence
Peters
Pitts
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reichert
Renacci
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Stutzman
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Visclosky
Walberg
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Watt

NOT VOTING—1

Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1349

Messrs. ENGEL and GRIMM changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. AL GREEN of Texas, ELLISON, Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. WILSON of Florida changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. JONES

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 135, noes 294, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

AYES—135

Amash
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Goodlatte
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Hall
Hastings (FL)
Heller
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hurt
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Mack
Markey
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Posey
Quigley
Rahall
Rehberg
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Royce
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schrader
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Upton
Visclosky
Waters
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—294

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hirono
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Cummings
Giffords
Latham
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1353

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 47, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 47, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

AMENDMENT NO. 237 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 299, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

AYES—133

Amash
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)

NOES—299

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—1

Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1358

Mr. CARNEY changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 136, noes 296, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

AYES—136

Ackerman
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Hanna
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Richardson
Richmond
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen

Velázquez
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—296

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Webster
Weiner
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—1

Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1402

Messrs. GARAMENDI, NEAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 153 OFFERED BY MR. MICHAUD

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 305, noes 127, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

AYES—305

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ross (AR)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Webster
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—127

Adams
Amash
Bachmann
Becerra
Benishek
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cantor
Chaffetz
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Cravaack
Culberson
Davis (IL)
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellmers
Eshoo
Farenthold
Flake
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gonzalez
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hall
Hartzler
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Honda
Huelskamp
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Jordan
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lankford
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Meehan
Moran
Napolitano
Nugent
Nunes
Palazzo
Pence
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Ribble
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (WI)
Schakowsky
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Smith (NE)

Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Velázquez
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
West
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—1

Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1407

Messrs. GOSAR, COLE, and HERGER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. AL GREEN of Texas and WU changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 368 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 262, noes 169, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

AYES—262

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conaway
Cooper
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Doggett
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—169

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Luján
Marino
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McIntyre
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schiff
Schilling
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tonko
Towns
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—2

Bishop (UT)
Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1410

Mr. LEWIS of California changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 260 OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 247, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

AYES—184

Adams
Akin
Altmire
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cuellar
Denham
DesJarlais
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts

Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rangel
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuler
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Watt
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—247

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Harman
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—2

Bishop (UT)
Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1413

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 125, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 203, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

AYES—228

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Butterfield
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chabot
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunnelee
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Richardson
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schilling
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—203

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Benishek
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Hall
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McKeon
McKinley
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Webster
West

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—2

Bishop (UT)
Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1418

Messrs. KEATING, GRIFFIN of Arkansas and CANSECO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 259, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

AYES—171

Adams
Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Fincher
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—259

Ackerman
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunnelee
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—3

Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1422

Mr. FLORES changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 192 OFFERED BY MRS. BIGGERT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 262, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

AYES—170

Adams
Akin
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrow
Bartlett
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Culberson
Denham
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Holt
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Quayle
Renacci
Ribble
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher

Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—262

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunnelee
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—1

Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1424

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 395 OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 159, noes 273, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

AYES—159

Andrews
Baldwin
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rogers (MI)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—273

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—1

Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1428

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 223, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

AYES—208

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—223

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carnahan
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—2

Giffords
Miller (NC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1431

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 259 OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 137, noes 293, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

AYES—137

Aderholt
Akin
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Hall
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Paul
Pence
Peters
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—293

Ackerman
Adams
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell

Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—3

Denham
Giffords
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1434

Mr. DEFAZIO changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 301, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

AYES—130

Amash
Baldwin
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Berkley
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Camp
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Crowley
DeFazio
DeGette
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Filner
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Garamendi
Garrett
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kingston
Kline
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Richardson
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shuler
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Stearns
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Upton
Velázquez
Westmoreland
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—301

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heller
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holden
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—2

Giffords
Roybal-Allard

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1438

Mr. NADLER and Mrs. MALONEY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. PASTOR of Arizona and LYNCH changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 223 OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 318, noes 113, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

AYES—318

Ackerman
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—113

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Hall
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Huelskamp
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Labrador
Lamborn
Latta
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
Markey
McClintock
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Ribble
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross (FL)
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tipton
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—2

Giffords
Herger

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1442

Messrs. GARDNER and RIGELL changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this deeply flawed Republican funding resolution.

The bill is a reckless and sweeping attack on the public health and environmental protections that keep our air safe to breathe and our water safe to drink.

One of the most egregious assaults on public health and the environment in the legislation is section 1746. This provision guts the Clean Air Act and bars the Environmental Protection Agency from addressing the grave threat to public health and the environment posed by carbon pollution, and it does so while destroying thousands of jobs.

The science is clear and the evidence is overwhelming. According to the National Academy of Sciences and the premier scientific organizations of all the world's major economies, carbon pollution is changing the climate and endangering the environment. But section 1746 prohibits EPA from taking commonsense, reasonable measures to address this threat.

The Clean Air Act currently requires that new source plants, new power plants, new oil refineries, and other major new sources of carbon emissions take steps to reduce their carbon emissions. This requirement makes sense because it is easier for facilities to plan for emission reductions before construction than to install retrofits afterwards. EPA says sources should be able to comply just by being energy efficient. Section 1746 would prevent EPA from implementing this commonsense requirement.

EPA has also indicated it plans to set minimum Federal standards for the two largest sources of carbon pollution: power plants and oil refineries. This section would prevent EPA from even proposing these standards.

Instead of gutting the Clean Air Act, the top priority for this Congress should be getting Americans back to work, but section 1746 does exactly the opposite. It imposes a de facto construction ban on many areas of the country. The Clean Air Act requires the largest new or expanding facilities to obtain carbon pollution permits before they begin construction. The Republican bill doesn't change this legal requirement to have a permit, but it does prevent EPA from actually issuing the needed permits. This affects every jurisdiction where EPA issues permits.

This construction ban would apply to all or part of 13 States, including my own State of California. It would block dozens of major projects, including power plants, refineries, cement kilns, and large manufacturing plants. The result would be the loss of thousands of construction jobs and permanent jobs at these facilities.

Members have different views about how to reduce carbon pollution, but we should all agree that a multi-State construction ban is a terrible idea.

The Republican bill has other damaging impacts. The bill blocks requirements to reduce carbon pollution emissions that Congress established in the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments and expanded a few years ago. The bill even blocks successful voluntary programs that partner with industry like Energy Star, and it blocks the renewable fuel standard that Congress established 4 years ago which aims to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

This is a sweeping, reckless, and irresponsible bill. I urge all my colleagues to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word to enter into a colloquy with Mr. DENHAM of California.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentlewoman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I originally planned on offering an amendment to cut the General Services Administration's budget to force it to sell unneeded Federal properties. My purpose was to get GSA's attention and compel it to stop wasting billions of dollars on Federal buildings we no longer need or barely use. However, through this colloquy, I hope our committees can make a commitment to work together and accomplish this same goal.

Just last week, I held my subcommittee's first hearing in a freezing cold, vacant Federal building on Pennsylvania Avenue. The building sits on one of the most famous streets in America, within walking distance of the U.S. Capitol and the White House. Yet it has been empty for over a decade and loses over $6 million in taxpayer money each year. I am sad to say there are buildings like this across the entire Nation. According to GAO, Federal agencies reported over 45,000 underutilized buildings that cost $1.66 billion annually to operate and maintain.

□ 1450

At GSA's current rate of disposal, it will take over 800 years to get rid of excess and surplus properties.

Our Nation is facing financial distress, and this wasteful spending must stop. GSA needs to get serious about selling wasteful properties. To date, GSA has failed to provide my office with detailed information about the Federal Government's inventory of properties. Congress needs to see the list of properties so we can hold GSA's feet to the fire, sell wasteful properties and save taxpayer money.

Madam Chairman, I would greatly appreciate your commitment to work with our committee on the following items:

To compel GSA to provide detailed property lists of unneeded or money-losing properties to our committees, as well as an inclusive list of the entire asset inventory under its jurisdiction;

Second, to compel GSA to greatly increase the number of properties it sells or redevelops;

And, third, to work with the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee on a legislative initiative to consolidate Federal employees into fewer Federal buildings.

Mrs. EMERSON. Let me thank the gentleman for calling attention to these important issues and offering to work with our subcommittee on your three initiatives. The Appropriations Committee shares your deep concerns about the number of wasteful properties in the government inventory, and I commit to working with you on the three items you mentioned so we can together save taxpayer money.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VII—INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES

SEC. 1701. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Management of Lands and Resources'' shall be $927,523,000: *Provided,* That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$927,523,000'' for ''$959,571,000'' the second place it appears.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam 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:

Page 263, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 263, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 359, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, I have talked to the leadership of the committee, and I think that this amendment is agreeable to them, and I don't think there is going to be a great deal of opposition to it.

What I want to do is I want to send a message to the Bureau of Land Management. This amendment only cuts about $2 million from the Bureau of Land Management's Management of Lands and Resources Account, and I know that is not much when you are talking about a $1.65 trillion deficit this year. But the problem I am addressing is the Wild Horse and Burro Management Program that they have. This program was started I believe in 1971, and since then the Secretary of the Interior has been charged with managing these mustangs that live on public lands out West primarily.

By any stretch of the imagination, this program may have been successful to a degree, but it is very, very costly. The cost has gone from $20.4 million in fiscal year 2000 to $64 million in 2010, and the President has asked for $75.7 million in this coming fiscal year. As far back as 2008, the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office has warned that the cost of this program will get completely out of control unless we deal with it in an efficient way, and this has not happened.

What is going on right now is they are taking these mustangs and they are transporting them from their habitat where they live now as far as 1,000 miles. They are putting them in holding pens. They just recently rounded up I believe about 10,000 of these wild horses. They ship them to a holding pen halfway from, let's say, Nevada to Oklahoma, and then they transfer them the rest of the way, about 1,000 miles. It costs about $2,500 per horse to keep them in these pens, and there are other ways to handle this problem. So the Bureau of Land Management really needs to get on with the problem of dealing with these wild animals in a very efficient and humane way, and they are not doing that.

I have talked to the people over at the Bureau of Land Management, told them we were going to bring this up, and that it was very, very important that they come up with a program that is a responsible way to deal with these animals and do it in a humane way.

Now, they are talking about, in addition to corralling them, to killing many thousands of these horses through euthanasia, and a lot of people in this country, the Humane Society and animal lovers, think this is a very inhumane way to deal with this problem. The Bureau of Land Management needs to talk to people who are interested in this issue and come to a conclusion that is acceptable to people all across this country that believe in the mustangs that are out West.

So, as I said, my amendment only cuts $2 million. It is just a drop in the bucket when you are talking about this overall cost problem we are facing. But it is one that I hope will send a very strong message to the Bureau of Land Management, to treat mustangs in a humane way and to solve this problem in a way that is acceptable to the Congress of the United States and the people of this country across America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, we agree that there is a major problem

with the wild horse and burro policy. It is too expensive and problematic for multiple uses on public lands and conserving western rangelands. I would like to work with Mr. BURTON, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. BISHOP on this problem. The true problem is the law, not the funding of the law.

In recognition of the problems that Mr. BURTON raises, we will accept this amendment, but first I would like to make some important points about the wild horse and burro program.

The wild horse population is not native to North America and can double every 4 years. If horses aren't removed from the range, it can cause degradation and reduced foliage for wildlife and livestock. If this program isn't appropriately funded and horses aren't removed from the range, wild horses will continue to reproduce, over-graze and eventually have a population crash, which means starving horses.

I would also point out that it is already illegal to slaughter wild horses or burros, and the BLM spends no funds on slaughtering wild horses or burros. But I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana pointing out the problem, and I would like to work with him to find a reasonable solution to this that doesn't cost the kind of money that it currently costs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairwoman, we are going to hear some opposition to the intent of this legislation, so let me share some thoughts about it.

Despite so much public support for allowing wild horses to remain wild, despite multiple scientific studies of their management that exposed poor analysis, fiscal waste, and no use of preventative methods, the BLM continues to use helicopters to round up and remove horses from the range and place them in long-term holding facilities. There are about 40,600 horses in these pens currently.

The most recently completed fiscal year holding costs accounted for $37 million out of a total wild horse and burro budget of $64 million. The average lifespan of a wild horse in captivity is about 30 years. Holding and maintaining one wild horse in these long-term facilities costs about $500 a year.

Last year, BLM received a 30 percent increase in their budget. Instead of using that to fix this broken wild horse management problem, they permanently removed another 10,000 wild horses and burros and put them into tax funded long-term holding pens.

BLM's approach has been enormously wasteful and misguided. Instead of capturing wild horses and holding them in pens for life, BLM should have already fully implemented a less costly, preventative, and more humane option, that of controlling herd size through contraception.

According to a study by the U.S. Geological Survey, the BLM could save up to $8 million a year with the implementation of herd reduction through birth control. It plans to use birth control for approximately 1,000 horses this year but will still round up and remove nearly 10,000 others they feel are ''excessive,'' in their words. At the same time, we have private citizens who are willing to use their own money to form public-private partnerships that will preserve these horses in the wild, promote economic activity, and reduce the cost to the Federal Government.

Instead of embracing these opportunities, such as Mrs. Pickens' generous plan, BLM has relied on procedural arguments to block such initiatives and maintain the status quo. That is why this amendment is important.

As we expanded into the West two centuries ago, we found millions of wild horses thriving on the American prairies and high deserts. They became part of our American heritage, helping us reach the West and develop and thrive as a nation. They have been our companions and our inspiration, but we have already destroyed too many of them.

The small herds that still run free symbolize our growth as a great nation. That is why Congress declared them protected in 1971. We said that they are entitled to the greatest protection possible, as they were fast disappearing from the American landscape. But rather than maintaining them in their natural state and allowing them to be free, we captured them, often causing harm and even death, and we contained them in these long-term holding facilities.

□ 1500

We had millions of wild horses at one time, now reduced to only 30,000 still living on the range. We have more in captivity than we have on the range. The fact is, it's time for the Bureau of Land Management to wake up, take this issue seriously, work with all the stakeholders to fix an unsustainable situation.

Mr. BURTON's amendment is intended to make this point abundantly clear to the Bureau of Land Management, and that's why we accept this amendment.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Chair, I rise to correct some of the statements that were just made. In my home State of Wyoming, we have more than 30,000 wild horses. The wild horses have no natural predators. And I have ridden BLM wild horses. My sister adopted two of them. I've ridden them. We've used them on our ranch, and I know whereof I speak.

Wild horses overgrazing our fragile ecosystems in the West on lands that were not conducive to the type of grazing that occurs when a hoofed animal that does not have a split hoof is grazing causes the soil to be tamped down. Horses are a solid-hoofed animal. When they run, they tamp the soil. When we have our sparse rains, it runs off, thereby causing soil erosion and causing difficult grazing situations.

The natural grazers on that land for millennia were split-hoofed animals such as elk and bison, and that is why sheep and cattle are more conducive to protecting the grazing of that sparse fragile resource than a solid-hoofed animal. When you put too many solid-hoofed animals tamping down that fragile grass with a very shallow reservoir of top soil, you cause overgrazing and you are loving horses in a way that causes the fragile grass ecosystem to the Western States to die.

It is this Congress that has caused the problems by saying that we cannot slaughter horses. Yet we're not supposed to keep them in pens. We're supposed to allow them to overgraze the West.

When the gentle people east of the Mississippi will take these excess horses into their backyards, I will support this amendment. Until then, I oppose efforts by those well-meaning people that measure animal unit months by the acre and we measure acres by the animal unit month.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I rise to discuss section 1746, which would eliminate EPA funding from going to implementation of the Clean Air Act.

Over the past 40 years, the bipartisan Clean Air Act has saved hundreds of thousands of lives and improved the health of Americans in every State. It protects the air we breathe. It protects our children from developing asthma and our seniors from developing emphysema. According to the American Lung Association, in 2010 alone the Clean Air Act saved over 160,000 lives. Even since 1990, the EPA estimates the Clean Air Act prevented an estimated 843,000 asthma attacks, 18 million cases of respiratory illness amongst children, 672,000 cases of chronic bronchitis, 21,000 cases of heart disease, and 200,000 premature deaths.

And yet in the irresponsible Republican spending bill, there's an attempt to eliminate all funding from the implementation of the Clean Air Act. It is clear that the Republican majority is doing all it can to stop EPA from carrying out its mission of protecting public health and protecting our environment.

Many will claim that the EPA is moving at a faster pace than any other administration in history. However, the EPA has proposed fewer Clean Air

Act rules under President Obama over the past 21 months than in the first 2 years of either President Bush or President Clinton. That is why in December of 2010, 280 groups, including the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, and others, sent a letter urging the Congress to ''reject any measure that would block or delay the United States Environmental Protection Agency from doing its job to protect all Americans from life-threatening air pollution.''

The irresponsible Republican spending bill is not the place to legislate these types of changes. These policy changes should not be made during this sort of process. The Clean Air Act is promoting innovation and breaking American oil dependence, but Republicans would give big polluters a loophole to roll back our clean energy process and continue our addiction to foreign oil.

The Clean Air Act is good for our economy. Many studies have shown the Clean Air Act's economic benefits to far exceed any costs associated with the law by as much as a 40-to-1 ratio. As President Obama so eloquently spoke of during his State of the Union address, we must out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build our global competitors and win the future. Rolling back a law that protects the air our children breathe to allow oil companies—companies that are already reaping record profits—the ability to spew chemicals, smog, soot, and pollution into the air just to please a lobbyist or a Big Oil corporation is irresponsible and extreme.

The Clean Air Act has been on the books for decades, with positive results for our economy, our environment, and our businesses. Rolling back these protections will only hurt our most vulnerable. We simply cannot afford to go backward.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1702. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Construction'' shall be $2,590,000: *Provided*, That no less than $1,000,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

AMENDMENT NO. 556 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

On page 263, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,590,000)''.

On page 264, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,750,000)''.

On page 264, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $23,737,000)''.

On page 264, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,055,000)''.

On page 267, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $171,713,000)''.

On page 268, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $14,100,000)''.

On page 278, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,100,000)''.

SEC. None of the funds made available by this. Act may be used for the Land and

On page 359, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increases by $239,045,000)''.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairwoman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment in the form at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairwoman, I object to the modification.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Chair, whenever a family is running behind on its obligations, the family begins to stop its investments and its purchases.

Madam Chair, I would draw the attention of our body to the chart in front of me. We're spending $3.5 trillion a year, and we bring in $2.2 trillion a year. That means that we have $1.3 trillion a year in deficit that goes into our debt barrel. Currently, our debt is around $15 trillion a year. That's on top of the $89 trillion unobligated funds that we have to pay in the future for Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

Madam Chair, it is time for us to live within our means as a Nation. So my amendment simply strikes the ability for BLM to purchase new land and buildings. It removes $15 million from fish and wildlife for land acquisitions.

□ 1510

It removes $14-plus million from national parks for land acquisitions. It removes $9 million from the Forest Service for land acquisitions. It removes $2.5 million from the OMB for new construction. It removes $23 million from the Fish and Wildlife Service for construction funds, and it removes $171 million from the National Park Service for construction funds.

As we look at the picture here of us as a Nation—and we are seeing that literally we are in the process of wrecking our economy, the same as a family would be wrecking its economy—it is time for us to not stop the purchases of land, but to simply put them off to a future time when we can get our economic house in order. We are not talking about stopping these programs forever, just for the rest of this fiscal year.

It is not the time for us to be spending money in this way. Our future is at risk. We are having to look at cutting significant funds from programs that matter. We are running a $1.3 trillion deficit this year. The President says in next year's budget he wants to run a $1.6 trillion deficit. CBO and OMB both have a chart here that shows our economy as simply discontinuous in the 2030 range.

When we are talking about the fiscal instability of our economy, when we are talking about this picture for our ability to pay our debts, when we are talking about this picture for the Nation, then it only makes sense for us to look and to prioritize our funding and to prioritize our expenditures the same way any family would.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Idaho continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairwoman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairwoman, the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment does not merely propose to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill, but also proposes language other than those amounts.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, in addition to its being a point of order, I think it should be noted that what we are talking about, nature and culture visitation, are huge industries, responsible for more than 3 million jobs.

The Park Service has a backlog in deferred maintenance of at least $6 billion. We can't be cutting construction. In fact, these funds enhance national parks, wildlife refuges, public lands, and create thousands of new jobs.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. MORAN. I would support, though, the motion that this is out of order and trust that it will be ruled as such.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the gentleman's point of order? If not, the Chair will rule:

To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must propose only to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill. Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico proposes also another kind of change in the bill, namely, a new limitation on funds in the bill, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Chair, there is bipartisan

agreement that Congress needs to create jobs, grow our economy, and live within our means. The bill before us today, though, goes too far, with irresponsible and arbitrary cuts that will threaten the economy and cost us more than 800,000 private and public sector jobs. Included in today's bill is reckless language that will cost thousands of jobs in coastal communities in my district and in Oregon by destroying the recreational and commercial salmon fisheries.

Over the years, my district has been hit hard by politically motivated water management decisions that have resulted in dramatic declines in salmon stock. For example, in the Central Valley, we witnessed a peak of 768,000 fall-run salmon in 2002, followed by a collapse to a historic low of only 39,500 fish in 2009. These declines have led to an estimated $1.4 billion in lost economic activity in 2008, 2009 and 23,000 lost jobs.

In these 2 years, the commercial fishery was completely shut down. Last year, only 14,500 salmon were caught by the California salmon fishery, which is about 20 percent as many as were caught during the 2006 disaster. This only exacerbates the economic crisis facing fishing families in communities in my district. These fishing families have been put out of work in my district and up through and into Oregon. Some have lost their homes, their savings, and their livelihoods.

Water management decisions in the collapsing bay-delta ecosystem need to be based on science, not politics. In 2002, the science on minimum flows in the Klamath River was ignored, resulting in the death of some 80,000 salmon and the loss of countless fishing community jobs. Today's bill does the same thing by waiving Federal protections, which put at risk fishing industry jobs. By de-funding the biological opinions, this bill also threatens water supplies for southern California farmers and cities by placing the burden to comply with the California Endangered Species Act solely on the State Water Project.

We know that with the right tools and careful water management we can meet our water needs in a cost-effective way and restore salmon runs and coastal economies. We need to continue the ongoing negotiations aimed at reaching balanced solutions for California's water challenges. This bill undermines that effort.

For these reasons and many more, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this reckless piece of legislation that hurts jobs, hurts the economy, and hurts my district.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chair, I am troubled to be on the floor this afternoon.

Americans still are facing staggering unemployment rates, and our economy has not yet fully recovered; but instead of talking about the many ways we can generate jobs, especially clean-energy jobs that can't be shipped overseas and about ways to improve the health of American families, we have an extreme piece of legislation before us.

Americans all agree that fiscal discipline is a must, but special interests giveaways and legislative earmarks to protect big polluters won't balance our checkbook. Putting health protection on the chopping block means dirtier air, dirtier water, and more children's lives at risk. One of the most egregious legislative earmarks in the bill would block the EPA from doing its job, which is to protect our health from air pollution.

Madam Chair, not allowing the EPA to address carbon pollution under the Clean Air Act is flat-out dangerous. Climate change is a serious problem. The scientific evidence is clear. The debate is over. Climate change is real. It is happening—and human beings are largely to blame.

2010 was the hottest year on record. In the last decade, the Earth experienced nine of the 10 hottest years since data has been recorded. We are also starting to see the irreversible damage to our economy and to our environment. Sea levels are rising. Acidification is happening in our oceans. The world is witnessing increased rainfall, floods, droughts, and wildfires; and our fresh water supplies and capacity to grow enough food will be severely challenged in the years ahead.

Madam Chair, the longer we delay taking action to address climate change, the more difficult and expensive the solutions will be. That is why the EPA is taking a cautious, flexible, and balanced approach to addressing carbon pollution. Each of the steps it has taken so far has followed the letter of the law. For four decades, the Clean Air Act has protected the health of millions of Americans, including our children, our seniors and the most vulnerable among us, from all kinds of dangerous air pollutants. The law also has a tremendous track record in providing certainty to businesses and delivering economic benefits.

Since the Clean Air Act was enacted, overall, air pollution has dropped while the U.S. GDP has risen 207 percent. We have also seen major health benefits, including asthma reduction, lower lung cancer rates, and much greater productivity. In fact, by 2020, the benefits of the Clean Air Act are expected to reach $2 trillion, exceeding any cost by more than 30 to 1.

All of these benefits, Madam Chair, are jeopardized by this dangerous rollback of the Clean Air Act included in the Republican omnibus spending bill.

□ 1520

And that's why groups, many groups ranging from the American Lung Association to the American Sustainable Business Council, have decried the harm of this proposal to people's health and our economy. And it's why I stand with them today in opposing the extreme earmarks to gut the Clean Air Act. This sweeping proposal has many impacts. It would block new construction. It tampers with the clean car agreement between the automakers, the States, and the Obama administration. And it would stop the renewable fuels standard in its track.

Madam Chair, our constituents want us to create jobs and to stand up for the health of our families. They don't want us to stand with the big polluters. This attack just doesn't make sense.

Last month, President Obama stood on the House floor and talked about ''winning the future'' through innovation, and he used clean energy as his central example. We know that clean energy will put Americans to work. It will help our economy grow, and it will help America compete in a global marketplace. Let's create jobs by investing in cleaner forms of energy. Let's not obstruct the EPA from doing its job of protecting the public's health and environment.

These are crucial issues, Madam Chair, for the public and the planet. It's our duty here in this place to ensure both are protected from harmful carbon pollution. Unfortunately, this extreme legislation does not meet this crucial test. Congress should be investing in America's future, not moving backwards.

So I urge my colleagues to say ''no'' to this irresponsible omnibus with all of its reckless spending cuts.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chairman, this spending bill is simply unacceptable on many levels. This is a bill drafted for a sound bite, not sound policy for the American people. Handcuffing the EPA is proof of that fact, and I have and will continue to oppose those attempts and propose amendments where possible.

This CR arbitrarily kills jobs, hurts the public health, and is a slap in the face to protecting our environment and clean air. This CR will set our country back decades by curtailing scientific research simply because Republicans don't like what the science says. Worse yet, it puts our children's health at risk by handcuffing the EPA's ability to simply police polluters. The American public needs real solutions and thoughtful policies, not sound bytes.

This bill is a backhanded way of achieving a policy objective. Just because the Republican Party doesn't like what the overwhelming science is telling us and they've stopped time and time again any meaningful reform, now they're attempting to legislate in a spending bill.

This bill simply continues the false logic often employed by Republicans: underfund an agency, then complain about its ineffectiveness, then call for

further cuts because the program didn't have the funds to work in the first place.

Madam Chairman, the EPA is working hard to protect us from pollution in a responsible way that spurs the economy. This CR prohibits any funding from being used to carry out the EPA's power plant pollution safeguards, the rules that target the largest power plants and prevent them from polluting our air.

The rules also spur economic growth. A recent study by MIT found that nearly 1.5 million jobs could be created by simply letting the EPA ensure that over time power companies move towards cleaner power plants. That's 1.5 million jobs cut by this CR. Furthermore, this provision only harms an industry by giving it increased uncertainty and not allowing them to plan for the future. In some cases, it might even lock up permits from going to companies that are a normal part of business. We don't need sound bites; we need sound policy.

The Clean Air Act guards the most vulnerable Americans, those with asthma and other lung disease, children, older adults, people with heart disease and diabetes, from the danger, the real danger of airborne pollutants, including threats from mercury, carbon dioxide and methane. Each year, the act prevents tens of thousands of ill health effects, including preventing asthma attacks, heart attacks and, yes, preventing premature death. This year alone, the Clean Air Act will save more than 160,000 lives, according to estimates by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Forty years of evidence shows that these health benefits come not only without harm to the economy but with benefits to the economy. Since 1970, the Clean Air Act has cut emissions by 60 percent. At the same time, the economy has grown by more than 200 percent.

Madam Chair, I implore the majority party to stop making grand gestures attempting to bully the EPA. Let it do its job of protecting your family and my family from dangerous pollution. Let it do its job to keep our air and our water clean.

This CR is a polluter's dream and a public health nightmare. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chair, we all recognize the need for us to reduce the deficit and curtail unreasonable spending, but this continuing resolution obviously goes far too in the extreme direction of harming our economy and harming many of the services that our citizens have come to rely on to finish and bring their lives together, whether they're working, whether they need health care, whether their children need education, and this resolution is harmful for that.

But I want to speak for the moment on section 1475, which is a rider that is added to this legislation that will harm the California economy, harm our ability to plan into the future for the use of water.

We have a water system in California that's dramatically oversubscribed, and we're in the process now of bringing that together to make sure that we can meet the future economic needs of our State and also the needs of the various sectors of that economy, whether they be the fishing sector, they be the energy producing sector, the farming sector or the settlement of our cities.

But with this rider—this rider, first of all, throws out 18 years of litigation successfully brought to an end, a long conflict on the San Joaquin River to provide for that settlement, a settlement that is agreed to by almost everyone. But more importantly, for the sake of the long-term water using, this amendment defunds the biological opinions that were going forward that are the cornerstone to provide for the final elements of the plan to provide California and the apportionment of that water for the protection of the fisheries and the economies in northern California, for the protection in the water supplies of the Central Valley's economy and the needs of the great urban areas of southern California. That planning must be completed.

This is as close as we've come. After decades and decades of water wars in the State of California, we finally have the opportunity now to bring the various parties together from all geographic regions, from all sectors of the economy, and plan the future of our State so that we will have the water that is necessary to secure our economy, to secure our families, to secure our agricultural areas of the State, and to provide for the great ecology of the State of California.

We've gone through some disasters, if you will, because of the droughts, because of water cycles, and my colleague from further north in the State, MIKE THOMPSON, laid out this. We saw thousands of jobs lost, the fisheries decimated because of political water decisions that were made over the last several years that decimated the salmon run, not only affecting just the San Francisco Bay delta but affecting the coastal regions of our State and the coastal regions of Oregon and Washington.

These are important fisheries. This is an important part of our economy. It's a renewable part of our economy if we take care of it, but if we have mindless riders that are put onto legislation like the one provided in section 1475, it will bring an end to these negotiations.

It's taken a long time to get the water parties from the south, the water parties from industry, the water parties from agriculture, from the environmental community and the government, the Federal Government and State government together. They are sitting at that table and they're working it through.

Just in the last couple of days, we see the delta planning organization put forth its first document to say what the requirements will be for the conservation habitat plan that all of these elements from north and south California working on. This amendment simply kicks that negotiating table over. It drives the parties away from the negotiation, and California goes back into water uncertainty, economic uncertainty, ecological uncertainty that our State cannot continue to have if we're going to grow our economy, if we're going to come out of this recession.

So I would hope that on passage the Members would vote against this continuing resolution, understanding the kind of damage that these kinds of riders that were inserted in the middle of the night on behalf of a few special interests have the opportunity to really destroy, destroy bipartisan geographical negotiations that are the most promising in the last 40 years in the history of our State.

The opposition from so many of the water users across the State, no matter where they reside, to this rider is well-known, to the fishing community, to so many parts of our economy in the San Joaquin-Sacramento Bay delta, and to the future of our ability to get a handle on these water issues that have plagued us for so many years in California. I would hope that we would reject this provision of this legislation.

□ 1530

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Chair, we all believe in economic growth and job creation and environmental stability, but this resolution goes in the wrong direction and affects my State and district adversely.

Madam Chair, water in California is never a dull subject. As we try to repair the delta and prepare our water system for the generations to come, it is imperative that we make progress and not take steps backwards. That means achieving a healthy delta and finding a way for water users throughout California to receive their water without harming the delta. The amendments to the continuing resolution that defund and cut funding from the San Joaquin River Restoration, the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund, and the implementation of the biological opinion of the delta smelt and salmon are steps backwards.

The balance that we have been trying to achieve in California is a negotiation that must not be thrown off balance. Decades of work toward a more certain future for California water is only attainable when everyone works toward a solution rather than throw up

roadblocks that cost us precious time. That work started during the Bush administration and continues to this day. I urge you to oppose the language in the continuing resolution and allow the work by key stakeholders in California to continue.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Chair, I rise today to oppose section 1746 of H.R. 1 and to urge defeat of this bill.

In my hometown of Louisville, Kentucky, and in communities all across the United States, a provision of H.R. 1, section 1746, will effectively ban new construction on power plants, refineries, and manufacturing facilities. By freezing the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to issue a mission-based construction permit, H.R. 1 would halt dozens of ongoing projects in communities like Louisville. Under this provision, thousands of jobs in construction, contracting, and manufacturing could be lost. In Louisville alone, plans to improve Ford's Kentucky truck plant could be derailed, jeopardizing the jobs of thousands of hardworking Kentuckians.

I know what you're thinking, what I'm saying can't possibly be true. But it is. You're thinking, this must be an unintended consequence of section 1746 or perhaps an error in drafting, but it's not. Apparently, this is exactly what the Republicans on the Appropriations Committee intended to do. They will let nothing stand in the way of their feverish rush to handcuff the EPA, not even American jobs. In their effort to slam through a package of irresponsible cuts and to thwart the work of the very agency charged with protecting the air we breathe and the water we drink, the casualties aren't just limited to our national environment but real people and real jobs. Republicans in the House are trying to shut down the EPA at all costs, except they aren't the ones paying the price.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1. It is reckless. It is irresponsible. And it is politics at their very worst.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Chair, the draconian cuts to EPA funding will negatively impact my congressional district which has one of the highest rates of asthma in the Nation. For many years, I have worked closely and been dependent on EPA's collaboration to address the impact that poor air quality has had on residents of my district. The funding limitation that stops the EPA from limiting greenhouse gases will negatively impact air quality not only in my congressional district but throughout the Nation. This would also cause the cancellation of numerous projects which would eliminate thousands of jobs.

The National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities are also facing severe cuts. What kind of society have we become if we cannot encourage and fund the arts and humanities? Are we focusing on jobs? We must remember that giving our young people the opportunity to experience the arts leads to a more qualified and educated workforce. The funding for the NEA and the NEH helps to provide an important investment in our local arts organizations.

Our national parks contribute to the standard of living that many Americans enjoy. Our national parks are one of our greatest treasures, available to all of us. We must continue to improve and protect this valuable resource. The cuts to the National Park Service will also negatively affect many historical and conservation projects. With cuts to the Drinking Water Fund, we will be eliminating communities' ability to provide clean and safe drinking water to their residents who we, as elected officials, are stewards of.

Now I know that we continue, over the last 24 and over the next 24 hours, to discuss these very serious cuts. All I would hope is that as we go forward and we deal with cuts that many of us agree have to be made, that we pay special attention to the future of our country. One thing is to simply say, cuts reduce the deficit. The other thing is to say, what are we going to do to parks, what are we going to do to drinking water, what are we going to do to the air we breathe, what are we going to do to all the good things we've done over the last 30, 40, 50 years to make our country even better? As we cut budgets, we must take that into consideration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Guam is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Chairman, I will not be offering my amendment No. 487 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It would restore funding to the Assistance to Territories Account under U.S. Department of the Interior's Office of Insular Affairs to fiscal year 2008 levels. The 7 percent reduction in funding offered by the Republican majority would cut necessary assistance to the governments of Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. The U.S. territories are provided assistance through the Office of Insular Affairs, and the financial assistance provided by the account to be cut has allowed our governments to fund disaster mitigation programs, coral reef conservation initiatives, infrastructure repairs, and environmental preservation. In fact, Madam Chairman, the Constitution under article IV, section 3, clause 2 gives this Congress explicit authority: ''The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.''

While this impacts all territories, on Guam, in particular, funding from the OIA has been critical to the mitigation of invasive species, management of coral reef conservation programs, technical assistance to modernize and develop our port which provides direct economic benefit as well as assistance in modernizing our tax collection and our auditing systems. If my colleagues on the other side want to help diversify and develop the economies of the territories, then it is essential that we continue to provide this technical assistance in a targeted fashion, as is done now, to jump-start that development process.

My colleagues from the U.S. territories, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. SABLAN, all agree that this funding cut is yet another example of the majority's lack of concern for the over 4 million residents of the U.S. territories. While the majority's removal of our symbolic voting rights at the beginning of the 112th Congress did not affect the livelihoods of our constituents, this funding cut would tangibly result in a reduction of public service in each of our districts, and I oppose the Republicans' continued neglect of our local governments in the territories.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from American Samoa is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the goal to cut spending and reduce the deficit, which is projected to hit $1.6 trillion this year; and I am very pleased with the approach laid out by President Obama. In his budget proposal for FY 2012 and beyond, President Obama is making the case for selectively cutting spending while increasing resources in areas like education and clean-energy initiatives that hold the potential for long-term payoffs in economic growth.

□ 1540

This commonsense approach will help bring down annual deficits to more substantial levels, but not at the peril of programs that are vital to economic growth, job creation and the well-being of our fellow Americans.

Madam Chairman, this spending bill, H.R. 1, which proposes to cut programs and funding under section 1729 and 1730 does not help our economically struggling fellow Americans through initiatives involving education, the environment and housing and employment. It

will cut critical programs and projects that are essential to economic development and job creation, not only in the 50 States, but also in the insular areas.

Madam Chairman, in particular, the proposed bill will cut approximately $6.6 million from the current budget outlays for the Department of the Interior's Office of Insular Affairs. These cuts also include an 8 percent reduction for technical assistance, and about 4 percent reduction of OIA salaries and expenses.

Madam Chairman, the OIA budget has maintained relatively constant funding levels since FY 1998, despite disproportionate need for improvements in the territories. For instance, the OIA Office General Technical Assistance program provides critical support not otherwise available to insular areas, combating deteriorating economic and fiscal conditions and to maintain momentum needed to make and sustain meaningful systematic changes.

Reduction in the OIA and the compact association funding will translate to cuts to the vital projects including, but are not limited to, these projects which foster development of the insular areas in accountability, financial management, tax systems and procedures, insular management controls, economic development, and also with regard to energy, public safety, health, immigration, the whole thing, Madam Chairman.

And, Madam Chairman, these projects are also critically needed funding for implementation of our obligations under the Compact of Free Association for the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Federated States of Micronesia.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to continue support for the needs of these insular areas and our obligations to our compact friends in the Pacific.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. Madam Chair, I rise in support of Ms. BORDALLO's amendment and to protest the gutting and slashing of more than $6 million for the insular areas. This will hurt American families and communities all across the country, from the Northern Mariana Islands to the northern border of Maine.

It hits our outlying territories particularly hard and the American citizens and families who live and work there. This bill takes more than 7 percent out of the Assistance to Territories Account which funds critical programs at the local level in Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. These communities have unique needs and this account helps them address those. It helps fund disaster mitigation programs, particularly important in low-lying islands susceptible to tropical storms. It helps ensure a strong and robust judiciary in American Samoa, a crucial program to ensure that the American Constitution and U.S. laws are upheld in every corner of our Nation. It helps these areas make needed infrastructure repairs, which creates jobs that are critical during this tough economic time.

This amendment would restore this funding; and just because these communities may be farther away does not mean that they are any less American and in any less need of the services this funding provides. Just because these communities are farther away does not mean that the slashing of programs will go unnoticed.

As chairwoman of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I want to express my strong support for the amendment offered by Ms. BORDALLO and oppose the cuts to the Assistance to Territories Account offered by the Republican majority in H.R. 1.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Chair, people in the Northern Mariana Islands pay up to 40 cents per kilowatt hour for electricity. That's four times the national average because we're dependent on diesel oil shipped long distances.

A technical assistance grant for the Department of the Interior's Office of Insular Affairs, however, has helped identify a possible source of geothermal energy on one of the islands. Further exploration and more investments are needed to be sure that this alternative source will work for us; but without the technical assistance grant from Interior, we wouldn't even know that we have this possibility of getting off our dependence on expensive foreign oil.

And now, H.R. 1 proposes to cut the funds that Interior uses to help the Northern Marianas and the other insular areas in this way. That kind of thinking is penny wise and pound foolish.

But helping us get free of foreign oil is only one example of how this Interior Department funding helps us. These cuts threaten the brown tree snake program. I know this may sound like a joke to some, but on Guam there are literally 500,000 or more of these snakes. A few came in on military aircraft and spread quickly. They have caused millions of dollars in damage to electrical distribution systems and destroyed the rare indigenous bird life.

And we don't want to see these pests spread to the Northern Mariana Islands or Hawaii or mainland United States. And the Interior Department funding is keeping these snakes in check. Do away with this funding and these unwanted immigrants will break through our borders.

The Interior Department funding that H.R. 1 cuts supports training programs for high school and college students in the islands. It supports training for our professional people in financial management, accounting and auditing to help us manage our money to U.S. standards. Take away that training money and you will make it even more difficult for us to build capacity and become fully integrated into the American family.

Our economy is based on tourism. Tourists come to enjoy our warm oceans and beautiful coral reefs there, but these reefs are at risk. Run-off from development on land kills the coral. Funding that H.R. 1 cuts is helping us to protect the coral that underpins our tourism economy. Take away the funding and you hit our already fragile tourism industry.

We all know that the Federal Government has to cut spending. There is no disagreement there. We need to weed out wasteful programs. We have to get more efficient and effective with our own spending.

But the money that goes to the Interior Department to help the insular areas is not wasted. It is effective. It is targeted on precisely the problems that the insular areas confront. It will be a mistake, it is a mistake, to cut this tiny amount of money that has a large positive effect in the Northern Mariana Islands and all of the U.S. insular areas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HEINRICH. Our Nation's unsustainable budget deficit is staring us in the face, but it is at critical moments like this when we must approach our Nation's greatest challenges with responsibility and prudence. Make no mistake that what's at stake here is grand in scope, and we could have grave consequences for our Nation's security, our infrastructure, and our economy.

Just this morning, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates called the Republicans' stopgap spending plan ''a crisis on our doorstep'' in terms of our national security, and these shortsighted budget cuts could lead to costlier and more tragic consequences later.

The approach we take must focus on responsible cuts which will have a lasting impact on our deficit, not arbitrary short-term cuts to programs to win a few votes back home.

We should be making decisions based on the best available science, not the worst possible politics. For example, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are focused on de-funding the Mexican Wolf Recovery program, instead of protecting the critically important jobs at the National Nuclear Security Administration.

□ 1550

The NNSA is responsible for the management and security of our Nation's

nuclear weapons and nuclear nonproliferation, and provides crucial funding for the work being done at our national labs.

Our national labs, like Sandia National Lab in central New Mexico, have a tremendous impact on our local communities and our national defense. Last year, Sandia Labs hired a little over 700 people; 203 of these new hires graduated from a New Mexico university.

I am in favor of reducing government spending. In fact, this week I voted to cut $3 billion in unnecessary spending. But installations critical to our national security which are also successful private sector economic drivers like Sandia National Labs should not take the hit.

Elsewhere in their spending plans, Republicans want to gut the Land and Conservation Fund, a proven economic multiplier that has yielded $4 in economic activity around national parks for every dollar of Federal investment. They want to slash the Antiquities Act, which, since 1906, has provided an economic lifeline to rural communities surrounded by public land.

Madam Speaker, in the West, outdoor recreation and public lands means jobs. They mean hunting and fishing and camping and a western way of life.

Also on the chopping block is vital funding for women's health care and service agencies like AmeriCorps.

In regard to infrastructure, the Republicans' continuing resolution cuts key investments aimed at fixing our crumbling roads, energy grids, and clean water programs. Just this month, in my home State of New Mexico, we experienced a major gas outage emergency. On the coldest night of the year, with temperatures as low as negative 32 degrees, families were left without heat due to distribution infrastructure failures across the Southwest.

In an era of infrastructure failures which wreak havoc on communities, cutting key transportation and infrastructure investments would leave America dangerously vulnerable. At the same time, these cuts will result in the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs.

The middle class is still on a shaky path to recovery from the worst recession since the Great Depression. Let's not pull the rug out from underneath the hardworking people we came here to represent.

It has been 2 months since the Republicans took over the majority, and they still haven't introduced a jobs package. It was bad enough that the Republicans were ignoring jobs, but with this CR, they are now actively trying to cut jobs. I don't know about you, but a ''so be it'' attitude is simply not going to cut it when it comes to the families I represent back home.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to resist the temptation to politicize the very serious business of reducing our Nation's deficit. That is the only way we will ever rebuild the public's trust in government and grow our economy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I am going to speak on the issue of water.

I represent an area where we have a Superfund site called the San Gabriel groundwater contaminated site. This resolution will risk the water supply of over 30 million people and directly affects the ability to continue the 20-year cleanup that has been in effect, with another 15 years to run on the contaminated site—the size of Connecticut—which undermines the agreement the local, the State, the Federal, and the potential responsible parties have come together on in doing the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.

With regard to Klamath settlements, which helps secure a clean water supply, an adequate water supply to farmers and the environment in the San Joaquin Valley and the Klamath Basin, impacting the entire State of California, the settlement impacts an agreement developed by not only the farmers, the tribes, and the conservation groups, but the power companies and the States of California and Oregon, negotiated by no less than the Bush administration for voluntary removal of these privately owned dams. This will prevent fair congressional consideration of the Klamath agreements.

Madam Chair, the San Gabriel Restoration Fund, the Superfund list that I cited before, on H.R. 1, is the last line of defense against migrating groundwater contamination that has affected our basin for over 35 years, which was due to pesticides, fertilizer, and other contaminants. The fund has treated 24,000 acre feet of contaminated groundwater, helped fund the construction of 24 treatment facilities, and has removed thousands of volatile organic compounds, or VOCs, carcinogens, which threaten the health of some 40, 50 communities in the southern California area. With another decade or more to complete this cleanup, the funding to fight the spread of this contamination must not be eliminated.

In the Bay Delta, the further cuts would also abolish key elements of the San Joaquin River Restoration program and the implementation of two biological opinions on endangered species protecting wild California Bay-Delta fisheries, risking millions of people's water supply delivery. Fish are species. So is the human race another species.

Conservation and water recycling save jobs, save money, and talking about conservation and these cuts is not warranted. We need that water, our economy needs the water, and the jobs all of these will produce. Our communities need our support in developing local and sustainable water supplies through all the programs we can afford.

ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA WATER AGENCIES,
Sacramento, CA, February 15, 2011.

Hon. TOM MCCLINTOCK,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water & Power, House Natural Resources Committee, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. GRACE NAPOLITANO,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water & Power, House Natural Resources Committee, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCLINTOCK AND RANKING MEMBER NAPOLITANO: The Association of California Water Agencies strongly supports the Bureau of Reclamation's Water Recycling and Reuse Program, known as Title XVI, and believes it should be funded in the continuing resolution. For this reason, ACWA opposes amendment 286 to HR 1. ACWA represents nearly 450 public water agencies in California that collectively supply over 90% of the water delivered in California for domestic, agricultural, and industrial uses.

As you are aware, managing water supplies in Western states is challenging. Title XVI projects provide a valuable source of water and help alleviate conflicts. In California alone, this program helps generate over 525,000 acre-feet of recycled water each year. It is strongly supported by local project sponsors who provide three local dollars for every one federal dollar invested in recycling and reuse projects.

Title XVI projects also create jobs and help local economies. As the projects are constructed, jobs are created in both the primary and secondary job market. As noted by Reclamation's Commissioner Mike Connor in his July 21, 2009 testimony to the House of Representatives Natural Resources Subcommittee on Water and Power, there is a $600 million unfunded backlog of authorized Title XVI projects. These projects are approved by Congress and have local support and funding. Instead of decreasing funding for this program, ACWA encourages Congress to provide more funding. The water reuse program creates jobs and provides near-term solutions to water supply challenges facing many Western states.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY QUINN,
Executive Director.

WATEREUSE ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, February 16, 2011.

Hon. TOM MCCLINTOCK,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water and Power, Committee on Natural Resources, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. GRACE NAPOLITANO,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water and Power, Committee on Natural Resources, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR HONORABLE MCCLINTOCK AND NAPOLITANO: On behalf of the WateReuse Association, I am writing to oppose efforts to eliminate funding for the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's Title XVI program and WaterSmart grant program. The WateReuse Association opposes amendments 286 and 289 of the fiscal year 2011 continuing appropriations bill (H.R. 1) that would eliminate these vital water supply programs.

The Title XVI program of P.L. 102–575 allows local communities to reduce their reliance on imported water supplies. Communities throughout the West are able to supplement dwindling local water supplies, reduce energy consumption associated with

transporting water, and allow greater quantities of fresh water to be reserved for municipal water supply, irrigation or environmental needs. The Title XVI program allows local communities to leverage federal funds by a factor of three by obtaining additional financing to complete projects. These projects create jobs and new water. The Title XVI program is a necessary tool to meet the growing demands on western water resources. Eliminating the perennially underfunded program will only exacerbate the burden on local communities in the West.

The WaterSmart grant program is another critical program to conserve and maximize local water supplies. The WaterSmart grant program allows communities to compete for grant opportunities for conservation projects and projects that address the viability of using brackish groundwater, seawater, impaired waters, or otherwise creating new water supplies. This program addresses the most significant challenges facing our water supplies in the 21st Century, including population growth, climate change, rising energy demands, environmental needs and aging infrastructure.

Title XVI and the WaterSmart grants programs are important tools to conserve water supplies in the West. These programs need funding and should be funded through H.R. 1. I encourage you to join the WateReuse Association in supporting these programs.

Sincerely,

G. WADE MILLER,
Executive Director.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, I am committed to cutting the deficit, and I sought a seat on the Budget Committee to do so. But I rise to express deep concerns over the congressional Republicans' irresponsible fiscal scheme that will harm communities and students back home that I represent.

We need a multiyear strategy to cut the debt and the deficit, but a strategy that ensures that America retains its superiority in education, innovation, and research.

We must cut waste and close the huge tax loopholes written by lobbyists, like the ones for oil companies. But congressional Republicans do not do this.

Instead of tackling the debt and deficit in a smart and strategic way, the congressional Republicans' scheme will result in job losses, and it will make economic recovery more difficult for American families and businesses. And here are some stark examples from the community I represent back in Florida in the Tampa Bay area.

First, on education and the Pell Grant. I represent an education community, with a large public research university, a private college, and many community colleges. When the Republicans propose cutting the Pell Grant and support to students, this harms our ability to maintain our superiority in education when we are competing with countries all across the globe.

You know, over 9 million students and families rely on the Pell Grant every year in America, and we have worked very hard through the economic recovery to help those students maintain that same level of Pell Grants. So don't take us backwards. You shouldn't be taking us backwards.

Do you know what it's like for a hardworking family to pay tuition right now? Is tuition going down? Is tuition being cut? Are books being cut? No. So let's not turn our backs on our students and families at this time.

The same thing for Head Start. In Tampa and Hillsborough Counties, we have an award-winning Head Start initiative. And the evidence that Head Start gives students a boost in life is very well known. Parents have to be involved. We wish all eligible kids could get that boost. Even now, before the congressional Republican cuts, we have 2,400 families on the waiting list and 1,000 infants and toddlers on the Early Start list. The Republican cuts again take us backwards. I hear from back home that 452 families will be told that there is no room for their child.

They will also lay off 123 teachers just in my home county alone, because in the State of Florida they predict that they will have to lay off almost 2,000 teachers under your cuts.

Schools and students. The Republicans again are off base in cutting my local schools, particularly the title I schools that serve kids that need a little extra attention. We estimate that Republicans will be eliminating 20 to 30 jobs in my home district that serve students that need that achievement gap boost. You are harming the high poverty middle and high school students also in the county across the Bay that recently was able to expand beyond elementary school.

□ 1600

Madam Chairman, rather than close the tax loophole for the oil companies that are making multi-billion dollar profits, the Republicans instead cut my local police and sheriff's departments, like the help we get under COPS for the anti-methamphetamine initiative and for our juvenile justice initiative to try to prevent gangs from forming in the counties. The youth initiatives have received national awards from the Attorney General, and it would be a real shame if we had to turn these back.

Also, in my home county, we rely on some very robust ports in the Tampa Bay area as our economic engine. You are going to cut that support for that economic engine to dredge the canals and ports so the ships can come in, and we rely on those for jobs.

You also are going to cut the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Now, after the Gulf of Mexico suffered the economic hit under the BP oil blowout, our coastal communities were hurt badly. The tourism industry, the seafood industry and our wildlife habitat suffered significant damage.

So, coming from Florida, when you all say that you are going to turn your backs on our ability to monitor our oceans, that is very harmful, because clean oceans and clean beaches mean a healthy economy. Certainly closing the oil company tax loophole would be a wiser course of action.

We all know how harsh it has been under the Great Recession with foreclosures. It has hit us especially hard, so hard that a local expert told me yesterday that the Republican budget cuts to the magnitude being considered would greatly and immediately increase homelessness, place more than 1,000 families at risk and put seniors on the street.

Vote ''no'' on this CR.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1703. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Land Acquisition'' shall be $2,750,000: *Provided*, That no less than $2,250,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division: *Provided further*, That the proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

AMENDMENT NO. 193 OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia reserves a point of order.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 264, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,750,000)''.

Page 264, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,250,000)''.

Page 264, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,055,000)''.

Page 264, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

Page 278, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,100,000)''.

Page 278, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,400,000)''.

Page 359, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $35,055,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Chairman, in December, I voted for that historic agreement between President Obama and Congress to keep American taxes low and to extend unemployment benefits. Now we are here to debate how to pay for that, and I have an idea about how to help pay for that.

My amendment, No. 193, would strike the remaining funding for this 6 months in this year totaling $35 million from the budgets of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the BLM and the Forest Service for the purpose of buying new Federal land. There are many alternatives to buying land with cash that would allow them to continue using Yankee ingenuity, and those include land exchanges.

In my own State, we have over half a million acres that have been designated for disposal by Federal agencies because these lands don't fit into

good land management, yet there are other lands that these same Federal agencies would like to acquire. They can do exchanges. They can do sales of this land that is designated for disposal and purchase other lands that work better for the fragmented land ownership patterns that we sometimes experience in the West. This is a much better alternative to using $35 million to pay cash to buy new land that adds to the management base and responsibility. At the same time, it would free up land that would be disposed of for people to buy and begin to earn a living on.

So this is a way to create jobs, not to burden the Federal Government, and to recognize that good stewardship and good conservation can be practiced by good Federal and private partnerships. Those are the opportunities that are available if we adopt this amendment. It saves the taxpayers money and it helps pay for those people receiving unemployment benefits, and this is a win-win amendment.

It is only a moratorium, and when we begin the next fiscal year, we would have an opportunity, from having reviewed projects between the Natural Resources Committee and the Interior Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and have a better understanding of the ultimate goal of our land acquisitions programs within these Federal agencies.

So, Madam Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, I withdraw the point of order, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, let me give this body the top 10 reasons to defeat this amendment.

Number one, these are not really taxpayer dollars. The money comes from oil drilling receipts.

Number two, this amendment represents a complete elimination of a bipartisan program that has existed for 45 years.

The third reason is that this amendment will eliminate all the land and water conservation funding, even the few dollars remaining under the continuing resolution for management of these programs.

The fourth reason is that this amendment would force land management agencies to end all the work on congressionally approved projects that are now underway using previous-year appropriations. It will hurt willing seller landowners by preventing agencies from finishing out commitments that are already in place.

The fifth reason is that many landowners, ranging from elderly widowers and family trusts to ranchers and forest owners, have pressing financial needs that now depend on completion of these ongoing land and water conservation projects.

The sixth reason is that by eviscerating the Land and Water Conservation Fund, you are going to cause severe impacts on many others as well, including schoolchildren in the State of Wyoming. The amendment will bring to an immediate halt the negotiated agreement between the State of Wyoming and the National Park Service to transfer $107 million of school trust lands to Grand Teton National Park. Without the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the State can't meet its mandate to sell those lands and generate revenue to support its educational system.

The seventh reason is that the amendment would frustrate land exchanges that are currently in process, many of which have been years in the making and are important for local private economic development and public land management.

The eighth reason, under this amendment, the staff wouldn't be in place to even accept and process donations of important natural historic and other properties from the public.

The ninth reason is that, without staff, right-of-way work to provide or maintain access for key public needs would be rendered impossible. The public would be unable to secure critically needed routes for fuel and wildfire management, watershed management, and access for sportsmen and other recreational use.

The tenth reason is that the amendment would exacerbate an already draconian cut to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a program that is already paid for using a very small percentage of oil drilling receipts.

This amendment should be rejected.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. In every State of the United States, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has been one of the most successful programs for preserving open space and our environment for future generations. It is important to note, as the ranking member has said, that the LWCF is not funded by taxpayer dollars but by fees charged to the industry for the extraction of oil and gas from public lands.

Congress created the LWCF 45 years ago on the principle that some funds garnered from extraction of resources should be devoted to the preservation of other resources, in fact protecting permanently important lands and waters and access to recreation for all Americans. The LWCF is the only environmental preservation program in the Federal Government that is fully offset, and under the LWCF, polluters, not taxpayers, pay to protect the environment.

□ 1610

So cutting this program doesn't save taxpayer dollars. It robs taxpayers of the returns. And, actually, as in so many things in this continuing resolution, it does away with jobs.

It's my belief that the LWCF should be fully funded at the authorized level of $900 million and the stateside program should receive at least $200 million to match State funds. This is what the President requested in his fiscal year 2012 budget—and I think that's a fair proposal. The draconian continuing resolution in front of us not only would zero out the stateside portion of the LWCF, it would cut the LWCF overall program to the lowest level in its history, ending much-needed balance between resource extraction and resource conservation. We should reject this amendment.

The budget before us and this continuing resolution would really turn back the clock on efforts to preserve open spaces. The stateside portion of LWCF, which I helped revive in one of my first acts when I came to this Congress, through its matching grants has saved over 73,000 acres in my State of New Jersey; and in our 12th District, which I have the privilege to represent, we've received tens of millions of dollars in stateside LWCF funding. Every family that visits Veterans Park in Mercer County, the Sickles recreation area in the Borough of Shrewsbury, or the Colonial Lake playground in Lawrence Township, to name a few of the hundreds of LWCF projects, have benefited directly from this successful program.

Preserving open space is more than an environmental issue. It really is a quality of life issue. It's not just about preserving beautiful vistas. It's about preserving nature's way of cleansing herself. It is about providing recreation and parks. It is particularly important for States east of the Mississippi, but it is no less important for all 50 States.

Every State has positive stories to tell about LWCF. Voters consistently have supported funding open space preservation. Recent polling found that 86 percent of Americans are supportive of reinvesting funds from offshore drilling fees to land and water protection.

President Johnson said, ''If future generations are to remember us more with gratitude than with sorrow, we must achieve more than just the miracles of technology. We must also leave them a glimpse of the world as it was created, not just as it looks when we get through with it.''

The Land and Water Conversation Fund is one of the few government programs that really benefits all Americans, does not use taxpayer dollars, and receives the overwhelming support of the Nation.

I ask my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand and sympathize with the

amendment that the gentlelady from Wyoming is proposing. We in the West sometimes have a little bit different point of view. Regardless of where the funding comes from, whether it comes from money that comes from oil sales or other things, when you're buying additional land in the States with 64 percent of Federal land currently, that causes some concern to westerners. So I understand why sometimes people from New Jersey and Massachusetts and other places that don't have a lot of public lands sometimes don't understand the same concern that we share out there.

So I sympathize with what the gentlelady is saying in this amendment, but I would point out this started out in 2010. There was $450 million in the Land and Water Conversation Fund appropriated for this year. We have reduced that in this bill to $58 million. It already terminates funding for any new Federal land acquisition projects, an action we had to take in order to meet the subcommittee's allocation halfway through this fiscal year. All that remains is enough funding for managing projects funded in prior years and for emergencies and in-holdings for small acquisitions that make sense and save taxpayers money in the long run. So we've reduced this fund for any new land acquisition.

I can't tell you what's going to happen in the next bill, but this one would allow for those in-holdings to be purchased, those things that are ongoing and currently under negotiation. So I think it's the appropriate thing to do. Terminating these programs will pull the rug out from under private landowners that we've already made commitments to, many of whom have fallen on hard times in this economy, who need to sell their lands and who would want to conserve those lands for the benefit of all Americans.

So as much as I sympathize with what the gentlelady is trying to do, I think reducing all of the funds out of that account would be inappropriate. And I would oppose the amendment and urge all Members to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. MARKEY. The Land and Water Conservation Fund is a nearly 50-year-old promise to the American people that if we are going to allow giant oil companies like BP to deplete our ocean energy resources, we will take a small sliver of their massive profits and deposit it into a conservation fund.

Since its creation in 1965, the Land and Water Conversation Fund has allowed Federal acquisition of critical acres inside the national parks, vital wildlife habitats, conservation easements, and water rights, as well as construction of local recreational facilities through grants to States. The fund has served as one of the most important tools in building and protecting our national resources heritage.

The underlying bill devastates this revered program by slashing the amount to be paid out of the fund for conservation by almost 90 percent compared to current levels—almost 90 percent of a cut from current levels. The funding level contained in the underlying bill is the lowest proposed amount since the program was created in 1965. This is not a return to fiscal year 2008. This is not a return to fiscal year 2009. This is a return to fiscal year LBJ. That's their goal, to go back right to the very beginning, and if they could, to the year before when it did not exist at all. That's the real goal of what this debate is trying to accomplish from the Republican side. And now this amendment proposes a further reduction in the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

To be clear, this amendment does not save this money. Rather, it borrows this money from a trust fund and uses it to offset spending that has already occurred. This is diverting oil money from its intended conservation purpose in violation of a promise made to the American people. The Outdoor Industry Association points out that outdoor recreation contributes $730 billion annually to the United States economy and supports more than 6 million jobs. The Land and Water Conservation Fund is good for the environment, it's good for the economy, and it's a 50-year-old promise to every American.

The cuts contained in the underlying bill would cripple the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Further cuts could kill it. This amendment should be defeated, and it should be seen in the context of this massive attempt by the new Republican majority to take the EPA and to turn it into every polluter's ally; to take the clean air and the clean water laws and begin to undermine them systematically; to take each and every one of these environmental areas that we've made tremendous progress in over the last 30, 40, and 50 years and begin to roll back those gains as though America was not the beneficiary.

There's a good reason why America is the number one box office smash in the world, and that's because they look at us and they appreciate the commitment that we have made to the public health, to the public lands, to clean water, to clean air. And if we begin to undermine that image, then we will be hurting our country; we will be hurting our tourism; we will be hurting our ability to be able to pass on this planet in better condition than the way we found it. I urge that under no circumstances we support a provision that would accomplish all those goals.

□ 1620

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

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

Mr. DICKS. 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 gentlewoman from Wyoming will be postponed.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. I rise more in sorrow than in anger about the legislation now before us.

Mr. Chairman, all Members will agree we have to confront our budget deficit; but we have to do so, I think, in a sensible fashion. I grieve that that does not happen here. The cuts of the magnitude that we are making today and the places they are being made is destructive beyond belief. We risk a continuation or, indeed, a re-igniting of the recession which has plagued us, and we risk seeing to it that the great needs of our country are not met. We are looking at the strong possibility of a loss of jobs.

The Economic Policy Institute estimates that 800,000 jobs will be lost, jobs that are not only important but that are, indeed, of major national priority, which are being put on the chopping block. Let us look at some of the things about which our Republican friends are dismissive.

The education of our children: the continuing resolution will eliminate or reduce aid for almost 1.5 million low- and middle-income students paying for college.

The safety of our food: these cuts here will hamstring the Food and Drug Administration's ability to implement critical food safety legislation, leaving us vulnerable to food-related illness and death.

Americans' health: the continuing resolution cuts billions from the Department of Health and Human Services, over $1 billion from the National Institutes of Health, and over $1 billion from community health centers.

The welfare of our homeless veterans: even housing vouchers for the homeless defenders of our country are eliminated. This is disgraceful, and indeed it is a dishonor to those who have served their country.

Job training: the continuing resolution cuts billions from job training for displaced workers, turning our backs on those hit hardest by the recession.

U.S. exports, which make jobs: even though both Democrats and Republicans have called for a reduction in the U.S. trade deficit, the continuing resolution severely cuts into our primary export promotion effort.

Security on our streets: millions will be cut from the funding for State and

local policing activities to fight drugs, gangs and terrorism. Moreover, the continuing resolution eliminates Federal grants that help police departments around the country hire or rehire police officers.

Critical conservation programs: the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, all of which are solid, bipartisan programs, would either be completely or effectively gutted. In addition, this legislation prevents the Environmental Protection Agency from taking important steps to protect the waters of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, with unemployment hovering around 9 percent nationally—and much higher in my own State—and with many Americans still struggling through this recession, we cannot pull the rug out from under them. Politics aside, cuts of this magnitude would be unhealthy, untimely, and would provide uncertainty for our Nation as we try to get back on our feet.

Instead of draconian cuts, we should be looking to see to it that we have wise and prudent cuts, while at the same time we have an investment in the future of our country and in our people. I do not see that in this proposal before us at this time.

As the President has said, we can and, indeed, we must out-educate, out-innovate and out-build our competitors. That is the only way that the United States can achieve the kind of hope for recovery and economic activity that will benefit our next generations. Contrary to H.R. 1, we need to balance investments that will help our economy recover while also committing to decreasing the Federal deficit.

It is clear that neither goal will be achieved overnight and that they certainly will not be achieved in this legislation. I stand ready to work with my colleagues and with the President to find responsible and effective ways to trim the budget, but I refuse to permit my Republican colleagues to gut vital government programs and bring our economic recovery to a standstill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I offer this motion to speak out against the blatant attack on clean water, which is contained in section 1747 of this Republican continuing resolution—a provision that does not save the taxpayer one single dollar.

As we know, the Clean Water Act became law in 1972 with the stated purpose of cleaning up America's waterways and wetlands. Since then, this landmark legislation has served as a framework for protecting our drinking water from deadly toxins and for preserving the ecological integrity of our waterways.

In my home State of New York, from the mighty waters of rivers like the Hudson to the many lakes of the Adirondacks, this legislation has been absolutely critical, where 95 percent of our population relies on public drinking water in some form. Unfortunately, in the last 10 years, millions of acres of wetlands and thousands of miles of streams have lost Clean Water Act protection.

Healthy streams and wetlands naturally filter and replenish our drinking water supplies. They absorb flood waters and protect coastlines and support local hunting, fishing, boating, and recreation industries. One-third of Americans get their drinking water from the types of streams that are vulnerable to pollution under recent rollbacks; and this bill includes a provision that would ban the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers from working within their legal authority to mitigate that threat.

This is an appropriations bill. According to my colleagues across the aisle, it is a bill with the sole purpose of reducing the deficit—a noble goal. However, the clean water rider in section 1747 of this bill does not save one dime of taxpayer money. It is not about funding. It is about restricting the legal authority of the EPA and the work of the Army Corps of Engineers in an underhanded ''politics as usual'' attack on our drinking water, on our environment, and on the thousands of recreational fishing, hunting and boating jobs that these water resources support.

We may have banned formal earmarks this year, but this rider amounts to a handout to big polluters at the expense of basic public health protections.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. The legislation before us, the continuing resolution, I believe is a full-throttled extremist assault on the environment, on the public health of the American people, and on the jobs and economic well-being of our Nation as a whole. In these difficult times that we are in, it is the economy and jobs that should be the top priorities for this Congress and for the Republican majority.

Mr. Chairman, this CR does irreparable harm to the environment, including to the air, water, our public lands, and to wildlife. The virtual elimination of public health protection by the reckless dismantling of the jurisdiction of the EPA and of the funding of the EPA will bring health crises to the American people and will endanger families and children.

□ 1630

Today, the President is announcing his great outdoors initiative, and at a time when he is asking for private, State, local, and Federal cooperation in the protection of public places in the enhancement of recreation and outdoor activities for the American people, this CR talks about the elimination of State and tribal wildlife grants which are essential in that coordination. It talks about reducing by 90 percent the land water conservation fund, which is essential to promoting that cooperation and promoting the joint planning and joint jurisdiction of many of our special places in this country.

And the upcoming punitive attempt to eliminate the national landscape conservation system will leave 800 public units abandoned without coordination and without the ability to plan for the future and to be coordinated in such a fashion that they save money and serve the American people the best.

This CR places our special public places and lands on the endangered list, with irrational cuts in ending the shared responsibility to protect and conserve. Big Oil and gas and mining do not own these public places and lands—the American people do—and to turn to extraction as the only goal for these public lands denies history, ignores science, and welcomes the exploitation of a shared resource by the American people.

If deficit reduction is the item on the agenda—and we all agree that we must confront that and be prudent, be pragmatic, and be realistic in cutting programs—then we also should put everything on the table because if it is indeed an issue of deficit reduction, then let's talk about some items that the majority did not put in their CR, some of the subsidies, some of the giveaways to industries that are part of the public land agenda and part of what happens within the Interior Department:

Expensing reforestation expenditures, $600 million under public land; excessive percentage over cost depletion for nonfuel minerals, $500 million; expensing exploration for nonfuel minerals, $400 million; intangible drilling costs, $8.9 billion; oil and gas royalty relief, $6.9 billion; domestic manufacturing and tax deduction for oil and gas companies, $6.2 billion. And if you keep going down that list with coal subsidies, nuclear industry subsidies, oil and gas subsidies, public land subsidies, you end up with a figure of $100 billion to $200 billion.

I'm not saying that all those cuts should be eliminated. I don't think we should take an axe to those areas. Some are productive and needed; but if we are going to scrutinize this budget, let's do it in a fair way that shares and balances what we're going through while we protect important things in our public lands and in our public health.

I urge all my colleagues to balance public health of families and children, the public lands we love, the shared responsibility we have to clean air, water, public health, and our national resources, balance that with the narrow agenda that is confronting us

today, an agenda that punishes taxpayers and the American people at the expense and for the profit of private oil and gas interests in this country.

As we confront this issue, I would suggest to my colleagues that the legacy of our public lands and our environment, the legacy of our clean air and water, the public health of our people should be the priority. And if cuts need to be made, then all cuts should be placed on the table, all cuts should be looked at, including subsidies and including giveaways and deductions that are not part of the norm with our public dollars. That would be good for the taxpayer, and it would be good for the environment, and it would be good in reducing the deficit.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the underlying bill.

I was an early and strong supporter of the President's bipartisan commission on the debt; and while I do not agree with all of the commission's recommendations, I recognize that their report to the President offered an important starting point for debate on an issue that affects the lives of every American, as well as future generations.

In the report, the commission warns against disrupting our fragile economic recovery: ''We need a comprehensive plan now to reduce the debt over the long term. But budget cuts should start gradually so they don't interfere with the ongoing economic recovery. Growth is essential to restoring fiscal strength and balance. We should cut red tape and unproductive government spending that hinders job creation and growth. But at the same time we must invest in education, infrastructure, and high-value research and development to help our economy grow, keep us globally competitive, and make it easier for businesses to create jobs.''

The bill before us fails to heed this sound advice, making shortsighted decisions that will sabotage our short-term recovery and undermine our long-term competitiveness. The reckless decisions made in this bill will lead to lost jobs in my district and throughout the Nation.

Some of these job losses are obvious. Deep cuts to COPS and SAFER funding will ensure that we will lose thousands of police officers and firefighters protecting our communities nationwide; but other losses may be less obvious but just as painful.

For instance, this legislation imposes deep cuts on the food Food and Drug Administration. Every single drug, vaccine, biologic and medical device must be approved by the FDA before it can ever be offered to patients. This means that not only do patients rely on the FDA but also American pharmaceutical and medical device companies that need an efficient and effective FDA to ensure that they can continue to innovate, grow, and create jobs.

We are lucky to have a medical device industry in this country that is on the cutting edge of technological advances in medicine. What we should be doing is modernizing the FDA to make it more efficient, transparent, predictable, and rigorous; and to do that, we need to ensure that the FDA has all the necessary resources to conduct proper and speedy review of life-saving devices that not only benefit patients but our innovative businesses so that many of them can get to work putting people to work.

For these private sector firms, cutting FDA resources means slowing down their approval process, driving some of them overseas, and losing many jobs here in our country as well. Likewise, cuts to local funding included in this bill will harm communities I represent, particularly the deep cuts to the Community Development Block Grant program. When I have asked leaders in the cities I represent how we can best help their recovery efforts, the answer has been unhesitating and unequivocal: CDBG funding.

Last week, the city manager in my hometown of Lowell wrote, saying, ''This is probably the most valuable tool that the Federal Government offers cities to address economic development, infrastructure, and community needs.''

What is most discouraging about the attack on CDBG funding is that it does just what my colleagues say they support: it provides local flexibility, allowing stakeholders to decide what makes sense for their communities, while ensuring an extremely efficient use of funds. For example, last year in the city of Lowell, every $1 in CDBG funding generated more than $16 in additional funding.

Over the years, Lowell has successfully used CDBG funds to redevelop a historic building into a much-needed senior center, turning a blight into a landmark and prompting the entry of private businesses nearby. It has used funds to spur the development of a mixed-use development that is bringing in millions of dollars in private development and restoring architectural treasures key to the city's identity. And it has provided seed money to nonprofits like the United Teen Equality Center, recognized nationally for the revolutionary work they're doing every day to curb gang violence in the city of Lowell.

All of these actions have improved the quality of life and created jobs for Lowell residents, and none might have been made possible without this modest Federal investment.

So I do not support the underlying bill, and I encourage its rejection.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. McCOLLUM. I rise today to let the American people and all Minnesotans know that this continuing resolution is an unprecedented assault on our public health and environment.

We know that the Federal budget is in crisis, and we know we must make tough choices; but those choices must be prudent, wise, and invest in our future. It should not put the basic health of Americans at risk. The Republicans' plan before us proposes to cut $3 billion from the EPA's budget, the largest percentage cuts to this critical agency in 30 years.

□ 1640

The bill also proposes radical policy language to keep the EPA from carrying out its historic mission—a mission to protect the health of the American people—by limiting the EPA's ability to enforce the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act.

The EPA needs to be allowed to do its job, and it needs the resources to do this job. This bill would cause the EPA to lay off 80 percent of its employees who are responsible for protecting public health.

State clean water programs are gutted by $2 billion in the Republican budget. Our local communities are struggling with their own budgets, and these vital funds allow for communities to hire engineers, construction workers, to upgrade water plants and drinking water projects.

It is the EPA's investment in clean water that allows parents to know that if their child walks up to a drinking fountain anywhere in America, they can have the peace of mind that that water is safe for their child to drink. These irresponsible cuts jeopardize that peace of mind.

The EPA does important work, and the work that the EPA does saves lives. I strongly oppose these reckless Republican cuts and radical deregulation proposals that endanger our communities. Congress needs to make difficult choices. Mr. Chair, I believe that these are foolhardy choices to short-change clean air, clean water, and the health of our families.

On Monday, I received over 1,000 valentines from Minnesotans, and those valentines were dedicated to the EPA. My constituents understand the important work that the EPA has done to protect our water, our land, and their health over the past 40 years. And it's work that they feel must continue. This continuing resolution would turn back all the tremendous progress we have made in cleaning up our environment, and I firmly reject it and urge my colleagues to do as well.

Mr. Chair, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate Speaker BOEHNER and my Republican colleagues providing for an open discussion on this legislation, and

I appreciate the Speaker's request that we be respectful of the process. I think that is important. But I think it is also important to come to the floor at this point to make a couple of observations that are critical to the people I represent.

We are ready to move forward to actually deal with cutting the budget. We have already seen today a significant amendment adopted dealing with defense. There are opportunities for us to accelerate health care savings in Medicare. And from the beginning of my coming to this body, I have been working on a bipartisan basis to deal with reductions in unnecessary and wasteful agricultural subsidies.

There are several items that we are dealing with in the continuing resolution that have nothing to do with saving money. Indeed, they are actually going to cost money in economic impact in my community and around the country.

I note, for instance, the policy rider that would prevent the EPA and the Corps of Engineers from clarifying provisions of the Clean Water Act. As a result, millions of acres of wetlands and thousands of miles of streams will lose Clean Water Act protections. Because these affect so much of the headwater streams supply to public surface drinking water in my State, it could end up threatening drinking water quality for almost 2 million people.

The cut to the State revolving funds are extraordinarily imprudent. This money leverages a great deal of activity and helps us deal with the massive infrastructure deficit with water quality. The American Society of Civil Engineers backs this up. We are talking about hundreds of billions of dollars we need to be investing in the next 20 years. Cutting the revolving fund is a dramatic step backward.

In the area of air quality, there is a rider that attempts to prevent EPA from regulating greenhouse gas emissions. Now I will tell you, on its merits, dealing with greenhouse gases, that this will look foolish for the people who are proposing it to their children and grandchildren. They will wonder, What were you thinking?

But put aside for a moment the problem of greenhouse gas emissions and carbon pollution. The language will have far-reaching—and I hope unintended—consequences. It would hinder EPA's ability to relax requirements on biomass plants that matter, for example, to my friend from Idaho and others in the Northwest. Very important to us. In addition, because of the way it was drafted, to prevent the issuance of permits, the language would impose a de facto construction ban on new sources in many States, including Oregon. This could block not only new or expanding power plants but refineries and large manufacturing plants. With unemployment rates high in my State and around the country, this construction moratorium hardly seems to make sense.

The budget decimates the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This was a program that represented a commitment to offset some of the destructive effects of oil and gas production by preserving many of America's high-quality recreational opportunities and vital wildlife habitat.

This is violating a commitment that this body has made to finally allow these funds to flow. Unfortunately, future investments are going to be at risk if this CR passes with the existing funding level, missing opportunities to complete landscapes and protect watersheds and actually preventing agencies from meeting commitments already in place.

My final concern at this point deals with the assault on energy investments. The United States invests approximately 0.5 percent of the trillion-dollar energy sector. If anything, we should be ramping this up. We are losing our competitive edge around the world. We are losing economic opportunities and opportunities to preserve the environment.

Mr. Chairman, I have other concerns. There are other people who have things to say. But I hope that we can reject these provisions in the CR that actually make no difference in terms of reducing the budget and violate commitments that we have made.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1704. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Resource Management'' shall be $1,204,240,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$20,945,000'' for ''$22,103,000''; and by substituting ''$10,548,000'' for ''$11,632,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 295 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. McCLINTOCK. 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:

Page 264, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $7,537,000)''.

Page 359, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,537,000)''.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation is a government-established, government-financed, so-called private nonprofit set up to act as a conduit to funnel public dollars to private environmental advocacy groups. The authorization for these grants has expired. Let me repeat that. There is no congressional authorization for this program, and yet the money just keeps rolling on.

If we are actually serious about spending taxpayer money as carefully as they spend what they've got left after they've paid their taxes, then we ought to start by insisting that if Congress has not authorized a program, it should not be funded. If we ignore this principle, then why do we have any committees other than the Appropriations Committee?

When Ronald Reagan very reluctantly signed the original legislation, NFWF's budget was $100,000. It has grown to $7.5 million, 75-fold. Nor was Reagan's signing statement exactly a ringing endorsement. Here is what he said: ''I must convey my serious reservations about the bill. The statements in the bill to the effect that the foundation shall be a nonprofit, charitable corporation and that it shall not be an agency or establishment of the United States are contradicted by the facts. Establishment of the foundation under the terms of the bill is an unwise and dangerous precedent.'' Well, Reagan had ''serious reservations'' about an unwise and dangerous precedent.

□ 1650

Reagan's ''serious reservations'' were well founded, and, at the very least, there ought to be a full congressional review of this program and a decision made to reauthorize it before we throw more money at it, money, by the way, if you haven't checked the newspapers recently, that we don't have.

In this particular case, these are public dollars being funneled to private concerns, many of which have a disconcerting habit of then turning around and suing the government, that is, suing taxpayers over environmental issues. As we all know, all funds are fungible. So, in essence, through this agency, we are using taxpayer money to give to groups to sue taxpayers.

Not all of these private foundations are even domestic. These grants have gone to such foreign groups as the Prakratic Society of India, the Centre for Dolphin Studies of Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University in Central Mozambique, and to the San Lorenzo Public Outreach Program in Panama.

Mr. Chairman, with our Nation facing the worst peacetime fiscal crisis in our history, do we really need to continue these expenditures? And shouldn't we at least review the program and renew the authorization before we throw more money at it?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. MORAN. I oppose the gentleman's amendment that reduces the Fish and Wildlife Service by $7.5 million. The gentleman says that it is aimed at the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, although it doesn't say so. But whether it is or not, it's still a bad idea.

The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation raises private funds with minimal Federal seed dollars. It should be

encouraged, not eliminated. Last year, the foundation leveraged $40 million in Federal funds into more than $180 million for on-the-ground conservation projects. That's a leverage ratio of 4½ times.

The Fish and Wildlife Foundation continues to be the best financial investment of public dollars to leverage private funds that pay for Federal priorities. In 1984, a quarter century ago, during challenging budget times, as well as we have today, the Foundation was created by a bipartisan group of Members of the House and Senate to leverage taxpayer dollars with private dollars.

This amendment would affect more than 400 conservation projects this year in most U.S. States and territories. These programs are nonregulatory, community driven; they promote working landscapes and foster innovation. In this critical time of constrained budgets, you would think we would want the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation more than ever.

So I would urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1705. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Construction'' shall be $23,737,000.

SEC. 1706. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Land Acquisition'' shall be $15,055,000: *Provided*, That no less than $2,500,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

SEC. 1707. Of the unobligated amounts under the heading ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Landowner Incentive Program'' from prior year appropriations, all remaining amounts are rescinded.

SEC. 1708. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund'' shall be $2,479,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$2,479,000'' for ''$29,000,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$5,145,706''; and by substituting ''$0'' for ''$56,000,000''.

SEC. 1709. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, North American Wetlands Conservation Fund'' shall be $0.

AMENDMENT NO. 338 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

Mr. MORAN. 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:

Page 265, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 274, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

Page 274, line 25, after the second dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I'm surprised that this continuing resolution eliminates all funding for the very successful, bipartisan-sponsored North American Wetlands Consersation Fund. It cuts $48 million.

My amendment simply adds $50 million for the North American Wetlands Conservation Act. The offset is the EPA Diesel Emissions Program which, in fact, has been eliminated in the budget just proposed by the President.

Now, both Houses unanimously reauthorized what's called NAWCA. That's the acronym for the North American Wetlands Conservation Act.

We authorized it unanimously in 2006. The appropriation authorization for NAWCA was increased to $75 million for fiscal years 2007 through 2012. It's wildly popular with all sportsmen and those who value our wetlands. So I'm surprised that H.R. 1 would eliminate it. This, frankly, shows what a meat axe approach has been taken here today by some in the Republican majority.

The North American Wetlands Conservation Fund conserves our waterfowl, fish and wildlife resources while, at the same time, generating environmental and economic benefits. This is a successful partnership involving Federal, State and local governments and especially nonprofit organizations like Ducks Unlimited.

The current CEO of Ducks Unlimited, Dale Hall, who incidentally was President George Bush's U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Director, wrote, and I quote, ''If these cuts and actions take place, waterfowl, waterfowl hunters and wetlands conservation would lose in a big way. In short, these actions would adversely affect all of us who care about and have funded wetlands and waterfowl conservation. We should remember, conservation in America pays for itself through the economic return from hunters, anglers and other outdoor enthusiasts.''

I could not have said it better than the spokesperson, the CEO of Ducks Unlimited, who served in the Bush administration as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Director.

Every Federal dollar provided by NAWCA must be matched by at least $1 from non-Federal sources. Because the program is so effective, NAWCA funds are usually tripled or quadrupled on the local level.

In short, this is both a highly popular and very successful program. Since its inception in 1989, more than 1,600 NAWCA projects have contributed to the conservation of more than 25 million acres of habitat across North America.

The offset we use, the Diesel Emissions grant program, is a good program. But sometimes we have to make hard choices. The President's fiscal year 2012 request also eliminates the Diesel grant program so as to encourage the truck industry to increase its own diesel R&D.

I ask the Members to support this amendment to protect our wetlands and wildlife and support the people who enjoy it.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I just want to rise in very strong support. This has been one of the most successful conservation programs. It brings in the private sector. They add two or three times to the contribution here. And I think this is a program that is very worthy and should be supported, and I hope the gentleman's amendment will be accepted.

Mr. MORAN. I greatly thank the Chair of the full committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CALVERT. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The North American Wetlands Conservation Fund is a good program. I have no objections to that program. It's just a bad offset that the gentleman is choosing to move ahead with.

Mr. Chairman, the $50 million that's included in the continuing resolution to support Diesel Emissions Reduction Act grants is a good program. Because heavy diesel engines can operate for 20 to 30 years after they enter service, many of these engines operating today were manufactured years before the modern clean air standards. DERA grants support projects to retrofit over 20 million aging diesel engines currently in use with modern technologies to reduce toxic emissions and improve air quality.

This successful environmental program is supported by a unique broad coalition of environmentalists, industry, State and local governments. This program enjoys strong bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate and was reauthorized in the lame duck session last Congress.

□ 1700

Since 2008, the EPA has awarded over 500 DERA grants for projects nationwide. These grants leverage two State and local dollars for every one Federal dollar invested and provide $13 of economic benefit for every dollar spent. These leveraged dollars buy us cleaner air and more green jobs in every State in our Nation.

Perhaps most importantly, recent studies indicate that black carbon, like that emitted from diesel engines, is the worst kind of pollution. The retrofit technology supported by DERA reduces black carbon emissions by 90 percent.

The EPA's third ''National Assessment of Toxic Air Pollutants'' found that 2.2 million Americans now live in areas where the air they breathe increases their risk of cancer to levels deemed grossly unacceptable, one in 10,000. Given these findings, we owe it to our constituents to continue to support clean air technology.

Mr. Chairman, DERA is a win-win program. It supports green American jobs and improves the air quality for all Americans.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, section 1709; however, I want to state for the record I am completely supportive of the program that he spoke of today.

This particular amendment, however, seeks to eliminate funding for the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act, a vital public health, environment and infrastructure program that was reauthorized with huge bipartisan support that Representative CALVERT referred to, through a bill I authored last year. That is the purpose of my standing, because I was an author of that bill this year.

DERA is a proven program that improves air quality by reducing diesel emissions. It has strong bipartisan support in both the House and Senate and from a diverse coalition of transportation, health, and environmental organizations.

I thank Congressman MORAN, and I applaud his leadership efforts to protect and preserve our environment and natural resources. He has been a stalwart advocate in the struggle to reduce harmful emissions from antiquated coal-fired power plants and protect green space and green infrastructure. However, today is a rare moment that he and I do not agree.

DERA is a voluntary national and State-level grant and loan program that reduces the diesel emissions by upgrading and modernizing older diesel engines and equipment. For someone like me and my district, this is important. It's the lives of my constituents. By design, it looks to reduce the emissions from 20 million existing diesel engines in use today by as much as 90 percent.

The $50 million designated for DERA is but half of the authorized level and already a 20 percent cut in the program from last year's funding. Although I would say, for the record, that it has not been terminated, it is merely a recommendation by the President at this time.

Eliminating funding entirely would be a huge mistake and cause substantial detriment to the economic health and environmental interests, particularly of communities that are along port areas.

Since DERA funding began in 2007, more than 3,000 projects nationwide have benefited from this program, creating considerable employment opportunities in the area of manufacturing, installation and servicing of emissions-related technology. The bill I authored this last year, which passed in December, will actually amplify job creation further by expanding the program and increasing the number of eligible beneficiaries.

Additionally, DERA is widely considered one of the most cost-effective Federal programs in the Nation. The EPA has estimated that in California alone the program averages more than $13 in health and economic benefits for every $1 that it receives in funding. Projections estimate that nearly 2,000 lives will be saved by 2017 in direct relation to DERA's impact on air quality.

In my district, the positive benefits of DERA are far reaching, home to the two busiest container ports in the United States, the Port of Los Angeles and the Port of Long Beach. On average, 35,000 trucks commute to and from these ports daily. By the year 2030, this number will be expected to triple. Just imagine for a moment the pollution caused by these vehicles in a single day.

Now, think of those Americans who live along those freight corridors and are exposed to the pollutants on a daily basis. Would you want that for you and your family? In my district, these folks already suffer from asthma and cancer rates far above the national average, and it's documented. Air quality improvements and reductions in emissions are vital to the quality of life and health of these families and countless others throughout the Nation.

I would also like to add that DERA is often mentioned in association with the trucking industry and freight movement. There is another important area where diesel engines are most frequently utilized and where DERA will create a substantial necessary improvement in our public transportation and our school bus system.

These vehicles are vital to the millions of Americans who rely upon them every day to get to work or school. Many of these folks include young children whose lungs and immune systems are still developing and who are especially susceptible to health problems. We owe it to these young people and their families to give the DERA program our full support and see its funding maintained.

DERA has been endorsed by a large coalition of leading environmental health and transportation organizations who also believe in its effectiveness at protecting and creating jobs, promoting healthy economies and healthier citizens. At a time when our future is so heavily dependent upon economic growth, infrastructure investment, and improving the quality of life of average Americans, it seems counterintuitive to cut funding for a program that provides us with so many benefits.

For these reasons, I urge opposition to the amendment, but I seek to work with my colleagues to support other funding to support the program laid out.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to very strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment and associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from southern California.

Before going to that, though, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to express my deep appreciation to both the work of my chairman and his ranking member putting together what I consider to be overall a very, very fine bill. I know of MIKE SIMPSON's concern about those issues that relate to our environment and the interior especially. He is a fabulous chairman, assisted today by a very, very fine young person who is his staff director, not so young as he used to be, Dave LesStrang. But this fine bill also is put together by a cross-section of great staffers who are doing all they can to improve the conditions in which we live.

I rise to oppose this amendment in no small part because KEN CALVERT and I over the years have shared the same problem. We live in a region known as the Inland Empire, and it is surrounded by beautiful, beautiful mountains. It's a wonderful area; but during much of our lifetime, indeed for decades, for 250 days-plus a year you could not see the mountains. How come? It wasn't because of the fog. It was because of 7 million automobiles starting their engines in Los Angeles and that which was spewed out going up against the mountains crystallizing with sunlight creating a thing called air pollution or smog. Indeed, the battle against air quality problems began many, many years ago for us, efforts to create a new standard of regulatory enforcement that would make a difference in the region.

Today, you can see that beautiful valley almost every day of the year because of the progress that we have made in terms of cleaning the emissions from mobile sources. We are very proud of the fact that we've controlled stationary sources. It is easy to point a finger at the big smoke stack and say, Oh, my God, that's the problem. Indeed, we have solved 99 percent of all those emissions, and air quality still is a challenge.

When you come to this question today, we are talking about serious efforts to improve the emissions that come largely from trucks, but diesel-using engines and those emissions have a tremendous impact upon air quality as well.

Over the years, all of our efforts have saved I don't know how many tens of

thousands of lives because we have improved the conditions in which these people have to live and breathe. But to suggest that we ought to begin to break down the progress being made on these engines by way of this relatively easy but, I must say, simplistic kind of transfer is a very, very big mistake.

So, Mr. Chairman, in the strongest way I urge our members to vote ''no'' on this $50 million transfer and recognize it's a lot more important to save the lives of those breathing foul air than to give a pittance to a very important environmental problem.

□ 1710

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

The question was taken; and the Acting CHAIR announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MORAN. 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 Virginia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1710. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation'' shall be $4,430,000.

SEC. 1711. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Multinational Species Conservation Fund'' shall be $7,875,000.

SEC. 1712. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, State and Tribal Wildlife Grants'' shall be $0.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I was very disappointed that the committee zeroed out the State and Tribal Wildlife Grant program. I think this has been a great program that has helped the States do plans on how they can use their habitat to protect endangered species. This is the kind of work that is necessary so that we don't get future listings.

I know my friend from Idaho and others are concerned about the Endangered Species Act and the number of listings, and we will talk more about that later, but this was a very important program and one that I as chairman strongly supported and actually created.

So I just want to mention that I hope in conference we can at least maintain some level of funding for this program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1713. Before the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this division, the Secretary of the Interior shall reissue the final rule published on April 2, 2009 (74 Fed. Reg. 15123 et seq.) without regard to any other provision of statute or regulation that applies to issuance of such rule. Such reissuance (including this section) shall not be subject to judicial review.

AMENDMENT NO. 194 OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

Mrs. LUMMIS. 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:

Page 266, strike line 12 and insert ''on February 27, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 10514 et seq.) without''.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia reserves a point of order.

The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank you personally, as well as your colleague from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and also Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS of Washington, for your work on this amendment.

The continuing resolution as written would reinstate a 2009 Fish and Wildlife determination that the gray wolf in Montana and Idaho should be removed from the endangered species list. This amendment would replace that 2009 determination with an earlier-approved Fish and Wildlife determination, the one made in 2008, and that expands the scope of delisting of the gray wolf to include the full range of the Northern Rockies wolf.

Mr. Chairman, after gray wolves were introduced in 1995 into Yellowstone National Park in my home State and placed on the endangered species list under section 10(j), which is the nonessential experimental population section of the Endangered Species Act, a list was determined about what it would take to recover the species, when would we consider it recovered, and it was determined by experts at the time that the recovery would be complete if the population of wolves grew to 300 wolves with at least 30 breeding pairs. That was the target, that was the goal, 300 wolves, 30 breeding pairs.

So how many wolves are there today, Mr. Chairman? Here we are, 16 years later. There are more than 1,600 wolves and 113 breeding pairs. By every reasonable definition, the wolf has recovered, and yet these wolves remain on the endangered species list. They remain protected, even as they overwhelm and decimate other wild game herds. For example, in the Grovont, the moose population in terms of young calves has declined 90 percent, 90 percent, and it is due to wolf depredation.

Wolves remain protected in each State because of court determinations, not because of science, and it is now time to be honest about the wolf and its recovery. Its continued inclusion on the endangered species list has everything to do with special interests and emotion and nothing to do with science. Organizations that repeatedly sue the government at taxpayer expense orchestrate these strategies and make people believe that the wolf is not recovered. The simple truth is the wolf is doing very well.

Lest anyone be confused, my amendment will not create an open season on wolves. It will return management of the wolf populations back to the States, and they are the ones who suffer the effects of the wolves. It will allow for appropriate management of wolf herds, wolf herds by any definition, that have fully recovered.

So it is time to be honest. It is time to delist.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states, in pertinent part, ''an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment imposes additional duties beyond what is legislatively authorized.

So I now ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there any other Member who wishes to speak to this point of order?

If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment imposes new duties on the Secretary to reissue a different final rule than is required to be reissued by the pending section. The amendment therefore constitutes additional legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1714. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Operation of the National Park System'' shall be $2,237,674,000.

SEC. 1715. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Park Partnership Project Grants'' shall be $0 and the matters pertaining to such account in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1716. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Recreation and Preservation'' shall be $57,829,000, of which $0 shall be for projects authorized by section 7302 of Public Law 111–11.

SEC. 1717. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Historic Preservation Fund'' shall be $54,500,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$0'' for ''$25,000,000'': *Provided further*, That the proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1718. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior,

National Park Service, Construction'' shall be $171,713,000: *Provided*, That the last proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division: *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances available under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 and in prior appropriation Acts, $1,000,000 is rescinded from amounts made available for the (now completed) project at Cape Hatteras National Seashore, North Carolina, and $1,000,000 is rescinded from amounts made available for the (now completed) project at Blue Ridge Parkway, North Carolina, and such unobligated balances are reduced accordingly: *Provided further*, That no less than $23,000,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

SEC. 1719. The contract authority provided for fiscal year 2011 by 16 U.S.C. 460l–10a is rescinded.

SEC. 1720. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Land Acquisition and State Assistance'' shall be $14,100,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$0'' for ''$40,000,000''; and by substituting ''$0'' for ''$9,000,000'': *Provided further*, That no less than $3,400,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division: *Provided further*, That section 113 of division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1721. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Geological Survey, Surveys, Investigations, and Research'' shall be $1,086,163,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$53,500,000'' for ''$40,150,000''; and by substituting ''$4,807,000'' for ''$7,321,000''.

SEC. 1722. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Minerals Management Service, Royalty and Offshore Minerals Management'' shall be $239,478,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$109,494,000'' for ''$89,374,000''; and by substituting ''$154,890,000'' for ''$156,730,000'' each place it appears.

SEC. 1723. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Minerals Management Service, Oil Spill Research'' shall be $10,632,000.

SEC. 1724. During fiscal year 2011, the Secretary of the Interior, in order to implement a reorganization of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement, may establish accounts and transfer funds among and between the offices and bureaus affected by the reorganization only in conformance with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations reprogramming guidelines described in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying Public Law 111–88.

□ 1720

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we're fortunate that the new Republican majority brought their proposal before this Congress the day after President Obama submitted his budget plan for next year. We are fortunate because it gives the American people the opportunity to compare very different approaches.

The President's budget is tough but it is responsible. It's tough because it cuts non-security discretionary spending by $400 billion over the next decade to the lowest share of the economy since the Eisenhower administration. It's responsible because it steadily reduces the deficit while making targeted investments in areas like education, clean energy, infrastructure, and scientific innovation—investments that will strengthen our economy and make sure America wins the future in a competitive global marketplace.

One of those key areas of investment the President has proposed is infrastructure. The American Society of Civil Engineers—hardly a left-wing group—issued a report card on the state of America's deteriorating infrastructure. They gave us practically failing grades—mostly Ds and D-minuses—for the state of our roads, schools, transit, and drinking water—not grades that we would want our kids to bring home from school.

So I'm very pleased that the President has announced that he wants to make critical investments in this area. As reported yesterday in USA Today, using the analysis of the Associated General Contractors—again, not a liberal group—his plan could create about 5.4 million construction jobs and 10 million more jobs in related industries in the broader economy. At a time when the construction industry is facing over 20 percent unemployment, those are exactly the kinds of smart investments that will help grow our economy. This proposal and this investment is supported by a diverse range of groups, from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the AFL–CIO.

The President's tough and balanced approach stands in stark contrast to the proposal we're seeing on the floor today. The proposal that we're talking about today, with very immediate and deep cuts, is a reckless approach when too many families are struggling to make ends meet, and it will do virtually nothing to address our long-term structural deficit.

The Economic Policy Institute found that the proposal before this House today would likely put 800,000 Americans out of work. Indeed, that's why the bipartisan commission charged with reducing our deficits and debt, along with the bipartisan Domenici-Rivlin Commission, recommended against taking deep, immediate cuts. Yes, they're coming together now to put together a plan to reduce the deficit in a stable way. No, to immediate deep cuts that could hurt a very fragile economy.

Let me read you exactly what the bipartisan commission on deficit and debts reduction said. ''In order to avoid shocking the fragile economy, the Commission recommends waiting until 2012 to begin enacting programmatic spending cuts.'' In other words, below the CR level. And that's exactly what the President's budget does.

Why should we cut essential investments in Head Start and in education rather than eliminate huge taxpayer subsidies to the oil industry? In fact, just today, the GAO came out with a report talking about the huge bonanza oil companies are getting for lack of royalty payments on many of their lands.

Just yesterday, in the Budget Committee, we had the OMB director, Jack Lew, testify. Mr. Lew reminded us that the last time he had testified before the Budget Committee was when he had served as the OMB Director for President Clinton. When he left office, he left the country with a $45.6 trillion surplus and an economy that during that 8-year period added 20.8 million private sector jobs. Unfortunately, we know the end of the movie. Those huge surpluses were squandered. The previous administration to this one, the Bush administration, cut taxes for the very wealthy. And, through a number of other policy actions, turned a $5.6 trillion surplus into a sea of deficits. By the end of that 8-year period, 653,000 private sector jobs were eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will oppose this approach and accept the approach the President has presented.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1725. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Operation of Indian Programs'' shall be $2,336,865,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$220,000,000'' for ''$166,000,000''; by substituting ''$585,779,000'' for ''$568,702,000''; and by substituting ''$46,129,000'' for ''$43,373,000''.

SEC. 1726. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Construction'' shall be $216,100,000.

SEC. 1727. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Indian Land and Water Claim Settlements and Miscellaneous Payments to Indians'' shall be $46,480,000, of which $0 shall be for the matter pertaining to Public Law 109–379.

SEC. 1728. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Departmental Offices, Office of the Secretary, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $117,336,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$10,636,000'' for ''$12,136,000''.

SEC. 1729. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Departmental Offices, Insular Affairs, Assistance to Territories'' shall be $78,516,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$69,590,000'' for ''$75,915,000''; and by substituting ''$8,926,000'' for ''$9,280,000''.

SEC. 1730. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior,

Departmental Offices, Insular Affairs, Compact of Free Association'' shall be $5,422,000: *Provided*, That $2,104,000 of such funds shall be available for section 122 of division A of Public Law 111–88.

SEC. 1731. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Departmental Offices, Office of the Solicitor, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $64,845,000.

SEC. 1732. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Departmental Offices, Office of Inspector General, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $48,389,000.

SEC. 1733. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Departmental Offices, Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians, Federal Trust Programs'' shall be $168,115,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88, as amended by Public Law 111–212, shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$31,534,000'' for ''$47,536,000''.

SEC. 1734. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Department-wide Programs, Wildland Fire Management'' shall be $769,897,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$150,000,000'' for ''$125,000,000''.

SEC. 1735. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Department-wide Programs, Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration, Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund'' shall be $6,320,000.

SEC. 1736. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Department-wide Programs, Working Capital Fund'' shall be $80,119,000.

SEC. 1737. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Environmental Protection Agency, Science and Technology'' shall be $790,510,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 376 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. 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:

Page 273, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $64,100,000)''.

Page 359, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $64,100,000)''.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to reduce the EPA's Science and Technology account by $64 million. It transfers the money into the Spending Reduction Account. Sixty-four million dollars is the level of the agency's astronomically expensive Science to Achieve Results, or STAR program, funded in fiscal year 2010. It's the intent of this amendment to zero out this costly program for the rest of the year, something that due to procedural limitations will be accomplished by supporting the cut to the account's top line for that purpose and the agency's operational plan that will come forth in 2011.

According to the EPA, the STAR program is the agency's primary grants program for funding extramural research in environmental science and engineering. In a recent press release, the EPA boasts that the taxpayer-backed awards ''ensure the best science is being used to protect the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the land we build our communities on.'' What it doesn't mention is that these grants average 3 years and about $1 million.

□ 1730

This program was funded at roughly $60 million last year, and the President requested $87 million for it in fiscal year 2011. I believe the committee used $50 million as an assumed funding level based on this CR for the rest of the year.

Don't get me wrong. If we were printing money in a basement and if we had plenty of it, this may be something we'd want to spend some money on. I'm sure something good comes out of it, but we're not in that situation now. We have a debt of $14 trillion, and we have an annual deficit now of $1.5 trillion. When we're funding research like this, just out of an account to give to grad students, I think it's time to question whether or not this is the time we should do this or not.

Not all of the grants that are issued, obviously, are used for good research. It's not all above reproach. For example, here are just a couple of the reports that we've received for the research that was done on these topics:

Environmental Regulation and Productivity Benefits in the Paper Industry;

Estimating Ownership and Use of Older Cars;

Transforming Office Parks into Transit Villages;

Public Opinion on Environment and Water Quality Management in the New York City Watershed;

Ironically, there is a study on Experimental Programs to Stimulate Competitive Research.

I thought that's what this program does.

I've often talked about a lot of the earmarks we used to have that were just simply earmark incubators that begot more earmarks. It seems that some of the funding for studies like these are studies that beget further studies.

If we can't move in now and say, hey, maybe we ought to slim back a little and save a little money for the taxpayer—remember, the money saved here will go into the spending reduction account and can be applied against this year's deficit—then we have to ask ourselves:

How can we go back to our constituents and explain, ''Sorry, that $50 million was better spent giving out research dollars to study experimental programs to stimulate competitive research or to transform office parks into transit villages or for public opinion on the environment and water quality management in the New York City watershed or for environmental regulation and productivity benefits in the paper industry?''

Let's say to the taxpayer that we are serious here, that we are serious about this debt and this deficit. Let's vote for this amendment and put $50 million into the spending reduction account.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chair, the scale of this reduction to EPA science shuts down EPA's STAR research grants this year and next, affecting researchers in universities throughout the Nation. The Science to Achieve Results program, whose acronym is STAR, grants money to leverage innovative, cutting-edge research with universities across the Nation.

Now, I don't know about the way they have titled some of these grants, but I suspect that the gentleman doesn't know much more than I do about the specific grant itself, other than the title.

What I do know is that this amendment ends funding for the Children's Health Research Centers, which focus on the study of children's environmental health hazards, including asthma and exposure to chemicals.

It ends funding for research for four EPA air research centers that focus on the health effects of air pollutants on all ages of Americans, especially the most physically vulnerable and those in smog-laden communities.

It ends funding for EPA's groundbreaking computational toxicology research effort, which enables us to screen literally thousands of chemicals at one time. I've seen how this works, and it's extraordinarily productive and cost-efficient. It screens chemicals for environmental health hazards, and it saves millions of dollars in the process. These innovative and cost-saving tools also offer the potential to greatly reduce our dependence on animal testing.

The amendment ends funding for critical research to assess risks of nanotechnology and to develop approaches to ensure the safe development of nano materials.

The amendment also wipes out EPA's STAR academic research fellowships program, affecting 350 current and future fellows and creating real economic hardship in the midst of our depressed economy. Cutting funding for the STAR fellows program eliminates the opportunity to develop the future generation of the best scientific minds to address 21st century environmental problems with new and innovative scientific and technological solutions.

Now, it's not the end of the world, but it will be the end of a program that works very well—a program that recruits, trains, and integrates some of the very best minds in preserving and protecting our environment.

So, for those reasons, I would urge the rejection of this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the CR, we have already proposed deep cuts with tough choices. In the Interior and Environmental section, we have proposed to cut $4.4 billion and to eliminate 26 different programs.

The STAR program competitively funds research grants and graduate fellowships in numerous environmental science and engineering disciplines.

I would note, as the gentleman from Arizona knows, that this is competitively awarded in that they actually, as I said, compete for these.

The EPA receives approximately 2,000 to 2,500 proposals each year, and it funds about 150 research grants and 125 graduate fellowships.

I'd be a little leery about coming down here and just naming off the title of what a research project is and then saying that it's silly, because I don't know. I don't know exactly what they're trying to do with some of these things. You actually need to dig into it and find out what they're trying to find out with some of these research grants.

A few years ago, some people did this with, I think it was, the National Academy of Sciences research grants. I can remember some of my colleagues brought down amendments to defund this research grant or that research grant. One of them was to defund a research grant on studying brown fat in panda bears.

Of course, we all on the floor went, Wow, that sounds silly. Why are we studying brown fat in panda bears? Can't we actually study brown fat in American bears?

When I called the National Academy of Sciences, what I found is that who supported that research was NASA, because, if you're ever going to do deep space research, you need to know something about brown fat. Guess what animal has more brown fat than any other animal on Earth? Panda bears. That's why they were doing it.

So just to look at the title of a research project is kind of a silly way to propose eliminating it and making fun of the program. Some of them may be silly—I don't know—but I know these are peer-reviewed, that they actually are competitively granted, and that the gentleman from Arizona has always been concerned that we give earmarks that are not competitively granted. Here we have a program that is competitively granted, so that seems, to me, to be the right way to do it.

Like many other EPA programs, the CR reduces the STAR grant funding. We did so by applying a $10 million reduction to fund the grants at $51 million in the CR, which is $8 million below the 2008 level. Therefore, while we understand the intent of the amendment is to eliminate all funding for the STAR grants, there is no longer $61.4 million in the CR to reduce for STAR grants, and other research programs would need to be reduced based on the way the amendment has been drafted.

In addition, I believe we must maintain our scientific competitiveness as we work to bring our fiscal house in order, and zeroing out this program, I don't believe, is in the best interest of our country or that it is the right thing to do.

This is a program that we should—and will—discuss on the record with the EPA during the 2012 budget hearings, and we will either build the case for further reductions or an elimination of the program, or we will have a better understanding of why we should look elsewhere for additional cuts.

Therefore, I recommend my colleagues vote ''no'' on this amendment given that it would unintentionally cut the EPA's research by more than that which is in the CR for the STAR grants and given that we will be taking a look at this during our hearings. The gentleman sits on the committee, and will be, obviously, involved as we have the EPA before us for our oversight hearings.

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

Mr. FLAKE. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

□ 1740

AMENDMENT NO. 407 OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 273, after line 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1738. The Environmental Protection Agency is directed to enter into a contract, within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, with the National Academy of Sciences to perform a comprehensive review of non-mercury hazardous air pollutants emitted by electric generating units and industrial boilers, and related health and economic data (including impacts on job creation and energy price, supply, and reliability) associated with potential regulation of such non-mercury hazardous air pollutants. The National Academy of Sciences shall prepare recommendations on appropriate regulatory standards for addressing non-mercury hazardous air pollutants and shall establish appropriate health-based exposure standards for such emissions. Upon completion of the study, the National Academy of Sciences shall report findings and recommendations to the Environmental Protection Agency and the Congress within 24 months of entering into the contract. The Environmental Protection Agency is discouraged from issuing any regulatory determination for non-mercury hazardous air pollutants, including a maximum achievable control technology standard for non-mercury hazardous air pollutants from electric generating units and industrial boilers, until the Environmental Protection Agency fully reviews the results and recommendations of such study.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment directing the United States Environmental Protection Agency to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to perform a comprehensive review of non-mercury hazardous air pollutants emitted by electric generating units and industrial boilers, recognizing the boiler maximum achievable control technology, called MACT, is moving toward the end of the rulemaking process while the utility MACT will debut soon.

My amendment requires that the review provide for health and economic data, including impacts on job creation, energy price, supply and reliability associated with the potential regulation of non-mercury hazardous air pollutants.

The Clean Air Act regulates two kinds of air emissions: criteria pollutants, which are high in volume; and hazardous air pollutants, which are low in volume but can be toxic.

Folks are familiar with the most noteworthy of the hazardous air pollutants for utilities and industrial boilers, mercury. Let me be clear, my amendment does nothing to affect mercury controls. The amendment focuses only on those hazardous air pollutants other than mercury. EPA simply fails to do all the necessary homework when it comes to potential regulation of hazardous air pollutants other than mercury.

This amendment asks the National Academy of Sciences to assist EPA in doing its homework and encourages EPA to listen and encourages EPA to learn. This will assist EPA in establishing a clear and direct administrative record for non-mercury hazardous air pollutants; and without adequate study, regulations in this area could place jobs and economic output at risk, while threatening household budgets.

The power sector faces an avalanche of regulations from EPA, and it's important to get each of them right and correct. A recent executive order laid out a new review process for regulations and asked that the agencies consider costs and how best to reduce burdens for American businesses and consumers.

The amendment echoes the need for responsible regulations that protect health and environment but also provide for reasonable rates and dates.

The EPA maximum achievable control technology rule for industrial commercial and institutional boilers and process heaters could impose tens of billions of dollars in capital costs at thousands of facilities across the country.

I, along with a large number of my colleagues, sent a letter to EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson expressing our concerns with the proposed rule. It's my understanding that although the boiler MACT rule will come out later this week, upon reconsideration of the rule, the information gathered by the review required under this amendment may be useful.

I remain concerned as EPA moves toward a utility MACT rule. Logically, I bring this amendment to the floor today to protect a simple way of thinking. The government should not regulate without sound science to back it up. Let's remind EPA to slow down and allow for reasoning along with regulation.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand the concern of the gentleman from Texas, and we pledge to work with him as the EPA comes before our committee to address this issue, but I must insist on my point of order.

I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part: an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if it changes existing law. This amendment gives affirmative action in effect.

I ask for a ruling by the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? Seeing none, the Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUJÁN. I rise today in opposition to the drastic cuts in this continuing resolution and the amendments that make further cuts that threaten to weaken our economy and destroy jobs.

It is critical that while we face growing budget constraints we do not shortchange investments that will create jobs or provide vital services that New Mexicans rely on.

Unfortunately, many of the cuts proposed in this bill and in a number of amendments would negatively impact our communities in New Mexico. For example, in the wake of the natural gas outages that left thousands of homes across the State without heat, this bill cuts the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program that helps working families, senior citizens, and disabled individuals heat their homes.

At a time when New Mexico needs critical investments in education so that we can prepare our children to be the next generation of leaders, the House Republican plan makes drastic cuts to education at all levels. Beginning with early education, Republicans cut the Head Start program, which helps build a strong foundation for New Mexico's children. The bill also cuts programs that help poor school districts. With more than one-third of New Mexico's students failing to graduate from high school, we must do more, not less, to ensure our children succeed. In addition, the Republican bill cuts Pell Grants that our young adults rely on to help make college more affordable.

Arbitrary cuts to New Mexico's national labs that are contained in this bill will hinder their ability to promote U.S. competitiveness and job creation.

We're ending our ability to win the race before we can even begin. Instead of making these cuts, we need to outpace the competition. We need to outeducate and out-innovate the rest of the world in order to grow our economy and put people back to work right here in New Mexico.

And as we debate the proposed amendments in this section of the bill, I am extremely concerned with amendments that will be proposed today that make cuts to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. In New Mexico, we take pride in our beautiful landscapes and the protection of our water. The LWCF has helped to protect dozens of New Mexico icons, including Tent Rocks National Monument, Valles Caldera National Preserve, Rio Grande River Gorge, Santa Fe National Forest, and Petroglyphs National Monument, just to name a few.

These attacks on the Land and Water Conservation Fund would eliminate a bipartisan program that has existed for 45 years by preventing revenues deposited in the LWCF account from being used for their authorized purposes, such as protecting public lands and promoting recreation.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund was established by Congress in 1964 as a bipartisan conservation offset for offshore oil and gas drilling. Under current law, Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leases and royalty receipts are deposited in a dedicated LWCF account in the Treasury. However, only a fraction of the annual receipts deposited in the LWCF have been appropriated, despite a surplus of over $17 billion.

In New Mexico, outdoor recreation is an integral part of the economy, and I know when I visit with many of our colleagues here in the Congress, Democrats and Republicans, everyone is eager to get out to New Mexico. The Outdoor Industry Association reports that recreation contributes about $730 billion annually to the U.S. economy, supports nearly 6.5 million jobs across the country, and generates $88 billion in annual State and national tax revenues.

A recent study by The Trust for Public Land found that every $1 invested in the LWCF returns $4 in economic value. Protecting the Land and Water Conservation Fund will expand opportunities for all Americans to have access to parks and natural areas for outdoor recreation and for hunting.

Protecting the Land and Water Conservation Fund has immediate relevance to our efforts to create jobs in this country, and it is critically important that we ensure funding for this important Federal program is protected, while also working together to find a permanent solution to LWCF funding shortfalls over the long term.

I urge my colleagues to oppose these amendments and vote ''no'' on this shortsighted spending bill that will hurt families and put more people out of work. While Republicans say, So be it, to chopping American jobs, the people of New Mexico deserve better.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1738. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Programs and Management'' shall be $2,571,099,000: *Provided*, That of the funds included under this heading $305,784,000 shall be for the Geographic Programs specified in the explanatory statement accompanying Public Law 111–88: *Provided further*, That of such amount for Geographic Programs, $225,000,000 shall be for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative; $40,000,000 shall be for Chesapeake Bay; and $20,000,000 shall be for Puget Sound.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

Mr. POMPEO. 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:

On page 273, line 6, insert ''(reduced by $8,458,000)'' after the aggregate dollar amount.

On page 359, line 13, insert ''(increased by $8,458,000)'' after the dollar amount.

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to return just under $8.5 million to the United States taxpayers by sending $8.5 million to the deficit reduction account.

□ 1750

In November, America elected a different set of leaders to this House of Representatives. They elected a set of leaders who understand job creation. But the EPA has not gotten the message. This Congress has refused to pass cap-and-trade and yet EPA continues down the road to try to implement cap-and-trade through regulations when there is no statutory authority to do so, and it's beyond its constitutional powers.

My amendment takes on only one very costly piece of the EPA's effort to destroy jobs, the Greenhouse Gas Registry. I'm not against bridal registries or even the registration of property

deeds, but forcing businesses to comply with these unnecessary and burdensome regulations will destroy jobs in Kansas and all across America. This registry drives up the cost of doing business all with the asserted mission of satisfying the left's obsession with regulating every nook and cranny of our existence.

Now EPA would, I'm sure, tell you that they are simply collecting a little bit of data on greenhouse gases, that this registry is just a very innocent effort to learn a little bit more about who is emitting greenhouse gases, who or what. But this data is the very foundation of the EPA's effort to pursue its radical anti-jobs agenda. Indeed, continuing the Greenhouse Gas Registry at currently funded levels will permit the EPA regulatory nose inside the job-destroying tent. We cannot head down this path.

The amendment I am proposing is very modest. In 2006, the registry had $3.2 million appropriated. That was increased to almost $16 million. I'm simply trying to roll back the amount of money that this registry has to 2008 already bloated levels.

Mr. Chairman, until about 45 days ago, I was in the private sector. I was running a small business. I can attest to you that this Greenhouse Gas Registry, an attempt to implement cap-and-tax, will destroy jobs in Kansas; it will increase the cost of manufacturing for every Kansas airplane manufacturer; it will increase the cost of energy for every Kansas farmer, and it will increase the cost of energy for every Kansas family.

With unemployment at record levels and energy prices already high, America cannot afford this additional government mandate, and our taxpayers would be well served by reducing the funding to this misguided Greenhouse Gas Registry. Please join me in rolling back to 2008 levels the amount of funds appropriated for the Greenhouse Gas Registry.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. MORAN. I rise in opposition to the Pompeo amendment which would basically strip all funding from EPA's Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program. It's part of an effort to ignore what scientists tell us is the most serious environmental problem of our time—climate change.

Some Republicans have introduced legislation that would repeal a scientific finding that greenhouse gases pose a danger to human health. The underlying bill we're considering says that no stationary source no matter how large should ever have to reduce its carbon pollution. This amendment goes even further. It says that we should not even bother to find out how much pollution is being put into our air. I guess you could call it the ''ignorance is bliss'' amendment.

The Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program simply requires the largest sources of carbon pollution—power plants, refineries, and the very largest factories—to tell EPA and the public how much they pollute. If we are ever going to deal responsibly with this pollution, we need to know where it is coming from and have some idea of how much is being emitted.

This amendment is yet one more example of putting profits and pollution ahead of people and public health.

Americans understand that pollution is dangerous to their health. The scientists tell us that. We know it intuitively. It makes us sick. Let's allow EPA to fulfill its legal responsibility to collect this information.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose the Pompeo amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chair, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Kansas, one of our new Members, Mr. POMPEO, for not only a thoughtful amendment but an amendment when he is jumping right into the fray some 45 days after he has assumed office here. I think I was here for about 2 years before I even gave my first floor speech. So congratulations to him.

Sadly, however, we have to oppose your amendment. This was an account that the committee and the staff looked at hard as the CR was being prepared. It has been reduced by $5 million in the continuing resolution. It was at $16 million. It's down to $11 million in the CR. The feeling continues to be that cutting it further would be irresponsible because cutting the funding does nothing to change the mandate that's in the law of March 31 of this year that the industry has to report their emissions by that date.

Since this is the first time through this reporting requirement, there are obviously a lot of questions that businesses and industries all across the country have, and they are calling the EPA for technical assistance on how to be in compliance. If the program is reduced, as the gentleman's amendment would suggest, it will leave companies high and dry with a reporting requirement with no one on the other end to answer the telephone to help them out to meet their obligations. Considering that, we have felt that we could achieve the $5 million in savings now.

And I can tell the gentleman that it's at least a majority of the committee's feeling that we will review and address this issue in a more comprehensive manner as we proceed with the 2012 budget. As such, I recommend that our colleagues vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POMPEO. 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 Kansas will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1739. The matter pertaining to planning and design of a high-performance green building to consolidate the multiple offices and research facilities of the Environmental Protection Agency in Las Vegas, Nevada under the heading ''Environmental Protection Agency, Buildings and Facilities'' in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1740. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Environmental Protection Agency, Hazardous Substance Superfund'' shall be $1,273,765,000: *Provided*, That the matter under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$1,273,765,000'' for ''$1,306,541,000'' the second place it appears; by substituting ''September 30, 2010'' for ''September 30, 2009''; and by substituting ''$24,527,000'' for ''$26,834,000''.

SEC. 1741. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Environmental Protection Agency, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund Program'' shall be $106,101,000, of which $71,671,000 shall be for carrying out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6991b(h)).

SEC. 1742. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants'' shall be $2,716,446,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$690,000,000'' for ''$2,100,000,000''; by substituting ''$830,000,000'' for ''$1,387,000,000''; by substituting ''$10,000,000'' for ''$17,000,000''; by substituting ''$10,000,000'' for ''$13,000,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$156,777,000''; by substituting ''$70,000,000'' for ''$100,000,000''; by substituting ''$50,000,000'' for ''$60,000,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$20,000,000''; and by substituting ''$1,056,446,000'' for ''$1,116,446,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 379 OFFERED BY MR. REED

Mr. REED. 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:

Page 274, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 274, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 359, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment.

But before I talk about that, I want to say that I am proud to be a part of this process. Last night, I heard one of my colleagues say that what we should do is, because the President threatened to veto this process at the end of the

day, we should pack it up, go in the back room and try to resolve our differences there.

To me, this is what the process was all about, to have this debate on the floor of the House so that we can have an open and vigorous debate about these spending issues because, ladies and gentlemen, today we face a national crisis, and that national crisis is a national debt that is going to destroy us as a nation and destroy it for our children and our grandchildren. So I am proud today to stand up and say that we need to shine the light on every aspect of every dollar that is spent in our Federal budget.

And today I rise to ask that we rescind and amend the continuing resolution to remove $10 million of spending on a sewer project in Tijuana, Mexico. When we are borrowing 40 cents on every dollar on the backs of our children and our grandchildren, I ask the question: Why are we spending $10 million so that a sewer could be constructed in Tijuana, Mexico?

□ 1800

Now, I understand and I empathize with my friends from San Diego and that area where waste apparently washes on the shore from Tijuana because they're not acting responsibly with their matters.

But I say this: today it is to hold the country of Mexico accountable for the situation in Tijuana. And rather than use our dollars, our borrowed dollars that are being absorbed by our children and grandchildren, we hold them accountable. And I think this is exactly what we should be doing and standing and calling out this kind of wasteful spending, in my opinion.

And I am proud and ask that my colleagues join me in approving this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chair, again, as with Mr. POMPEO's amendment, the gentleman from Kansas, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) is also a new Member of the body, and I commend him for coming to the floor and offering this thoughtful amendment.

For those of us who have been here a little while, the seat which Mr. REED holds used to belong to our dear friend Amo Houghton, who was a friend and a champion for many issues for many years in this body.

And although we welcome Mr. REED to our company, we oppose his amendment. In the CR we have reduced the U.S.-Mexico border program by $7 million from $17 million in 2010 to $10 million in the continuing resolution. It's a 41 percent decrease. This action taken on behalf of the committee reduces the CR level to a level below the increase that was added in 2010 by the previous majority party, over and above President Obama's request.

This is a program that we plan to have active discussions on with the EPA during the 2012 budget hearings, and we'll either build the case for further reductions, or we will have a better understanding of why we should look elsewhere for additional cuts based upon programmatic needs.

Therefore, while I congratulate my friend and new colleague from New York, I recommend that our colleagues vote ''no'' on this amendment, given that we have achieved what we intended to achieve via the CR, and that is to take the necessary first step at past programmatic increases and allow for a deliberative process in 2012 to examine the true needs of this program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. REED. 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 New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 415 OFFERED BY MS. EDWARDS

Ms. EDWARDS. 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:

Page 275, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

Page 274, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,816,446,000)''.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I understand that a point of order is reserved and, of course, I have the amendment as modified with language that would ensure that the amendment is budget neutral. I would ask unanimous consent for the modified amendment that is at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I object to the modification of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Idaho has reserved a point of order.

The gentlewoman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before you takes rescinded funds, increases the amount of State Trouble Assistance Grants to make sure that we can really fund our water and sewer infrastructure. The continuing resolution really deals a death low to our water and sewer infrastructure in this country. That means jobs all across the country in every single State.

I would ask support of the amendment and note that in April 2000, the Water Infrastructure Network released its first report, ''Clean and Safe Water for the 21st Century,'' and that report documented significant improvements in water quality and public health that was associated with America's investments in water and wastewater infrastructure.

But it also documented unprecedented financial problems. Over the next 20 years, America's water and wastewater systems will have to invest $23 billion a year more than current investments to meet the national environmental and public health priorities in the Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act to replace aging and failing infrastructure.

The epidemic isn't isolated. Eroded infrastructure is prominent in every neighborhood across this country; and nationwide, wastewater infrastructure needs range from $300 billion to $400 billion over the next 20 years. My home State of Maryland has self-reported that it has an $8.4 billion deficit in water infrastructure needs.

Just last month, out in my district on a cold winter morning, not far from Capitol Hill, a 54-inch water main broke that created massive destruction, overturned cars, destroyed businesses, and left residents like me without safe drinking water for days. It stopped the traffic along the Nation's beltway. The trucks that travel up and down the eastern seaboard were stopped, stopping commerce along the way. This happens all across the country. We've had at least 278 water main breaks just since January 1 in the counties that I represent.

I would note that under the continuing resolution, States like Maryland would lose $33 million in funding, 937 jobs in States like Idaho, for example. In that State alone, there would be a loss of $6.9 million and 192 jobs, and this at a time when we need to do real job creation.

Overall, the continuing resolution would see a loss of about at least $1.4 billion in funds from wastewater and water treatment, to the tune of 39,253 jobs at a time when the economy is really staggering.

So I would strongly urge consideration of this amendment; and whether or not it's done in this continuing resolution, the fact is that our water infrastructure is failing. It's failing all across the country. We have needs that are unmet. Local communities cannot meet those needs, and it's really incumbent upon us to improve the Nation's water infrastructure so that we improve our competitiveness and we ensure that we have clean drinking water.

I would not like any other community across the country to have to do what I've done three times just during this last year, that is, boiling every single bit of water that I use because of our failing infrastructure. And this isn't just about my community in

Maryland. It's about communities across the country.

And I think if anything, in this continuing resolution we need to be thinking about economic development and job creation. And the resolution in front of us does exactly the opposite. It takes millions of dollars away from communities for wastewater and water infrastructure and ensures that we won't be competitive over this next century. So I would urge strong consideration of the resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. I continue to reserve my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho continues to reserve a point of order.

Mr. MORAN. I move to strike the last word, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to be on the record strongly agreeing with the concept of the gentlewoman's amendment, to add $200 million to State and local grants.

Our congressional districts are on either side of the Potomac River. We can also see the Blue Plains sewage treatment plant from Maryland and Virginia.

Now, we've made strides thanks to Federal funding in cleaning up the Potomac River, which all of us can see, and most of us cross every day; but much work still lies ahead.

This bill's cuts to State and local infrastructure grants will undermine the progress that we have made on this river and will cripple hundreds of State and local government efforts throughout the country.

The Republican bill slashes the clean water and safe drinking water State revolving funds by $2 billion, or 56 percent, reducing the number of wastewater and drinking water projects by about 750 nationwide.

□ 1810

The needs of our Nation's aging water infrastructure exceed $660 billion. This would also be a missed opportunity to add thousands of engineering, construction, and other support service jobs if we cut these programs. Additionally, the bill includes an undesignated $300 million rescission to EPA already that will most likely also impact these revolving funds.

So the gentlewoman's amendment does have great merit. Albeit technically it may be out of order, it should be offered because it addresses a very important problem with this continuing resolution. It should be accepted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I must insist on my point of order.

The amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase a rescission to offset an increase in an appropriation. And I would ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must propose only to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill. Because the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland proposes also another kind of change in the bill, namely, to increase the amount of a rescission, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

Therefore, the point of order is sustained and the amendment is out of order.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) would be willing to engage in a colloquy with me concerning the climate change provision in the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I want to ask the gentleman, first of all, if he could explain section 1746 of the bill to me.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to.

Section 1746 hits the pause button on the EPA's efforts to regulate greenhouse gas emissions because of what I think are unfounded fears about global climate change.

As the chairman knows, and as the gentleman from Kentucky knows, over the last 2 years, EPA Administrator Jackson has been very busy creating an enormous body of regulations on greenhouse gas emissions. These regulations will cost jobs, drive up energy costs, and further imperil the American economy.

EPA's greenhouse gas regulations need to be stopped in their tracks, and that's what section 1746 does. It provides a time-out for the balance of this fiscal year, during which time EPA will be prohibited from acting on them or enforcing them.

Section 1746 is intended to put a halt to the regulations that we feel will harm this economy. It is not intended to affect permitting or other matters unrelated to greenhouse gas emissions such as construction starts or permit approvals.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I thank the gentleman, and I do agree with you wholeheartedly.

I might add that Congress and the U.S. Senate have specifically addressed this issue on three separate occasions, and on every one of those three occasions have said ''no'' to EPA regulation.

I might also add that last week we had a hearing with Administrator Jackson, and Mr. GREEN, our colleague from Texas on the Democratic side, asked her a question. He said: My question is this. What happens if only the United States acts to reduce these emissions while major emitters like China or India do not take action, do not follow suit? Can we really address climate change without strong mandatory reductions by other major emitters around the world?

And Ms. Jackson, the Administrator of the EPA, said: We will not ultimately be able to change the amount of CO_2 that is accumulating in the atmosphere alone.

So I would say, Mr. Chairman, that EPA's regulations will lead to higher costs for the coal industry, the oil industry, and natural gas industries that comprise 85 percent of America's energy mix, burdening both individuals and businesses and, most important of all, destroying jobs.

So let me ask the gentleman. Is this a debate about global warming science?

Mr. SIMPSON. No. It's not even necessary to be a climate change skeptic to be an EPA greenhouse gas regulations skeptic. These regulations are all economic pain for little, if any, environmental gain.

EPA can only regulate American companies, and we know that China already emits more carbon dioxide than we do. Its rate of emissions growth is many times faster than ours, and the Chinese Government has repeatedly made clear that they will never impose such job-destroying regulatory measures on themselves. Even Administrator Lisa Jackson, as you said, has concluded that unilateral action would have little or negligible impact on further temperatures.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

I do want to mention that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has released a discussion draft on exactly this same issue, called the Energy Tax Prevention Act, that would block EPA's global warming agenda under the Clean Air Act.

The bill does not weaken the Clean Air Act, however. It would have no effect on the agency's ongoing efforts to deal with smog, soot, lead, mercury, and all the other pollutants that have been addressed under the Clean Air Act. It is simply a bill to stop the agency and bureaucrats from issuing regulations absent congressional approval.

As our former chairman JOHN DINGELL said, avoiding the glorious mess is what we would be doing, because the Clean Air Act was never designed to regulate greenhouse gases.

As it is, EPA's global warming regulatory agenda, which is just beginning to roll out, is so open-ended that it is already having a chilling effect on investment and job creation. The longer it moves forward, the more domestic manufacturing jobs will be forced overseas to countries not similarly burdened.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. When do you expect Congress to act on the Energy Tax Prevention Act?

Mr. WHITFIELD. We have already had our first hearing, which was on February 9. We have heard from a wide range of industries about the job creation issue, and I expect that we will be moving this legislation within the next month and a half.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, in light of the last colloquy, I find it necessary to make a few points about this underlying bill.

It contains language that stops EPA from limiting greenhouse gas emissions for the term of the continuing resolution in other words, through the end of fiscal year 2011.

First, let me point out that this issue should not be included in an appropriations bill that has received zero days in the Appropriations Committee for debate. I do understand that the Energy and Commerce authorizers are working this issue through a regular order process, but this is anything but regular order. Not that we would necessarily agree on the language that they are working on. But the reason you don't deal with complicated policy issues in eight lines of bill text is because often the only thing you achieve is unintended bad consequences. In this instance, I believe that is exactly what has happened.

EPA has a new permitting program that is currently in place as of January. It is to be implemented by both the States and EPA. There would be serious implications from this CR language, since new and modified large facilities are now required by law to obtain greenhouse gas permits before construction, but this bill's language would prevent Federal and State permitting authorities to take action to issue the permits. This would subject large facilities to legal challenges from citizens for failing to obtain permits and will lead to construction delays effectively eliminating thousands of American jobs. This is going to be held up in the courts indefinitely because of this language.

We have heard the arguments that these regulations will stop power plants and refineries and other big industry from creating jobs, but EPA's regulations encourage companies to make major new investments and to find cleaner ways to do business. This language is an actual assault on jobs.

The chair of the Republican Energy and Commerce Committee stated last week at a hearing, I bring this up since in the last colloquy the Chinese Government was mentioned, and I quote the Republican Chairman, ''The Chinese Government and other competitors have no intention of burdening and raising the cost of doing business for their manufacturers and energy producers the way EPA plans to do here in America.''

□ 1930

Now, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that we should be taking our cues on public health and environmental policies from China, the People's Republic of China, exposes a majority party that is clearly on the side of industry, but not of their constituents, let alone being on the right side of history.

This language is not about deficit reduction. It is a free pass to allow certain industries to pollute at whatever damage to the public health, they choose. We know that pollution is dangerous to the public health, we know that EPA has a legislative responsibility to limit that pollution, and yet this language would gut EPA's legal responsibility to carry out that legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for your attentiveness to this process. I know it is laborious.

I want to draw attention, I want to go back just a few steps here when we were listening to an amendment brought to us by my good friend from New York (Mr. REED).

As we are going through this process, there are those who have been working extremely hard, the Appropriations Committee and Members all across this House, and Mr. REED dug very deep and he found something I think all of us wanted to see, something that was exposed, that the American people pointed out clearly, that the Federal Government has been spending money where it does not need to be spending money.

Think about where we are as a nation: $14 trillion in debt; unemployment unacceptable; GDP dropping; $1.5 trillion of deficit, which is almost 150 percent of what the Federal Government takes in. Think about where we are. And then children, upon conception, you ask any economist, they will vary somewhere between $42,000 and $47,000 of debt inherited upon conception.

Yet Mr. REED, he points out here today a great find: That this government is funding a Tijuana sewer rehabilitation project. There is something about that that just stinks. And I would hope that this House, that Americans all across this country, that Members of this House would see that just $10 million is being funded for a rehabilitation project of a sewer facility in Mexico, yet we are in this position of this fiscal house being out of order and in disorder.

I would hope that this House would see and recognize that this simple amendment, only $10 million, a small amount compared to that $1.5 trillion deficit, is worthy of a ''yes'' vote of amending this out of this CR, and we would send a message to the American people: It doesn't matter if it is $1, $10 million, $1 billion, if it is unnecessary funding coming from this government, we are going to get it out and get this fiscal house back in order.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1743. The matter pertaining to competitive grants to communities to develop plans and demonstrate and implement projects which reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the second proviso under the heading ''Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants'' in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1744. Notwithstanding section 1101, the amounts authorized to transfer under the heading ''Environmental Protection Agency, Administrative Provisions, Environmental Protection Agency'' in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$225,000,000'' for ''$475,000,000''.

SEC. 1745. Of the unobligated balances available for ''Environmental Protection Agency'' $300,000,000 is rescinded: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a proposed allocation of amounts by account and program project to rescind 30 days prior to the rescission: *Provided further*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

SEC. 1746. None of the funds made available to the Environmental Protection Agency by this division or any other Act may be expended for purposes of enforcing or promulgating any regulation (other than with respect to section 202 of the Clean Air Act) or order, taking action relating to, or denying approval of state implementation plans or permits because of the emissions of greenhouse gases due to concerns regarding possible climate change.

AMENDMENT NO. 521 OFFERED BY MR. BRALEY OF IOWA

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. 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:

Page 276, line 11, after ''climate change'' insert '': *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from implementing or enforcing section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (relating to the renewable fuel program)''.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, all day we have been hearing a lot of talk about job-killing regulations, but, Mr. Chairman, section 1746 is a job-killing statute that would block implementation of the Renewable Fuel

Standard that was established just 4 years ago. The Braley amendment would allow the Renewable Fuel Standard to move forward and allow this burgeoning industry, which is reducing our dependence on foreign oil and creating thousands of jobs all over the country, to move forward.

The continuing resolution prevents the Renewable Fuel Standard from promoting clean, renewable home-grown fuel that reduces our dependence on foreign oil.

Prior to the RFS, my State of Iowa produced less than 1 billion gallons of ethanol annually, and in large part because of its implementation, we now produce more than 4.5 billion gallons per year. Ethanol and biodiesel support nearly 49,000 jobs throughout the Iowa economy. This accounts for nearly $550 million in State tax revenue. Without the Renewable Fuel Standard, we would take a huge step backwards, potentially having a devastating impact on rural economies across the country in every congressional district.

The RFS promotes biofuels by ensuring that transportation fuel sold in the United States contains certain volumes of renewable fuels, including advanced biofuels, cellulosic biofuels, and biomass-based diesel. That includes advanced biofuels, including ethanol from waste material, from crop residue, vegetative waste, animal waste, food waste, yard waste, biomass-based diesel, bio-gas, and butanol.

The RFS promotes biofuels and is supported by the American Coalition For Ethanol, Growth Energy, the National Corn Growers Association, and the Renewable Fuels Association, and this particular legislation was described by the American Advanced Ethanol Council as language that would defund efforts to implement the RFS.

The required volume of each type of fuel is established annually by the EPA, and this summer EPA needs to propose the volume requirements for calendar year 2012. But the Republican provision in this section would prevent EPA from doing so. If EPA can't set the volume requirement, then RFS won't function next year, and renewable fuel producers all across country are counting on these requirements.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, in your area, there are two plants, White Plains Energy in Plainview and Hereford Renewable Energy and White Energy in Hereford that will be affected if this provision becomes law.

In fact, the gentleman from Idaho has Pacific Ethanol in Burley, a 50 million gallon producer, and Idaho Sustainable Energy, which is on the front edge of biofuels with algal biodiesel, in Glenns Ferry, Idaho, which will be impacted if this provision becomes law.

So instead of investing in certainty that allows these producers to move forward, this provision would pull the rug from farmers and refiners all across the country. That is why I urge my colleagues to oppose this flawed funding language and support my amendment to ensure the Renewable Fuel Standard is allowed to move forward. It is a bad policy to have job-killing statutory provisions that are going to increase our dependence on foreign oil and move us backward, not forward, in the important area of bioenergy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Idaho continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the chairman, and I appreciate the gentleman's concern on section 1746 of the continuing resolution that some people think would negatively impact renewable fuel standards. That rider in the bill specifically prohibits the EPA from regulating greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources. However, reports that this provision will also block EPA from setting standards for the 2012 Renewable Fuel Standard are totally unfounded. The Energy and Commerce Committee confirms this and everyone else. The gentleman, I know, used to be a member of that committee.

I think it is really important to clarify that the rider in the CR is narrowly focused on EPA's new stationary source permitting authority and does not affect EPA's renewable fuels program.

Under the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act, which was referred to, Congress expressly stated that the Renewable Fuel Standard does not, and I say not, constitute regulation of greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act. The fundamental purpose of the Renewable Fuel Standard is to ensure our Nation's energy security and to reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil while providing a valuable incentive for the production of agriculture.

□ 1830

As an Iowan, I understand the vast importance of agriculture to our economy by creating thousands of good-paying jobs and contributing numerous economic benefits to our rural communities. I understand concerns that may have been expressed. However, it is very clear that the renewable fuel standard falls outside EPA's rulemaking authority addressing climate change. I want to assure my colleagues and the people of Iowa that this legislation will not affect the renewable fuel standard or bring an end to the program, as some have erroneously suggested.

Mr. Chairman, rules have already been written. Anything in this bill is prospective. We already have the standard in place, and this does not affect that anyway. In the Senate, Senator ROCKEFELLER, a Democrat over there—and I hate to see this be politicized because it should not be a political issue—but the Democrat Senator from West Virginia has this identical language and nobody has said anything about that. He wants to have a prohibition for 2 years. The Energy and Commerce Committee is having debates as to making permanent as far as the prohibition. And I have not heard any concerns about that.

So it is, I think, very unfortunate that some information is being put forth on the floor of the House here that is not true. The Energy and Commerce Committee has said over and over again that this does not affect renewable fuel standards. It will have no impact as far as ethanol is concerned.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The problem with the language as drafted, Mr. Chairman, is that it is so broad and poorly drafted that it does threaten the renewable fuel standard, which is why all of those renewable energy advocate groups that I mentioned in my remarks are in support of the amendment that I have offered. The RFS promotes biofuels by ensuring that transportation fuels sold in the United States contain the requisite number of volume for each type of fuel that's established annually.

This summer, the EPA has to make sure that those standards are identified for each one of the various categories; but if they don't have the required guidance available to them because of the confusing language that's currently in this provision, it's going to create confusion and those same industries that waited and waited and waited for the tax extenders package to be passed at the end of the last Congress are going to have the same type of uncertainty governing their investment decisions moving forward, which is why those groups that I mentioned earlier are so concerned about this matter and are in support of the Braley amendment.

They are Growth Energy, the National Corn Growers Association, the American Coalition for Ethanol, the Renewable Fuels Association, and the Advanced Ethanol Council. If the Advanced Ethanol Council believes that this language is so vague that it would de-fund efforts to implement the RFS, that's not me speaking. That's the very groups that would be subject of regulation by the EPA, and that's why this amendment is important to clarify that that is not within the scope of EPA's powers.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman from Idaho.

If there are people concerned about this, why didn't they come to us and talk to us before? We talked about the different groups out there, and that's because they've been given bad information that's not true. It is clear from the 2007 bill—and if someone would read it around here, they would understand that the renewable fuel standard is not affected by this. It is specifically outside the jurisdiction of what we're talking about, and so to make any assertion otherwise is simply giving erroneous information purposely on the floor. And that's very, very unfortunate because you do have people that are being told something that is not true, and now they're getting all worked up about it. I think it's very, very unfortunate.

We had a meeting this last week with the Iowa delegation talking to each other. If you have concerns, why don't you bring it forth so we can take care of the problem? If you want to have the amendment, I would have supported it, but it's not needed. It is absolutely fictitious, this idea that this is somehow going to affect the renewable fuel standard. I think it's very unfortunate that this issue has become something that has been dreamt up for other reasons, I think. That's very, very unfortunate because we should need to work together for energy independence in this country and to lessen our dependence on foreign sources of energy.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rules states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' The amendment gives direction in effect.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that section 1746 of the bill contains a legislative limitation on the use of funds. Such a provision may be properly amended by a non-legislative exception or by a germane, merely perfecting change.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, rather than merely excepting section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act from the terms of the limitation, seeks to impart direction to the EPA Administrator with regard to the application of that section of the Clean Air Act.

The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 193 by Mrs. LUMMIS of Wyoming.

Amendment No. 338 by Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

Amendment No. 376 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 84 by Mr. POMPEO of Kansas.

Amendment No. 379 by Mr. REED of New York.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 193 OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) 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 213, noes 216, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

AYES—213

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—216

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rooney
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Alexander
Clay
Giffords
McCarthy (NY)

□ 1902

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. BOREN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. COLE, MEEHAN, BONNER, LANDRY, and McKEON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 338 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 73, noes 352, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

AYES—73

Andrews
Bachmann
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Boustany
Braley (IA)
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Clay
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Davis (CA)
DeGette
Dicks
Dingell
Ellison
Farr
Fattah
Fortenberry
Gerlach
Griffith (VA)
Harman
Heinrich
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Landry
LoBiondo
Lowey
Marchant
McCollum
McDermott
McIntyre
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Moran
Napolitano
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Pitts
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rigell
Rothman (NJ)
Ruppersberger
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scott (VA)
Shuler
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Weiner
Welch
Wittman
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—352

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Watt
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Amash
Paul

NOT VOTING—6

Giffords
Lummis
Lynch
McCarthy (NY)
Sullivan
Waters

□ 1906

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 376 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 230, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

AYES—199

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)

Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—230

Ackerman
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunnelee
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Crenshaw
Giffords
McCarthy (NY)
Sullivan

□ 1911

Messrs. COHEN and RAHALL changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 185, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

AYES—239

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—185

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Bachus
Capps
Carney
Fattah
Franks (AZ)
Giffords
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (NC)
Smith (NE)

□ 1914

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 379 OFFERED BY MR. REED

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 203, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

AYES—228

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—203

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Canseco
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flores
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Landry
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—2

Giffords
McCarthy (NY)

□ 1919

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. INSLEE. I rise to ask, what happened to the party of Teddy Roosevelt? What happened to the party that helped us adopt, under Richard Nixon's leadership, the Clean Air Act? What happened to the Republican Party that used to be allied in the adoption of the clean air rules that have so helped the health of Americans? What happened to the party that adopted the Clean Air Act 40 years ago which has helped save over 200,000 lives? And I ask why today, in this continuing resolution, the Republican Party has abandoned any pretext whatsoever to stand for clean air when they eviscerate the clean air law in their continuing resolution.

This is a sad statement to think that a party that at one time helped us clean up the air, reducing cancer deaths and reducing respiratory illness and reducing heart attacks, has seen fit to go and leave with the polluting industries to gut the Clean Air Act.

I want to make it clear so people know what the Republican continuing resolution does. Even though the Clean Air Act today requires the Environmental Protection Agency to clean up our air against dangerous gases like carbon dioxide and ozone, even though the Supreme Court has ruled that Americans are entitled to this protection, the Republican Party has decided to make it illegal for the cops on the beat to do their job.

This bill, amazingly enough, the Republicans have passed a provision, or want to in this bill, that would make it illegal for the Environmental Protection Agency to protect the environment. Now, why would you want to make it illegal for the Environmental Protection Agency to protect the environment?

And I want to make clear how radical this action is. There is no fiscal reason for this. This is just an assault on clean air. The ''dirty air act'' is not going to revise any proposed rules of the Environmental Protection Agency. It isn't going to modify any clean air laws. It's going to eliminate them by saying that it is illegal for the EPA to enforce these clean air laws.

And the sad thing about this, Mr. Chairman, this is an assault on science. You read the specific scientific conclusions of the thousands of scientists who have reviewed this, and here is what the scientists and the physicians say. Mr. Chairman, not the politicians, the physicians. Here is what they say: Greenhouse gases are the primary driver of climate change, which can lead to hotter, longer heat waves that threaten the health of the sick, poor, or elderly, increases in ground level ozone pollution linked to asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as other threats to the health and welfare of America.

Now, why would the Republican Party want to make the air more dangerous for our kids who are using those inhalers to try to prevent asthma attacks?

In our Commerce Committee hearing, we had a young woman from North Carolina, and she talked about the fact that increasing ozone increases and aggravates her asthma. What reason on

this green earth do we have to increase the rates of asthma of our kids? And that's what the Republican Party wants to do in this continuing resolution.

Now, that's kind of a harsh statement. It's a harsh statement to say that one of our noble parties wants to increase the availability of ozone to damage our kids' health. But facts are stubborn things, and this is what the Republican Party is sentencing our kids to, which is more dangerous air. And it's a real sad statement when you consider the past history of the Republican Party which helped, under Richard Nixon and Teddy Roosevelt, to adopt these environmental laws.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that at some point we will get a little more bipartisanship here for clean air, we will abandon this commitment to the polluting industries that are running this effort, and reject this continuing resolution and these anti-clean air laws.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Chairman, today we are debating amendments on a continuing resolution because the leadership of the 111th Congress failed to do one of their most basic jobs last year: Pass a budget to fund the Federal Government.

Left without a budget to work with and our financial house in shambles, it is clear that we are in a state of financial crisis. Our debt requires immediate action, and the CR is just the beginning.

I came to Congress because, like many other new Republican Members of the freshman class, I run a small business, sticking to my budget and trying to make plans for the future. All the while I was watching Washington politicians drive this country's economy into a ditch. I knew that something had to change.

My friends on the other side of the aisle are trying all the same worn-out tricks. But I am here to say to the American people, this is not about tricks or politics. This is about preserving the greatness of America.

No one in this Chamber finds joy in the tough decisions we have to make, but we can no longer ignore them. The American people have elected this Congress to be good stewards of their money.

Today is not a happy day. This is not a happy speech.

Government spending and burdensome regulations have driven the American people to anger and frustration with good reason. Sadly, our Nation stands on the edge of bankruptcy. Our love for future generations of Americans requires that we not ignore today's problem only to find them, years from now, in irreparable financial ruin.

Regardless of the program, today's deficit spending is tomorrow's tax increase. In my neighborhood, there have been three babies born recently. Each of those babies now owe $45,000 in Federal debt.

□ 1930

We are fighting for our very survival. At risk are the freedoms representative of a free market economy and free society; the freedom to choose, freedom of private industry to compete, freedom from burdensome taxation, and freedom from mandated government programs. Washington today is slowly smothering the personal liberty Americans so greatly esteem.

As the 112th Congress struggles to pass legislation that meets our Nation's current challenges, fundamental disagreement remains. Unfortunately for the American people, the debate is being framed by my colleagues on the other side as ''vicious cuts to vital programs by Republicans who simply don't care.'' Hear me now when I say this has never been farther from the truth.

Today we come to terms with the fact that we cannot spend money on everything we want, regardless of the good intentions. For years politicians have ignored these problems. Not this Congress. Not this Congresswoman. The people elected us to end the talks and take swift action, and we must.

As a small business owner, when finances get tight, we cut where necessary. Raising prices isn't always the option. As painful as it may be, you make tough decisions to cut waste, operations, production costs, and eventually jobs as a last resort. Why should the Federal Government be any different?

Today's debt crisis is a very real threat to our liberty. Liberty allows people to work hard and achieve what they want, be responsible for their own actions and be free. No one shackled by debt is free.

Today's budget crisis is dangerous and threatens our basic freedom. Free societies value every citizen equally, placing no preference one over another. I believe that no one should be entitled to another's hard-earned provisions, and that government should support its citizens, not burden them with insurmountable debt and obligations they cannot fulfill. Government spending is not the answer to our looming problem.

I know there will be those who argue that my rhetoric is too harsh and that the financial crisis is not as bad as it seems. This crisis is real; and without immediate action, America will continue spiraling toward financial disaster.

Today, I challenge my colleagues to let real leadership begin. No longer should we turn to China to finance that which we cannot afford. Let us have the courage to right our wrongs, the strength to see it through, and the vision to lead with the powers entrusted to us from the consent of the governed, rather than selfish ambition.

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

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this bill and the priorities and the values it represents.

Republicans repeat like robots the same talking points we have heard again and again tonight, that to get our debt under control, middle class families are going to have to suck it up. We face tough choices, harsh choices; but really there is no choice. We are going to have to cut public education drastically, along with Head Start for the children who otherwise would start kindergarten too far behind to ever catch up; job training for workers who have lost their jobs; Pell Grants so middle class kids can afford a college education; research at the National Science Foundation and Department of Energy, and on and on.

Mr. Chairman, we do have choices. We have this deficit because of choices we have made. Just a decade ago, the debate here was what to do with the surplus. Alan Greenspan, who was then the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, worried that it might unsettle the economy if we paid off the national debt too quickly. President Clinton urged that we use the surplus to shore up Social Security and Medicare so that my generation could live in dignity when we retire.

A Republican President and a Republican Congress decided instead to cut taxes sharply for the richest of the rich. The deficit we face now is because of that choice, and we saw just 2 months ago that protecting those tax cuts for the richest of the rich, even Americans making more than $1 million a year, was their first priority. So despite all of the weeping and wailing, the gnashing of teeth, the rending of garments about the deficit now, just 2 months ago they said not a word about the deficit when they were voting to cut taxes, to explode the deficit by cutting taxes on the very richest Americans.

So now Congress is voting to kick 200,000 kids out of Head Start so that Americans who worked and strived to be conceived to the right parents will pay little in inheritance taxes.

Now Congress is voting to fire 17,000 teachers and special educators so Americans making more than $1 million a year will not have to pay the income taxes that they paid in the nineties, which was hardly a confiscatory rate.

And much of the bill obviously has nothing to do with saving money or whether the government is too big or too small. It is about whose side the government is on. This bill cuts drastically the funding needed to protect middle class families from the gouging that has lurked in the legalese, the fine

print of financial contracts, the tricks and the traps written by banks' lawyers. That cut has nothing to do with saving money. It is all about putting government on the side of financial predators, not on the side of hard-working honest Americans trying to make an honest living.

We have seen clusters of rare cancers and birth defects that we know are the result of an environmental exposure to something, and this bill devastates environmental protection. Middle class children are facing life with lower IQs because of unchecked environmental exposure so polluters can have bigger profits and CEOs can reward themselves with bigger bonuses.

Many of my colleagues have argued that this bill is penny wise and pound foolish, it is shortsighted and will hurt the economy. All of that is true. But I am most disturbed that this bill represents values that are incompatible with values that I learned at my mother's knee, the values of generations of Americans, the values of the faith traditions of most Americans, including me, the values that have been the glue that has held our country together in tough times. I will vote ''no.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I am totally opposed to this resolution. I knew back in December when Congress cut taxes for millionaires and billionaires that in February we would be cutting services for the working poor, children, and the disabled.

The House Republican CR in fact is very similar to the last December tax cut bill, which included billions of dollars in tax breaks for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans, while driving up the budget deficit an extra $700 billion. The proposed continuing resolution will be what I usually call reverse Robin Hood: it will rob from the poor and working people to give tax breaks to the rich.

In my area of specialization, transportation and infrastructure, this bill would rescind $2.5 billion for high-speed rail projects already awarded, as well as cancellation of 76 transportation projects in 40 States, bringing about a loss of 25,000 new construction jobs. Pink slips.

While the unemployment rate is still 9 percent in our Nation, it is critical to invest in infrastructure at this time. As I always said, Federal transportation and infrastructure funds are essential to job creation, and for every $1 billion invested in infrastructure projects, over 42,000 well-paid, permanent jobs are created and over $2 billion in economic development.

This resolution also cuts programs to assist homeless vets. Over 130,000 of our Nation's 24 million veterans are homeless on any given night. In this time of foreclosures and uncertainty in the housing market, it is inconceivable that we would limit the help available to those who serve and protect our country's freedom that we hold so dear. So we are going to give pink slips to over 130,000 veterans. I want to say that that will not happen—but pink slips to the veterans.

In addition, over 200,000 children we are going to kick off of Head Start. A pink slip for the Head Start program. We are going to reduce the maximum Pell Grant $800 per student. It takes away over 20,000 researchers supported at the National Science Foundation. And a program that is near and dear to my heart, over 1,300 cops will be taken off the beat. This program was started under President Clinton, where we put an additional 100,000 cops on the beat and cut down crime.

□ 1940

We cut another 2,400 firefighters. Pink slips for the firefighters. And we cut $2.5 billion to the National Institutes of Health. Budget decisions by Congress and the President should prioritize the most vulnerable communities who are struggling to make ends meet at this difficult economic time, not the wealthy and the powerful.

Today's bill on the House floor does absolutely nothing to create jobs or improve our Nation's economy but is a direct assault on the most vulnerable by cutting the budget in every single area, from transportation to our Nation's veterans to our Nation's children to police on the beat protecting our citizens. Once again, the Republican Party is asking our seniors, our students, our children, and working families to make fiscal sacrifices while millionaires and billionaires and powerful special interest groups get to walk off without a scratch.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1747. None of the funds made available by this division or any other Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to implement, administer, or enforce a change to a rule or guidance document pertaining to the definition of waters under the jurisdiction of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

SEC. 1748. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest and Rangeland Research'' shall be $297,252,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$61,939,000'' for ''$66,939,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

Mr. POMPEO. 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:

Page 277, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,400,000)''.

Page 359, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,400,000)''.

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that will reduce spending for the International Forestry Program by $7.4 million. Some on the other side have said $7.4 million isn't very much money when we have a deficit of a little over $1.5 trillion. In Kansas, that's still a little bit of money.

This program started out a long time ago to provide funds for saving the Brazilian rainforest. But like so many programs that had good intentions, it's morphed, it's morphed into something terribly different. Just this past year, this program funded field trips for students in Mexico to follow the migration of monarch butterflies. It funded research in China to protect the Panda habitat and make sure that we didn't have the infestation of forest pests in China. I think the Chinese can fund themselves if someone thinks that's a worthy task. Last year, the International Forestry Program funded a study on the declining hummingbird populations in the western United States, Canada, and Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, there are difficult decisions to make when the country is at this point in its economic life, but this is not difficult. These are precisely the kind of programs that Americans sent a new Congress to take care of to make sure that we're not doing things that make no sense for America. So I would urge support for this amendment.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to Ms. MCCOLLUM from Minnesota to explain why the Democrats on the subcommittee are very strongly opposed to this amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to make it clear that while the Congressman says the amendment eliminates the U.S. Forest Service's International Programs, it does not. The amendment only calls for a reduction in the budget of the Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, State and private forests. Should this shortsighted amendment pass, the agency would decide what to cut within its budget. That being said, the gentleman from Kansas has unfairly maligned an important agency that's doing unsung work.

The U.S. Forest Service's International Programs plays a unique role as one of the few Federal agencies working with international governments and NGOs to, one, stop the flow of illegal wood that is undercutting our U.S. timber industry and costing us jobs. Another example, protecting western Canada's boreal forests in partnership with Ducks Unlimited to ensure future generations of hunters will have access to waterfowl habitats. This area is the second most productive breeding ground for ducks that migrate to the United States.

The examples of working with China and Russia are important, working

with China and Russia to address such invasive species as the emerald ash borer and the Asian gypsy moth, both of which currently are threatening millions of forest acres in my home State of Minnesota and have devastated parts of the eastern part of the United States.

Similarly, all wildlife salmon migrate from the rivers of the West Coast of North America to eastern Russia to the Pacific Ocean. The Forest Service is working with the Russians to improve the watershed management on these rivers in eastern Russia to preserve the wild stock of this important species for future generations.

One of the things that disturbs me most is the way that a program has been described that allows students to interact with one another and learn about forestry management, biology, and how we are interconnected in this world. There are no Mexican students that go on field trips here in the United States, but there is an exchange of classrooms in Canada and the United States and in Mexico where teachers online follow the migration of the monarch. Students learn about, yes, insects. They learn about the trees that are important to them, and they learn biology.

These are very, very important programs. They should not be maligned. And this amendment, while it does not eliminate the program, should still be opposed.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I would associate myself strongly with the remarks of the gentlelady from Minnesota, and strongly urge rejection of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The International Forestry Program has already been reduced by 25 percent in this proposal. It's funded at $7.4 million in the CR. In FY10 it was funded at $9 million. The International Program brought in an additional $36 million in funds from State and USAID. The International Program brings in approximately $3 for every dollar invested. This program, regardless of the amount of money spent, is still a lot of money in Idaho, just as it is in Kansas.

But this program is critical to protecting forestry and the forest products industry in the United States. It's the only forestry entity representing the U.S. at trade summits. International Forestry is the only program working directly to counter the flow of illegally harvested forest products abroad. These materials compete with legally and sustainably harvested U.S. forest products.

The U.S. negotiators from the Department of State and the U.S. Trade Representatives rely on the International Program to provide technical input to effectively advocate for the domestic forest products industry. These agencies do not have this expertise.

The International Program also prevents the introduction of invasive and nonnative pests that would cause millions of dollars of damage to U.S. forests and the U.S. economy. The International Program, though funded through funding from USAID, plays a critical role in protecting U.S. security interests in conflict-prone areas. Unrelated, illegal resource extraction many times leads to unrest and corruption abroad.

So I would oppose this amendment, even though I understand that it's easy to go after international programs when we have such problems here. The fact is that they protect industry here in this country, in the U.S. forest products industry in this country, because, as I said, they're the only ones representing the U.S. forest products industry and forestry in general in international trade agreements.

I would oppose this amendment and hope that my colleagues would also.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POMPEO. 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 Kansas will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1750. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, National Forest System'' shall be $1,525,339,000: *Provided*, That no less than $10,000,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

SEC. 1751. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Capital Improvement and Maintenance'' shall be $495,409,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$50,371,000'' for ''$90,000,000'': *Provided further*, That no less than $10,000,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

SEC. 1752. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Land Acquisition'' shall be $9,100,000: *Provided*, That no less than $3,400,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

SEC. 1753. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management'' shall be $1,978,737,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$200,000,000'' for ''$75,000,000'': *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances available in the FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund for the Department of Agriculture created by section 502(b) of Public Law 111–88 (43 U.S.C. 1748a(b)), $250,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 1754. The authority provided by section 337 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447; 118 Stat. 3102), as amended, shall remain in effect until September 30, 2011.

SEC. 1755. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Indian Health Service, Indian Health Services'' shall be $3,883,886,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$862,765,000'' for ''$779,347,000''; by substituting ''$53,000,000'' for ''$48,000,000''; and by substituting ''$444,332,000'' for ''$398,490,000'': *Provided further*, That of the funds included under this heading, $29,211,000 shall be for staffing and operating costs of newly constructed facilities.

SEC. 1756. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Indian Health Service, Indian Health Facilities'' shall be $255,497,000: *Provided*, That no less than $10,000,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

SEC. 1757. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences'' shall be $77,546,000.

SEC. 1758. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Toxic Substances and Environmental Public Health'' shall be $74,039,000.

SEC. 1759. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Executive Office of the President, Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality'' shall be $2,848,000.

SEC. 1760. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $10,799,000: *Provided*, That the matter pertaining to methyl isocyanate in the last proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1761. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Smithsonian Institution, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $634,661,000: *Provided*, That no less than $200,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

SEC. 1762. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Smithsonian Institution, Facilities Capital'' shall be $123,600,000: *Provided*, That no less than $1,400,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

SEC. 1763. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Smithsonian Institution, Legacy Fund'' shall be $0.

SEC. 1764. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''National Gallery of Art, Repair, Restoration and Renovation of Buildings'' shall be $48,221,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$42,250,000'' for ''$40,000,000''.

SEC. 1765. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Operations and Maintenance'' shall be $22,500,000: *Provided*, That the proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1766. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Capital Repair and Restoration'' shall be $13,920,000.

SEC. 1767. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $9,844,000.

□ 1950

Mr. SIMPSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 281, line 17 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1768. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, National Endowment for the Arts, Grants and Administration'' shall be $145,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 196 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

Mr. WALBERG. 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:

Page 281, line 21, insert ''(reduced by $20,594,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 359, line 13, insert ''(increased by $20,594,000)'' before the period at the end.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, currently, the CR funds the National Endowment for the Arts at the approximate fiscal year 2008 level of $145 million. Amendment No. 196 takes the funding levels back to the fiscal year 2006 levels at $124.4 million. If accepted, this cut returns $20.6 million to the spending reduction account.

Though some would call for the full defunding of the NEA, I'm not doing that. You see, I believe in the true fine arts, and of course that's defined by individual standards, I understand. I found that to be a fact for a number of years when I was a finance chair of a symphony orchestra. People will support what they appreciate.

However, at a time when our government is in a position where it must cut Federal spending, I believe one of the main sources of the funding for the arts needs to be through philanthropy, but that only happens best in a sound and a growing economy. This budget crisis, this economy, continues to be frustrated by the spending of government, which frustrates individuals, who, indeed, would be willing to support and, in fact, still do support the arts as well.

The National Endowment for the Arts does provide benefits to our country, and helps fund some true fine arts. However, we are asking them to only fund their true priorities, priorities approved by the majority of taxpaying citizens, of sponsors and of patrons of the arts. Limiting resources sometimes refocuses and defines that focus.

We know that the public has had questions on some of the programs that the NEA has supported—major questions, major concerns. Attention to those concerns will gain the support of the taxpayer as well as of the philanthropist. Our country is in financial hardship, and we are not taking programs like the NEA off the table.

I refer to a letter I received last night from a very strong patron of the arts, of the symphony for which I served as a finance chair. He is the chairman of a major manufacturing corporation in my district, who is writing about what they have just gone through as a business. I will just read excerpts:

Until today, we have been operating under a forbearance agreement that began in 2008. It has been a struggle. Our leadership group accepted 15 to 50 percent cuts in salary, and our hourly staff accepted 10 percent wage reductions. Our salesmen continue to find new opportunities. We reduced our spending tremendously and only spent for essentials. Our belt was very tight. We did all we could to help ourselves, and we all made many sacrifices. Above all, we never stopped believing in our future.

That's the type of impact that happens in the private sector, even in programs we enjoy, benefit from and help out on, that we need to understand. Our country is in financial hardship, and we are not taking programs, even like the NEA, off the table.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. MORAN. I rise in opposition to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The NEA has already been cut by $22 million in this continuing resolution. The NEA's contribution to deficit reduction is really infinitesimal, but its elimination would not be. It would be very costly.

Mr. Chairman, the NEA represents less than 1/100th of discretionary spending. The economic dividend this Nation receives from the Endowment for the Arts, however, far exceeds the investment we make.

It seems to me that, when there are too many issues that divide this Nation, and when there remains too much harshness and rancor, the arts have an even more important role to play because they remain a powerful medium through which we can all transcend our common differences, appreciate beauty, and empathize with all of humankind. This is what the arts are all about. This is what the NEA enables all Americans to more greatly appreciate. The NEA budget is small, but it is such an important catalyst in helping to create and sustain the arts.

Last year, actor Jeff Daniels spoke at an Interior Appropriations subcommittee hearing as to how the NEA had supported the revival of a theater in his hometown in Michigan. It was a small grant, but in his case, it restored the theater and its productions so that neighboring owners could then restore their homes and turn them into bed and breakfast places. Restaurants and antique shops saw boosts in their businesses. In fact, the State of Michigan just built an exit ramp off the State highway to serve the increasing numbers of cars that are flocking to his hometown, which otherwise would be a virtual ghost town.

The NEA is a magnet for businesses in every place to which they locate, and it searches out those opportunities. There are 668,000 businesses involved in the creation and distribution of art, and there are millions of jobs. I have two examples in Virginia. Actually, to save time, I'll just give one example:

Signature Theatre in Shirlington, Arlington, Virginia, received NEA grants for its nationally recognized artistic and education programs.

I would suggest that all of our Members go there some time. They will invariably see an extraordinary good performance, one that has generated economic activity throughout that community and one that could not have gotten on its feet without the help of the National Endowment for the Arts.

When you cut that budget, you will see a dramatic adverse impact on the national arts community and on specifically the arts education programs that are developing throughout community centers and in our schools.

□ 2000

We do need to invest in the cultural lives of our citizenry and in our children's future. I can't help but fathom how a Nation as rich and prosperous as ours could not find it in its heart to provide $167 million for the Endowment for the Arts.

The arts and humanities will survive, but they will not be accessible for the large majority of our citizens who couldn't otherwise afford the expensive tickets that too often are charged at those performing arts places where frankly the financially elite are only able to afford to go. What the NEA does is to expand artistic achievement, to give people an opportunity to fully appreciate and for us to appreciate their talent.

Denyce Graves, who grew up in Washington in the Anacostia area, said that The Kennedy Center could have been a world away. She never would have seen it had it not been for a National Endowment for the Arts grant. That enabled her to then pursue a career that ultimately resulted in one of the finest operatic performers in America, in the world.

The chair of the National Endowment for the Arts, Rocco Landesman, a Broadway producer, extraordinarily effective, active leader, he has suggested reform, that we probably have too

many arts venues. Let's consolidate them. Let's make sure that all of them are of the highest quality. It has started a discussion that needs to be done, but what shouldn't be done is to cut the National Endowment for the Arts even further than this continuing resolution does.

I would urge rejection of the amendment, Madam Chair.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words and rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. CAPITO). The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. First of all, I have been on the committee for a long time, the Interior Appropriations Committee, and I can remember when Sid Yates from Chicago was the chairman, and we had arts funding at about $180 million, then we had new Republican leadership come in in 1994 and 1995 and they cut the endowments in half. What we found out was that when the endowment had less money to give out in grants, the private sector started to give less money for grants and to help these institutions. I applaud the gentleman for being a leader in his local arts community.

Americans for the Arts did a major study 4 or 5 years ago about the economic impact of the arts, and the gentleman from Virginia is absolutely correct; the arts have exploded across the country. We have given grants now in almost every single congressional district, which has helped the proliferation of arts institutions. Consolidation, it doesn't scare me. I think that, in some areas, it might be a good idea. I've seen in the Puget Sound area, in Seattle, and in Tacoma how much this has meant to the local communities, and this is a relatively small amount of money.

When I was chairman of the committee, I did increase it, but I never increased it by an amount that the Republican ranking member could not also support. So Rocco Landesman said, well, why didn't you just put up the $250 million. We did this on a bipartisan basis. We also have an Arts Caucus in the Congress that operates on a bipartisan basis, and we've had on the floor over the years a multiple of votes, and we've had, you know, 40 or 50 enlightened Republicans who have joined with us and made a good majority in support of these programs.

The humanities is also extremely important in literature and in education and helping our teachers. So I think these are worthy programs. I think the committee made the right decision here. I wish it was still at $167.5 million, but they've reduced it down to about $145 million. I think that's good enough. I think going further than that will really do damage to both of these endowments that have been there since 1965 back in the Johnson administration, and I just think this would be a mistake.

I support what the committee did, and I think we should stay with that number.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. I rise in opposition to this amendment and want to state that the arts not only contribute to education and enlightenment, they're important job creators. The NEA contributes to the development and economic growth of communities nationwide, and each year, the arts industry generates $166 billion in economic activity and provides 5.7 million full-time jobs. In my district alone, nearly 120,000 people are employed in the museum, theater, art galleries, and other arts organizations that I'm proud to represent.

So this is not the moment for trying to score political points in the name of fiscal responsibility, and we should not be proposing deep cuts that will take effect right away and destroy jobs in the arts and other places at the very time we're trying like mad to create them. This CR threatens our recovery just as the economy is bouncing back from the worst recession in decades, and it proves that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are tone deaf to the American people's number one priority, which is jobs.

Earlier this week, President Obama laid out a budget that makes tough choices, a thoughtful budget that includes a 5-year freeze on non-defense discretionary spending and reduces the deficit by $1.1 trillion. It does all of this while making important investments in education, infrastructure, jobs, and our Nation's competitiveness, investments that will prepare us to compete now and in the future.

As the President said at his press conference on Tuesday, when it comes to this budget, we need to use a scalpel, not a machete. The Republicans, by contrast, are making deep, painful, and seemingly arbitrary cuts, cuts that would result in more than 200,000 children being dropped from Head Start. Thousands of teachers would lose their jobs and be forced to leave the classroom. Some $2.5 billion in NIH cuts would jeopardize critical cancer and other disease research, and 1,300 fewer cops would be on the beat as a result of eliminating the COPS hiring program, which we restored in a vote on this floor earlier tonight, thankfully. There will be 2,400 fewer firefighters through the elimination of SAFER grants, which again we fought to restore. Science and energy research, to help drive our clean energy economy, would be reduced, and the horrible list goes on and on, including this cut that is before us right now.

Let's be clear: Cutting education, the arts, letting our infrastructure deteriorate further, and failing to harness the power of innovation is a recipe for declining competitiveness in an increasingly competitive global economy. It's imperative that we must invest in the future, invest in creating jobs, and this grant to the National Endowment for the Arts is an important investment that will pay dividends years down the road.

I strongly support the program, and I'm opposed to the gentleman's proposal to cut it.

Sure—it's harder to be strategic—but it's required.

It's required that we recognize some investments make sense and some don't.

We need to do more of what's working and eliminate what's not.

The reality is that we have to keep growing the economy to bring down the deficit.

And we have to bring down our long-term deficits to sustain that growth.

But indiscriminate steep cuts—like the ones now being advocated by the Republicans—will jeopardize our recovery and make deficit reduction that much more difficult to achieve.

This CR is bad for the recovery, bad for jobs and will hamper efforts to get out our long-term deficit under control.

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

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

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, 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 Michigan will be postponed.

□ 2010

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1769. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, National Endowment for the Humanities, Grants and Administration'' shall be $145,000,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$130,700,000'' for ''$153,200,000''.

SEC. 1770. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs'' shall be $4,500,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 249 OFFERED BY MR. CANSECO

Mr. CANSECO. Madam 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:

Page 282, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,500,000)''.

Page 359, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $4,500,000)''.

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

Mr. CANSECO. Madam Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It would eliminate Federal funding for the National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs grant program which the underlying continuing resolution funds at $4.5 million. This program provides noncompetitive grant funding for overhead costs to support artistic and cultural programs in the District of Columbia exclusively.

In his budget last year and this year, President Obama has requested that this program's funding be cut by 50 percent, which the underlying legislation does. In this year's budget, President Obama notes that ''in general, these institutions are also able to apply for Federal funding from other resources.''

I'm not here to debate the merits of the program. I'm not here to question whether or not the money has been used by the institutions to accomplish good things. What I'm here to do today is to debate and question why this program should be considered a priority and receive taxpayer funding when we're in a fiscal crisis. Make no mistake, we are in a fiscal crisis that threatens not only our economic security but our national security.

However, you don't have to take my word for it. Admiral Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said, ''I think the biggest threat we have to our national security is our debt.'' Dr. Alice Rivlin, a former Office of Management and Budget Director under President Clinton and member of the President's Deficit Commission, said in testimony before the Senate Budget Committee last February, ''On any reasonable set of economic assumptions, the U.S. budget is on an unsustainable track. There is no disagreement among the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Accountability Office, and leading private forecasters on where the budget is headed if we do not change course.'' And she continued, ''The growing deficit will be more and more difficult and expensive to finance. Ultimately, we will not be able to borrow enough to finance the widening gap between spending and revenues.''

Even before the government's spending spree began that occurred under President Obama, then-Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HARRY REID, our Nation was headed for a day of fiscal reckoning. They simply sped up the day our Nation will hurtle off the fiscal cliff, increasing non-defense discretionary spending by 84 percent in just 2 years. Under their leadership, Federal spending has risen to levels as a share of our economy not seen since World War II and resulted in the Federal Government borrowing approximately 40 cents out of every dollar we spend. Where is all this headed if we don't stop our spending?

If you followed the situation that occurred last year in Greece, you know that that nation had to make many painful choices very quickly because it had spent too much and investors were demanding higher interest rates to take on the risk associated with buying Greece's debt. If we don't get our fiscal house in order, what occurred in Greece is a preview of events to come to America. If we don't stop the spending and get our fiscal house in order, we will be the first generation of Americans to leave the next generation with a legacy of less freedom and prosperity. Do we want to leave our children and grandchildren a legacy of debt and limited opportunity?

We have two choices: we can either stop the spending that is driving our fiscal crisis, or we can continue the spending and one day become the next Greece.

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. MORAN. I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman. This amendment would entirely eliminate funding for a successful, proven program. The National Capital Arts grant program was established in 1986 to fill a substantial funding gap affecting the major private arts groups in the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital. It now funds 23 such groups. In every other major city in the United States, major private arts groups receive Federal funds from their State arts councils, which frequently have such a major institution's funding category.

That's not particularly important, but those who are involved in arts organizations understand that that's the money they depend upon. In D.C., they don't have that money to depend upon. No similar flow of government funds from any level is available to major arts groups in Washington, D.C.

The 23 groups that receive this money employ thousands of people. Outreach efforts to schoolchildren is one of the principal things that is funded through this National Capital Arts grant program. If we didn't have this, those outreach programs would be virtually eliminated. They constitute almost all of the arts outreach and arts educational programs that are available to children in the D.C. schools and schools in the suburbs. It's a program that has widespread popular support. It is not a lot of money for each organization, but it's essential money to enable them to continue functioning.

The fact that we are talking about such a small amount of money in the context of such an enormous deficit, it really seems wrong that children in our Nation's Capital would be denied outreach from these arts institutions that are proximate to where they live but wholly inaccessible without this program. So I would urge that we have a heart, particularly for the children in the schools in Washington, D.C. Reject this amendment and leave this very small amount of money in this interior appropriations bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the amendment. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the ranking member, Mr. MORAN. This is a program that was created because the arts institutions in the District of Columbia, many of them do not get any support from the District of Columbia government. And there's no State government. In New York, they get money from the city, from the boroughs, from the State government for their major arts institutions.

This program was a very modest program that helps 23 performing arts institutions which are extremely important, all of which have very solid educational programs that help inner city youth here. We have a very high population of inner city youth in the District of Columbia.

So I just think this has been a proven program. It is very modest. It's been cut in half. Last year I think we had it at about $9.5 million. It has been cut in half. I think we should leave that. I think the committee has made a decision; and to go further would just be, in my mind, punitive.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CANSECO. Madam Chair, 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 Texas will be postponed.

□ 2020

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1771. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Presidio Trust, Presidio Trust Fund'' shall be $15,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 381 OFFERED BY MR. REED

Mr. REED. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 282, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $15,000,000)''.

Page 359, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment seeking to rescind $15 million of funds out of this continuing resolution.

As I've listened to the debate here this evening and yesterday and over the last few days, as a freshman Member of Congress, I've come to a realization that part of the problem is that many Members of this esteemed body look at our spending in terms of it's a relatively small amount of money; it's a small sum. But we're talking about millions of dollars. We're talking about $15 million in this situation.

Now, I proposed this amendment without any disrespect to any Member

of this House. But I proposed it in a time when we face a national crisis that goes to our very existence for generations to come, a nation that won't be here for our children and our grandchildren.

And when I look at the Presidio Trust fund and I look at the park—and it's a great park. I concede that point. But the plan for the park was to be self-sufficient. And upon researching, going through page by page of this budget and doing the hard work, my staff and I have uncovered that this park is at the point where it can be self-sufficient on its own.

They receive grants of $80,000 from the Cowell Foundation for three projects. They have a $15 million gift from the private sector from Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. LucasArts video games and Industrial Light & Magic are leasing portions of the park, and it's a private revenue stream. This is a success story. And at this point it's time for us to put all our cards on the table and say, Now that you are standing on your own two feet, when we face this fiscal crisis, this government now has to make a responsible decision. And to me, that responsible decision is to allow the park to stand on its own two feet—it has shown plenty of ability to do that—and save the children and grandchildren so that we can have a nation that they can be proud of and can have a nation that they can live in, because that's the point that we are in our Nation's history.

So I stand today and ask your support for this amendment. I think it is the responsible action to do. And I applaud this process, because this process is being conducted in the open and through a vigorous debate, and that's what the American people have called upon us to do. No line of our spending shall be left under stones. We shall uncover each stone.

I urge all my fellow Members to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. MORAN. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment that would eliminate funding for the Presidio Trust.

The Presidio was in continuous use as a military post from 1776 until 1994. An Army installation, the post was closed in 1994 as part of the BRAC process and transferred to the National Park Service. In 1996, Congress established the Presidio Trust to govern this unique national park site and to ensure its preservation by making it financially self-sustaining. And that's exactly what has happened.

Over the past 12 years, appropriations as a percentage of the overall trust budget have been reduced from over 95 percent Federal funding in fiscal year 1998 to less than 20 percent in fiscal year 2010. The current ratio of private investment in the Presidio to Federal appropriations is already greater than 4:1. Appropriations, though, are authorized through fiscal year 2012. That was the deal. After 2012, the trust itself, by itself, alone, is responsible for long-term operations and maintenance of the Presidio.

Since it took over management of the Presidio in 1998, the trust has rehabilitated and leased 97 percent of the Presidio's housing units and rehabilitated 75 percent of the Presidio's 433 very historic buildings. I've been there. I've seen it. It's phenomenal what the trust has accomplished.

Eliminating funds just 1 year short of its goal violates the spirit of the 1996 law, and it undermines the trust's ability to achieve self-sufficiency. This would result in higher future obligations, as the Federal Government might have to assume full responsibility to maintain the historic properties.

It also sends a terrible signal to communities across the country that may also have innovative solutions in partnering with the Federal Government. They are time-controlled; in other words, it's not forever. But they say for a certain period of time, if you'll partner with us, we'll take this responsibility off your hands.

The $23 million appropriated for the trust in fiscal year 2010 has created 860 jobs. Federal appropriations in this current fiscal year will help expedite rehabilitation of historic buildings and take advantage of favorable construction costs that exist today.

At a recent oversight hearing, the members of our Appropriations subcommittee received assurances that the trust will accomplish its financial stewardship and public use goals. That was the deal. They said, We'll meet our part of the deal, assuming that the Federal Government will meet its obligation.

As one of the Nation's oldest and most important military posts, the trust has had some unique extraordinary challenges since the Defense Department closed out its installation, but the trust is well on its way toward meeting its legislative objectives. It should not be undermined by this amendment.

This has worked well. It's an example for the rest of the country. Let it serve as an example. One more year to go, and then it will be off our books. The trust will take over responsibility, and we will point out that this is the way to do it, in partnership, where we will not be perpetually responsible but, in fact, the private sector will come in, let the market work and have a national gem, really, a national asset for everyone to visit and appreciate and learn from.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time and strongly urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, I rise in concurrence with the comments of my ranking member from Virginia. Funding for the Presidio in this CR is $8.2 million below the FY10 enacted level, and $7 million below the fiscal year 2008 level.

When the government closed down the Presidio Army base in 1994, it was transferred to the National Park Service as part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. It could have been turned over to the National Park Service and run as a historic park, but that would have cost tens of millions of dollars per year to the taxpayers. Instead, Congress devised a unique management and funding model by creating the Presidio Trust to preserve the Presidio and help it become financially self-sufficient. The trust manages 80 percent of the Presidio lands, including most of the buildings and infrastructure. The Park Service manages the remaining 20 percent, including the coastal areas of the Presidio. The Presidio Trust receives Federal appropriations that are diminishing each year and, as was mentioned, will cease at the end of FY12, when it becomes self-sufficient.

This truly is a model of how we can do these things where they will become self-sufficient and off the roll of the taxpayer. But our part of this is we have to keep our end of the deal. And so through FY12 we need to make sure that we keep our word on what was agreed on in 1996 and let this Presidio Trust take over and become self-sufficient at the end of the next fiscal year.

So I rise in opposition to this amendment and would encourage my colleagues to vote against it.

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

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

Mr. REED. Madam 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 New York will be postponed.

□ 2030

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1772. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $0.

SEC. 1773. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, Capital Construction'' shall be $0.

SEC. 1774. Section 409 of division A of Public Law 111–88 (123 Stat. 2957) is amended by striking ''and 111–8'' and inserting ''111–8, and 111–88'', and by striking ''2009'' and inserting ''2010''.

SEC. 1775. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for section 415 of division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be $0.

SEC. 1776. Section 433 of division A of Public Law 111–88 (123 Stat. 2965) is amended by striking ''2010'' and ''2009'' and inserting ''2011'' and ''2010'', respectively.

SEC. 1777. Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this division, each of the following departments and agencies shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a spending, expenditure, or operating plan for fiscal year 2011 at a level of detail below the account level:

(1) Department of the Interior.

(2) Environmental Protection Agency.

(3) Department of Agriculture, Forest Service.

(4) Indian Health Service.

(5) Council on Environmental Quality.

(6) Smithsonian Institution.

(7) National Gallery of Art.

(8) National Endowment for the Arts.

(9) National Endowment for the Humanities.

SEC. 1778. None of the funds made available by this division or any other Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce Secretarial Order No. 3310 issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 22, 2010.

TITLE VIII—LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

SEC. 1801. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Training and Employment Services'' shall be $221,699,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$0'' for each amount included in paragraph (1); by substituting ''$167,538,000'' for ''$470,038,000''; by substituting ''$29,160,000'' for ''$229,160,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$200,000,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$102,500,000''; by substituting ''$54,161,000'' for ''$389,043,000''; by substituting ''$44,561,000'' for ''$93,450,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$48,889,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$108,493,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$40,000,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$125,000,000''; and by substituting ''$0'' for ''$12,500,000'': *Provided further*, That of the funds made available for dislocated worker employment and training activities under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117, $65,000,000 is rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available for dislocated worker employment and training activities under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117, up to 25 percent may be used for the period April 1, 2011, through September 30, 2011, for youth activities.

SEC. 1802. (a) Of the unobligated balances available for ''Department of Labor, Departmental Management, Office of Job Corps'', $300,000,000 is rescinded.

(b) None of the funds made available by this division or any prior Act may be used to initiate a competition for any new Job Corps center not previously approved by the Secretary of Labor as a Jobs Corps center through a competitive selection process.

SEC. 1803. Of the unobligated balances of the funds made available for ''Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Training and Employment Services, Federally Administered Programs, Dislocated Workers Assistance National Reserve'' in division D of Public Law 111–117, $100,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 1804. Of the unobligated balances of the funds made available for ''Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Training and Employment Services, National Activities, Evaluation'', $10,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 1805. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Community Service Employment for Older Americans'' shall be $300,425,000, and for purposes of funds appropriated by this division, the amounts under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied by substituting ''$0'' for ''$225,000,000'', and the first and second provisos under such heading in such division shall not apply.

SEC. 1806. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $355,843,000, of which up to $15,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Labor to be transferred to ''Departmental Management, Salaries and Expenses'' for activities related to the Department of Labor's caseload before the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, and the amounts included under the heading ''Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Salaries and Expenses'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$0'' for ''$1,450,000''.

SEC. 1807. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Labor, Departmental Management'' shall be $315,154,000, and the third proviso under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1808. Of the unobligated balances available for ''Department of Labor, Working Capital Fund'', $3,900,000 is permanently rescinded, to be derived solely from amounts available in the Investment in Reinvention Fund (other than amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

SEC. 1809. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Health Resources and Services'' shall be $5,313,171,000, of which (1) not more than $100,000,000 shall be available until expended for carrying out the provisions of Public Law 104–73 and for expenses incurred by the Department of Health and Human Services pertaining to administrative claims made under such law; (2) no funds shall be for the program under title X of the Public Health Service Act (referred to in this title as the ''PHS Act''), to provide for voluntary family planning projects; and (3) $352,835,000 shall be available for health professions programs under titles VII and VIII and section 340G of the PHS Act.

(b) The eighteenth, nineteenth, twenty-first, twenty-second, and twenty-fifth provisos under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Health Resources and Services'' of division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

(c) Sections 747(c)(2) and 751(j)(2) of the PHS Act, the proportional funding amounts in paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 756(e) of such Act, and section 511(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 711(f)) shall not apply to funds made available by this division for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Health Resources and Services''.

(d) For purposes of this section, section 10503(d) of Public Law 111–148 shall be applied as if '', over the fiscal year 2008 level,'' were stricken from such section.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. As I visit all the communities of my district, I am asked about high unemployment, how government can help promote job growth, and how we can get the economy working again for families trying to make ends meet. It is clear that the top priority in New York and across the country is creating jobs. But when I'm in Washington, I don't hear the House leadership answering that call.

Since the beginning of the year, we have yet to debate a single bill that would create a single job. There have been no attempts to make the targeted investments in innovation and education that will help us win the next century, as the President mentioned in the State of the Union.

In the last decade, unemployment has skyrocketed while the number of abortions has decreased. Yet today the majority is pursuing an extreme assault on women's health and reproductive rights by eliminating the cost-effective Family Planning Program.

My amendment would restore $317 million for title X family planning because it is a wise investment. Publicly supported family planning clinics save taxpayers nearly $4 for every $1 that is spent providing contraceptive care. In New York, more than 340,000 women are served by title X funding clinics and 66 percent have incomes at or below poverty level. Elimination of the program in the CR would only guarantee higher government health care costs for these low-income Americans in future years.

If our goal is to cut spending, it is reckless to eliminate this program that saves taxpayer dollars. It is unconscionable that those Americans who most need access to the affordable basic health care title X provides, like cancer screenings and contraceptives, have become victims of the extreme right's divisive partisan attempts to deny women a full range of legal health services.

Even as we consider this wrong-headed bill, they are simultaneously pursuing legislation and authorizing committees to roll back the clock on a woman's right to choose, women's services available to victims of rape and incest, and even allow hospitals to deny lifesaving treatments for women.

Not once have I heard a constituent say that it's important for the government to get to work on restricting women's health choices and denying basic care. At a time of high unemployment and enormous economic challenges, Congress should focus on job creation. The assault on women's health must stop now.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, in a breathtaking and a radical step, the Republican majority has proposed to eliminate title X funding which has connected millions of American women to health care since 1970.

In 2009, title X funding provided 2.3 million breast exams, 2.2 million Pap tests, and nearly 1 million HIV tests to

men and women both. This Republican Congress is trying to turn back the clock on women's health and turn back the clock on women's basic rights. They are taking us back to a day when family planning was not a given opportunity for women.

In Connecticut, more than 62,000 men and women benefit from care at title X-funded health centers each year. Over 70 percent of them have a family income of less than $16,245 a year. In other words, this is the only way they can afford health care. In fact, six of every 10 women who seek care at a title X-funded center consider it their main source of medical care. Yet the majority is trying to take these important services away.

It is argued that we need to cut title X services to reduce the deficit. This is simply not true. For every dollar invested in title X, taxpayers save just under $4. The fact of the matter is that vital preventive care and family planning services supported by title X save money and save lives.

Make no mistake, cutting title X funding is a breathtaking and a radical step. The majority is using the guise of budget cutting to launch an assault on title X, which would endanger women's health. Understanding their purpose has nothing to do with the deficit. They want to impose their traditional view of a woman's role.

Let's get real. This legislation is not about Federal funding for abortion. Federal funds, including title X, are already banned from going toward abortion services under the Hyde amendment. Rather, much like the repeal of health care reform, this is part of an agenda to force women back into traditional roles with limited opportunities. Under their proposal, more than 5 million people lose access to basic primary and preventive health care. As a cancer survivor myself, who is only here today because my cancer was found at stage I, I can tell you, losing access to screenings will cost lives.

It comes down to this: The proposal to eliminate title X is a bad policy. It will hurt women and do nothing for our economy. It costs money. Instead of making it harder for women to get health care, we should be standing up for these vital services.

The American public called for job creation and turning our economy around last November. I believe that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have not heeded that call. This bill will do nothing to create jobs nor reduce the deficit.

On behalf of women, on behalf of middle class and working families we represent, I urge my colleagues to leave this extreme and divisive social agenda out of the picture of support. We should not be playing games with women's health and with basic rights.

□ 2040

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROBY. I oppose increased funding for title X. We should not allocate Federal funds to groups like Planned Parenthood that use the money for abortion.

Planned Parenthood has recently made plain the centrality of abortion to its mission, mandating that every affiliate have at least one clinic performing abortions within the next 2 years. Additionally, it is beyond shocking that Planned Parenthood employees were recently found on video aiding and abetting in the alleged sex trafficking of minors.

This is not the first time that Planned Parenthood has shown such shocking behavior. It happened in my home State of Alabama back in 2009. A Planned Parenthood counselor was caught on hidden camera telling an alleged 14-year-old statutory rape victim that the clinic ''does sometime bend the rules a little bit'' rather than report sexual abuse to State authorities. Two years later, we are still seeing this outrageous behavior by Planned Parenthood employees. It is time to stop funding such an organization with taxpayer dollars.

Planned Parenthood ignores statutory rape law reporting, pushes abortion procedures, and opposes any effort to elevate the legal status of a fetus at any stage of development. It is not a proud day that citizens learn that these activities have been continually funded by the Federal Government. It is an even worse day when we are told that our government has funded Planned Parenthood with more than $363 million in government grants and contracts.

Since fiscal year 1998, title X has seen increased funding for 10 of the 12 years. From fiscal year 1998 to fiscal year 2010, title X funding has increased by over 56 percent. In appropriations for fiscal year 2010, title X saw a 3.3 percent increase in funding, which was a $10 million increase over 2009 funding. This is unacceptable spending at a time that we must cut Federal spending.

The continual action by Planned Parenthood and its employees is demeaning for women and a black eye on our society. Funding must be stopped. We should not spend any more taxpayer dollars to push Planned Parenthood's agenda to take away the rights of the unborn.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the amendment to add money to title X.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1810. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for the first undesignated paragraph under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Disease Control, Research, and Training'' shall be $5,742,989,000, of which (1) $750,000,000 shall be derived from funds transferred, pursuant to section 4002(c) of Public Law 111–148, from amounts appropriated by section 4002(b) of such Public Law; (2) no funds shall be available for acquisition of real property, equipment, construction, and renovation of facilities; and (3) $523,533,000 shall remain available until expended for the Strategic National Stockpile under section 319F–2 of the PHS Act.

(b) The amount included before the first proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Disease Control, Research, and Training'' of division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$0'' for ''$20,620,000''.

(c) Paragraphs (1) through (3) of section 2821(b) of the PHS Act shall not apply to funds made available by this division.

(d) For purposes of this section, section 4002(c) of Public Law 111–148 shall be applied as if '', over the fiscal year 2008 level,'' were stricken from such section.

SEC. 1811. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases'' shall be $4,214,275,000, and the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall transfer up to $256,627,000, on a pro rata basis, based on total funding levels, from the other Institutes, Centers, and Office of the Director accounts within the National Institutes of Health Account to ''National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases'', and the requirement under ''National Institute of Allergy and Infection Diseases'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 for a transfer from Biodefense Countermeasures funds shall not apply.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the first proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1812. The amount provided by section 1101 for ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health'' is reduced by $260,000,000, through a pro rata reduction in all of the Institutes, Centers, and Office of the Director accounts within ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health'', based on the total of the projected funding levels for the Non-competing Research Project Grants in fiscal year 2011 for each such Institute, Center, and Office of the Director account. In addition, the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall ensure that the average of the total cost of Competing Research Project Grants for all of the Institutes, Centers, and Office of the Director accounts within ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health'' during fiscal year 2011 shall not exceed $400,000.

SEC. 1813. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, Buildings and Facilities'' shall be $22,700,000.

SEC. 1814. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services'' shall be $3,202,152,000.

(b) The amount included before the first proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$0'' for ''$14,518,000''.

(c) The second proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services,

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services'' of division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

AMENDMENT NO. 565 OFFERED BY MR. BASS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Madam 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:

Page 291, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $98,000,000)''.

Page 293, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 293, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

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

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Madam Chairman, my amendment very simply adds $50 million to the Low Energy Assistance Program, otherwise known as LIHEAP. Winters in the Northeast and elsewhere in America are long and hard, and especially this year it has been difficult. It has been a tough year. In January we saw more or less twice the average amount of snow. Temperatures have been well below average in some parts of the country; and there are similar stories not only in New Hampshire, but elsewhere in the Northeast and around the Nation.

The problem with reducing the contingency fund in the Low Income Energy Assistance Plan is we are in the middle of the winter right now, and what my amendment does is add $50 million to ensure that we have adequate resources to make it through March and into April. The amendment also reduces the substance abuse and mental health services by an equivalent amount, but that is only about 1 percent of the total funding for that line item.

Let me point out that what this amendment will do is ensure that low-income individuals in America have the necessary resources in order to ensure that they have adequate heat throughout the rest of the year.

This is a difficult process that we are going through here, and I recognize there are trade-offs; but this is a very small change in a safety net that provides an enormous resource very quickly. We can debate the rest of the Low Income Energy Assistance Plan later in the year. What this $50 million increase does is make it possible to get through the winter.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REHBERG. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. REHBERG. We accept this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, 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 New Hampshire will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1815. The amount included under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Healthcare Research and Quality'' of division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$372,053,000'' for ''397,053,000''.

SEC. 1816. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for amounts transferred from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Program Management'' shall be $3,012,162,000, of which the level for the Research, Demonstration, and Evaluation program shall be $0.

(b) The amount under the third proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Program Management'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$9,120,000'' for ''$65,600,000''.

(c) The sixth proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Program Management'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1817. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Low Income Home Energy Assistance'' shall be $4,709,672,000, of which $4,509,672,000 shall be for payments under subsections (b) and (d) of section 2602 of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621); and of which $200,000,000 shall be for payments under subsection (e) of such Act, to be made notwithstanding the designation requirements of such subsection.

(b) The second proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Low Income Home Energy Assistance'' of division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

AMENDMENT NO. 160 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 293, line 4, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $390,328,000)''.

Page 293, line 8, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $390,328,000)''.

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new sections:

SEC. 4002. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''End Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act of 2011''.

SEC. 4003. AMORTIZATION OF GEOLOGICAL AND GEOPHYSICAL EXPENDITURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 167(h)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''major integrated oil company'' and inserting ''covered large oil company''.

(b) COVERED LARGE OIL COMPANY.—Paragraph (5) of section 167(h) of such Act is amended by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C) and by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

''(B) COVERED LARGE OIL COMPANY.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'covered large oil company' means a taxpayer which—

''(i) is a major integrated oil company, or

''(ii) has gross receipts in excess of $50,000,000 for the taxable year.

For purposes of clause (ii), all persons treated as a single employer under subsections (a) and (b) of section 52 shall be treated as 1 person.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading for paragraph (5) of section 167(h) of such Code is amended by inserting ''AND OTHER LARGE TAXPAYERS''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 4004. PRODUCING OIL AND GAS FROM MARGINAL WELLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 45I of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYER WHO IS NOT SMALL, INDEPENDENT OIL AND GAS COMPANY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any taxpayer which is not a small, independent oil and gas company for the taxable year.

''(2) AGGREGATION RULE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), all persons treated as a single employer under subsections (a) and (b) of section 52 shall be treated as 1 person.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to credits determined for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 4005. ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 43 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYER WHO IS NOT SMALL, INDEPENDENT OIL AND GAS COMPANY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any taxpayer which is not a small, independent oil and gas company for the taxable year.

''(2) AGGREGATION RULE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), all persons treated as a single employer under subsections (a) and (b) of section 52 shall be treated as 1 person.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 4006. INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS IN THE CASE OF OIL AND GAS WELLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 263 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''This subsection shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is not a small, independent oil and gas company, determined by deeming all persons treated as a single employer under subsections (a) and (b) of section 52 as 1 person.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 4007. PERCENTAGE DEPLETION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 613A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYER WHO IS NOT SMALL, INDEPENDENT OIL AND GAS COMPANY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—This section and section 611 shall not apply to any taxpayer which is not a small, independent oil and gas company for the taxable year.

''(2) AGGREGATION RULE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), all persons treated as a single employer under subsections (a) and (b) of section 52 shall be treated as 1 person.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 613A(c)(1) of such Code is amended by striking ''subsection (d)'' and inserting ''subsections (d) and (f)''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 4008. TERTIARY INJECTANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 193 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYER WHO IS NOT SMALL, INDEPENDENT OIL AND GAS COMPANY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any taxpayer which is not a small, independent oil and gas company for the taxable year.

''(2) EXCEPTION FOR QUALIFIED CARBON DIOXIDE DISPOSED IN SECURE GEOLOGICAL STORAGE.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the case of any qualified tertiary injectant expense paid or incurred for any tertiary injectant is qualified carbon dioxide (as defined in section 45Q(b)) which is disposed of by the taxpayer in secure geological storage (as defined by section 45Q(d)).

''(3) AGGREGATION RULE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), all persons treated as a single employer under subsections (a) and (b) of section 52 shall be treated as 1 person.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to expenses incurred after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 4009. PASSIVE ACTIVITY LOSSES AND CREDITS LIMITED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 469(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYER WHO IS NOT SMALL, INDEPENDENT OIL AND GAS COMPANY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any taxpayer which is not a small, independent oil and gas company for the taxable year.

''(ii) AGGREGATION RULE.—For purposes of clause (i), all persons treated as a single employer under subsections (a) and (b) of section 52 shall be treated as 1 person.''.

SEC. 4010. INCOME ATTRIBUTABLE TO DOMESTIC PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 199 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYER WHO IS NOT SMALL, INDEPENDENT OIL AND GAS COMPANY.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the income derived from the production, transportation, or distribution of oil, natural gas, or any primary product (within the meaning of subsection (d)(9)) thereof by any taxpayer which for the taxable year is an oil and gas company which is not a small, independent oil and gas company.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 4011. PROHIBITION ON USING LAST-IN, FIRST-OUT ACCOUNTING FOR MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 472 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)) may not use the method provided in subsection (b) in inventorying of any goods.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND SPECIAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

(2) CHANGE IN METHOD OF ACCOUNTING.—In the case of any taxpayer required by the amendment made by this section to change its method of accounting for its first taxable year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) such change shall be treated as initiated by the taxpayer,

(B) such change shall be treated as made with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, and

(C) the net amount of the adjustments required to be taken into account by the taxpayer under section 481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be taken into account ratably over a period (not greater than 8 taxable years) beginning with such first taxable year.

SEC. 4012. MODIFICATIONS OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT RULES APPLICABLE TO DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

''(n) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.—

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, any amount paid or accrued by a dual capacity taxpayer to a foreign country or possession of the United States for any period with respect to combined foreign oil and gas income (as defined in section 907(b)(1)) shall not be considered a tax to the extent such amount exceeds the amount (determined in accordance with regulations) which would have been required to be paid if the taxpayer were not a dual capacity taxpayer.

''(2) DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'dual capacity taxpayer' means, with respect to any foreign country or possession of the United States, a person who—

''(A) is subject to a levy of such country or possession, and

''(B) receives (or will receive) directly or indirectly a specific economic benefit (as determined in accordance with regulations) from such country or possession.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxes paid or accrued in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

(2) CONTRARY TREATY OBLIGATIONS UPHELD.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to the extent contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States.

Mr. REHBERG. I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chairman, we all recognize that we must make calculated decisions to drive down our deficit, but today we see the cold calculations of the Republican leadership, who are cutting hundreds of millions of dollars that would help our Nation's poorest families heat their homes while continuing the billions in taxpayer subsidies we send to big oil companies.

My amendment would fully restore LIHEAP funding and reduce the deficit by repealing these $40 billion in tax breaks for Big Oil. Oil companies don't need the 100-year-old tax breaks to sell $100-per-barrel oil while making $100 billion per year.

For millions of families across the country this year, heating bills have been piling up along with the snow, and so are the record numbers of people turning to LIHEAP to help them get through the winter.

□ 2050

In my State of Massachusetts alone, LIHEAP is projected to help 250,000 families this winter. But even as the mercury has dropped, House Republicans are now considering dropping this important safety net for millions of low-income families nationwide. The only way this bill is going to help families heat their homes would be if they tossed all 359 pages in the fireplace.

It takes a frigid heart for the Republican leadership to continue to defend tax breaks for oil and gas companies while putting heating fuel assistance for America's neediest on ice. But that's exactly what they are doing.

The majority spending bill presents us with a false choice. We shouldn't be cutting heating assistance for the poorest families before repealing the $40 billion in tax subsidies to big oil companies, the most profitable companies in the history of the world. The Republicans can continue to make their choices, but the American people will not stand with them. When they are faced with giving tax breaks to Exxon or fuel assistance to low-income Americans, they have chosen Exxon. When they are forced to choose between a free lunch for BP or lunch for hungry senior citizens, they make the choice for BP. We should not be balancing the budget on the backs of the poorest families. I urge support for this amendment to protect the neediest amongst us with a ''no'' vote on this cold-hearted funding bill.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Chair, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part, ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' And the amendment directly amends existing law.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair finds that the amendment proposes directly to change existing law, to wit: the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

As such, it constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to the continuing resolution. Instead of fighting the war on cancer, this bill declares war on cancer research and those who undertake it. The National Cancer Institute Director, Dr. Harold Varmus, said it best in December when he warned that the proposed cuts would have dire and lethal consequences. He is right. The proposed $1.6 billion cut to the National Institutes of Health would undermine the most successful innovation model the world has ever seen. The classic view of innovation is that government funds basic science while industry comes up with new innovative products based on that science. This model has worked well.

Over the past 40 years, 153 new FDA-approved drugs and vaccines were discovered through research carried out at public institutions with Federal funds. In the last 20 years alone, one out of every five important medical advances approved by the FDA was invented in a federally funded lab. Those inventions, which included 40 new drugs for cancer, are currently generating more than $100 billion a year in sales for drug and biotechnology firms.

This includes drugs like Herceptin for breast cancer; Avastin for lung cancer; and Gleevec for gastrointestinal stromal tumors that inhibit and/or block cancer cell growth. This research in cancer alone supports over 1,300 clinical trials each year for promising new therapies for more than 200,000 cancer patients.

President Nixon, a Republican, recognized the importance of a sustained public commitment in basic research when he signed the National Cancer Act in 1971. Last year, under President Obama, $5 billion was provided to the National Cancer Institute to continue that mission.

This funding bill would take us back years, decreasing the National Institutes of Health budget by 5 percent, disrupting this tremendously successful innovation model. The only failure in cancer research is when you quit or you're forced to quit because of the lack of funding.

Our sustained commitment to biochemical research is vital to the community I serve in western New York, where approximately $100 billion in Federal funding supports research each year. Institutions like Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Hauptman Woodward Medical Research Institute, the University of Buffalo, and companies along the Buffalo campus all rely on this funding to conduct research and translate that research into new treatments and products to improve quality of life. The cuts proposed would not only hurt these institutions and small businesses, it will hurt the entire Buffalo community that is now beginning to realize the tremendous economic benefit of this research.

Alleviating suffering due to diseases like cancer in our lifetime should be Congress's goal. This continuing resolution falls dangerously short of that.

Mr. MARKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIGGINS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Right now, 2010, we spent $172 billion on Alzheimer's patients—$172 billion, Medicare and Medicaid. You're cutting the budget for NIH to find a cure for Alzheimer's. By the time all the baby boomers have retired, the budget for each year is going to be $1 trillion to take care of the 15 million baby boomers that are going to have Alzheimer's in nursing homes.

So what are you guys doing? You're saying, We're going to cut the budget for Medicaid, which pays for Alzheimer's patients in nursing homes, and we're going to cut the budget for the cure for the funding for the NIH. You're having it both ways. No cure—and you're then going to cut the money for these poor families under the Medicaid and Medicare budget. You shouldn't do this.

The NIH are the National Institutes of Hope—researchers in medicine's field of dreams from which we harvest the findings that give hope to millions of families in our country. You are cutting this budget and you're not giving us an opportunity to make amendments in which we'll be able to put the funding in for the NIH budget. And that is just a very bad moral decision which you are making. And you're sending a false hope to people that you're actually solving the problem by cutting the NIH budget.

All of those people who are going to have Alzheimer's—and it's a demographic certainty—are going to cost $1 trillion by 2050. You are doing nothing about that right now. And, by the way; you won't have the courage to tell people you're not going to take care of them in nursing homes across the countries. That demographic is going be so strong. Put the money in NIH for Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, for all of these diseases. Please, God, let's at least agree on that as a bipartisan issue—that all our families are going to be equally struck by all of these diseases.

The gentleman from New York has put his finger right on this great moral and political dilemma for our country. A stitch in time will save nine. The money we put up now will save not 9 but 900 times the money that is ultimately going to have to be spent on all of these Alzheimer's and Parkinson's patients. It is a demographic certainty.

Mr. RUSH. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. RUSH. Madam Chair, today I am rising to speak out on the severe lack of centers and facilities for Level 1 trauma centers throughout this Nation. I introduced an amendment, which I am withdrawing.

Madam Chair, in my home State of Illinois, our family members are dying due to the tragic lack of Level 1 trauma centers in close proximity to those who need it. Sadly, our newspaper headlines, including yesterday's Chicago Sun-Times, are filled with tragic stories of victims struck by bullets, stabbed, and other kinds of trauma visited upon them. Despite the best efforts of witnesses, bystanders, and paramedics, the lack of nearby Level 1 trauma centers dramatically reduces survival rates and drives up long-term acute care needs and costs.

Madam Chair, in 1999, my son, 29-year-old Huey, was shot two blocks from a hospital. But he couldn't go to that hospital because they didn't have a Level 1 trauma center. So they had to transport him some 10 miles away, where eventually he passed.

This is just one example of one of these sad stories. It is not only patently unfair, but it's an injustice that in a Nation as vast and prosperous as ours that we have a tragic lack of such misplaced priorities by not having Level 1 trauma centers close to the communities where people reside. The fact that a community that's home to about 750,000 people on the greater South Side of Chicago, an overwhelming portion of which sits in my congressional district, does not have one Level 1 trauma care center literally results in the needless loss of life for far too many of us.

□ 2100

Our Nation has seen time and time again the amazing work that gifted trauma surgeons and fully equipped trauma care facilities can deliver to pull patients back from almost certain death. What I want to ensure, Madam Chair, is that the same level of care that is available in the affluent communities in this Nation is also available to the men, women and children in low-income communities.

The aforementioned editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times reported on the tragic set of circumstances that befell an 18-year-old trauma victim, who, after being struck by a bullet in a drive-by shooting last August, could not go to the nearby University of Chicago Medical Center, which was only four blocks away, because that facility did not have a trauma center. The University of Chicago Medical Center, one of the major hospitals in this Nation, does not have a level 1 trauma center. Instead, at a time when every moment counts, when every minute counts to save a life, paramedics had to drive the victim 9 miles to the nearest level 1 trauma center, to Northwestern Memorial Hospital, where the victim later died.

Madam Chair, situations like this simply should not happen in America. As I stand here today, I am fully aware of the need to provide funding to trauma centers for the financial losses they

incur. The National Trauma Care Foundation has estimated that the economic loss to trauma centers due to their treatment of the uninsured and underinsured patients is $230 million per year.

In the same Sun-Times editorial that I mentioned before, they also reported on a study last year by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, which found that almost three-fourths of the Nation's emergency rooms are unable to provide round-the-clock specialty care and that almost one-fourth of hospitals cited this as a reason for the loss or downgrading of their trauma center designations.

It is time for us to address the nationwide shortage of trauma care, especially in underserved areas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIMM. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIMM. I rise in support of Representative BASS's amendment, which supports the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. The continuing resolution cuts the LIHEAP program by almost $400 million.

Madam Chairwoman, this program is crucial to the homeowners of the Northeast, specifically in my district of Staten Island and Brooklyn, New York. LIHEAP helps low-income families and seniors remain healthy and secure from cold winters in the North and from hot summers in the South, as well as keeping them from having to face the impossible choice of paying their home energy bills or affording other necessities, such as prescription drugs and food.

I am cognizant of the fact that at a time of record deficits and of reduced spending, we must tighten our respective belts. However, it is imperative that we make smart spending choices. That being said, I believe, when given the choice between ensuring that our seniors have the ability to heat their homes during frigid New York winters or putting even more money into the catchall slush fund at NASA, there is no choice at all.

As I have stated numerous times, I absolutely believe that deep budget cuts are required to get our government back on a sound fiscal path. However, we must first look to cut spending that is truly wasteful. For that reason, I stand in support of Representative BASS's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I am really intrigued by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have made the determination to cut LIHEAP by $390 million, a decision that, in fact, wasn't important enough to consider the well-being of people, whether they are in the Northeast, whether they are in the Midwest, or whether they are in other parts of the country which have very tough winters. So now what they would want to do is take money from other worthy programs that, in fact, they have cut but would further cut.

In the instance of Mr. BASS's amendment, he would reduce the money from SAMHSA. That is the money for substance abuse and mental illness. What it does is help to reduce the impact of substance abuse and mental illness on America's communities by focusing its services on the people who are in most need. It translates research, and makes it useful and more effective so that we can get this into the general health care system.

How do you treat addiction? How do you treat mental illness? Very difficult issues.

So they would take that money, but they have cut LIHEAP, low-income energy assistance, which, for the most part, we are looking at low-income people. Then if it's applied to seniors, what they will do is they won't cook their food at the right temperature, which will put their health in jeopardy. They will buy space heaters, potentially, which will put their lives in jeopardy.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle really cared about low-income energy assistance, they wouldn't have started to make their cuts there. They would have moved to the $40 billion in subsidies for oil and gas. They would have moved elsewhere to look for this funding. What they would have done is cut back on the subsidies for special interests to do that.

It is a bit disingenuous, and it robs Peter to pay Paul; but I believe that that's the nature of what this unfixable bill is all about.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I rise today to support the amendment offered by my friend and colleague from New York (Mrs. LOWEY). This amendment would restore vital funding to the title X family planning program.

Now, I am all for reducing our deficit and for getting our fiscal house in order, but let's be clear on something: this cut to title X will not save money.

The proponents of eliminating family planning funds want us to believe that cutting these funds is fiscally responsible and that it has to be done to balance our budget. What they don't want us to know is that investing in family planning actually saves money. For every public dollar invested in family planning, taxpayers saved nearly $4. So while cutting family planning appears to be a savings up front, over the long run it will cost us both in dollars and in the health and well-being of millions of women.

While we are being honest, let's also discuss the other motive of the proponents of cutting title X. They argue that cutting funds for family planning will reduce abortions. Once again, they are wrong. In fact, if they wanted to reduce abortions, they would increase funding for title X. Why? Because title X services prevent nearly 1 million unintended pregnancies each year, almost half of which would otherwise end in abortion.

If we want to get serious about cutting Federal spending and reducing abortions, a good start would be investing in title X, not eliminating it, which is exactly what this amendment will do. Of course, in addition to reducing unintended pregnancies and saving taxpayers' money, family planning providers, like Planned Parenthood, provide essential life-saving and preventative care.

In 2009, title X providers performed 2.3 million breast exams, 2.2 million Pap tests, over 6 million tests for STIs, and close to 1 million HIV tests. For six out of 10 women who receive care from women's health centers, this is their only source of health care. Eliminating all funds for family planning would cut millions of women off from their primary and, in many cases, their only source of health care.

To the millions of women out there who want comprehensive reproductive health care: this is what they think of you.

They think that women should not have access to basic reproductive health care, including birth control. Recent legislation revealed that they think you shouldn't be able to access care even if you are a victim of rape or incest.

□ 2110

This is what they think of you.

All these bills reveal the true mindset of the opponents of choice: women are not capable of making their own decisions about their own health and their own lives.

These cuts to family planning programs would have a devastating impact in my community. Ten Planned Parenthood health centers in Illinois that provide primary and preventive care, including flu vaccines, diabetes screening, and cholesterol screening would all be forced to close. This would affect approximately 30,000 low-income patients and eliminate the jobs of 200 health center workers. Not exactly the kind of job-stimulating legislation we should be focusing on.

The conversation we're having today is not about choice, but choices. With family planning, we can reduce abortions and save the Federal Government money; without, we only pretend to do either. With family planning we can embrace educating and providing health care to women; without, we abandon women when they need care the most. With family planning, we can empower the women of America; without, we undermine them.

We have the choice. And we must choose to stand up to these attacks and fight back against the mistruths because the health, well-being, and lives of millions of women and their families are at stake.

This amendment is a strike against these wrongheaded cuts to family planning. I encourage my colleagues to restore funding to title X family planning programs and vote ''yes'' on Mrs. LOWEY's amendment.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this continuing resolution because it ignores the needs of America's families and does nothing to create jobs, strengthen the middle class, or effectively lower the deficit.

The $1.3 billion cut to community health centers is astounding. In my district alone, if these cuts are enacted, over 112,000 individuals will suffer a significant loss in primary health services, and they will be forced to use costly hospital emergency care. Nationally, these cuts mean health centers will be unable to serve 11 million patients over the next year. It means 127 new health centers in underserved districts will lose their funds. And it means the loss of thousands of health care jobs.

Also on the chopping block is the title X program, which provides over 8,000 men and women in my district with reproductive health care and cancer screening. Nationally, the $317 million cut to title X will force many clinics to close, eliminating another primary care safety net for 5 million men and women.

Also unbelievable is the $210 million in proposed cuts to the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant program. This cut will devastate primary and preventive health services in California for an estimated 2.6 million pregnant women, infants, and special needs children.

The cuts also endanger other critical programs such as California's newborn screening program, which last year tested almost 550,000 newborns for treatable genetic and metabolic diseases, which if undetected could have become painful and life threatening. On the national level, these cuts in MCH grants will reduce or eliminate prenatal health services for 2 million women and primary health care for more than 17 million children. In a country that ranks far behind almost all other developed nations in maternal and infant outcomes, we can ill-afford to slash funding for the only Federal program that focuses solely on improving the health of mothers and their babies.

Madam Chair, this bill is a Trojan horse that pretends to address our Nation's deficit crisis at the expense of the most vulnerable among us. This bill is not worthy of this House, for it fails to honor the true priorities and values of the American people, and I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this irresponsible resolution.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chair, I rise to speak in strong support of the Lowey amendment reinstating the funding for the title X program, which supports family planning services for all of our constituents. While we all agree on the need to reduce spending, it is just bad policy to eliminate a proven, successful program that saves the taxpayer money and provides critical health care services for our mothers, our sisters, our friends. This is bad policy.

The title X program, the only Federal program devoted to family planning, is the core of the public effort to ensure that all women, regardless of income, have the knowledge and health care they need to plan for their families. Its flexible grant funds not only help pay for direct client services but also help to ensure that State and local governments and nonprofit organizations across the country can place safety net clinics in the communities that need them the most. These clinics are the primary source of health care for millions of low-income American women.

By helping women and couples plan and space their pregnancies, family planning services have led to healthier mothers and children and have been instrumental in the long struggle for women's equality in education, the workforce, and society.

In light of the economic downturn, the freedom that the title X program has given to women in the workforce is particularly important. But this program hasn't just been successful for the over 4½ million Americans who use it every year. It has been successful for the American taxpayer, as every dollar spent on this program saves our Nation nearly $4 in return.

In light of the important role that family planning has played in health care and society, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has called family planning one of the top 10 greatest public health achievements of the 20th century, alongside other critical breakthroughs like vaccinations and the campaigns against smoking.

Over 40 years ago, title X family planning funding was enacted on a unanimous vote in the Senate and by an overwhelming majority in the House. When signed into law, then-President Richard Nixon said it fulfilled a promise that ''no American woman should be denied access to family planning assistance because of her economic condition.''

How far we have come from that time to this day, when we have the research to prove that a program works, and yet the House Republican leadership has recklessly decided to cut it completely. Eliminating title X now would be a devastating blow to the health, the security, and the dreams of millions of American women and their families, denying 5 million women preventive care, including annual exams, lifesaving cancer screenings, contraceptive services, and testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infection.

If Members of Congress really want to reduce our Federal deficit, we would double funding for family planning, which studies have shown could save the taxpayers nearly $2 billion per year. And yet, for some reason, my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to believe that cutting this program, defunding a program that actually saves Americans money and improves the health, improves the health of millions of Americans, that somehow this is a good idea.

For those Members who oppose title X funding, I ask you: How do you plan to ensure that the women in your district and your State have access to lifesaving prevention services? This sham of a Republican omnibus spending bill contains no answers to these questions, just broken promises for the American people.

Let's be clear. A vote against title X is a vote for unintended pregnancies. A vote against title X is a vote for the spread of sexually transmitted diseases and HIV. A vote against title X is a vote for increased rate of cervical cancer and breast cancer if caught late or if at all. And a vote against title X is a vote for increased abortion rates.

While I would like to think of this as an oversight, it is not the first attack to women's access to health care that has been seen in the 112th Congress. Combined with the mean-spirited bills moving through House committees that reopen the culture wars, it is obvious that this extreme and reckless proposal by the Republican majority to defund title X clinics is just the next step in an all-out Republican assault on women's health.

This Congress should be focused on creating jobs for the millions of moms working to put food on the table, not attacking their rights and their health.

I urge my colleagues to support the Lowey amendment to add some common sense to this omnibus spending bill.

□ 2120

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, first let me just say, I am shocked and appalled at the comment yesterday by the Speaker when he said ''so be it'' in response to the likely job losses that will occur as a result of this continuing resolution.

An independent analysis by the nonpartisan Economic Policy Institute indicates that this bill will result in the

direct loss, mind you, of 800,000 private and public sector jobs. Instead of doing everything we can do to halt the loss of jobs and put people back to work, this bill takes the wrong approach, putting our economy and our country back on the path to recession.

For every job opening in this country, we have 4.7 unemployed people who are looking for work. Why would we want to add to their numbers? ''So be it'' cannot and should not be our response to this economic crisis, not with a 9 percent unemployment rate and over 15 percent in communities of color, and record layoffs and furloughs at the State level, and especially not when Republicans have the temerity to demand tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires paid for through borrowed money. This is just wrong, and it's immoral.

As a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, I am in strong opposition to these cruel cuts. Budgets are moral documents, and they are a reflection of who we are and what we value. This spending bill makes it clear that the poor, the young, women, the elderly, teachers, firefighters, cops, and the communities that they protect and serve are not valued. Make no mistake, this bill will harm the most vulnerable among us, and it represents a wrongheaded approach to reducing the deficit or expanding job growth in our country.

Madam Chair, I am especially concerned about the proposed cuts to education and training programs. Among the range of cuts include Workforce Investment Act programs, which last year helped over 8.4 million job seekers find jobs. They got additional education and job training support. This is being cut.

All told, when counting rescissions of prior funding, elimination of the requested FY11 funding, and the advanced funding needed to run these employment and training programs, they will experience nearly a $5 billion cut. Republican cuts in job training will only prolong the recession, keep unemployment high, and keep more Americans collecting unemployment instead of training and getting ready for our 21st century job opportunities.

How can we justify cutting job training programs in the middle of an economic crisis? How will my Republican colleagues respond to the unemployed in their communities who come to them and ask them for help? Will they just say ''so be it''?

Pell Grants. Pell Grants provide vital funds for students who wish to attend 2- and 4-year colleges but who need help to pay their expenses. In my district alone, there are 16 institutions that provide Pell Grants to over 18,000 recipients. This proposal would cut Pell Grants by $845, making college less affordable and accessible for low- and moderate-income students. More than 8 million students benefit from Pell Grants, and many would be hurt by this cut, especially as schools are raising tuition fees to meet rising costs and to deal with tighter budgets.

The bill also entirely eliminates Federal funding for Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, which colleges and universities use to assist undergraduates who have the greatest financial need. That program assisted 1.3 million college students last year.

Head Start, under this proposal, is cut by nearly $1.1 billion. This will effectively knock out 200,000 children, mind you, in Republican and Democratic districts from participating in this critical early education program. This helps provide health, nutrition, and supportive services to prepare our children for school.

The Job Corps program, this program is cut by $891 million, which will result in 21,384 jobs lost in communities in every State, the majority of which are in the private sector. There will be $1.7 billion lost in economic activity as a result of this. And 36,000 at-risk young people will be turned away from Job Corps, costing the government and the economy as much as $17 billion over the course of their lifetimes. Additionally, the cuts will guarantee the closure, mind you, of 75 Job Corps centers across the Nation in your districts and in our districts. Slashing one of the most effective, accountable, and market-driven solutions for millions of youth who leave our schools unprepared is really the wrong move at the wrong time.

The majority has stated that they want to cut the deficit, but, in effect, they are cutting the social safety net lifeline for those who need it the most. This CR leads us down a path that will result in hopelessness, joblessness, and desperation, and it destroys the future for our young people.

I urge my colleagues to meet the challenge before us and reverse the potential harm that will be inevitable if this bill is enacted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, let me thank the former chair of the Health and Human Services Subcommittee and now the ranking member, Ms. DELAURO, and the manager and the chairman of the subcommittee.

I thought, Madam Chairwoman, that we lived in a country that was a land of the free and the brave. We had a sense of pride in the progress that America has made, and we have always said we would never want to go back, whether it has to do with actual equal rights for women, whether it is civil rights and the ability to be empowered to vote. But I stand on the floor today with a great deal of disappointment because it seems as if, with this continuing resolution, that will literally stop in its tracks the functioning of this government. We are really going back.

I rise to support the Lowey amendment because I really can't believe that this CR is eliminating $327 million in family planning. It just baffles the mind that this critical aspect of health care is now in jeopardy. It is now being part of turning the clock back. It is amazing that we would not acknowledge the fact that lives of women have been saved, lives of young girls have been saved because they've had access to family planning.

As much as we have fought to be able to ensure that around the world where indigent women who have lost their lives through the birthing process now have access to good medical care—and yes, family planning—so that they can have live births, now we come here to the soil of the United States, and to take $327 million out of the mouths and the hands of women and children—yes, children who can be born healthy. Children who are part of the health care process that these women are able to secure through the many clinics that are around this Nation and in this community.

I am disappointed in the games that are played with Planned Parenthood and to be able to demonize them with false and fraudulent tapings and a lot of bogus arguments about the fact that they are not in the business of helping people. I am disappointed in using those tactics because this is a very serious issue. Mrs. LOWEY's amendment addresses the seriousness of it because she realizes that if we were to go through with the elimination of $327 million, there would be many, many lives that are lost.

We have a Planned Parenthood office in my community. It is mostly focusing its attention on educating the community about healthy births, about ensuring that teenagers are not alone when decisions have to be made, decisions that will allow for the healthy birth or determination that is made by their faith leader with their family. They will not be left alone. In fact, family planning and Planned Parenthood extinguishes, I hope for good, the back alley procedures and, as well, the rusty hangers that were used in years past.

Just a day or two ago, we heard of a horrible abortion clinic that saw the lives lost of babies and their mothers because of the dastardly tactics that were being used. That is not what we speak of here today. We speak of the right of a woman to be able to choose but also to accept the good health care of family planning.

□ 2130

We speak of the rights of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence that really ensure that we all are created equal, with certain inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The Bill of Rights, which allows us due process, is what is being denied in this continuing resolution for, as we speak, if that money is eliminated, clinics around America will have their doors closed. Women will be standing outside, banging on

the door and asking for good health care.

So I ask my colleagues to support Congresswoman LOWEY's amendment, and I truly ask you to not take this Nation back and eliminate $327 million in family planning, benign but healthy and good health care and good policy for America and for America's women and for America's children.

Let us support the Lowey amendment and let us reject the elimination of $327 million in family planning and this continuing resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. I move to strike the last word, Madam Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chairman, as we continue to work our way out of the recession towards the thriving economy that offers economic opportunity to all Americans, we must out-innovate, out-educate and out-build the rest of the world; but the House Republican continuing resolution will do none of that. What it accomplishes is nothing but irresponsible slashing of necessary programs just so they can go back home and say that they cut government spending.

Now, I'm not sure if our Republican colleagues realize that actions have consequences. House Republicans are going too far, and they're sacrificing Americans' health, safety and future in the process, all in order to protect special interests. And what makes it worse is they are offering no real plan to deal with the deficit or create jobs.

Madam Chairman, American competitiveness depends on our ability to innovate and keep America number one. But, instead, this bill holds $2.5 billion in cuts to the National Institutes of Health, representing a significant setback in cancer and other disease research. We have to properly fund the key agencies like NIH that are essential to disseminating medical research and assisting in the development of new drugs and devices. Declining or stagnant Federal funding for research and development has an impact on all sectors of our workforce. And I want to use my home State of New Jersey as an example.

A report that was released last year showed that the pharmaceutical and medical technology industries are the leaders in private sector capital construction in New Jersey. In fact, in 2008, that meant $1.4 billion to the State and almost 6,000 jobs for construction alone.

In addition, there's a new report, ''Research America,'' that notes that New Jersey is the third largest R&D employer in the United States with more than 211,000 jobs supported by health R&D, including 50,000 direct jobs in health R&D. The same report shows the economic impact in New Jersey is $60 billion.

And that's why I believe that we must provide R&D incentives, additional research grants and more technology funding. These investments will provide new jobs, not only in the research sector, but in the construction and maintenance of labs and research facilities.

So, Madam Chairman, the government must be responsible for facilitating an environment where Americans can continue to innovate. This is what President Obama talked about in his State of the Union speech. That is the key to creating new thriving industries that will produce millions of good jobs here at home and a better future for the next generation.

If government abandons its role in R&D, we run the real risk of squandering many, many opportunities. Oftentimes, government can support and advance initial research that is then developed by the private sector. Government can plant the seeds, often with modest investments relative to the long-term payoffs in new products, new discoveries, new jobs, and economic growth.

Government has limited resources in these tough times, but that doesn't mean we abandon our role. In fact, we have a responsibility to the future to make wise investments that can lead to so many innovative discoveries and so much in economic benefits.

Now, last Thursday, Speaker BOEHNER said, ''Everything's on the table. We're broke. Let's be honest with ourselves.''

But the Pentagon, in this CR, gets 99 percent of what they ask for. Now, defense spending makes up more than half of our discretionary budget. The non-defense discretionary spending in this CR is enduring brutal cuts. Why should defense spending remain so high when all this non-discretionary spending, including R&D, is cut so severely? It simply makes no sense.

And I would say, Madam Chairman, really this is all about priorities. The Republicans clearly have the wrong priorities. They're not making investments in the future. They're not creating jobs. They're not creating an environment where people can be educated for new jobs and be trained for new jobs. They simply have the wrong priorities here with their spending cuts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MOORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer my strong support for the Lowey amendment, which would restore nearly $318 million in title X, and I rise to vehemently oppose the continuing resolution which completely eliminates title X funding.

Title X funding provides low-income women with access to contraceptive services; but it also provides coverage for primary care services, prevention services, including screenings for breast and cervical cancer, STD and HIV testing, screenings for high blood pressure, diabetes, anemia, pregnancy testing, health education and referral for other services. It has nothing to do with abortion. Title X, of course, prohibits recipients from expending these monies for abortions.

Madam Chair, I find this CR particularly troubling because I know that the overwhelming majority of title X patients are very, very poor. In fact, 70 percent of the these patients have incomes at or below the Federal poverty level, meaning that they earn less than $10,830 a year; 92 percent have incomes at or below 250 percent of the Federal poverty level, meaning that they earn less than $27,075 a year.

Now, you know what? We begrudge these patients Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, so that if they would become pregnant and have an unintended pregnancy, we would call them welfare queens and begrudge them welfare benefits. And these patients, who are disproportionately poor, women of color, would not be able to receive the economic support they need and, with this cruel continuing resolution, would not be able to receive the primary care that they deserve and that they need.

We talk about the need to have jobs in this tough economic time. How can women who have no family planning dollars sustain a job or get a job when there are unplanned pregnancies?

As a co-chair of the Women's Congressional Caucus, I want to take a final moment to note that access to family planning services has been nothing short of revolutionary for women in the United States. Women's ability to control their own reproductive destiny has changed the landscape at home, at work, and in the community. It's fundamentally altered women's role in society, and researchers tell us that it's helped to decrease infant mortality, child mortality, and maternal deaths. These are all incredibly worthy goals for women, men and families.

We've heard the cry of those who want our country back. We've heard the cries of those who want limited government. We've heard the cries of those who want to cut spending.

Well, I say, we want our bodies back. We want to govern our destinies, and we want to cut suspending our choices.

And so, therefore, I urge all of you to join me in supporting Congresswoman NITA LOWEY's amendment to restore title X funding.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. Madam Chair, I rise to support Mrs. LOWEY's amendment to restore title X funding.

At a time when we need to come together around jobs and the economy,

the Republicans are, instead, focusing on bills attacking women's health. The Republican gutting and slashing spending plan isn't about Federal funding; it's about undermining women.

□ 2140

This bill is an unprecedented display of disrespect for American women and shows no concern for their health. And all this raises the key question: Isn't the Republicans' real goal here just to end women's access to birth control?

Preventing unintended pregnancies and thus the need for abortion should be a goal on which both pro-choice and anti-choice lawmakers should agree. But the Republicans' anti-women continuing resolution includes language that dismantles Federal funding for family planning, attacks successful organizations that provide critical women's health care, and jeopardizes women's access to affordable birth control.

Now, this is a program that affects real people, and these drastic cuts will only hurt American women when they need help paying for these basic services the most.

Title X funding helped Shania, a woman who received care at Planned Parenthood in Los Angeles. She learned a terrible lesson when her mother broke her hip, was brought to the hospital, and then was discovered to have stage 5 cervical cancer, too late for a cure. But thanks to Planned Parenthood, her daughter is with us today, because after learning about her mother's illness, doctors urged Shania to get checked for the same diseases. Unemployed and without health insurance, she couldn't afford to go to a regular doctor. Instead, she walked into that clinic, which indeed did the testing and found her cervical cancer early enough to save her life.

Title X funding helped Beth, a volunteer soldier in our military who put her life on the line for our country. But in the military, they do not provide family planning services for our hardworking servicewomen, forcing them to look elsewhere for the care they need and deserve. When Beth needed help, Planned Parenthood and the title X fund was there for her even when the military wasn't, and she was able to get the help she needed for birth control.

This Federal money is a critical health care safety net for women around the country. It has helped improve the quality of women's health, given women free choice, and saved lives. What will Republicans tell Shania when she can no longer get the lifesaving checkups she needs? What will they tell Beth when she no longer has access to her reproductive choices despite serving her country?

It is clear that the real Republican agenda is to roll over women's health and steal away their rights. This Congress and this bill should be about creating jobs, not attacking American women.

Instead of working on the economy, Republicans are working to limit women's choices. Instead of doing the bidding of ideological extremists, let's address the true needs of the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. BARLETTA

Mr. BARLETTA. Madam Chair, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 321, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert

''(reduced by $42,676,000)''.

Page 293, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert

''(increased by $42,676,000)''.

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARLETTA. Madam Chair, I rise today to voice my concerns with a number of items listed in this continuing resolution.

I understand that the time has come for the government to tighten its belt, and I accept the fact that painful decisions must be made in order to get our economy on the right track. However, it is my belief that we have a responsibility to conduct our due diligence before defunding some of our most important programs.

For my district in Pennsylvania, that includes a thorough examination of alternatives to any cuts in clean coal technology research.

According to the National Mining Association, 52,000 Pennsylvanians are dependent on our coal industry for their jobs, jobs that may be put in danger without an investment in the future. And as the recent events overseas have demonstrated, we no longer have the luxury of time when it comes to our energy independence.

While clean coal research will prepare us for the future, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program invests in our most vulnerable. Last year, LIHEAP provided heat to 545,000 families in our country. And with an unemployment rate that's held over 9 percent for 21 consecutive months, we must remember that the cuts we debate here today will have a drastic effect on families who are already struggling to make ends meet.

The same can be said for the Community Service Employment for Older Americans. In 2008, this program helped nearly 90,000 older Americans prepare for the next phase of their careers, even assisting in their placement in the workforce.

Seniors constitute 16.5 percent of my district's population, and given the current nature of our economy, many of these hardworking men and women will be forced to prepare for changes in their future.

As a former mayor, Madam Chair, I understand how important the Community Development Fund is to supporting our local communities. It serves as a critical lifeline to towns, cities, and communities that are already struggling to pay their most basic bills.

It also supports revitalization programs in our communities and assists communities that have fallen victim to disasters.

And in a similar vein, State and local law enforcement assistance helps to keep our communities and neighborhoods safe. In particular, it supports communities that are forced to incarcerate illegal aliens for extended periods of time as well as programs that strive to protect our borders.

Madam Chair, I understand that we are broke, that programs such as those I have listed here today will be forced to bear the brunt of our new economic realities. Yet, I stand here today to reiterate my support of these important programs, and to remind my colleagues to remain ever cognizant of the fact that our cuts are again both necessary and painful.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HIRONO. I rise today in strong support of the Lowey amendment and in strong opposition to cuts to the title X funds in this continuing resolution.

These cuts are a threat to women's health, as you have heard from so many of the previous speakers. For example, these cuts will prevent Planned Parenthood from receiving needed Federal funds. Much of the cuts in H.R. 1 target the most vulnerable among us, the poor, children, young adults, and women.

We are a diverse country, proud of it, with good people on all sides of an issue, including of course the issue of abortion. We know that cutting title X funds strikes at a favorite target of the anti-choice group, Planned Parenthood.

□ 2150

Sadly, in pursuing their anti-choice agenda, tens of thousands of women in our country will be denied health care services that have absolutely nothing to do with abortions. The vast majority of Planned Parenthood's medical services are related to contraception, testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infections, cancer screening and other services, like pregnancy tests and infertility treatments. Abortion services comprise only 3 percent of the medical care Planned Parenthood provides. Federal law already prohibits title X funds from being used for abortion services. It is important to point out that there are no known violations of this law.

I would like to share with this body my views on how Planned Parenthood Hawaii has helped women and their families in my State. In Hawaii, there are three Planned Parenthood centers: one in Honolulu on the Island of Oahu, one in Kahului on the Island of Maui, and one in Kailua-Kona on the Island of Hawaii. Together, these three centers served over 7,800 patients. They provided 2,582 cervical cancer screenings that detected 321 abnormal results that required further diagnoses and treatment. These represent lives saved. They provided 2,705 breast exams. They conducted 3,346 tests for chlamydia, the leading cause of preventible infertility, that resulted in 172 positive results and follow-up treatment.

By cutting funding for title X family planning programs, the Planned Parenthood clinic in Kailua-Kona would have to close its doors. That center is one of the only dedicated sexual and reproductive health clinics on that island. The centers in Maui and Oahu would be forced to reduce their clinic hours. Cutting title X funds eliminates a safety net program that provides family planning services and lifesaving preventative care to 3 million Americans every year.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 1, and I join my colleague, Mrs. LOWEY, in saying to the women of this country, we need to take our bodies back.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1, which cuts the heart out of safety net programs which sustain and help sustain the most economically challenged and most vulnerable individuals and families in our society.

Of particular concern to me are the maternal and child health programs, Community Development Block Grants, cuts to legal assistance services, education and training, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, known as LIHEAP, and others which sustain the most vulnerable, the most disadvantaged, the most disjointed, and, in many instances, the most helpless and the most hopeless members of our society.

I am obviously concerned about health services in a real sense, because if you have all of these other problems and then you are sick on top of it and have no way of taking care of yourself, then you have no way of addressing the other needs that you have.

I have been involved with health services for more than 40 years, and I have had a good look at what we call Community Health Centers, which have become to me the most effective way of providing quality health care to large numbers of low-income people in this country.

When we talk about cutting over $1 billion to Community Health Centers, we are talking about ending funding for 127 new centers in underserved areas across the country. It means ending funding of Increased Demand for Services, or IDS grants, which have allowed health centers to expand to serve 3.3 million new patients in the last year and a half.

These cuts would raise costs in the Medicaid program and overall general health care services to the country. As a result, patients would lose access to primary care, to a regular doctor, and seek care for nonemergency health situations by using hospital emergency rooms, which would cost the country billions of dollars and continue to increase high-cost health care to our economy.

If these cuts go through, it would have an additive effect to the States that are cutting nearly $90 million in financial support to health centers due to their own fiscal crises, therefore leaving health centers with no way to continue to serve their existing patients.

Community Health Centers provide high quality health care and they do it cost-effectively and efficiently. In the State of Illinois, in 2008, 40 of these centers operated over 350 sites, contributed almost $1 billion to the Illinois economy and directly employed almost 6,000 individuals. For every 10 people employed by an Illinois health center, an additional four jobs were created in their surrounding communities. These programs served over 1.1 million patients, nearly 80 percent of whom all fell below the Federal poverty level and 30 percent of whom had no health insurance at all. Without these cuts, these centers can continue to operate and provide services.

I say let's not be what my mother used to call penny wise and pound foolish. It might look like we are saving, but every time we take care of one's health, we are making an investment.

I urge that we reject these cuts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment that Mrs. LOWEY presented and in opposition to this continuing resolution, which would completely eliminate the national women's health and family planning programs known as title X.

The resolution we are considering would cut care to Americans who need it most. Title X funds ensure that millions of low-income and uninsured individuals have access to primary health care. For most of these individuals, this is the only medical care they receive. Without access to this health care, they are at risk of developing serious medical conditions. If title X funding is eliminated, it would remove the only access point to primary health care for millions of women and would increase the health care costs for all Americans.

Now, some of my colleagues would argue that title X is all about abortion. That statement is simply not true. These programs fund prevention, provide lifesaving care to millions of women each year, cancer detection, care provided, women and families treated with the dignity they deserve, and it is family planning.

I know these claims, and I know the work of these clinics and their importance to our society. Maybe the men who put together this continuing resolution don't know what these programs do. I assure you, I do. Cutting funding to these programs would be devastating for women's health, and I strongly oppose efforts to do so.

These programs prevent an estimated 1 million unintended pregnancies each year. For every dollar spent on family planning, several dollars are saved, saved, in Medicaid costs. These clinics provide lifesaving and preventive care to millions of women. In 2009 alone, providers performed millions of Pap tests, millions of breast exams, over 6 million tests for sexually transmitted infections and nearly 1 million HIV tests.

In my home State of New Jersey, it is estimated that the elimination of these programs would cause as many as 40,000 patients to lose their access to women's health care. I estimate that without these funds, 14 Community Health Centers would close their doors.

We need to take a careful look at whom we hurt by cutting these programs. In 2009, these funded health centers provided services to over 135,000 patients. Eliminating national family planning programs would result in millions of women across the country losing access to primary care and preventive health care.

□ 2200

I can't emphasize that too strongly. Simply put, without these programs, more women will experience unintended pregnancies, face potentially life-threatening cancer, and other disease—diseases that could have been prevented. This is unacceptable.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentlewoman, Representative LOWEY's, amendment to restore funding for the title X family planning program. I also want to convey my strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana prohibiting Planned Parenthood from receiving any Federal funds, including any funds for cervical or breast cancer screening. These draconian proposals will end preventive and primary care for millions of American women—primary care services that are for so many women the only

medical care they receive throughout the year. In fact, six in 10 women who access care from a family planning center consider it to be their main source of health care.

What we are seeing here today is nothing less than an attack on access to women's health services. The real impact of these cuts is that 5 million women across this country will lose access to basic primary and preventive care services.

Let's be clear, Planned Parenthood does offer needed family planning services, and they also offer preventive health care services. In 2009, in the State of Ohio, Planned Parenthood served 97,574 patients by providing primary health services like cervical and breast cancer screenings, birth control, along with general services including smoking cessation, flu vaccinations, and screening for diabetes and anemia. Planned Parenthood in Ohio provided 32,532 cervical cancer screenings in 2009. Planned Parenthood in Ohio provided 32,717 breast exams in 2009—32,717 women given piece of mind that they are free from cancer or put on the path to necessary further treatment for breast cancer; 32,717 women given access to preventive care services that each and every American woman needs.

From the cuts to the Women, Infants, and Children program to these cuts targeted at women's health care, a pattern is quickly emerging. And it's unacceptable. It shows a disregard for women's health and safety. Rather than jeopardize the health of women and children across our country; rather than cutting heating assistance for those with low income; rather than cutting funding for Community Health Centers that help our most vulnerable; rather than cutting Community Development Block Grant funding that helps with economic development and job creation, this Congress can cut things like billions of dollars out of oil subsidies that go right to the profits of those oil companies. We can require the negotiations of lower drug prices to benefit our seniors and the bottom line.

We as a Congress, rather than focusing on these draconian cuts to jeopardize the health of women and children, we should focus on job number one, and that is making investments helping Americans get back to work. We need to be working to strengthen U.S. manufacturing, rebuilding our infrastructure, and stopping the outsourcing of American jobs. I urge my colleagues to join us in these efforts.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I think for over an hour we've been hearing people say, I rise in support of this amendment, over and over, speaker after speaker.

My parliamentary inquiry is: Is there an amendment before the floor right now?

The Acting CHAIR. No.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I stand strongly in support of Congresswoman LOWEY and her amendment and title X and its protections for women and family. What a shame we're here tonight defending a woman's reproductive rights—defending a woman's right to make choices that work for her, that work for her family, that work for their future. Instead, we should be debating how we can get our economy going, how to provide jobs. Instead, we're defending a woman's right to control her body, her right to good health care, her right to prevent a pregnancy, and her right to end a pregnancy.

This, my friends, is the 21st century. We are not in the Middle Ages. It is time to respect women and to respect their choices. It is past time to begin creating jobs here in the United States of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1818. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Payments to States for the Child Care and Development Block Grant'' shall be $2,088,081,000, of which no funds shall be for the Child Care Aware toll-free hotline.

SEC. 1819. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children and Families Services Programs'' shall be $7,796,499,000, of which $405,000,000 shall be for making payments under the Community Service Block Grant Act (''CSBG Act''), except that such level shall include $10,000,000 for section 680(a)(3)(B) of the CSBG Act and $6,151,783,000 shall be for making payments under the Head Start Act.

(b) The fourteenth and fifteenth provisos under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children and Families Services Programs'' of division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

AMENDMENT NO. 457 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 293, line 25, insert ''(reduced by $100,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 294, line 1, insert ''(reduced by $100,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 359, line 15, insert ''(increased by $100,000,000)'' before the period at the end.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the Administration for Children and Families programs by $100 million, with reductions specifically targeting the Community Service Block Grant program. Under this amendment, this reduction would be transferred to the savings reduction account and would save the taxpayers $100 million. The agency has already spent $295 million on this program for fiscal year 2011. This amount of money is already out the door, and an authorization requiring $10 million to be spent on discretionary activities is already out; but this amendment would essentially zero out funding for grants for the remainder of the fiscal year.

The program is administered through the Department of Health and Human Services. It provides Federal funds to States, territories, and tribes for distribution to local agencies to support a wide range of community-based activities. This program, however, has been flagged previously for its lack of accountability and oversight for the use of taxpayer dollars.

In 2006, GAO was asked to review the administration of the Community Service Block Grant program. GAO indicated in a letter to the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families on February 7, 2006, that ''the Office of Community Services does not have the policies, procedures, and internal controls in place needed to carry out its monitoring efforts.''

Later, GAO writes: ''By sending staff without sufficient expertise in financial management on monitoring visits, the Office of Community Services failed to ensure that States spend Federal dollars appropriately.''

We have a projected deficit, as we've said many times today. It's $1.5 trillion this year alone. Sobering reports say that the national debt may soon exceed our annual GDP. Simply put, the Federal Government does not have the resources to fund every grant program, particularly one that has little accountability over how taxpayer dollars are spent.

□ 2210

Beyond issues related to oversight, there have been concerns related to the effectiveness of taxpayer dollars spent on grants under this program.

In a New York Times article published on February 5, White House Office of Management and Budget Director Jacob Lew wrote about the CSBG program, stating: ''For the past 30 years, these grants have been allocated using a formula that does not consider how good a job the recipients are doing.''

In fact, presumably for this reason, President Obama cut funding for the Community Service Block Grant program by 50 percent in his FY 2012 budget request. Let me say that again: the President for the FY 2012 budget has cut this program in half, from $700 billion to $350 billion. I suppose it's likely because of these problems.

The President defended this reduction by stating: ''CSBG provides funding for the important work of Community Action Agencies, but does not hold

these agencies accountable for outcomes.''

On November 2, taxpayers sent a clear message to all of us here to spend money more wisely.

As I mentioned, we are borrowing 40 cents for every dollar we spend. So when you have programs we are told by GAO and other groups that simply aren't using taxpayer dollars wisely, it behooves us to cut the funding. If we don't cut this funding, we will actually be funding this program at a greater level than the President is asking for. Let me repeat that:

Unless we do this cut that we are talking about today, we will be funding for fiscal year 2011 this program at a greater level than the President is requesting for the following year.

I think that we ought to move now, when we have a deficit of $1.5 trillion and a debt nearing or over $14 trillion, to save money where we can for the taxpayers.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just wanted to ask the gentleman a question.

Has the gentleman given any consideration as to what the impact of this Federal cut is on State programs and as to the likelihood that States are to follow suit after the enactment of his proposed amendment?

Mr. FLAKE. I think any impact there will be is dwarfed by the impact of having a $1.5 trillion deficit and a $14 trillion debt and what happens to us as a country if we continue to run that kind of deficit and debt.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in strong opposition to the Flake amendment and to the Republican cuts of the Community Service Block Grant.

Mr. Chairman, there isn't any question that Democrats are committed to reducing the deficit. We believe we should start by ending the tax subsidies and special interest waste. We also must make sure that programs are accountable and that we end those that do not work.

But what we have here is a program that serves as nothing short of a lifeline. It provides assistance to our Nation's poorest families, families who are trying to meet the most basic of human needs. We have the latest Census data, which tells us that more than 43.7 million people are living in poverty in the United States. That number is growing.

A striking point is that many in this category are hardworking Americans who have, in fact, been making it; yet some may refer to them now as the ''new poor.'' In this Great Recession, life has changed very quickly for so many American families who have first lost their jobs and then lost their homes. The majority of Americans served by this program can be described as extremely poor, with incomes below 75 percent of the Federal poverty threshold. That's $9,735 for a family of three. That's the average size: $9,735.

Is that what we make in this institution here, $9,735? You know what, Mr. Chairman? We'd be hard-pressed to find a corner of our Nation that doesn't feel the impact of these severe cuts. The service areas of Community Action Agencies cover 96 percent of the Nation's counties.

I just might add that not so long ago this body voted for a tax increase for the richest 2 percent of the people in this Nation, providing them with $100,000 in tax cuts—the richest 2 percent of the people in this country as opposed to people who make $9,735. Now, if we really want to be serious about that deficit, let's start with several items.

Let's go to the oil subsidies of $40 billion over 5 years and eliminate 10 tax breaks for the oil companies. Let's start there. What about ending what they call ''treaty shopping,'' which would be a $7.4 billion savings over 10 years? Let's shut down the current practice that allows multinationals to avoid paying their taxes. I think that's a good idea that we ought to implement. That certainly is un-American if they're not going to pay their taxes.

As for other savings, why don't we cut agricultural subsidies in half and save almost $8 billion? We can do that. We could save $3 billion a year if we ended the licensing agreements in which pharmaceutical companies pay competitors to slow the introduction of cheaper generic drugs. That raises the cost of health care for all of us. Then we could immediately save $450 million and almost $3 billion if we stop spending on the alternate engine for the Joint Strike Fighter.

It's very interesting. Those total about $61 billion, which is the size of the cuts that the other side of this venerable House has proposed we cut: K–12 education for the neediest people in this Nation and the National Institutes of Health, which provide the opportunity to look for groundbreaking discoveries to cure disease.

One should really be opposed to this amendment for what it would do to the most vulnerable people of this Nation. It is effectively a 100 percent cut. It is again the example of how the Republican resolution hits those who can afford it least.

With 9 percent unemployment in our country, this is not the time to be cutting critical services. These are services in local communities to help low-income families get on their feet. The issues are child care, job training, nutrition. The money goes to nonprofit agencies, to the Boys and Girls Club, to Habitat for Humanity, to Feeding America, to hundreds of local faith-based churches and synagogues, to the United Way, and to Big Brothers and Big Sisters.

I urge defeat of the Flake amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the Community Service Block Grant program provides grants and other services to States to combat poverty and to increase self-sufficiency. The funding is directed to community organizers in poor neighborhoods. The range of services provided includes emergency services, housing, health care, food and nutrition, economic development, and education.

States award the funds to Community Action Agencies. I've got several of them in my congressional district, which are nonprofit, private and public organizations established under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Today, there are approximately 1,000 Community Action Agencies serving the poor in every State.

Now, I know the gentleman from Arizona is basing part of his cut on what is in the President's budget. From my perspective, the President's budget is wrong on this subject. To cut this program in half and then say we're going to have competitive bidding for the other half is going to hurt thousands, if not millions, of poor people in this country. It is not the right thing to do. This is shredding the safety net. Then this last $100 million, because so much of this money has already been spent this year, would take this program down to zero. It would be a disaster. All of these agencies would have to close, and the people who are the poorest people would not have any place to go to get help.

So I just think it's despicable that we have finally gotten down to where we're going to go after the Community Service Block Grant, which helps the poorest people in each of our districts around the country.

□ 2220

It's indefensible, it's just not right, and I hope that the gentleman from Arizona will reconsider this amendment, and I would hope that the committee would reconsider this in conference committee. I don't think the other body should in any way embrace this. This is a bad amendment, a bad cut, and it's going to hurt people, the poorest people in this country.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the

Lowey amendment, I rise in strong opposition to the Flake amendment, and I want to begin by saying that my friend, Mr. FLAKE from Arizona, is a very nice man. He's a decent man. He's just dead wrong on this. He's just wrong, wrong, wrong. Before I get into the specifics of the amendment, I want to highlight the deep cuts my friends on the other side of the aisle want to make to the accounts in the Labor-Health and Human Services and Education bill.

This subcommittee not only funds the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, but programs that make vital investments in people. That's why the Labor-H bill is often referred to as ''the people's bill.'' It provides resources that train people for jobs; offers educational opportunities in early, secondary, and higher education; and expands social safety net programs to millions of Americans that need temporary assistance.

While some of my colleagues will argue that with our growing budget deficit and growing levels of spending that we need to make some cuts—and we must, by targeting wasteful and unnecessary spending—the legislation that has been brought to the floor by my colleagues from the other side of the aisle seeks to weaken some of the critical social safety nets for the most vulnerable amongst us: for working families, for children, for seniors, and for the poor.

Mr. Chairman, I've been listening to this debate for a couple of hours now, and as we get later and later into the night, I'd just like to take a moment to remind my friends that these cuts are not just about dollar amounts and percentage cuts over the last fiscal year, but cuts to real people. I think some of us often forget that. So the way this works is the Federal Government cuts these programs. Without matching funds available from the Federal Government, States then in turn cut the exact same programs, and suddenly, millions of Americans wake up without the Federal Government or without the State government providing them with any assistance. This isn't just about the Federal deficit and the Federal budget. The ramifications of this cut spiral, trickle all the way down to the States, and the ramifications for States' indebtedness continues to grow.

Under the Department of Labor, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle propose a $2.5 billion cut to programs to support job training opportunities for dislocated workers, the unemployed, and young Americans at a time when the unemployment rate remains at a historic 9 percent. That's nearly 14 million Americans. By some estimates, this number is even higher. This is a 40 percent cut to programs that help unemployed people get out of the unemployment office and get their feet in the door.

From Health and Human Services, this legislation cuts $1 billion for 1,250 community health centers. That does not include the ramifications of States that are not likely to fund the exact same health centers and even more. These health centers serve nearly 20 million low-income individuals by providing access to primary, dental, and preventative care.

The $1.8 billion cut from the Head Start program will threaten jobs of thousands of teachers and teachers' aides and will cut off access to an estimated 200,000 low-income children across this country.

And $694 million will be cut for grants to schools that serve disadvantaged students. Teachers, tutors, and teachers' aides are likely to lose their jobs, and after-school and supplemental programs will be cut. And the students that need the help the most will suffer. Nearly $558 million will be cut from special education programs that serve children with disabilities.

As the cost of tuition, textbooks, and living expenses continues to rise, the 8 million students in community colleges and universities that benefit from Pell grants will no longer be able to receive the current maximum award of $5,550 per year. My colleagues across the aisle believe that $4,705 is adequate.

I could go on and on, Mr. Chairman, with the detrimental cuts my colleagues plan to make to these social safety net programs. But the fact is that the legislation in front of us provides cuts to people in this country that can least afford it. These devastating cuts to health care, to education, to energy assistance, and other programs means the most vulnerable Americans will be left to fend for themselves, in the midst of the worst economy of our lifetime.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend my colleagues vote against any amendments that further cut any of these vital programs for Americans. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this irresponsible continuing resolution.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. The spending bill that the Republicans have introduced is a threat to our economy, a threat to our competitiveness, and a threat to America's working families, and with this amendment, a threat to America's poor.

No one is in favor of wasteful spending and outdated government regulations that don't work or special spending for the powerful and the special interests. Instead of identifying real governmental waste, like subsidies to Big Oil and tax cuts to billionaires, the House Republicans have decided that all the cuts will fall on the backs of working people, on students, and on the poor in this country. The universe of cuts will be limited to those parts of our population, the most vulnerable parts of our population, those who struggle every day to keep their jobs and provide for their families, to hold on to their homes, or maybe to catch a break and get a job, or maybe to catch a break and have their child be put into Head Start, or to have mental health services for a member of their families.

They deny workers the basic rights and protections on the job, and they prevent unemployed Americans from getting job training that will give them a leg up in this economy because they zero out these programs. Simply put, the Republican spending bill eliminates hundreds of thousands of jobs and hundreds of thousands of job opportunities for Americans who are seeking to get back into the economy. This bill is reckless and irresponsible. The programs that are targeted in this bill are a lifeline to the future of our economy.

These cuts mean over 200,000 young children will lose their spots in a Head Start classroom. For the first time, as we celebrate the 100th birthday of President Reagan, we destroy Ron and Nancy's favorite program. Those children will not be allowed into the Head Start classroom, and we know exactly what that means. They will start school behind, they will continue behind, and if they graduate, they will graduate behind. That's what we cast them into. That's why it's called Head Start. These children need a head start. These quarter of a million children will not get a head start. They will go to the back of the line. It means that parents will have to choose between going to work and putting their children in a low-quality child care without an option for those Head Start classes.

It means that 2,400 disadvantaged schools that rely on title I, the funding that will provide quality education, will lose the funding for teachers and tutors and after-school programs. And again, the most vulnerable children, the children who start without that head start, the children who are the poorest in our Nation, they will receive the least resources available so that they could participate in an economy if they can get a good quality education, and have the opportunity to achieve it.

These cut means reduced support for students with disabilities. It will leave some 7,000 special education teachers and staff unemployed. And the services those students so desperately need—and they can prosper when they're given those services in our education programs and thrive in regular education programs—they will be denied that opportunity.

And of course, as has already been mentioned, it means that $845 that would have been available for the poorest students, middle-income students who are starting college, whether it's community or 4-year college or it's a proprietary school, that money won't be available for them. But mind you, the costs in the community colleges, the costs in the public institutions, the 4-year institutions, the proprietary

schools, they're all going up. These students' resources to pay for college are going down, and many of these students do not have the ability to replace those resources.

By eliminating the Corporation for National Community Services, we break the great bipartisan compact here that we would join together to provide people an opportunity to give back to this Nation, that we would organize services to serve our community and to volunteers in our community, whether they be senior citizens or whether they be young people starting out, and the people could earn an opportunity by serving their community to earn a scholarship, and grandparents could earn a scholarship to give to their children if they gave back to their community and volunteered in their community. Those programs are gone. They're eliminated. They're zeroed out in this legislation.

□ 2230

By eliminating critical job training opportunities offered through the Workforce Investment Act, some 200,000 unemployed Americans who need these skills to compete in the workplace will be denied their services, as will the returning vets from the vets program who use the One-Stop services. In April, 3,000 of them will be gone, closed down because of the budget cuts here.

Where will those veterans go? Where will those veterans go that are seeking opportunities? Where are we going to take these veterans who were harmed, who have suffered in combat, who are recovering from their injuries and trying to navigate the employment sector and our economy? They can go to a One-Stop shop. They can get special treatment as a veteran in that place. They can see the array of opportunities that they might have to bring to them. But no, now they can cruise the community. They can go from place to place, trying to find and knit together the services that are available today in those One-Stop centers.

So this legislation is devastating, devastating to millions of Americans. Millions of Americans with the slightest bit of help would be able to engage in our economy, be able to engage in our society, and be able to prosper for themselves and for their families. Tonight, the Republicans foreclose that future. They foreclose that future for millions of Americans who will not be able to fight back or hire lobbyists.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, for the last 5 weeks or so since the new majority has taken over the House, as 15 million people are unemployed in this country, as people are losing their homes, losing their businesses, the majority has focused like a laser beam on everything except job creation for the American people. They have found time to dabble in a variety of political issues while ignoring the essential purpose for which I believe we were all sent here, which is to foster an environment where businesses and entrepreneurs can create jobs for this country.

This week they have changed. They have gone from ignoring the jobs problem to making it worse. The legislation that's on the floor tonight does reflect a good faith and necessary goal of reducing spending in our country. I don't think there is anyone here who would disagree with the proposition that continuing to spend more than we take in eventually will cause even greater pain and harm to the U.S. economy than it has already caused, which is considerable, indeed.

But all spending cuts are not created equally, and all spending decisions don't have the same consequences. The prism through which we have to look at spending cuts is whether they are sensible or reckless, whether they help to create jobs or destroy jobs. And I would submit, ladies and gentlemen of the House, that the legislation before us is worsening the very deep economic crisis in our country in three ways.

First of all, you can't have economic growth if you don't have safe streets and a safe country. But the provisions of this bill will lead to the layoff of more than 10,000 police officers in cities and towns across our country. The provisions of this bill will lead to the dismissal or furlough of over 1,000 people whose job it is to check containers coming into this country to see if they have dirty bombs or chemical weapons in them. A country that isn't safe won't grow.

Ladies and gentlemen, the other cuts in this bill, let's talk about education. A country that can't learn won't grow. But this legislation will result in the elimination of 10,000 reading tutors and math coaches for the neediest students in this country. It will remove 7,000 teachers who teach autistic kids, children with a learning disability, from classrooms. For the single mom who is struggling to pay her bills, raise her children, and go to school, it will raise her tuition by up to $825 this year by eliminating the college scholarship on which she relies to go to school. A country that doesn't learn doesn't grow, and these cuts will lead us into a country that makes it very difficult in which to learn.

And finally, this country is fueled by research and development, inventing and creating new products, new cures, new solutions to the world's problems. Yet in this bill, in one of the most important areas, medical research, the majority has given us an unwelcomed surprise. There is a spending cut in excess of $600 million from the National Institutes of Health that is described, ladies and gentlemen, as further cuts to get to the 2008 levels. I don't know what that means. I don't think anyone on the majority side will tell us what that means. But I do know this: Thousands of Americans work doing medical research through the National Institutes of Health. Millions of Americans depend upon the miracles which grow out of that research, and this country's economy is stronger when that research continues. That research will be cut. The average cancer research grant in this country is about $500,000. Looking at the cut that's in here, it appears that over 500 cancer research grants will go by the wayside.

A country that isn't safe, a country that isn't learning and investing won't grow. This bill means America won't grow. This bill should be defeated.

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

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

Mr. FLAKE. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1820. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging, Aging Services Programs'' shall be $1,445,323,000.

(b) The first proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging, Aging Services Programs'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

(c) None of the funds appropriated by this division for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging, Aging Services Programs'' shall be used to carry out sections 1701 and 1703 of the PHS Act (with respect to chronic disease self-management activity grants), except that such funds may be used for necessary expenses associated with administering any such grants awarded prior to the date of the enactment of this division.

SEC. 1821. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary, General Departmental Management'' shall be $375,938,000: *Provided*, That amounts included under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$0'' for ''$5,789,000'': *Provided further*, that the third and seventh provisos under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1822. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary, Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'' shall be $708,510,000, of which $65,578,000 shall be for expenses necessary to prepare for and respond to an influenza pandemic, none of which shall be available past September 30, 2011, and $35,000,000 shall be for expenses necessary for fit-out and other costs related to a competitive lease procurement to renovate or replace the existing

headquarters building for Public Health Service agencies and other components of the Department of Health and Human Services: *Provided*, That in addition, $318,000,000 of the funds transferred to the account under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary, Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'' in Public Law 111–117 under the fourth paragraph under such heading may be used to support advanced research and development pursuant to section 319L of the PHS Act and other administrative expenses of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be made available to the United States Postal Service for the delivery of medical countermeasures.

SEC. 1823. Of the funds made available for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary, Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'' in Public Law 111–32, $1,397,439,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 1824. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Education for the Disadvantaged'' shall be $3,994,365,000, of which $3,944,530,000 shall become available on July 1, 2011, and remain available through September 30, 2012 (in addition to the $10,841,176,000 previously appropriated under such heading that became available on October 1, 2010), and an additional $10,841,176,000 to remain available through September 30, 2012, shall be available on October 1, 2011 for academic year 2011–2012: *Provided*, That of the amounts available for such heading (1) $6,405,844,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (''ESEA''); (2) $1,365,031,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of the ESEA; (3) $3,014,000,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA; (4) $3,014,000,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA.

(b) The tenth, eleventh and twelfth provisos under the heading ''Department of Education, Education for the Disadvantaged'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

(c) Of the unobligated balances available for ''Department of Education, Education for the Disadvantaged'' in division D of Public Law 111–117, $189,000,000 is rescinded, to be derived from the amounts specified under such heading for availability under section 1502 of the ESEA.

AMENDMENT NO. 276 OFFERED BY MRS. MCMORRIS RODGERS

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. 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:

Page 296, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $336,550,000)''.

Page 296, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $336,550,000)''.

Page 297, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000,000)''.

Page 298, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000,000)''.

Page 299, line 20, after the first and second dollar amounts, insert ''(increased by $557,700,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It increases funding for the part B program of IDEA, which provides educational grants to States for children with disabilities, by $557 million, restoring funding for the program to 2010 levels. The amendment is fully offset by reducing funding to the Teacher Quality State Grant program and the School Improvement Grant program, two programs that have received substantial funding increases since 2009.

Mr. Chairman, 35 years ago Congress recognized that too many special needs children were being denied an education and the opportunity to maximize their potential and contribution to our society, and 35 years ago severely disabled children who were confined to State institutions received no education. Special needs students did not attend school. They were kept out of classrooms, receiving little education.

□ 2240

Today, more than 6 million children receive an effective education because of IDEA. Special needs children are no longer confined to institutions. The number of special needs students who graduate high school with a diploma has increased. The number of children who go on to enroll in high school has more than tripled since IDEA's enactment. And through IDEA, we have increased our Nation's expectations of our children. But more can and must be done.

The McMorris Rodgers/Kline/Sessions/Harper amendment ensures that Congress keeps its promise. Too often IDEA is overlooked in our education debates. For example, Congress has yet to meet its commitment to cover 40 percent of a student's cost. Barriers to reliable research prevent effective teaching. Low expectations continue to plague our school systems. The reductions to IDEA in H.R. 1 are just another example of the challenges that IDEA experiences.

This amendment reaffirms that there is no greater priority in Congress than ensuring all children have access to an appropriate education.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Providing a quality education for all students, including those with disabilities, should be one of our highest priorities. So I agree with the goal of this amendment.

But, in fact, we are considering a Republican resolution, this continuing resolution this evening, and it's the majority party, to which the gentlewoman belongs, which cuts IDEA. It cuts special education by $558 million. So now we have an amendment that attempts to undo the damaging cuts to IDEA, but only by cutting other critical education programs. The damage done in this bill cannot be alleviated by robbing Peter to pay Paul. That's what this amendment is about.

Let me just mention to you that—and our colleague spoke about special education and what it does. But $558 million is where they come from with regard to education for special needs kids. What that means is almost 7,000 special education teachers and aides and other staff who serve these youngsters would not be there. And it is critical. Teachers and staff are critical to the education of these youngsters. As a matter of fact, the Federal Government mandates that local school districts have to provide this education. And when it was determined that that would be the case, it said that the States would do 60 percent, the Federal Government would do 40 percent.

What's happened now is we've been at about 17 percent in terms of Federal contribution. With the $558 million cut we go down to about 15 percent.

I would suggest that if there is such a great urgent need and a great burning desire to be able to provide education to special needs children, that we do not cut $558 million.

Now, where does the money come from? As I mentioned, we're talking about other critical education programs. School improvement grants. I venture to say that everybody is concerned about those schools that are failing, that there's got to be student achievement at these schools. And that's what the current Federal law requires, that there's demonstrable success in student achievement. The funds for the school improvement grants are appropriated precisely for those schools that fail the test and are seeking to implement a strategy for turning around our Nation's lowest-performing schools. That's where we would take money from in order to turn a potentially failing school, to turn around so that they can go from the lowest-performing to better-performing schools.

The other place that my colleague takes funds from is something called the Teacher Quality Grants, an approximately $3 billion program and a major piece of No Child Left Behind. This provides funds to States and school districts to develop and support a high quality teacher force.

Aren't we all about making sure that those people who teach our children are qualified to do that? These funds are distributed by formula to all States. They are relied upon tremendously to reduce class size, to ensure that classroom teachers have the proper training and credentials to be effective instructors.

There isn't a day that goes by that we aren't talking about school reform, and at the center of school reform is to develop quality teachers. And, in fact, we want to try to link merit pay to quality teachers, do everything we can, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like to take the money for school improvement grants, teacher quality grants.

I suggest to you that what you do, if you are really truly interested in educating special needs children, that you

decide that a $558 million cut is just not the right thing to do to children who have these special needs and who are mandated by the Federal Government to States to get the kind of training that they need to achieve their level and realize their dreams and aspirations.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. KLINE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment, and I intend to vote for the amendment.

Mr. KLINE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, budgeting is about making tough choices. Congress has a responsibility to outline a budget the country can afford that sets priorities to live within those means. Too often in recent years Congress failed in this basic duty. I'm pleased to see us beginning to move in a new direction.

The choice we face today is whether we will begin to uphold our commitments or continue to kick the can down the road for another debate another time. That's why I'm proud to support this amendment.

This amendment will move Congress closer to meeting its commitment to students with disabilities and help schools, all schools across the Nation. It adds to our effort to set the right priorities.

In 1971, a landmark decision was handed down by a Federal judge that ruled the U.S. Constitution prohibits schools from denying access to education based solely on a child's disabilities. While this represented the judgment of one court, states soon followed.

Four years later Congress passed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. That law, now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, was designed to help states meet their obligation to provide a quality education to students with disabilities. It is a law that has been improved over the years, most recently, in 2004.

We've worked to strengthen the law's focus on academic achievement, empowered parents to take greater responsibility for the direction of their child's education, and helped to improve the critical relationship between local school leaders and the parents and students they serve. Despite our efforts over the years, more work remains to strengthen the law to ensure students with disabilities receive the education they need. That's why we're here today.

Over the past 35 years, while states have worked to follow the letter of the law and serve these students, the Federal Government has failed to deliver on its promise to fund 40 percent of the additional costs of educating students with disabilities. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we've never funded 20 percent. We haven't made it halfway.

This amendment reallocates resources at the Department of Education to improve our commitment to meet this important need. It makes tough choices we were sent here to make. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment. The suggestion has been made by the chairman of my committee that somehow if you vote for this amendment you're increasing the government's commitment to fully fund IDEA. No you're not. You're simply restoring the cut that the Republican caucus already made a decision about, and that was to cut $558 million. That would be admirable if you restored the cut.

But when you decide therefore to restore the cut, you're going to now have to make additional cuts, and those additional cuts will come out of the most difficult, hard-pressed failing schools in our country, many with increased populations of children with disabilities. Those will be the schools that we will target.

□ 2250

We will target those schools in the poorest neighborhoods with the poorest records where now, for the first time we have a proposal made, carried out by the Governors, by the local school districts to turn those schools around and to provide the quality education that those children are entitled to so they can take advantage of the opportunities that America presents.

But now money for those schools is going to be taken away on the theory that somehow you are doing a favor for students with disabilities. Don't do them such a favor. I don't think they would appreciate that you are taking the money from their poorest neighbors.

And then, on top of that, you are going to take the funds that we are speaking to. And you have all given the speeches, you have all told people, the most important thing outside of the family is the teacher. Well, this is the funding by which we have prepared teachers to be special education teachers, to be title I teachers, to teach math, to teach science. And now we're going to take that money in the name of somehow that this is a restorative amendment that will be good for IDEA.

Let us understand something. When we were doing No Child Left Behind, we circulated a petition signed by Republicans and Democrats. We had over 300 people sign that and said let's go for full funding. When we offered that amendment in the conference committee, the Republican Members voted it down. You signed the petition. You just didn't have the courage to stand up and put the funding into play, and you have been screwing around with this program ever since. You have tried to use funding for IDEA to batter some other portion of the education community. Little incremental parts were offered year after year, but it always came out of the hide of the less fortunate. You ought to stop it. You ought to stop it.

Poor children need access to high-quality education and students with disabilities need access to high-quality education. The kind of barbaric attitude that is being carried out here in terms of playing these two populations off against one another is simply outrageous. It's unfair to the students with disabilities because it is being done in their name, and we know how desperate they and their families are for education and for the resources to carry out that education. And in their name, we are stripping the resources from some of the poorest children, and also some of the poorest children with disabilities we're stripping the resources for them. That doesn't sound like a win-win. That doesn't sound like a plus for disabilities.

I have been at this a long time. I had the honor of writing this legislation with my colleagues back in 1975, 1976, and it's an honor and I have defended it my whole life and it's changed people's lives. And the nicest thing that has ever been said to me in public life is when a parent says, But for that law, my child would have never had an education.

But for that law. But I don't think they would have thought that we are now trading their child's education for somebody to deny another student an education. That's not the game that they wanted to play.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind Members that they must address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I thank the chairman for recognizing me. And I have great respect for my colleague from California and all the hard work that he has done now for generations, practically on this issue.

I would point out that from the late seventies through all of the eighties, special education was funded at 1, 2, 3, 4 percent. And it wasn't until 1995, 1996, 1997—actually '96, '97, '98, '99, into the 2000s that funding for special education began to increase significantly under the Republican-controlled Congress.

President Clinton's own Education Secretary said on a number of different occasions that full funding of special education had to take a second place to the new programs that the administration was offering at the time, which

was school construction, school improvement, and these other programs that my friend, the maker of the amendment, was proposing to reduce in order to fund special education.

I have felt for many years that IDEA funding should be the top priority for education funding in the Congress, and I am pleased that we have this amendment that will restore funding to the same level that it was in fiscal year 2010. I would certainly like to have it higher than that, but under the circumstances I believe that this is a good and justifiable improvement. It is especially important and it is different from SIP and teacher quality grants because we make the rules, when it comes to special education, here at the Federal level, and the school districts put out their individual service plans for students, which they have to pay for. So without this amendment and with a cut in funding for special education, it is a direct dollar-for-dollar cost shift to every school district in America.

So this is an amendment that is good. It should be bipartisan, and we should all support its passage so that we can get special education funding back to FY10 levels.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS).

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

Ms. DELAURO. 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 gentlewoman from Washington will be postponed.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I offer this motion to speak out against the egregious cuts that are being addressed here to public education contained in this irresponsible Republican spending bill.

This spending bill cuts over $1.25 billion in education funding that goes directly to States and school districts to support educating disadvantaged students and special education students. Now is not the time to choke off funding to school districts when stimulus money is eroding and when States are cutting their own budgets. I fear we are leaving schools and our Nation's most vulnerable students behind.

These sections of the irresponsible Republican spending plan represent a nearly 5 percent cut in aid to school districts. For title I funding that supports school budgets and teacher jobs in low-income school districts, this means a $693.5 million cut. For Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the IDEA Act, special education funding that supports school districts educating children with special needs and disabilities, this means a $557.7 million cut.

Title I funding has helped school districts with high poverty levels meet State education standards and ensure equal access to quality education for all of their students. More than 50,000 public schools around this Nation depend on these Federal dollars to maintain their educational services.

This cut to title I funding alone would affect 2,400 schools that serve nearly 1 million disadvantaged students. These schools would lose funding for teachers, for tutors, and for after-school programs. It would mean that nearly 10,000 teachers and aides could lose their jobs. Children could see larger class sizes. And, yes, access to quality education would again be threatened.

Not only does this bill cut funding for education for low-income children, but it institutes painful cuts to special education programs funded with the IDEA dollars.

For 35 years, IDEA has supported special education, guaranteeing students with disabilities the right to a free, appropriate public education. Millions of students with disabilities have been able to go to public schools because of the IDEA funding school districts receive, allowing them to provide an individualized education for children with those special needs. This bill cuts over one-half billion dollars out of special education funding to school districts. Cuts of this proportion could force States and school districts to lay off almost 7,000 special education teachers and aides and other staff serving children with disabilities.

Just last week, I met with members of the New York State School Board Association who advocated for full funding for title I and especially for IDEA. They stressed the fact that special education funding has never been fully funded to the amount that was originally promised to our schools. These cuts are giant steps backwards after several years of quality investments in title I and IDEA funding.

Furthermore, these cuts would come at a time when States across this country are also slashing education funding. These cuts come at a time when supplemental stimulus aid is drying up. Cuts mean that school districts in local communities will have to make up the difference, potentially with teacher layoffs, larger class sizes, reduced programs, and higher—higher—property taxes. This is not responsible policymaking, especially while our economy is still in recovery.

The majority in this House is lauding the fact that this bill represents the largest spending cut in the history of our country. If they want to cut funding to satisfy their base, fine, but I will not stand for cutting education funding. I will not support budget cuts balanced on the backs of our Nation's students, our youngest citizens, and, indeed, our future.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2300

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in strong support of the amendment to add funding back to title X from my colleagues Congresswoman LOWEY and Congresswoman DELAURO, who have always been fierce advocates for women's health, and I am thrilled to join them in this important fight.

Since 1970, the title X family planning program has been a key component of our Nation's health care infrastructure and an essential element in the winning strategy to reduce unintended pregnancies. Efforts to cut the title X program would take away funding from essential women's health care providers like Planned Parenthood.

Today, title X serves over 5 million low-income individuals every year. In every State, women and men rely on title X for basic primary and preventative health care, including annual exams, lifesaving cancer screenings, contraception, and testing and treatment for sexually transmitted diseases. In fact, in 2009 alone, title X providers performed 2.2 million Pap tests, 2.3 million breast exams, and over 6 million tests for sexually transmitted diseases, including nearly 1 million HIV tests. And preventative care isn't limited to cancer screenings and education on how to avoid STDs.

If Republicans truly wanted to reduce abortions in this country, they would vote for this amendment. Indeed, title X actually reduces the number of abortions. Title X services help to prevent nearly 1 million unintended pregnancies each year, almost half of which would otherwise end in abortion. So we can say for certain that title X funds play a vital role in helping to reduce the number of abortions in our Nation, working towards the goal of making abortions safe, legal, and rare.

But it goes further. The title X programs through providers like Planned Parenthood provide vital family planning services which help improve the life of the mother and the child. It has been proven time and again that family planning keeps women and children healthy. Studies have shown that when women have better access to family planning, it leads to healthier outcomes for both mother and child.

When women plan their pregnancies, they are more likely to seek prenatal care, improving their own health and the health of their children. In fact, access to family planning is directly linked to declines in maternal and infant mortality rates.

Eliminating the national family planning program will result in millions of women across the country losing access to basic primary and preventative health care and to the providers that offer these services. Without title X, more women will experience unintended pregnancies and face potentially life-threatening cancer and other diseases that could have been prevented.

In recent weeks, Republicans in this Congress have produced some of the most anti-choice, anti-woman, anti-family bills that we have ever seen, trying to redefine rape, raising taxes on women who have private insurance with comprehensive health care coverage, telling women who need our help the most that they are on their own.

But that just didn't just go far enough for them. Republican proposals to cut title X funding and completely shut down Planned Parenthood, where millions of women receive their only health care, is one of the most spiteful, egregious moves we have ever seen.

It is truly mind-boggling that the same Members who purport to be anti-choice can turn around and say in the same breath that they want to strike all Federal family planning funding. So now they don't just want to make abortions illegal, they also want to throw a huge obstacle in the path of those who want to prevent themselves from ending up in a situation where they might need one. This helps no one. It doesn't help women, it doesn't help families, and it certainly doesn't help reduce our deficit. That is because title X actually saves taxpayer dollars.

Since many of the patients served by title X are on Medicaid, preventive care like cancer screenings and contraceptive counseling actually means fewer costs to the taxpayer in the long run. Indeed, for every public dollar invested in family planning, $3.74 is saved in Medicaid-related costs. That is savings to both Federal and State governments.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to support this amendment of my good friends that would reinstate title X funding in the continuing resolution. The decision by Republicans to defund title X was not only reckless, but thoroughly anti-woman, anti-child, and anti-taxpayer.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and help correct a massive injustice against American women and families.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1825. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, School Improvement Programs'' shall be $3,066,967,000, of which $2,978,515,000 shall become available on July 1, 2011, and remain available through September 30, 2012 (in addition to the $1,681,441,000 previously appropriated under such heading that became available on October 1, 2010), and an additional $1,681,441,000, to remain available through September 30, 2012, shall be available on October 1, 2011 for academic year 2011–2012: *Provided*, That of the amounts available for such heading (1) $7,463,000 shall be available to carry out subpart 6 of part D of title V of the ESEA; and (2) no funds shall be available for activities authorized under part B of title II, part D of title II, subpart 9 of part D of title V, part B of title VII, or part C of title VII of the ESEA, or part Z of title VIII of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

(b) The first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, eighth, twelfth and thirteenth provisos under the heading ''Department of Education, School Improvement Programs'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

AMENDMENT NO. 532 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows.

Page 298, line 12, insert, ''or'' after ''title II,''.

Page 298, beginning on line 12, strike '', part B of title VII, or part C of title VII''.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will strike the language in H.R. 1 that prohibits the Department of Education from funding the Alaskan Native Education Equity Act and the Native Hawaiian Education Program. The amendment will not add money to the Department of Education budget but will allow the department to fund those programs as they see a need.

I yield at this time to the good lady from Hawaii for a very short statement.

(Ms. HIRONO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HIRONO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this amendment introduced by my colleague, Congressman Don YOUNG, to support Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian education. This amendment makes these worthwhile programs eligible for these education funds.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of the amendment introduced by my colleague Congressman Don YOUNG.

I appreciate the opportunity to work with him on this amendment. For many years, Congressman YOUNG has been a leader on issues of importance to the indigenous, aboriginal peoples of the United States. He understands that we have a special trust responsibility to American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians. And while we sit on different sides of the aisle, the bond between the native peoples of Alaska and Hawaii transcends political party.

The Native Hawaiian Education Act was enacted in 1988 and was last reauthorized in 2002 as a part of the No Child Left Behind Act. Native Hawaiians have historically experienced educational risk factors, such as high rates of poverty and low academic achievement. The modest appropriations provided under the Native Hawaiian Education Act have helped to improve educational opportunities for Native Hawaiian children and remain necessary in reversing low achievement trends.

One of the successes of the program has been the flourishing of the Hawaiian language. Following the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii in 1893, use of the Hawaiian language in public classrooms was banned. This decline in the use of the language paralleled declines in other aspects of a once vibrant culture and community. We know that loss of one's language is part and parcel of the loss of one's culture. Like all too many native languages, Hawaiian was on the brink of extinction. It was only in 1986 that the ban on Hawaiian language in schools was removed. Now, with funds from the Native Hawaiian Education Act, Hawaiian language is taught through immersion schools, beginning in kindergarten and continuing through high school.

We now have a growing cadre of young people who are fluent in the Hawaiian language—thanks in great part to the existence of the Native Hawaiian Education Program. Several tribes have looked to the success of the Hawaiian language program as a model for how they can ensure the survival of their language.

I met with a student named Kuulei last week. She grew up in a Hawaiian homestead community where attending college was not thought possible. She attended a Native Hawaiian immersion school and through hard work and perseverance is now a student at the University of Hawaii at Hilo. After graduation, she plans to become a teacher so she can inspire the next generation of Native Hawaiian students.

The school that Kuulei attends, the University of Hawaii at Hilo is home to the Ka Haka Ula O Keelikolani College of Hawaiian Language. In December 2010, the College awarded its first two doctorates in Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization. The honors went to Katarina Edmonds, a Maori educator from New Zealand, and Kauanoe Kamana, the first of Native Hawaiian ancestry to receive a Ph.D. in Hawaiian Language from UH Hilo.

The amendment before your today does not increase funding for Alaska Native or Native Hawaiian education programs. All this amendment does is make these worthwhile and successful programs eligible for funds from the Department of Education School Improvement account.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Mahalo nui loa (thank you very much).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the current definition of an earmark as defined by this body, the two programs that the gentleman is seeking to restore are both earmarks.

Alaskan native education and native Hawaiian education programs are worthy programs, there is no doubt in my mind, and I believe the overall purpose of both is to ensure that the unique educational needs of Alaskan and Hawaiian natives are met. Clearly we all

want the same for our constituents. But I think we have to be clear about what these programs are. They are earmarks with a pricetag that approaches $70 million.

Now, this majority has been very proud of their policy to ban all earmarks. If I might, I would like to just read from the comments of the chair of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. ROGERS, in his summary for the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution.

''The continuing resolution includes no earmark funding and eliminates all previous earmark funding from fiscal year 2010, saving the taxpayers approximately $8.5 billion. In addition, the bill includes language specifically negating any and all earmarks as defined by House rules.''

Again, as I say, this majority has been very, very proud of their policy to ban all earmarks. That is why, really, the decision by my Republican colleague from Alaska is therefore hard to understand, and the support that the majority is providing for this amendment is hard to understand. But I think it is clear evidence that the status quo remains when it comes to special favors and when it comes to special interests.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. REHBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I am deeply disappointed in the lady from Connecticut. This is a program that has been in existence since 1994, and you voted for it every time. This is not an earmark. This is an existing program. And I've heard you rail all night about restoring money, which are all earmarks. You're dead wrong.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chair, doesn't the gentleman have to address the Chair?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Well, all right. I'll address the Chair, but I'll look over there.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I am going to say respectfully, this is an existing program, and the reason it was started is because Alaskan natives and the Hawaiian natives do not receive money from the BIA. It was started to recognize an inequity of those people that live in both of our States. It is not a new program, and this language as written is at the discretion of the Department as they see a need.

Like I say, I thought we were going to start a little bit of a bipartisan effort on this side, and I don't see it when those people will take away from some of the most impoverished people who have not had that opportunity.

So I am urging my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment. And I say to those that oppose it, shame on you. I have heard the bleeding hearts all night, and it deeply disturbs me that they would say this is something different when it is an existing program.

□ 2310

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished ranking member.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say to my colleague and friend, I might add, and my friends here, that this in fact is in the same category of a program as Teach for America, the National Writing Project, and other projects, just to name a couple, that have been designated by the majority as earmarks. This is the same category of programs. We cannot be talking about a series of programs on the one hand which are categorized as earmarks and then the other the same, in the same breath, then say these, because they are of specific interest to me or anyone else, that in fact then they are not.

If the majority is going to be true to it's principle—and it has been a very, very defined principle. It's one which I quoted specifically the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who made a special point of letting not only us but the country know that earmarks were not going to be a part of this continuing resolution. I did not say that. I have not stood here and made a claim that the problem with spending in this country is about earmarks and they should all be gone.

Now you either have to define the earmarks, stick to your definition and your principle, or don't. And then let's talk about Teach for America, the Writing Project, and the others that have been categorized as earmarks. Let's have a level playing field.

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

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. 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 Alaska will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1826. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Innovation and Improvement'' shall be $885,786,000, and no funds shall be available for activities authorized under subpart 5 of part A of title II, part D of title II, part D of title V, or section 1504 of the ESEA, or part F of title VIII of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

(b) The first, second, third, fourth, fifth, seventeenth and eighteenth provisos under the heading ''Department of Education, Innovation and Improvement'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1827. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Safe Schools and Citizenship Education'' shall be $191,341,000, of which no funds shall be available for activities authorized under subpart 3 of part C of title II or subpart 2, 3, or 10 of part D of title V of the ESEA.

(b) The first, second, and third provisos under the heading ''Department of Education, Safe Schools and Citizenship Education'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1828. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Special Education'' shall be $3,414,870,000, of which $3,168,654,000 shall become available on July 1, 2011, and remain available through September 30, 2012 (in addition to the $8,592,383,000 previously appropriated under such heading that became available on October 1, 2010), and an additional $8,592,383,000, to remain available through September 30, 2012, shall be available on October 1, 2011 for academic year 2011–2012.

(b) The first and second provisos under the heading ''Department of Education, Special Education'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1829. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research'' shall be $3,453,388,000.

(b) The second proviso under the heading ''Department of Education, Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1830. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Career, Technical, and Adult Education'' shall be $1,017,338,000, to become available on July 1, 2011, and remain available through September 30, 2012 (in addition to the $791,000,000 previously appropriated under such heading that became available on October 1, 2010), and an additional $791,000,000 to remain available through September 30, 2012, shall be available on October 1, 2011 for academic year 2011–2012: *Provided*, That of the amounts available for such heading, no funds shall be available for activities authorized under subpart 4 of part D of title V of the ESEA, or part D of title VIII of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998.

(b) The first, second, third, seventh and eighth provisos under the heading ''Department of Education, Career, Technical, and Adult Education'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1831. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Student Financial Assistance'' shall be $18,475,492,000, of which $17,495,000,000 shall be available to carry out subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and $980,492,000 shall be available to carry out part C of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The maximum Pell grant for which a student shall be eligible during award year 2011–2012 shall be $4,015.

AMENDMENT NO. 490 OFFERED BY MS. CHU

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 301, line 16, strike ''$4,015'' and insert ''$4,860''.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlelady's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved by the gentleman from Montana.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chair, I rise today to strongly support investing in America's future. I rise to present the Chu-Moore-Jackson Lee amendment to restore full funding to the Pell Grant program.

With this CR, the Republicans slashed the very funding that ensures every American has the opportunity to go to college. H.R. 1 does something that is shocking, especially in these tough economic times. It deprives millions of students of the financial support that they need to go to college. At a time when people are losing jobs, when people can't find jobs, when people are scared about whether they have a future, Republicans are cutting Pell Grant financial aid by 15 percent for students across the board. This is an astounding number.

If the Republicans gut this program, there will be 9 million students who will have cuts in their financial aid, endangering their ability to go to college. It is the largest cut in student financial aid in history. This will hit the neediest students hardest. In California, my home State, one-third of undergraduates—nearly 65,000 students—get this money for college. And most come from families making less than $30,000 a year.

But this is about more than just numbers and statistics. This is about real people and real students, whose real futures are at stake. Students like Chris Hamm who attends the University of Cincinnati. Chris' Pell Grant pays for a quarter of his college tuition. Without this money, Chris doesn't think he will be able to afford school and will be forced to drop out, leaving him few options in this tough economy.

Today, we know we are no longer in an arms race. Today, we are in a brains race. Every year, we are falling further and further behind other countries. Fewer Americans are getting a college degree compared to those from other countries. We don't have all the science, math, and talent we need to compete. America's ability to remain competitive in a global modern economy hinges on our ability to encourage and grow a highly educated workforce.

Gutting Pell Grants in this bill will only compound our future economic challenges and undermine the dream that we have for our young people to join the middle class. Pell Grants aren't just an investment in an individual student but an investment in the future of our Nation.

We need a comprehensive approach that makes strategic cuts in investments with an eye to the future. Instead, the Republicans are taking a meat ax to programs that are crucial to American competitiveness. This strategy is senseless and it is tragic. It is tantamount to telling our young people, You will not have a future.

Instead, we must win the future by out-innovating, out-building, and out-educating the world. We must train all Americans from every class and background to succeed in the economy of tomorrow. We must give them the financial aid that they need. So I ask Members to support this amendment and restore Pell Grant funding to our students.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. The amendment is not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, which states: ''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that I think that the point of order should not be considered in order because this continuing resolution looks at striking waste, fraud, and fat out of our budget. And I would argue that amendment No. 490 is in fact the bone, the nerve, the blood, and the sinew of our economy.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will confine her remarks to the point of order.

□ 2320

Ms. MOORE. I am, Mr. Chair, making the point that this amendment is in order because it deals with the continuing resolution which would slash the Pell Grant funding by $845 and that the purpose of this continuing resolution is to slash funding that is unnecessary in our budget. I would argue that this amendment should be made in order because the Pell Grant is the cornerstone of our Federal financial aid programs.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would again remind the gentlewoman to confine her remarks to the point of order.

Ms. MOORE. Will the gentleman restate his point of order?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized to restate his point of order.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, which states:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Montana makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California violates section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(j)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

The Chair has been persuasively guided by an estimate from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 239 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 301, at the end of line 16, strike ''$4,015'' and insert ''$4,860.''

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Montana reserves a point of order.

The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I respect the gentleman, but there were individuals who wanted to debate on the amendment of Ms. CHU, and I think we are allowed to do that except that the gentleman rose on his point of order and started speaking to it before we could strike the last word.

Will others be allowed to debate before the gentleman pursues his point of order?

The Acting CHAIR. The Members may offer pro forma amendments. But when an amendment is offered, there is no requirement that any point of order be reserved rather than pressed.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. So, if Members are on their feet, you would be kind enough to recognize them before the gentleman from Montana pursues a point of order, which he has already reserved?

The Acting CHAIR. A pro forma amendment may not be offered while a point of order is pending.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me say that I rise to join with the Chu-Moore-Jackson Lee amendment and that I now rise to introduce the Jackson Lee amendment, which also addresses the question of the Pell Grant. I would hope that my colleagues would be allowed to debate it. I consider this an emergency, and I will make this point as the gentleman makes his point of order.

Mr. Chair, let me just refer to where we are today because we are needing to be engaged in creating jobs. I am not sure what my colleagues heard in the last election, but what I heard was that we needed jobs.

It is clear—and I hope that we can see this—we have been here for 5 weeks plus, and the number of jobs that have been created by the Republicans is zero. So here we are now with a 15 percent cut on Pell Grants.

What does that mean?

It means that schools all around the Nation will not be able to provide Pell Grants to the individual students who need them. In fact, in my own district, with this 15 percent cut, this 5,550 going down to 4,705 will drastically impact students in my constituency.

For example, the cuts will jeopardize education and the future of 16,570 students who are currently dependent on Pell Grants in order to finance their education. 5,726 are currently studying at Texas Southern University and 10,847 at the University of Houston—16,570 in my district alone. Those from the State of Montana will lose their Pell Grants. Those from the State of Alabama, from the State of Connecticut, and from the State of Wisconsin will lose their Pell Grants. But the real insult is that this will stop the education of thousands upon thousands of students in the middle of their education.

Again, how many jobs have the Republicans created?—zero.

I always want to bring this chart, which is very hard to see, but we can see how many jobs we lost in the last administration. We are on the rise of creating jobs. In fact, the CBO said that our future is great. It will not be great with a misguided plan to eliminate $600 million from the Pell Grant program. It is absolutely absurd. For example, let me share with you thoughts from The New York Times:

> This CR is ideologically driven. We started with a $74 billion cut, but because the Republicans decided that it is preferable to abide by polls, they decided to move to a draconian and ludicrous $100 billion.

That means that $600 million was cut from Pell Grants.

In addition to an amendment that I did not offer, the NIH, we see that those grants that were competitive for fellowships and research have also been drastically cut at Texas Southern University and at the University of Houston, and many State institutions in Texas are impacted by the cuts of the NIH grants.

But this is the greatest sin: In a meeting that I had with my community colleges and my school districts, they were in complete panic about losing Pell Grants that will then impact on the wonderful upsurge of jobs from what we had lost in the last administration.

I would simply ask my colleagues: Why are we going down a pathway that would take away the growth that we have provided?

So I would ask, as we look to the future, that this be restored. My amendment and Ms. CHU's amendment—the one that I joined and the one that I intended to speak on—was, in fact, to restore these dollars.

A new Wall Street Journal survey of economists shows they expect the economy to expand at the fastest pace since 2003 but not with these draconian cuts. Why wouldn't they do as the President's budget has done, which is to get rid of the 2 percent tax cuts for the billionaires? We might be able to provide $600 million for students. But no. We want to, I guess, stand with ideological viewpoints and with individuals who say, I was sent here to budget cut.

You were sent here to govern. You were sent here to protect the American people. Students who will create the workforce of the 21st century, you are now telling them they can't get an education.

Let me say this: The Constitution reminds us of what a wonderful country we live in—a country that believes we all are created equal. We don't have the same economic opportunities, meaning the same wealth, but we do have the ability to access education through wonderful programs like the Pell Grant program. Now you're telling poor and low-income students the door is closed; the lights are out; you're not equal, and you don't deserve an education.

I would say that this is an abomination. Support the amendments that will provide for $600 million restored to the Pell Grants. I ask my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

H.R. 1, the Continuing Resolution making appropriations to fund the federal government through September 20, 2011 contains some very deep cuts that will be very hurtful to many Americans, especially those who are the most vulnerable—disadvantaged women and families, children, minorities, the elderly, and our nation's university students. The proposed cuts in the CR will have a disproportionate effect on the low-income and minority portions of our population.

As we face a large deficit and growing debt, we know that cuts will have to be made. And yes, some of those cuts will be painful. However, we must be careful not to place added burdens and cause greater harms to those Americans who are the most vulnerable and in need of our support the most.

The proposed CR calls for a 15 percent reduction in funding for Pell grants. Such a cut will reduce the maximum Pell grant award from its current level of $5,550 to $4,705. This would present a serious problem for institutions of higher learning, but more importantly, it creates a major hardship on students.

Current students who receive Pell grants would have to figure out a way to come up with nearly an additional $1,000 in order to continue their education. Students who have been accepted to school and have received their financial aid packages are also put in a position that would force them to find and secure additional funds for their schooling. Pell Grants provide the basic foundation of federal student aid and help more than 8 million students afford to attend college.

To some of us, $800–$1,000 may not seem significant. However, to a student who qualifies for Pell grant assistance, and relies on those funds, this would be a great hardship, potentially forcing students to take time off from their schooling.

In my district in Houston, TX, these cuts will jeopardize the education and future of 16,570 students who are currently dependent on Pell grants in order to finance their education—5,726 currently studying at Texas Southern University and 10,847 at University of Houston. 16,570 students in one Congressional District alone will be unfairly affected by these cuts.

In the entire state of Texas, 650,790 students currently enrolled in school will be forced to deal with unexpected financial hardships under this provision. In other words, in my state alone, the number of students negatively impacted by this drastic cut to Pell grant funding is more than the entire population of Washington, DC. Nationwide, more than 9 million students would potentially be impacted.

Mr. Chair, these cuts are an unnecessary and unfair hardship that will be forced on college students. These young men and women represent the future labor force of our country, and in these trying economic times, I believe it is extremely appalling for Members of Congress to purposefully jeopardize the educational and economic future of our country.

ESTIMATED STATE-BY-STATE IMPACT ON FEDERAL PELL GRANT PROGRAM

State or Area	AY 2011–12 $5,550 Maximum Grant			AY 2011–12 Difference at $4,705 Maximum Grant		
	Aid Available	Recipients	Avg. Award	Aid Available	Recipients	Avg. Award
Alabama	$772,900,000	178,348	$4,334	($127,700,000)	(184)	($713)
Alaska	$32,700,000	8,434	$3,877	($5,400,000)	(8)	($637)
Arizona	$2,221,700,000	601,345	$3,695	($356,500,000)	(337)	($592)
Arkansas	$416,200,000	94,780	$4,391	($68,800,000)	(97)	($722)
California	$4,330,700,000	1,038,137	$4,172	($704,000,000)	(980)	($675)
Colorado	$594,400,000	150,699	$3,944	($98,200,000)	(156)	($648)
Connecticut	$281,300,000	72,492	$3,880	($46,400,000)	(75)	($636)

ESTIMATED STATE-BY-STATE IMPACT ON FEDERAL PELL GRANT PROGRAM—Continued

State or Area	AY 2011–12 $5,550 Maximum Grant			AY 2011–12 Difference at $4,705 Maximum Grant		
	Aid Available	Recipients	Avg. Award	Aid Available	Recipients	Avg. Award
Delaware	$65,500,000	16,594	$3,947	($10,800,000)	(17)	($647)
District of Columbia	$165,600,000	44,606	$3,713	($27,400,000)	(46)	($612)
Florida	$2,563,500,000	587,309	$4,365	($416,200,000)	(388)	($706)
Georgia	$1,365,500,000	314,859	$4,337	($223,000,000)	(241)	($706)
Hawaii	$80,700,000	18,859	$4,279	($13,300,000)	(19)	($702)
Idaho	$211,600,000	48,803	$4,336	($35,000,000)	(50)	($714)
Illinois	$1,693,800,000	395,672	$4,281	($277,500,000)	(282)	($699)
Indiana	$802,900,000	204,045	$3,935	($132,700,000)	(210)	($647)
Iowa	$809,200,000	205,546	$3,937	($133,700,000)	(212)	($647)
Kansas	$316,500,000	76,782	$4,122	($52,300,000)	(79)	($678)
Kentucky	$593,300,000	138,742	$4,276	($98,000,000)	(143)	($702)
Louisiana	$578,200,000	130,187	$4,441	($95,600,000)	(134)	($730)
Maine	$133,000,000	31,503	$4,222	($22,000,000)	(32)	($695)
Maryland	$492,600,000	123,070	$4,003	($81,400,000)	(128)	($658)
Massachusetts	$575,600,000	136,517	$4,216	($95,100,000)	(141)	($693)
Michigan	$1,404,800,000	346,109	$4,059	($231,700,000)	(461)	($665)
Minnesota	$583,000,000	148,629	$3,923	($96,300,000)	(153)	($645)
Mississippi	$566,100,000	120,540	$4,696	($93,500,000)	(125)	($771)
Missouri	$736,600,000	179,451	$4,105	($121,700,000)	(185)	($675)
Montana	$104,700,000	23,896	$4,381	($17,300,000)	(25)	($720)
Nebraska	$171,400,000	43,355	$3,953	($28,300,000)	(45)	($649)
Nevada	$129,600,000	32,896	$3,940	($21,400,000)	(34)	($647)
New Hampshire	$86,100,000	21,354	$4,032	($14,200,000)	(23)	($661)
New Jersey	$804,000,000	185,446	$4,335	($132,800,000)	(192)	($712)
New Mexico	$274,000,000	66,784	$4,103	($45,300,000)	(69)	($675)
New York	$2,832,900,000	536,983	$5,276	($466,200,000)	(713)	($863)
North Carolina	$993,900,000	249,958	$3,976	($165,700,000)	(312)	($659)
North Dakota	$81,000,000	18,821	$4,304	($13,400,000)	(20)	($708)
Ohio	$1,499,800,000	366,549	$4,092	($247,900,000)	(705)	($670)
Oklahoma	$455,400,000	107,109	$4,252	($75,200,000)	(110)	($699)
Oregon	$459,600,000	111,109	$4,136	($76,000,000)	(115)	($680)
Pennsylvania	$1,226,500,000	302,255	$4,058	($209,900,000)	(804)	($686)
Rhode Island	$151,600,000	36,251	$4,182	($25,000,000)	(38)	($686)
South Carolina	$541,300,000	128,126	$4,225	($89,400,000)	(132)	($694)
South Dakota	$109,800,000	26,634	$4,123	($18,100,000)	(28)	($676)
Tennessee	$778,500,000	184,299	$4,224	($128,700,000)	(190)	($695)
Texas	$2,723,000,000	650,790	$4,184	($444,800,000)	(805)	($679)
Utah	$390,800,000	96,550	$4,048	($64,600,000)	(100)	($666)
Vermont	$55,200,000	13,301	$4,150	($9,100,000)	(14)	($680)
Virginia	$746,300,000	180,219	$4,141	($123,300,000)	(186)	($681)
Washington	$574,000,000	139,500	$4,115	($94,800,000)	(144)	($676)
West Virginia	$274,800,000	61,818	$4,445	($45,400,000)	(63)	($730)
Wisconsin	$486,000,000	119,192	$4,077	($80,300,000)	(123)	($670)
Wyoming	$51,100,000	12,284	$4,160	($8,400,000)	(13)	($680)
Puerto Rico	$1,258,000,000	270,060	$4,658	($195,800,000)	(535)	($717)
U.S. Territories	$71,300,000	15,628	$4,562	($11,700,000)	(16)	($744)
Total	$39,718,500,000	9,413,225	$4,219	($6,517,200,000)	(10,437)	($688)

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment to strike the provision of the Continuing Resolution, CR, that would significantly reduce the level of funding used by the National Institutes of Health, NIH, to fund competitive and noncompetitive grant programs. The proposed cuts would have a direct detrimental impact on students studying at institutions of higher learning.

Majority of the fellowships offered at institutions of higher education are funded by these competitive and non-competitive grants issued by the National Institutes of Health, NIH. Under the proposed Continuing Resolution, NIH funding would be cut by close to $1 billion. Such a cut would have a massive and immediate impact on the ability of students to continue their studies.

Many of the fellowships funded by NIH are multi-year programs, meaning that many of the students in receipt of these fellowships are studying in expectation of a certain level of funding. These students are dependent on these funds in order to continue their studies and pay their living expenses. Drastic cuts such as the ones proposed would leave these students in a very difficult situation financially, and in some cases, may even require them to put their studies on hold.

My district, the 18th Congressional District in Houston, TX is home to a number of colleges and universities, amongst those, Texas Southern University—a Historically Black College, and the University Houston system—a massive institution responsible for the education of over 60,000 students.

In 2010, Texas Southern University, a relatively small institution, received $895,228 in educational grants from NIH alone. The University of Houston, a much larger school, was able to offer close to 900 fellowships to students because of over $13.9 million dollars of grant funding received from NIH. Under the cuts proposed in the CR, approximately a thousand students in my district alone would be potentially negatively impacted.

These grants from NIH enabled students in my district at Texas Southern University and University of Houston to study and research in the fields of engineering, pharmacy, optometry, education, social work and other sciences. These students, and hundreds of thousands of other students across the country, are our future. They are actively taking steps to win the future for America, and the cuts proposed in this CR creating hardships that could lead to failure.

Not only will these cuts to NIH funding affect current students, but it will reduce the number of fellowships that colleges and universities will be able to offer to students in the future. We are living in a highly competitive global economy. If America intends to remain a global super power, we must arm our students with the knowledge and tools to remain competitive, specifically quality education. Cutting funding to these organizations will impose a great hardship on students striving to educate themselves in order that they may be competitive in a global economy.

Just a few weeks ago, during the State of the Union address, President Obama laid out his blueprint for how America can ''win the future.'' He acknowledged the need for America to tighten its belt and make difficult cuts to address our national debt Saying, ''we need to take responsibility for our deficit and reform our government.'' And I wholeheartedly agree—cuts will have to be made, and some of those cuts may be painful.

However, in the next breath, President Obama stated, ''The first step in winning the future is encouraging American innovation.'' The research grants and fellowships that NIH has been providing to students do exactly that. They allow American students to research and spur innovation, which is a long term investment in our economy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, which states:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

□ 2330

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I tried to craft my discussion in the form of an emergency. The loss of thousands upon thousands of

students' access to education, I consider that an emergency.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will suspend.

Will the gentlewoman speak to the point of order.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I will.

I consider this an emergency, and I would ask that this point of order be waived in order to provide for the thousands of students, Mr. Chairman, that are now going to stop school because of the $1,000, $800 they will lose. I'm asking the gentleman for a waiver so that this is based on an emergency and the fact there was no offset available that would not impact negatively other vital programs to make America equal. I'd ask for a waiver and I'd ask for this amendment to be accepted and the point of order to be waived.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Montana makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas violates section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(j)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

The Chair has been persuasively guided by an estimate from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Chu-Moore-Jackson Lee amendment for the continuing appropriations act, H.R. 1, because we're deeply concerned about the cuts to the Pell Grant funding contained in the continuing resolution which would slash funding by $845, a 15 percent cut, and, of course, this amendment would preserve the Pell Grant program and maintain the full award level.

I am, you know, again, just a little bit perturbed, Mr. Chairman. This cut, like so many cuts in the resolution, would disproportionately harm traditionally underserved communities. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, Pell recipients are more likely to be female, first-generation college students, and less likely to be white than those who don't receive the grants. In other words, Mr. Chairman, they kind of look like me.

Minority students also face disproportionate unmet need, meaning the amount that they still need to pay for college even after family contributions, parties, raising money from their churches, grants, nonprivate loans still will not meet their needs to go to college. Women sometimes come into college with more precarious financial situations. They're already parents and mothers.

Now, you know, if this country is prepared to just slide into irrelevancy in the global economic community because we don't educate our workforce, this would be the loss leading legislation to do that. Cutting the program is so counterintuitive to our remaining a first-rate power.

And what is our secret weapon in this country for staying on top? It's our diversity, our diversity to be competitive. We're women. We're blacks. We're Asians. We're Hispanics. We're Indians. We're Hmong. We bring different talents and abilities to the table, and our ability to educate these young people comes with our ability to provide a Pell Grant which levels the playing field for all students.

There's not a politician in this country that doesn't make part of their platform that this country has got to have a highly educated 21st century workforce. There's not a politician, Democrat, Republican, Independent, or any other stripe, that doesn't say and pronounce that education is the key, and yet we're not willing to provide the lubricant so that key can fit into the lock, and that is the resources to make sure our students can go to school.

This Pell Grant is that opportunity. Don't deny it to students. Don't deny it. Don't deny it, Mr. Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1832. Of the unobligated balances of funds made available in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 401A(e)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $986,433,851 is rescinded.

SEC. 1833. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Higher Education'' shall be $1,690,285,000, of which no funds shall be available for activities authorized under part A of title II, part B of title VII or subpart 1 of part D of title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965, section 1543 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1992, part H of title VIII of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, part I of subtitle A of title VI of the America COMPETES Act, or section 117 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006.

(b) The fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth provisos under the heading ''Department of Education, Higher Education'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1834. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences'' shall be $530,106,000.

SEC. 1835. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Corporation for National and Community Service, Operating Expenses'' shall be $0.

SEC. 1836. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Corporation for National and Community Service, National Service Trust'' shall be $50,000,000.

SEC. 1837. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Corporation for National and Community Service, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $68,000,000.

SEC. 1838. (a) Of the funds made available for ''Corporation for Public Broadcasting'' in title IV of division F of Public Law 111–8, the unobligated balance is rescinded.

(b) The amounts included under the heading ''Corporation for Public Broadcasting'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$0'' for ''$86,000,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$25,000,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$36,000,000''; and by substituting ''$0'' for ''$25,000,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 436 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

Mr. BLUMENAUER. 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:

Page 303, strike lines 3 through 9 and insert the following:

(b) For payment to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (''Corporation''), as authorized by the Communications Act of 1934, an amount which shall be available within limitations specified by that Act, for the fiscal year 2013, $460,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available to the Corporation by this Act shall be used to pay for receptions, parties, or similar forms of entertainment for Government officials or employees: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Corporation by this Act shall be available or used to aid or support any program or activity from which any person is excluded, or is denied benefits, or is discriminated against, on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, or sex: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Corporation by this Act shall be used to apply any political test or qualification in selecting, appointing, promoting, or taking any other personnel action with respect to officers, agents, and employees of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Corporation by this Act shall be used to support the Television Future Fund or any similar purpose.

(c) For taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, the allowance under section 611 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to an oil or gas well shall be calculated without regard to subsection (c) or (d) of section 613A of such Code.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Montana reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I'm sad to have to offer this amendment this evening. It's more unfortunate that if we're going to be subject to a strict interpretation of the House rules, I have a list of provisions already in this young session where time after time the majority has chosen to waive the rules since they were first adopted, when it served their purpose. If our colleagues are serious about cutting the deficit, they will not just allow the amendment to be debated, but they will vote upon it and pass it.

Mr. Chairman, the public doesn't care whether the deficit is reduced by closing a tax loophole or reducing spending. I'll bet it would rather stop another giveaway to large oil companies rather than cutting programs that are important to them. For that matter, I think the voters like public

broadcasting a lot more than they like Congress.

These funds for public broadcasting are absolutely essential to protect. It helps serve 170 million Americans every month. Especially important are the innovative programs for education, culture, and public affairs.

Make no mistake, the reduction of the funds that are contemplated by my colleagues in 2 years, eliminating public broadcasting support altogether, will damage all the stations, and, indeed, I think all of us listen to these stations ourselves. But it would particularly hurt the stations in rural and small town America.

First, small town stations rely more heavily on public funds than the stations in big cities like Boston, New York, Chicago, and even Portland, Oregon.

Second, not only do these smaller communities rely more heavily on the stations that are located there, but in rural and small town America, the circumstance is that it is much more expensive to broadcast to them. Taking an example in a region familiar to the Chairman, in our Pacific Northwest, for Oregon public broadcasting, which serves both our districts, it costs 11 times as much to broadcast to remote Burns, Oregon, than it does in the metropolitan area.

Public broadcasting is also the source of innovative journalism that you're not going to find anyplace else. At a time when large corporate newsrooms are cutting back on foreign affairs, for instance, public broadcasting, because of the generous support of viewers and support from the country itself, is being able to expand its foreign coverage.

□ 2340

I'll bet most of us in this Chamber today relied on NPR first thing in the morning as we were getting ready to go to work to be aware of the recent events, for example, in Egypt. It is particularly important for our children. Public broadcasting is the only source of programming that is geared to educate our children, not try to sell something to them. Pulling out this vital public funding stream is going to undermine that mission of educating our children.

And at a time when I would think that we would want to support public-private partnerships, taking away the essential contributions that the Federal Government has provided since 1967 undermines that public-private partnership where we see six, seven times the funding leveraged as a result of that public contribution.

Mr. Chairman, we've seen this movie before. The Republicans, when they came into power before, tried to shut down public broadcasting, and we have seen the American public push back. Just this last week, tens of thousands of people have called our offices entreating us to allow the funding to continue. I would strongly urge that there not be selective application of the rules to this amendment but waive, as the majority has done time and time again for their purposes, to enable this provision to go forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, the amendment adds a limitation to a general appropriations bill. Under clause 2 of rule XXI, such amendments are not in order during the reading of a general appropriations bill. The rule states in part: ''Except as provided in paragraph D, an amendment proposing a limitation not specifically contained or authorized in existing law for the period of the limitation shall not be in order during consideration of a general appropriations bill.''

Mr. Chairman, the amendment adds a limitation and is not specifically contained or authorized in existing law during the reading. The amendment, therefore, is in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment includes a limitation. As such, under clause 2(c) and 2(d) of rule XXI, it is not in order, as a matter of form, until the reading for amendment has progressed to the end of the bill.

The point of order is sustained.

Mrs. LOWEY. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. It's deja vu. Here we go again. This week, we are again fighting extreme efforts to dismantle the public broadcasting services that 170 million Americans use for news and education. In 1995 and in 2005, we defeated efforts to slash the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. How long will it take for some people to learn that the public wants Congress to focus on creating jobs, not laying off Burt and Ernie with GO-pink slips. My grandchildren are learning from not only old favorites like Big Bird, but also Maya and Miguel, Clifford the Big Red Dog, and a cast of other fun and educational characters.

Millions of Americans rely on public TV and radio for vital news in the community, and broadcasters leveraged $6 for every $1 in Federal funds. Do we want to live in a society in which the only characters that appear on children's programs are those who gross the highest profits rather than those who deliver the most compelling lessons to our kids? Or one where our news is delivered primarily from sources focused on their bottom line? Of course not. That is why I am so pleased to support this amendment to restore cuts.

In recent years, we have already cut funding for programs related to public broadcasting, including the Department of Education's Ready-to-Teach Program. We cannot abandon the Corporation for Public Broadcasting altogether. Republicans should be less preoccupied with silencing Cookie Monster and more focused on getting our economy back on track.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the hard work that the House Appropriations Committee has done in crafting a bill that in so many ways is making the tough choices necessary to bring back fiscal sanity to Washington. I am pleased that they have incorporated a bill that I had earlier filed in this session, H.R. 69, which also would eliminate taxpayer subsidies for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. There are a number of well-known accountability groups, such as the Club for Growth, Americans for Limited Government, and National Taxpayers Union, that have all endorsed this end of funding for taxpayer-supported broadcasting.

You know, if we go back in time, in 1967, when the Public Broadcasting Act was first enacted, the intent of that act was ''to provide telecommunications services to all citizens in the United States.'' Well, that has been accomplished. That was over 40 years ago. Now we have 500 channels on cable TV. People get Internet access on their cell phones. We have satellite, wireless available around this country. We have so many media options that are available now that were not available 40 years ago. So we have fulfilled the purpose of that Act.

Now that Republicans are in control of the House, we're getting serious about getting the budget under control.

There is some good programming that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting produces that I personally enjoy and like; but that's not the issue, whether we like it or not. It's whether taxpayers should subsidize this form of broadcasting. When something puts out good quality programming, like the corporation does, they could survive, if they wanted to go into the free market and get funding—whether it's selling advertising or something like that. They are perfectly capable of surviving, and not just surviving but thriving in the open market because they do have some good-quality programming. They don't need to rely on taxpayers.

And when you look at what a deep fiscal hole we are in now as a country—for instance, this annual deficit that we are in the middle of right now is going to be $1.6 trillion, the highest in the history of this country. The time has come to end funding for government programs that are no longer necessary.

So it's a matter of fiscal responsibility and fiscal sanity that the Appropriations Committee has produced this

amendment. It's not against the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; but it's for the taxpayers, saying, You don't have to keep subsidizing something that no longer needs the government crutch that it originally was given.

□ 2350

The amount of money we're talking about is considerable. For fiscal year 2011, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting appropriation is $430 million. For next year, it will be $445 million. And President Obama's budget request that was just submitted that we got on Monday asks for $451 million for 2014. That's almost half a billion dollars. When we have $1.5 trillion annual deficits, we have to get our budget in order. And the reason is because, by leaving money in the private sector, that will create jobs. Rather than the government and the favored programs having the money, if that can stay in the private sector, people can invest and create private sector jobs, and those are the jobs that Americans are really looking for.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon that the majority has, unfortunately, ruled out of order.

In this continuing resolution, the Republicans are trying to dismantle one of the most precious landmarks of the entire media landscape. Public broadcasting is an electronic oasis for learning in what has been called the vast wasteland of commercial television.

Now, why do I say that? Well, I say it because you just have to look at what is on commercial television from the perspective of a parent with children trying to ensure that those children are given the educational and informational programming that will help in their development.

Here's a short sampling of what was on television during the day today. There's a spate of daytime soap operas which are full of adult themes not appropriate for young children. Then there were programs on this afternoon such as ''Hoarding,'' ''Buried Alive,'' and ''The Babysitter's Seduction.'' Again, more programming not suitable for children. In addition, there was ''Hollywood's Most Shocking Breakups,'' and ''Dog, the Bounty Hunter,'' and they were not talking about Clifford the Big Red Dog.

Ladies and gentlemen, what we hear is that the private sector, private television, commercial television is taking care of the children's audience. It does not. The Cartoon Network is in no way to be compared to what is on the Public Broadcasting System from 6 a.m. every morning until 6 p.m. every night, 12 hours every day, something that parents can rely upon for their children to see which is educationally nutritious for their development. And it's on every television station, every public television station in the country, every single day.

Let me give you a typical day. On WGBH up in Boston, but on every other public television station, beginning at 6 a.m., it's ''Between the Lions,'' then ''Clifford the Big Red Dog'' and ''Arthur,'' followed by ''Martha Speaks,'' ''Curious George,'' ''Dinosaur Train'' and ''WordWorld,'' which brings us all the way up to noontime. The parents are happy. The kids have good programming that they're watching.

And then rather than soap operas in the afternoon, on the Public Broadcasting System, the kids get to see ''Sid the Science Guy,'' ''WordGirl,'' ''The Electric Company,'' and on and on and on until 6 every night.

PBS is really the children's television network, and generations of children and parents have benefited from this programming being on.

What the Republicans are trying to do is just end this era and just toss these families over to this commercial world, which is fine if you really do believe that Cartoon Network and other networks like that targeted at children for commercial purposes can in any way substitute for this Sesame Street diet that children have been on for more than one generation and have immeasurably helped, not just those that come from the white upper middle class, but in polling it's actually above 80 percent, whether your family is Asian, Hispanic, white, African American. All poll out at 80 percent in terms of what those parents believe about the benefit that comes from the Public Broadcasting System in the children's programming that is presented to those children.

So CPB doesn't just stand for Corporation for Public Broadcasting. It also stands for Children and Parents Benefit. And that's why it's important. And that's why it was important in 1967, and that's why it is important today. This has been the crown jewel in our national media mix when it comes to the children of our country. And this attempt to take out a meat cleaver and to cut this programming source off in a way that would harm those families in our country is a huge mistake.

Now, Mr. BLUMENAUER has attempted to offer an amendment that would have restored the full $460 million in funding for the Public Broadcasting System. But in turn, what his amendment would have tried to do is to go to the big tax breaks for oil and gas companies in our country.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARKEY. I would ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. And it's altogether understandable why the gentleman who did object objected because I know where he's coming from on this. He did not want to hear the next sentence, because the gentleman from Montana is someone who does believe that the tax breaks for Big Oil should stay on the books. It's $40 billion over the next 5 years, and he'd rather see a cutting of Big Oil be substituted by a cutting of Big Bird. Okay? That's what tonight's all about, just this misallocation of resources within our society.

And I understand why the gentleman from Montana doesn't want to hear those words spoken, but he should get ready to hear it over and over again. Big Oil is going to get all the breaks that they want, and it might come at the expense of children's television or poor people. But I will tell you this much. Grandma isn't going to get her lunch because of these people over here. And these guys want to continue to take Big Oil to lunch, but we're going to have a big debate about this as each and every day goes by.

I thank the gentlelady, and I congratulate the gentleman from Oregon for making this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Very briefly, and I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for confirming the strategy that is being used by our friends on the other side of the aisle. If it's good, if it has been good, it's time for it to go.

I'm going to join the gentleman in supporting the gentleman from Oregon's amendment and to cite Channel 8 in Houston, Texas, that compensates for bloody domestic fights on domestic or commercial TV during the day and doesn't expose our children to opportunities for learning.

I might add, the National Public Radio, as well, has its challenges. So I just hope that as we begin to understand that our economy is churning, that we will invest in our children, which the National Public Radio represents.

And as my friend from New York said, Big Bird is still alive, and other new characters have been utilized to teach children. Public broadcast equalizes opportunity for good education in preschool for children who are at home, or in home daycare, to give them an exposure to learning, reading, writing and colorful activities.

So let me just say that I'm sorry the gentleman's amendment was ruled out of order. It looks as if we have just turned our head away from investing in education—cutting Pell Grants, cutting NIH fellowships and scholarships,

cutting public broadcast. It looks like we've just said enough is enough with job creation and let's get rid of education as well. And I ask, of course, that this CR be defeated.

□ 0000

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1839. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Institute of Museum and Library Services, Office of Museum and Library Services, Grants and Administration'' shall be $265,869,000.

SEC. 1840. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $12,450,000.

SEC. 1841. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''National Labor Relations Board, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $233,400,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 410 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk made in order by the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 303, line 19, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $233,400,000)''.

Page 359, line 15, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $233,400,000)''.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I think it's important to put this discussion tonight in a little context.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle are fond of saying that we want to dismantle this and slash that and cut that. And the truth of the matter, Madam Chair, is that what we want to do is save. We want to save the American taxpayer and, yes, save the country. Because what is happening, and the American people know it, is that this Federal Government has for year after year after year and more over the last 4 years borrowed too much and spent too much and taxed too much, and it's destroying jobs. It is destroying jobs.

If you don't believe the words, all you have to do is look at the picture. The pictures show very clearly that's what is happening. This is 2006 down here when Speaker PELOSI came into power, and the amount of spending at the Federal level. And this is where we are right now, about one-third more under this administration, and this is where it is going. And the American people are sick and tired of it. And what they sent folks here to Washington to do is to decrease spending, to decrease borrowing, and to decrease taxes so that we can put the American people back to work.

That's what this is all about. It's not about some small program here or some large program there. It's about putting American people back to work and making the government the right size.

So I rise on my amendment, which identifies an agency that can only be described as anti-worker and anti-business and anti-jobs. You know what it is, Madam Chair. It is the National Labor Relations Board. It's a New Deal relic charged with conducting elections for labor union representation and investigating unfair labor practices. However, what has happened is that the board has gotten beyond any claims that it's a neutral arbiter of labor relations. And this starts with Craig Becker, the recess appointment, which means no Senate confirmation by the Obama administration, to lead the board. He has got huge ties to SEIU and AFL–CIO, and has proven to be very adept at carrying the water for Big Labor while siding against American employers and the American taxpayer. He could hardly be characterized as an impartial voice.

The out-of-control NLRB now is seeking to expand the board's role beyond current law. American businesses are under constant threat from the NLRB. They tried to push for card check, which is actually the ''Secret Ballot Destruction Act.'' You will recall, Madam Chair, that this was a bill that the Democrats, when they were in charge of this whole place, couldn't get through Congress so now they want to do it by rule. They want to enact it by rule through the NLRB. A remarkable, remarkable overreach. They try to rig the deck over and over again.

But the rigging of the deck is just what Big Labor needs at this point, because the private sector unionization is only about 7 percent in this country of our workforce. So a new influx of dues-paying members is needed for their contributions and for their political campaigns.

So my amendment is very simple. At a time of crippling national debt that destroys jobs, my amendment would defund the NLRB and save the American taxpayer $283 million. It makes sense, since this agency really has seen its role remarkably diminish. The NLRB's caseload has shrunk dramatically, by some estimates, a 40 percent drop in elections and petitions since 2001. And yet, while its role has been diminishing, its reach into America's workplaces and into America's pocketbooks has only expanded.

So a vote for this amendment would be a vote for America's job creators, and we would work to defund an agency whose time has really, really passed. So I urge the adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I seek time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. This is amazing. What a step backward for democracy if there was support for this bill. This amendment would actually eliminate all funding for the National Labor Relations Board.

The NLRB has been in existence for 75 years. Its functions are to protect the rights of workers to unionize or not unionize; to promote peaceful, productive relations between labor and management. It conducts secret ballot elections to determine whether workers want to be represented by a union. It investigates, it resolves complaints of unfair labor practices that are brought against both unions and employers. It protects workers from retaliation from exercising their rights. These functions are fundamental to democracy and a workplace. Why do we want to throw out the entire system with nothing to replace it?

If the amendment were adopted, what would take the place of the NLRB in determining workers' preferences about unionization? If workers are fired for joining a union, where would they go for a remedy?

The continuing resolution itself is bad enough as far as the NLRB is concerned. It cuts the board's budget by $50 million, an 18 percent cut to be made in the last 6 months of the year. So it really winds up being a 36 percent cut. It would have to furlough employees to get through the rest of the year, furloughs that could be as much as 3 months per each employee. Now, these are folks who want to really create jobs, and now we are going to lay off people. In other words, the CR has crippled already the ability of the board to protect workers' rights. It's simply about protecting workers' rights, and to shut down the board completely truly is a backwards step for democracy.

I urge the defeat of the amendment. And I certainly hope whatever the final appropriations legislation for 2011 ultimately emerges will ensure that the NLRB has enough funding to continue to do its job.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. This amendment sets a new standard of irresponsibility that I hope the House never again emulates.

Let's assume that a worker who is trying to organize a union is fired because of his or her union organizing activity, files a complaint against the employer for an unfair labor practice, and the National Labor Relations Board is in the process of determining whether that claim is right or wrong and what should happen as a result.

Or, let's imagine that a worker believes that he or she has not been properly represented by the union they are in, and they file a claim against their union claiming that the union has failed in its duty to represent that worker.

This amendment says that both of those claims and others will just stop in the middle. We will pull the plug from the adjudication of the rights of these Americans.

I frankly think that it's ironic that a majority which chooses to define itself in terms of its great devotion to the Constitution may be proposing an amendment that violates the due process rights of American citizens kind of on its face.

If you file a claim and a duly constituted adjudicatory body starts to hear that claim, my sense is the Congress cannot step in and interrupt that claim in the middle of its adjudication and take your rights away. But that appears to be what is happening here.

This is a precedent that would be inappropriate and even dangerous to the extreme in this regard: The principle that apparently informs this amendment is if Congress doesn't like something that an agency is doing substantively, we can pull the plug on the agency and not give it any more money in the middle of its deliberations.

Imagine for a moment if during the runup to the Wall Street meltdown in 2008 that those of us who were unhappy with decisions of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which we were unhappy with, said we're so unhappy with what the SEC is doing, we're going to defund that organization and stop the process of any investigations they are doing, stop the process of any decisions they are making. Just pull the plug in the middle of their deliberations.

□ 0010

I think that the majority would have correctly criticized us for an act of irresponsibility. We didn't do that. When we disliked the actions of the SEC, we came together and passed a law, the Dodd-Frank law last year, that tried to improve its operations. That is the way a responsible legislative body acts.

So forget for a moment about the consequences of this amendment for those who work for the NLRB or for those somehow engaged in it. Let's talk about the litigants, the workers, the employers, the unions, all of those involved here. The agency just disappears the day that this law is signed.

Yes, Congress has the power of the purse, but with power comes responsibility. This is an amendment which sets a new low standard of irresponsibility in this House. If we don't like the substantive decisions of an agency, then amend the statute they are operating under or litigate those decisions. But to pull the plug in the middle of decisionmaking that affects thousands of Americans is, frankly, an abuse of the power of the purse. I think it is unconstitutional or a violation of the due process rights of those litigants, and I would urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation. As my colleague from New Jersey has pointed out and the ranking member of the subcommittee, this amendment, to begin with, seems to make no sense at all. It is interesting, as the gentleman said, you pull the plug, but then everybody is left without a right. There is no private right of action. There is no place to go.

There were some 1,571 secret ballot elections for union representation last year that were supervised by the National Labor Relations Board to certify those unions, or to decertify unions in some cases where that action was taken in the secret election; and now there will be no remedy. You won't be able to decertify the union; you won't be able to certify the union.

There are employees every day who are fired for simply suggesting to their employer that they would like to have a union. That alone will get you fired over and over again in this country. That employee is now without a job, but no right of action to go back and find out whether that person was wrongfully fired.

The same is true if an employer wants to make an allegation of secondary boycott, which is illegal under the law. Where do they go for the remedy? Where do they go? There is no private right of action. It is contained within the National Labor Relations Act, and it is administered by the board.

So this amendment just sort of creates chaos; and it denies people rights, be they employers or employees, be they pro-union or anti-union, whatever it is. Whatever their situation is, this simply denies them the ability to take advantage of the law or to have the law administered in any way or fashion, and it provides really no alternative to them, because, as I said, this occupies the entire area for these individuals.

So I don't know if this law is a temper tantrum. I don't know if this law is just—I don't know what the hell it is. But clearly it doesn't address what might be legitimate concerns about the operation of the board.

The board has been controversial over the years and back and forth, and people have agreed and disagreed with its rulings and its actions. Or you might want to amend the law. But this amendment doesn't do any of this. And I would certainly hope that we would continue—when you look around at other countries, I think you would say this is a pretty successful system of managing labor relations in the workplace. It certainly took a history of actions that people considered wrong and dangerous and concerned about the economy, concerned about individual safety, concerned about the safety of workplaces and the ability of businesses to survive, and through the passage of the National Labor Relations Act regularized that so people had a place to go for their complaints and determine their rights.

So I would hope that Members of Congress would reject this amendment and maintain the rights of workers and employers to have their concerns addressed and adjudicated, if necessary.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chair, 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 Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1842. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Railroad Retirement Board, Dual Benefits Payments Account'' shall be $57,000,000.

SEC. 1843. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Social Security Administration, Payments to Social Security Trust Funds'' shall be $21,404,000, and in addition such funds may be used to carry out section 217(g) of the Social Security Act.

SEC. 1844. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for the first paragraph under the heading ''Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses'' shall be $10,675,500,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 304, beginning on line 3, strike section 1844.

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chairman, I offer this amendment because I am seriously concerned about the effect the irresponsible Republican spending plan will have on our Nation's seniors.

This amendment would stop the cut of $125 million to the Social Security Administration's operating budget. Slashing funding for the Social Security Administration is slashing money out of Social Security, plain and simple. Cuts to Social Security will directly affect our seniors, there is no way around it; and my amendment seeks to avert this impending crisis.

The funding in this irresponsible Republican spending plan is over half a billion dollars less than what Social Security spent in 2010 to process payments to seniors and carry out basic operations. But the cost of running Social Security in 2010 will not suffice for 2011. Our Nation's baby boomers are retiring each month, growing the number of seniors in the system and the number of claims Social Security must process each month. This continuing resolution leaves Social Security more than $1 billion short of what they actually need to help keep checks going out on time to seniors.

This irresponsible Republican spending bill creates an enormous funding shortfall that Social Security will not have to survive on for the remainder of the year. Both Social Security and the Office of Management and Budget have confirmed that these massive cuts would force Social Security to lay off nearly 3,500 employees, furlough other employees, and close their offices in States across the country for up to 4 weeks.

What does this mean for seniors on Social Security? It means that 400,000 seniors would not have their applications processed this year. It means that 290,000 people would not have their disability applications processed, adding months of wait time for newly sick and disabled workers with no other source of income.

It means that 70,000 fewer people will have their appeals heard, burdening seniors and the disabled with wait times of over a year before their cases can move forward and allow them to receive their benefits earned. And it means that there will be 32,000 fewer investigations to root out improper payments, fraud and abuse.

Each month Social Security processes nearly 500,000, half a million, yes, half a million, new applications from seniors and the disabled. Employee layoffs and office closures lasting a month would delay benefits to all those applicants, disrupting seniors' and widows' checks and delaying payments for those trying to live on a fixed income.

Furthermore, closing Social Security offices would create a backlog of applicants, so even when offices reopened they would be dealing with an ongoing backlog of applications affecting our seniors long into the future. Who knows when they would ever catch up on the claims.

Never in the history of Social Security has there been a backlog of retirement and survivors' benefit applications. This bill is certainly precedent setting. Without a doubt, it would create the first Social Security backlog in our Nation's history.

□ 0020

This bill would force the Social Security system to shut its doors for up to a month, something that will affect every person receiving Social Security payments. People will get busy signals or unanswered rings when they call their local offices for help. Seniors will wait weeks for appointments and wait even longer to access their hard-earned benefits. Make no mistake about it, the seniors we represent—the entire body here represents—will feel the impact of these cuts.

The majority is lauding the fact that this bill represents the largest spending cut in the history of our country. If they want to cut funding to satisfy that base, fine. But I will not stand for cutting Social Security. I will not support budget cuts balanced on the backs of our Nation's seniors and middle class that bail out the rich and comfortable. I urge defeat of this bill and the adoption of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Chair, the amendment proposes a net increase in the budget authority in the bill. The amendment is not in order under 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, which states: ''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I rise to speak against the point of order.

My amendment eliminates the extreme and irresponsible budget cuts to Social Security. These cuts will create massive gaps in Social Security's operating budget, leading to even larger costs in the future. My amendment averts this shortsighted downfall, creating a net budget savings that addresses the gentleman's point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. TONKO. These cuts pose real threats and force to Social Security Administration and senior benefits.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York will confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I ask that this point of order be waived. And on behalf of seniors in my district and seniors across this country who rely on Social Security, I ask that the gentleman withdraw his point of order. We cannot blindly cut Social Security in the name of reducing the deficit without regard to drastic consequences.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Montana makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York violates section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(j)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

The Chair has been persuasively guided by an estimate from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1845. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for the first paragraph under the heading ''Social Security Administration, Supplemental Security Income Program'' shall be $39,892,164,000, of which $3,402,164,000 shall be for administrative expenses.

SEC. 1846. Of the funds appropriated for ''Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses'' for fiscal years 2010 and prior years (other than funds appropriated in Public Law 111–5) for investment in information technology and telecommunications hardware and software infrastructure, $500,000,000 is rescinded.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 304, beginning on line 12, strike section 1846.

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I offer this amendment because I am seriously concerned about the effect of the irresponsible Republican spending bill on our Nation's seniors and most specifically on our Social Security system. If my amendment does not pass, $500 million will be stripped from Social Security. In this nearly 400-page irresponsible Republican spending bill, which has held no hearings, which was written and debated through the night and is being rammed through this Chamber, Social Security is put at risk.

The bedrock and foundation for so many of our Nation's seniors and retirement is Social Security; and yet this bill would steal half a billion dollars from the program. This is money that helps keep the lights on, the doors open, and the checks going out to those who earned it—those who worked hard and play by the rules. It goes to those who have rightfully paid into the system and deserve their return on investment. And it should not be taken away in the dead of night.

Nearly half a billion dollars, if stolen back from Social Security, will be devastating. In fact, we might as well put the sign on the door of Social Security now: Sorry, we're closed for business. That is because a cut of $500 million will lay off employees that process and mail these checks to seniors. It will furlough every Social Security Administration employee for a month or more this year. Every worker that works for the Social Security Administration could potentially lose his or her job for at least 1 month this year.

Most of my constituents might say, Well, I don't really know anybody that works for the Social Security Administration. What does that mean for me? Unfortunately, it means 400,000 people across these United States will not have their claims processed this year. Think of it. You're finally eligible for

Social Security. Your plan for monthly income and budget based on this program is disrupted. Perhaps it even allows you to retire completely after a long and productive life of work. You walk up to the office to apply, but you are greeted with a dark and empty building. Or perhaps you called to ensure your payments will soon be processed, and all you get is a dial tone. Nobody is there to answer.

This is unthinkable. Even more egregious, 290,000 disabled workers would wait months for their claims to be processed, threatening already vulnerable people with further insecurity. Or imagine you want to appeal your funding amount or there's an error in your payment. What do you do?

Something my office prides itself on is helping these appeals get heard and settled to give Social Security recipients their due payment and peace of mind. Under this irresponsible Republican spending bill, which will cut half a billion dollars to Social Security, some 70,000 appeals cases would cry out but nobody would be there to listen, nor would the Social Security Administration be able to clean up cases of fraud, abuse, and improper payment. This cut could actually cost the government more than it saves.

It is no secret that the majority in this body seeks to privatize Social Security. Their top budget-maker has already proven that in his plan. This provision in the irresponsible public spending bill is simply another brick laid along the path to Social Security's destruction.

President Bush proposed privatizing this program in 2005, and Americans said ''no.'' We were right to say '' no,'' as Social Security would have trillions in the stock market during the meltdown of the Bush recession lost. Instead, Social Security did not lose a single penny. That bears repeating. In the worst economic recession since the Great Depression, Social Security did not lose a single penny.

We must protect Social Security from being raided for short-term political gains. Without it, almost half of all our seniors would be living in poverty. It makes up 76 percent of the total income for middle- and low-income seniors. But it is not just the seniors who depend on Social Security. Families who have lost loved ones are able to survive on their loved one's benefits, including about 6.5 million children. Raiding Social Security would hurt them, too.

In 1934, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt uttered a quote that is as true today as it was 76 years ago. He said, ''We put those payroll contributions there so as to give the contributors a legal, moral, and political right to collect their pensions and their unemployment benefits. With those taxes in there, no damn politician can ever scrap my Social Security program.''

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Chair, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. The amendment is not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, which states: ''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard?

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I rise to speak against the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized and is asked to confine his remarks to the point of order.

□ 0030

Mr. TONKO. I want to be clear so that everyone in this House and everyone watching knows what a $500 million cut to Social Security will do.

On the point of order, Madam Chair, my amendment eliminates harmful budget cuts to Social Security, which actually saves more money in the long term than what is cut by the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York will confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, on the point of order, the Social Security Administration has said that an additional cut in their funding would lead to many local offices closing their doors, stopping all claims processing, and not being able to answer the phones for a month.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlemen from New York and Montana will suspend.

The Chair needs to hear the argument that the gentleman from New York is making.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, on the point of order, I am disappointed that the other side submitted a rule that doesn't allow an amendment to save this funding for Social Security and guarantee that checks go out on time; but they can right this wrong right now. My amendment will ensure that checks go out on time. It will ensure that we continue to save billions by allowing Social Security to continue to go forward.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York will suspend. The gentleman is not confining his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEINER. Madam Chair, I ask to be heard on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Through all of the talking and interrupting, the gentleman was addressing the point of order directly.

Madam Chair, the point of order alleges that, if Mr. TONKO's amendment is accepted, it will raise net budget authority in this line. In fact, as Mr. TONKO has said, if you will look at the net effect of reducing this line item, the net effect is to increase the amount of senior poverty, to increase the amount of seniors who are not getting Social Security checks on time and, therefore, raising the cost to society and ultimately raising the cost to the budget. In fact, unless you adopt the Tonko amendment, you will be agreeing not only to slash services to seniors but to increase the deficit by raising costs throughout the system.

It is directly on point, and it is important to understand that the points that Mr. TONKO is making about the quality of the service under Social Security impacts directly on whether or not this is net higher budget authority, which it is not. It saves money to endorse the Tonko amendment. This House should consider it on its merits, ''yes'' or ''no.'' This point of order should be ruled out of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Montana makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York violates section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5.

For the reasons stated in the previous ruling of the Chair, the point of order is sustained.

The amendment is not in order.

Mr. WEINER. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WEINER. Madam Chair, the support for your last three points of order rulings against Mr. TONKO has been relying upon the Budget Committee chairman's advice to the Chair. The Budget Committee chairman is someone who advocates on behalf of the majority for privatizing Social Security.

To explain to the viewers and to this Chamber what that means, it is that he believes and the Republicans believe, if you take Social Security, which is a guaranteed program that can pay 100 percent of all of its benefits for at least 26 years, and if you invest a portion of that in the stock market, it is a better policy.

It is on that person's advice that you have been ruling on the last few occasions that Mr. TONKO is out of order in trying to preserve that system that we have.

If there is an important debate in the context of the American budget in the year 2011, it is the one that Mr. TONKO is trying to engage: It is privatizing Social Security, which is what this side of the aisle, Madam Chair, seeks to do, versus keeping this program the way it is—the single most successful government program, arguably, in American history.

What Mr. TONKO and many of us are trying to do is to preserve that program. Let's have this debate on this

floor in an honest way. For months now, we've had this kind of strange shadow dance around the idea of the privatization of Social Security. Well, the chairman of the Budget Committee, not some fringe element of the Republican Party, has suggested in a book that they paraded around the country that they are going to offer the privatization of Social Security as the foundation for their budget.

Now, for the last three amendments, Mr. TONKO has been trying to engage that debate, and the Chair has said, in using the best judgment of the Budget Committee, it seems that his policies would increase the net budget authority in the bill.

Let's put that aside for a moment and have a real full-throated debate about whose side the different people in this Chamber are on with regard to this fundamental question of the security of the Social Security system. Let's review the bidding.

On one side, you have Democrats who have created, supported, and fought for the Social Security program ever since it was passed in 1933 and ever since the first check went out in 1935. We say it should be something that generation by generation is there for seniors. One group works; the seniors retire, and we support each other as part of that contract. It is fundamental to democratic values—I believe with a capital ''D'' but also with a small ''d.''

Then you have my Republican friends. They say, You know what? In watching the stock market, we think it would be a good idea to take a portion of that Social Security trust fund and sock it into stocks and equities and bonds. They make an argument that actually has an element of truth to it. They say, if you'd invested every dime of Social Security into the stock market since the beginning of the Social Security system, you would have had more money in it today, because they say, Look. The stock market has gone way up since 1933.

Yes, but as we all know, it didn't go like this (indicating). Let the stenographer note my hand going up. It went like this (indicating). Let the stenographer note a roller coaster shape.

So I ask: Do you want to be one of the seniors who retires in the dip of the roller coaster?

They apparently want to take that chance. My Republican friends want to take that chance. We Democrats say, No, this is not a program that seniors get wealthy on, but it's a safety net program—and it worked. It took, roughly, a 30 percent poverty level among seniors to the single digits that we have today.

Then they say, Oh, no, but it will never be there in the future.

The baby boomer generation, the biggest generation in American history. We've heard that one before. Huh-uh. The baby boomers had babies. Now they're the biggest generation in American history. Now they're paying in.

By the way, do you know what helps the Social Security program more than anything else? People working, people paying Social Security taxes, people on the job, which are all the things that they're cutting in this very same budget.

So, as Mr. TONKO tries to make that point and engage that argument, I see nothing but Members on this side of the aisle cowering under their desks and hiding behind Roberts Rules.

When the Chair makes her rulings, listen carefully. She says she is relying on the best judgment of the chairman of the Budget Committee. Now, I like the chairman of the Budget Committee. He is a fine man—his judgment, not so much. I think that we should have this conversation because, if there is a fundamental difference here, it is on Social Security and its future. We want it to be there.

So I say to people watching at this hour:

First of all, have a warm glass of milk. There might be other ways to get to sleep. I would say to you, think very carefully about what the budget debate is about. It's very easy to lose sight of page this, line that. What it is really about is a fundamental difference in philosophy.

On the Democratic side of this debate, we are saying let's try to build this country on a foundation of everyone having a safety net, of everyone having a basic opportunity, and none of us can really get too far ahead if we're leaving a whole bunch of people behind.

This debate is not new, and I will let someone else continue it.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I appreciate the comments from my colleague from New York.

Madam Chair, I think that one thing that comes out, the clarity that comes out of tonight's debate on this bill, is to look at what, in fact, the American people have asked us to do. They have asked us to truly work together to address what their top priority is, which is creating jobs and fostering economic recovery.

Again, as we listen to this debate that unfolded tonight, what we see is that, unfortunately, the majority's priorities are deeply out of touch with those of the country. Democrats are committed to reducing the deficit. We believe that we start by ending tax subsidies and special interest waste. We need to make programs accountable and end the ones that will not work.

But the challenge is not whether we address the deficit and spending, or not to do that. The question is: Where do we start? Do we start with slashing special interest waste and ineffective programs, or do we start with what helps the middle class, our businesses, our working families, with children, and with seniors?

We could have achieved cuts. We could have achieved cuts in spending in this continuing resolution.

□ 0040

It was where the majority decided to start to make cuts. What about those oil subsidies that we spoke about tonight, $40 billion over 5 years, and eliminating the 10 tax breaks for the oil companies? What about the $7.4 billion we can save over 10 years by shutting down the current practice that allows multinational corporations to avoid paying their taxes? What about cutting agriculture subsidies in half and saving $8 billion? What about the $3 billion a year we can save by saying to the pharmaceutical companies that you can no longer pay to delay in order for us to get cheaper generic drugs to market because it raises the cost of health care?

Let's do away with the $3 billion that we want to spend on an alternate engine for the Joint Strike Fighter. That's about $61 billion. That is approximately the amount of money that you are taking out of K–12 education, Pell grants where you lower the amount of maximum award that people could get, 9 million people trying to get an education, trying to be able to get that education in order to be able to get a job and to go to work, take care of their family, pay their taxes, and do the right thing. You say no.

Another 1.3 million, you say no to the Supplemental Education Opportunity Grant so that they can no longer get education. You take 218,000 kids off of Head Start. You lay off 55,000 teachers, you close down centers around the country, and you don't give youngsters the opportunity for early childhood education, and we know that that succeeds.

You tell seniors, up to 10 million, meals will no longer be served to you because you're a homebound elder, you can't get out. We're not going to do anything about low-income energy assistance for you—you're on your own.

It is, in fact, Washington to the country: Drop dead, is what you're saying to them, and all because there is no courage, no courage at all to go after the special interests and the tax subsidies that could overwhelmingly pay for the cuts that we need in order to be able to bring down the deficit.

That is what's wrong with this bill tonight. The issue is where do you start. Do you start to cut in that reckless rush to slash without regard to the impact on our economy, without regard for our businesses to create jobs, or the middle class or working families who are being responsible? They're doing the best for their families today. They're trying to educate themselves for the future. You are hitting families with children and the elderly, and that is your starting point. It is not our starting point. Therein lies the difference of Democrats and Republicans in this continuing resolution debate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair must remind Members that remarks must be addressed to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1847. Notwithstanding section 1101, and section 505 of division D of Public Law 111–117, section 505 of division F of Public Law 111–8 shall apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1848. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $459,653,000, of which $138,928,000 shall be for compliance assistance programs: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting ''$89,502,000'' for ''$104,393,000''.

SEC. 1849. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, Office of the Director'' shall be $1,128,800,000, and the fifth proviso under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting ''$495,609,000'' for ''$544,109,000''.

SEC. 1850. The amount provided by section 1101 for ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health'' is reduced by $639,463,000 through a pro rata reduction in all of the Institutes, Centers, and Office of the Director accounts within ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health'', based on the total funding levels for each such Institute, Center, and Office of the Director accounts (excluding the Common Fund). In addition, the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall ensure at least a total of 9,000 new competing research grants are awarded in fiscal year 2011 from all Institutes, Centers, and Office of the Director accounts within the ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health''.

SEC. 1851. Of the unobligated balances available for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Refugee and Entrant Assistance'' in division D of Public Law 111–117, $77,000,000 is rescinded.

AMENDMENT NO. 221 OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 306, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 1852. (a)(1) Section 4002(b)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''80'' and inserting ''131''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''20'' and inserting ''34''.

(2) Section 4002(f) of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) RULES RELATING TO ADDITIONAL WEEKS OF FIRST-TIER EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a State determines that implementation of the increased entitlement to first-tier emergency unemployment compensation by reason of the amendments made by section 1852(a)(1) of the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 would unduly delay the prompt payment of emergency unemployment compensation under this title, such State may elect to pay second-tier, third-tier, or fourth-tier emergency unemployment compensation (or a combination of those tiers) prior to the payment of such increased first-tier emergency unemployment compensation until such time as such State determines that such increased first-tier emergency unemployment compensation may be paid without undue delay.

''(B) SPECIAL RULES.—If a State makes an election under subparagraph (A) which results in—

''(i) the payment of second-tier (but not third-tier) emergency unemployment compensation prior to the payment of increased first-tier emergency unemployment compensation, then, for purposes of determining whether an account may be augmented for third-tier emergency unemployment compensation under subsection (d), such State shall treat the date of exhaustion of such increased first-tier emergency unemployment compensation as the date of exhaustion of second-tier emergency unemployment compensation, if such date is later than the date of exhaustion of the second-tier emergency unemployment compensation; or

''(ii) the payment of third-tier emergency unemployment compensation prior to the payment of increased first-tier emergency unemployment compensation, then, for purposes of determining whether an account may be augmented for fourth-tier emergency unemployment compensation under subsection (e), such State shall treat the date of exhaustion of such increased first-tier emergency unemployment compensation as the date of exhaustion of third-tier emergency unemployment compensation, if such date is later than the date of exhaustion of the third-tier emergency unemployment compensation.

''(4) COORDINATION OF MODIFICATIONS (RELATING TO ADDITIONAL FIRST-TIER EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION) WITH EXTENDED COMPENSATION.—Notwithstanding an election under section 4001(e) by a State to provide for the payment of emergency unemployment compensation prior to extended compensation, such State may pay extended compensation to an otherwise eligible individual prior to any additional emergency unemployment compensation under subsection (b) (payable by reason of the amendments made by section 1852(a)(1) of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Expansion Act of 2011), if such individual claimed extended compensation for at least 1 week of unemployment after the exhaustion of emergency unemployment compensation under subsection (b) (as such subsection was in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this paragraph), (c), (d), or (e).''.

(3) Section 4004(e)(1) of such Act, as amended by section 501(b) of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–312), is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (G) the following:

''(H) the amendments made by section 1852(a)(1) of the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011; and''.

(4) Section 4007(b)(3) of such Act, as amended by section 501(a)(1)(C) of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–312) is amended by striking ''June 9, 2012'' and inserting ''September 22, 2012''.

(b) The Secretary of Labor may prescribe any operating instructions or regulations necessary to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section.

(c) The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–205), except that no additional first-tier emergency unemployment compensation shall be payable by virtue of the amendments made by subsection (a)(1) with respect to any week of unemployment commencing before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d)(1) The budgetary effects of this section, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

(2) This section—

(A) is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-139; 2 U.S.C. 933(g)); and

(B) is designated as an emergency pursuant to section 3(c)(1) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010''.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the fourth quarter of 2010 pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. William D. Delahunt	10/9	10/13	Russia		1,620.00						1,620.00
	10/13	10/15	Belarus		681.03						681.03
							[4] 3,190.30				3,190.30
Howard Diamond	10/16	10/22	Israel		1,645.00				632.70		2,277.70
							[4] 6,632.29				6,632.29

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2010—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Keith Ellison	11/10	11/14	Morocco		337.34						337.34
	11/14	11/14	Nigeria		118.00						118.00
							[4] 11,114.60				11,114.60
Hon. Eni F. H. Faleomavaega	11/20	11/22	United Arab Emirates		786.00						786.00
	11/22	11/24	India		1,478.00						1,478.00
	11/24	11/27	Vietnam		916.00						916.00
	11/27	11/29	South Korea		580.00						580.00
							[4] 11,435.00				11,435.00
Sajit Gandhi	12/12	12/17	India		2,337.00						2,337.00
	12/17	12/20	Sri Lanka		561.00						561.00
	12/21	12/23	Pakistan		813.90						813.90
							[4] 9,672.90				9,672.90
Samantha Goldstein	10/4	10/6	Switzerland		922.71						922.71
							[4] 1,713.40				1,713.40
Mark Little	10/4	10/6	Switzerland		1,052.71						1,052.71
							[4] 1,713.40				1,713.40
	12/8	12/11	Mexico		1,038.00						1,038.00
							[4] 715.00				715.00
Vili Lei	11/20	11/22	United Arab Emirates		786.00						786.00
	11/22	11/24	India		1,478.00						1,478.00
	11/24	11/27	Vietnam		916.00						916.00
	11/27	11/29	South Korea		580.00						580.00
							[4] 7,205.00				7,205.00
Alan Makovsky	11/19	11/20	Kuwait		402.52						402.52
	11/20	11/22	Iraq				(3)				
							[4] 10,950.70				10,950.70
Mary McVeigh	12/9	12/12	Argentina		852.00						852.00
	12/12	12/16	Colombia		1,498.00						1,498.00
							[4] 3,336.20				3,336.20
Hon. Mike Pence	11/20	11/21	United Arab Emirates		245.00						245.00
	11/21	11/22	Iraq		20.00		(3)				20.00
	11/22	11/22	United Arab Emirates								
							[4] 10,522.10				10,522.10
Peter Quilter	12/9	12/12	Argentina		862.00						862.00
	12/12	12/16	Colombia		1,511.00						1,511.00
							[4] 3,336.20				3,336.20
Sheri Rickert	10/17	10/22	Kenya		1,359.00						1,359.00
							[4] 11,587.90				11,587.90
Algene Sajery	10/17	10/22	Kenya		1,556.00						1,556.00
							[4] 11,580.90				11,580.90
Daniel Silverberg	11/22	11/24	Poland		570.00						570.00
							[4] 3,006.00				3,006.00
Hon. Christopher H. Smith	12/10	12/12	Norway		560.00						560.00
							[4] 1,547.00				1,547.00
Jason Steinbaum	12/10	12/14	Kosovo		665.00						665.00
							[4] 3,370.60				3,370.60
Lisa Williams	11/20	11/22	United Arab Emirates		786.00						786.00
	11/22	11/24	India		1,478.00						1,478.00
	11/24	11/27	Vietnam		916.00						916.00
	11/27	11/29	South Korea		580.00						580.00
							[4] 7,205.00				7,205.00
Brent Woolfork	12/8	12/11	Mexico		1,003.00						1,003.00
							[4] 625.72				625.72
Committee total					33,510.21		120,460.21		632.70		154,603.12

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] Round-trip airfare.

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN, Feb. 1, 2011.

N O T I C E

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

508. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Emerald Ash Borer; Addition of Quarantined Areas in Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virgina, and Wisconsin [Docket No.: APHIS-2009-0098] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

509. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prevention of Payments to Deceased Persons (RIN: 0560-AH91) received January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

510. A letter from the Chief Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Regulation Restructuring: Issuance Regulation Update and Reorganization To Reflect the End of Coupon Issuance Systems (RIN: 0584-AD48) received January 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

511. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza [Docket No.: APHIS-2006-0074] (RIN: 0579-AC36) received January 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

512. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Loan Servicing; Farm Loan Programs (RIN: 0560-AI05) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

513. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Departmant of Defense, transmitting a report Pursuant to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Armed Services.

514. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Marking of Government-Furnished Property (DFARS Case 2008-D050) (RIN: 0750-AG44) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

515. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8167] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

516. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket IN: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8165] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

517. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a letter of notification to authorize an unconditional guarantee on a supply chain finance facility; to the Committee on Financial Services.

518. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Joint Final Rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations (RIN: 3064-AD68) received January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

519. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for the Handling of Retaliation Complaints Under the Employee Protection Provisions of Six Environmental Statues and Section 211 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as Amended [Docket Number: OSHA-2007-0028] (RIN: 1218-AC25) received January 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

520. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Commission Involvement In Voluntary Standards received January 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

521. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Interpretation of ''Children's Product'' [Docket No.: CPSC-2010-0029] received January 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

522. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Substantial Product Hazard Reports received January 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

523. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i) Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Huntsville, Alabama) (MB Docket No.: 08-194) (RM-11488) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

524. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Comission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, (North Pole and Plattsburgh, New York [MM Docket No.: 99-238] (RM-9669) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

525. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revisions to Forms, Statements, and Reporting Requirements for Natural Gas Pipelines [Docket No.: RM07-9-003; Order No. 710-B] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

526. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Direct Investment Surveys: BE-11, Annual Survey of U.S. Direct Investment Abroad [Docket No.: 100217100-0608-02] (RIN: 0691-AA74) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

527. A letter from the Under Secretary, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — U.S.-India Bilateral Understanding: Revisions to U.S. Export and Reexport Controls Under the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No.: 101222617-0617-01] (RIN: 0694-AF10) received January 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

528. 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; Sculpins, Sharks, Squid, and Octopus in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 0910131362-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XA156) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

529. 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; Pacific Cod by Non-American Fisheries Act Crab Vessels Harvesting Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 0910131362-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XA155) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

530. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No.: 100830407-0626-02] (RIN: 0648-XY51) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

531. 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; Inseason Adjustment to the 2011 Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Atka Mackerel Total Allowable Catch Amount [Docket No.: 0910131363-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XA129) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

532. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Amendment 20 and 21; Trawl Rationalization Program; Allocations for the Start of the 2011 Fishery [Docket No.: 101221628-0628-01] (RIN: 0648-BA40) January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

533. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Passenger Weight and Inspected Vessel Stability Requirements [Docket No.: USCG-2007-0030] (RIN: 1625-AB20) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

534. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Loan Guaranty Revised Loan Modification Procedures (RIN: 2900-AN78) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

535. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management, Office of Regulatory Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Herbicide Exposure and Veterans with Covered Service in Korea (RIN: 2900-AN27) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

536. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Certification of Factual Information to Import Administration during Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Interim Final Rule [Docket No.: 0612243022-1049-01] (RIN: 0625-AA66) received February 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

537. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Branded Prescription Drug Sales [Notice 2011-9] received January 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 733. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a Pancreatic Cancer Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BILBRAY (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H.R. 734. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the medical device tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. PITTS, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 735. A bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. RICHARDSON (for herself and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 736. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Build America Bond program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AKIN:

H.R. 737. A bill to terminate the Paul S. Sarbanes Transit in Parks Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. FARR, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 738. A bill to reauthorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 739. A bill to provide that no Federal or State requirement to increase energy efficient lighting in public buildings shall require a hospital, school, day care center, mental health facility, or nursing home to install or utilize such energy efficient lighting if the lighting contains mercury; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 740. A bill to require disclosure to the Securities and Exchange Commission of certain sanctionable activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 741. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the marketing of authorized generic drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 742. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Giuseppe Garibaldi and to Recognize the Republic of Italy on the 150th Anniversary of its Unification; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 743. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the work opportunity credit to small businesses which hire individuals who are members of the Ready Reserve or National Guard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 744. A bill to establish the National Commission on Women's Business Ownership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself and Mr. MACK):

H.R. 745. A bill to repeal the wage rate requirements commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MACK (for himself, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 746. A bill to repeal the wage rate requirements commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 747. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Build America Bonds program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. HERGER):

H.R. 748. A bill to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from authorizing the use of gasoline containing greater than 10 percent ethanol in certain vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 749. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the subpart F exemption for active financing income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 750. A bill to preempt regulation of, action relating to, or consideration of greenhouse gases under Federal and common law on enactment of a Federal policy to mitigate climate change; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. TERRY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.J. Res. 37. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to regulating the Internet and broadband industry practices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.J. Res. 38. A joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Robert P. Kogod as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.J. Res. 39. A joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Shirley Ann Jackson as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.J. Res. 40. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Stephen M. Case as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WEST, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. REED):

H. Res. 95. A resolution supporting the preservation of Internet entrepreneurs and small businesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. CRITZ):

H. Res. 96. A resolution recognizing the soldiers of the 14th Quartermaster Detachment of the United States Army Reserve who were killed or wounded by an Iraqi missile attack on Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, during Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the attack; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

5. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relative to House Resolution 2001 memorializing the intent to affirm the sovereignty of the State of Arizona under the Tenth Amendment; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AKIN:

H.R. 737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached legislation falls within Congress' constitutional authority to regulate interstate commerce pursuant to Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, clause 3, Congress has the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes. Under Article I, Section 8, clause 3 Congress created the Securities and Exchange Act of 1933.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate commerce among the several States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI to the United States Constitution.

Description: The first is ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises...'' and; the second grants Congress the power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Because this legislation adjusts the formula the federal government uses to spend money on federal contracts, it is authorized by the Constitution under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress its spending power.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Build America Bonds Extension Act is constitutional under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 provides Congress with the authority to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. The bill is also constitutionally authorized under the Necessary and Proper Clause, which supports the expansion of congressional authority beyond the explicit authorities that are directly discernible from the text.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill makes changes to existing law relating to Article 1, Section 7 which provides that ''All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.''

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.J. Res. 37.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution (''The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes'').

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.J. Res. 38.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, giving Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. That clause was cited as the authority for the government's ability to accept the original Smithson donation and the creation of the Smithsonian Institution via the Act of August 10, 1846.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper clause, which provides the power to enact legislation necessary to effectuate one of the earlier enumerated powers, such as the authority granted in Clause 17 above.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.J. Res. 39.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, giving Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. That clause was cited as the authority for the government's ability to accept the original Smithson donation and the creation of the Smithsonian Institution via the Act of August 10, 1846.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper clause, which provides the power to enact legislation necessary to effectuate one of the earlier enumerated powers, such as the authority granted in Clause 17 above.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.J. Res. 40.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, giving Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. That clause was cited as the authority for the government's ability to accept the original Smithson donation and the creation of the Smithsonian Institution via the Act of August 10, 1846.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper clause, which provides the power to enact legislation necessary to effectuate one of the earlier enumerated powers, such as the authority granted in Clause 17 above.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 10: Mr. REED, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 27: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 140: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 198: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 217: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. AUSTRIA.

H.R. 343: Mr. SCHILLING.

H.R. 358: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 362: Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 401: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 423: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 432: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 436: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. BERG.

H.R. 455: Mr. PALAZZO and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 458: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 459: Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 471: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 572: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 573: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 584: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 589: Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 601: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 605: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 638: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 651: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STARK, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 659: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 660: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 661: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 680: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 690: Mr. HANNA, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JONES, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MACK, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. MCHENRY, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 692: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 695: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 700: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 711: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 720: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. FORBES, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. PLATTS.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H. Res. 34: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BASS of California, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 36: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 57: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Mr. JONES.

H. Res. 83: Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 88: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KIND, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CHU, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1

OFFERED BY: MR. KINZINGER OF ILLINOIS

AMENDMENT NO. 584: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. No funds made available in this Act may be used to participate as a party in any lawsuit that seeks to invalidate those provisions of the Arizona Revised Statutes amended by Arizona Senate bill 1070, 49th Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess., Ch. 113 (Az. 6 2010) (as amended by Arizona House Bill 2162, 49th 7 Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess., Ch. 211 (Az. 2010)).

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2011 No. 25

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, the hope of the world, let Your kingdom come. Let Your will be done on Earth as it is in heaven.

Fill the minds of our lawmakers with Your truth so that they will labor for freedom with integrity and compassion. Lord, use them to establish Your rule in the life of our Nation. May they be guides who lead us away from sin, sorrow, and destruction, toward truth, justice, and peace. Shelter them in their coming in and going out, in their labor and leisure, as they seek to advance Your kingdom.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, February 16, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following any leader remarks, there will be a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each. That time will be equally divided and controlled between the leaders or their designees.

At 11 this morning, the Senate will resume consideration of the FAA authorization bill. As a result of cloture being filed yesterday, any germane first-degree amendments must be filed at the desk prior to 1 p.m. today in order for the amendments to be in order postcloture. We have the opportunity to complete this legislation tomorrow. There will be two cloture votes in the morning. We hope to be able to have some votes today. Senators will be notified when rollcall votes are scheduled.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

SPENDING FREEZE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, as the debate over government spending comes into focus this week, I think it is worth noting once again how this debate has shifted in recent weeks.

After 2 years of bailouts and stimulus bills, we are finally talking about how much government should cut instead of how much it should spend.

Obviously, the details matter. And we will be working those out in the weeks ahead. But the fact that this debate has shifted is a testament to the millions of Americans who insisted that their voices be heard on this issue. They have made a difference. It is important we acknowledge that.

Now the question shifts to whether those in power will actually follow through in any serious way. Will Democratic leaders in Washington really do something to rein in a government we can no longer afford or will they just pretend to and hope the American people focus on their words instead of their actions.

Unfortunately, the early signs are discouraging.

The President's response to the growing national alarm about spending and debt was a proposal to freeze government spending at the already-irresponsible levels that he himself has set over the past 2 years—levels that, if maintained, will only intensify the current crisis by putting us deeper and deeper in debt.

The consensus on the President's proposal is that it is both unserious and irresponsible, and that, despite what the President may say, he is not in fact treating this crisis with the seriousness it demands. The President even seemed to concede the point yesterday, saying his budget wasn't adequate to the task and suggesting that maybe Congress could do something more meaningful than he has.

And what do we find in Congress?

Well, we find one party in the House of Representatives making a genuine effort to cut spending and debt, and we find Democrats in the Senate announcing today that they intend to line up behind the President's timid proposal for a partial spending freeze.

In other words, Democratic leaders in Congress intend to join the President

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

in resigning themselves to a future of growing debts and deficits at a time when Americans are demanding cuts instead.

So here is what we have learned this week: on the most pressing issue of the day, the President and Democratic leaders in Congress have decided to take a pass. They are either unwilling to admit that Washington needs to live within its means or they are completely unwilling to make the tough choices that will get us there.

It is hard to believe, really.

Americans are screaming at us to do something about a $14 trillion debt, the President proposes a budget that nearly doubles it, and Democrats clap their hands in approval.

Maybe Democrats were so focused on passing their health care bill last year they didn't notice what has been going on in Europe.

Maybe they were so focused on defending their stimulus that they missed a national uprising right here at home about the spending and the debt they have racked up.

Maybe they missed the fact that while they were busy adding $3 trillion to the debt, nearly 3 million Americans lost their jobs.

Maybe they have been so focused on passing their agenda that they didn't notice the fact that the American people just repudiated their entire agenda.

They need to get real.

The men and women who were sent to Washington this year were not sent here on a mission to keep spending at the levels this administration has set. They were sent here to change the culture, to convince the administration that it needs to change its ways.

Democrats in Washington seem to think they can wait it out; that if they just agree to freeze current spending levels in place people will think they are listening. Don't they realize that current levels of spending are the reason we just had the biggest wave election in a generation?

The senior Senator from New York seems to think that anything short of freezing current spending levels is extreme.

I will tell you what is extreme: extreme is to insist in the middle of a jobs and debt crisis that government has to spend a trillion dollars more than we take in every year.

That is extreme.

Extreme is a view of the world that says government will not live within its means, even when the American people demand it.

Extreme is a view of the world that says the survival of this or that program is more important than the survival of the American dream itself.

Extreme is telling our children they may have to do without because we refuse to do with less.

So I suggest to my Democratic colleagues that they stop thinking about what they can get away with and start thinking about what is actually needed to solve this crisis.

I suggest they start listening to the American people who are telling us in no uncertain terms that a freeze will not cut it.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 15 minutes in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Madam President.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 361 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. INHOFE pertaining to the introduction of S. 360 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I understand the time for morning business has come and gone, but I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 20 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REGULATORY RESPONSIBILITY FOR OUR ECONOMY ACT OF 2011

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I recently introduced a bill called the Regulatory Responsibility for Our Economy Act of 2011—it is S. 358—and I would urge my colleagues who would like to, after hearing my remarks, to cosponsor this. I realize the bill is a mouthful—the Regulatory Responsibility for Our Economy Act—but I think it is appropriate.

This bill would strengthen and codify President Obama's Executive order from January 18. In that Executive order, the President made a commitment to review, to modify, to streamline, to expand or repeal—that is a lot of things, to review, modify, streamline, expand, and repeal—those regulatory actions that are duplicative, unnecessary, overly burdensome, or would have significant economic impacts on Americans. So the Regulatory Responsibility for Our Economy Act of 2011 would ensure just that.

My legislation would require that all regulations put forth by the current and future administrations—regardless of the President—consider the economic burden on American businesses, ensure stakeholder input—i.e., the people who are affected—during the regulatory process, and promote innovation. Back on January 18, the President signed an Executive order to do precisely that, we thought. It was for ''improving regulation and regulatory review.'' But the President also released a factsheet on the intent for his regulatory strategy. It was in detail. Per the factsheet, ''In this Executive Order, the President requires Federal agencies to design cost-effective, evidence-based regulations that are compatible with economic growth, job creation, and competitiveness.'' My legislation would ensure that would actually happen.

In addition, the President published an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal detailing the administration's commitment to reviewing regulations. As part of this op-ed, the President stated:

> We have preserved freedom of commerce while applying those rules and regulations necessary to protect the public against threats to our health and safety and to safeguard people in business from abuse.

But he also noted that—and this is the key:

> Sometimes those rules have gotten out of balance, placing unreasonable burdens on business—burdens that have stifled innovation and had a chilling effect on growth and jobs.

I must say I absolutely agree with the President. I was extremely pleased when he came out with the Executive order on January 16. And as I travel across my home State, I have heard Kansan after Kansan, regardless of the business, regardless of where they are on Main Street, who find themselves weighed down by the burden of too many regulations. As a matter of fact, I think if any Member of this Senate would like to get a standing ovation from even a group of five at a coffee shop or at a meeting of any organization that is business-oriented or just folks, you can talk about the debt, you

can talk about spending, you can talk about other issues, but the one that really grabs them is this business of overregulation.

This has been going on for too many years—too many decades. As a matter of fact, you can come into a meeting, and you will probably get the question—even the distinguished President pro tempore, the Senator from New York, would get the question, though probably a little nicer than I would get it, and certainly the other Senator from New York, who is now leaving the Chamber—the question usually comes as: PAT, what on Earth are you doing back there, saddling us with paperwork and regulations that are costly, burdensome, and that we don't even know about? All of a sudden, on a Wednesday morning we wake up and we face this regulatory dictate. It is counterproductive, and the cost outweighs the benefit. What is going on back there? What are you guys doing?

My response: Well, let's stop there for just a minute. I am not a ''you guy,'' I am an ''us guy.''

Clear back in the days when I was in the House of Representatives and I had the privilege of serving in that body, we were all trying to do something about unnecessary and burdensome regulations. So I have had a longstanding concern with the regulatory process, and that is the one issue that is a tinderbox issue. It is one where you really get an immediate response, with people saying: Amen. Somebody needs to do something about that. And they were so pleased with the President when he came out with the Executive order, saying: Hey, I am going to do something about this.

As of January 3, 2011, less than 6 months after the Dodd-Frank act was signed into law, regulators have issued over 1,000 pages of regulatory proposals and 360 pages of final rules. Talk about asking Senators whether they have read a bill, I know that nobody in the Senate has read over the 1,000 pages of regulatory proposals and 360 pages of final rules on the regulatory reform act. And many more pages of regulations—upwards of 5,000—are expected.

Regulations such as those put forth by the Department of Health and Human Services, along with the Departments of Labor and Treasury, have resulted in the child-only insurance market effectively disappearing in 20 States because of the regulations. The idea was to provide just the opposite but in 20 States today, that is not the case.

The Environmental Protection Agency began implementing its greenhouse gas regulations on stationary sources of energy that emit 75,000 or more tons of CO_2 a year, which, on its surface, aims to only regulate those largest emitters, such as powerplants and oil refineries, but it is only a matter of time—it is only a matter of time—before stricter regulations are handed down that will impact every corner of commerce.

Let me just say that the EPA—knowing, of course, that Congress said no to cap and trade—is trying very hard to go around the Congress to try to put forth these regulations into compliance with the law.

Last year, the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyard Administration—and everything has to have an acronym in Washington, but the one for that is called GIPSA—published a proposed rule that would change longstanding rules governing the production and marketing of livestock. This is an agriculture thing. This proposed rule goes far beyond what was intended in the last farm bill. In fact, a number of items in the proposed rule were defeated here on the Senate floor, and yet they were put in the proposed rule.

A number of private economic studies show the loss of gross domestic product is in excess of $1 billion—much more costly than the $100 million threshold required for an economic analysis to be completed. Unfortunately, an economic analysis is yet to be completed.

So I was encouraged, Madam President. I was a happy camper there for a little bit by President Obama's commitment to a new regulatory strategy. But the devil is in the details, and with staff help, after reviewing the Executive order, I must say I was left with some larger concerns. I was upset.

The Executive order states:

> In applying these principles, each agency is directed to use the best available techniques to quantify anticipated present and future benefits and costs as accurately as possible.

Wonderful. We will have a cost-benefit yardstick applied to all of the regulations pouring out of all the agencies in Washington. The distinguished Speaker of the House said the other day that we had 200,000 more Federal employees in Washington than we did 2 years ago. I can assure you they are not twiddling their thumbs. They are issuing regulations, and they tend to be agenda-oriented, not really getting down to sound science or determining the unanticipated effects of their regulations.

Picking up again on what the President said:

> Where appropriate and permitted by law, each agency may consider and discuss qualitatively values that are difficult or impossible to quantify, including equity, human dignity, fairness, and distributive impacts.

The partridge in the pear tree was left out.

Let me read this again.

> Where appropriate and permitted by law, each agency—

As they go through the regulations to determine which are counterproductive to this economy, costing billions in regard to manufacturing and businesses and harming our economy where it should not be harmed, they say, OK, but, but, but—

> Where appropriate and permitted by law, each agency may consider—

And this is the part where we ought to really take a look at it—

> values that are difficult or impossible to quantify—

How are you going to do that? How are you going to quantify values that are difficult or impossible—

> including equity—

Everybody is for that—

> human dignity—

I don't know anyone who is against that—

> fairness, and distributive impacts.

Now, try to figure that out if you are working in a Federal agency and you are trying to issue a regulation. If that isn't a loophole large enough to drive a truck through, I don't know what is.

As the Wall Street Journal captured so eloquently in their response to President Obama's editorial, ''These amorphous concepts are not measurable at all.'' You can't do it. You can't measure them.

On the surface, I think this language has the potential to be a very large loophole. This, coupled with an exception for independent agencies such as the FDIC, the SEC, or the EPA, has the potential to result in no changes at all. So we issue an Executive order saying: Let's take a tough look at the regulations that are so terribly counterproductive, and we may end up with nothing, more especially without the independent agencies. Note I said the FDIC. Note I said the SEC. Read Dodd-Frank, read financial regulatory reform. Read the reach into the small community banks and what they are going to have to put up with and hire a bunch of bad news bears—employees—to figure out and tell the rest of the employees how on Earth they are going to comply with these new regulations.

And my favorite, the EPA, which had the temerity and the unmitigated gall, after this loophole came out, to say: Well, none of our regulations even apply. Our regulations are just fine. I got news for the EPA. The chairwoman of the Agriculture Committee, DEBORAH STABENOW, and I have agreed to hold a hearing on this to determine just exactly where we are, and where we are is not good.

My legislation would close the loophole in President Obama's Executive order and would close other existing loopholes, including those that the administration has been using to bypass valuable stakeholder input on regulations. Again, there is that word—''stakeholder.'' That is a Senate word. Those are the people who are getting smacked right up alongside the face in regard to the regulations they do not even know adhere to their business or what they are about.

The President has also agreed—and here is the key word or phrase:

> Sometimes, those rules have gotten out of balance, placing unreasonable burdens on businesses—burdens that have stifled innovation and have had a chilling effect on growth and jobs.

The President went on to say, ''At other times, we have failed to meet our

basic responsibility to protect the public interest leading to disastrous consequences,'' precisely what I am trying to demonstrate here. My legislation would assure a review of these regulations to assure fewer burdensome and economically irresponsible regulatory actions on struggling businesses in the United States.

President Obama's Executive order ''requires the Federal agencies ensure that regulations protect our safety, our health and environment while promoting economic growth.'' So does my legislation. ''And it orders a government-wide review of the rules already on the books to remove outdated regulations that stifle job creation and make our economy less competitive.''

That is what the President's Executive order does, and so does my legislation.

The President said, ''It's a review that will help bring order to regulations that have become a patchwork of overlapping rules, the result of tinkering by administrations and legislators of both parties and the influence of special interests in Washington over decades.''

The President was right. My legislation would do this but would add some teeth to the commitment—sharp teeth—by cutting out the loopholes, the very loophole I read. I am not going to read it again. I defy anybody to tell me what it means or how anybody could use that kind of language in determining the cost-benefit of any regulation.

The President has made it his ''mission to root out regulations that conflict,''—and I am quoting here—''that are not worth the cost or are just plain dumb.'' That is pretty clear, if the President says these regulations are just plain dumb. I said ''counterproductive.'' That is the Senate word. He said ''dumb.'' That is the Dodge City word and I think Dodge City would agree. I think my legislation is something the administration can support. So while the President believes his Executive order ''makes clear, we are seeking more affordable, less intrusive means to achieve the same ends—giving careful consideration to benefits and costs,'' and that it ''means writing rules with more input from experts, businesses and ordinary citizens,'' there were a number of loopholes in the Executive order I am happy to address with the administration in my legislation.

My bill would keep the President accountable for another promise to Americans, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, the details of which I am happy to share with my colleagues. I hope we get a great number of colleagues to help us codify the Executive order, put some teeth in it, make it work, and get at regulatory reform as opposed to being disingenuous. I think that is exactly what has happened in regard to this, what turned out to be a very noble effort, but the end result had so many loopholes in it as to be completely ineffective.

I yield any time I may have.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

FAA AIR TRANSPORTATION MODERNIZATION AND SAFETY IMPROVEMENT ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 223, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 223) to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Rockefeller (for Wyden) amendment No. 27, to increase the number of test sites in the National Airspace System used for unmanned aerial vehicles and to require one of those test sites to include a significant portion of public lands.

Inhofe modified amendment No. 7, to provide for an increase in the number of slots available at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

Rockefeller (for Ensign) amendment No. 32, to improve provisions relating to certification and flight standards for military remotely piloted aerial systems in the National Airspace System.

McCain amendment No. 4, to repeal the essential air service program.

Rockefeller (for Leahy) amendment No. 50, to amend title 1 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include nonprofit and volunteer ground and air ambulance crew members and first responders for certain benefits, and to clarify the liability protection for volunteer pilots that fly for public benefit.

Reid amendment No. 54, to allow airports that receive airport improvement grants for the purchase of land to lease the land and develop the land in a manner compatible with noise buffering purposes.

Udall (NM) modified amendment No. 49, to authorize Dona Ana County, New Mexico, to exchange certain land conveyed to the County for airport purposes.

Udall (NM) modified amendment No. 51, to require that all advanced imaging technology used as a primary screening method for passengers be equipped with automatic target recognition software.

Paul amendment No. 18, to strike the provisions relating to clarifying a memorandum of understanding between the Federal Aviation Administration and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

Rockefeller (for Baucus) further modified amendment No. 75, of a perfecting nature.

Hutchison modified amendment No. 93 (to modified amendment No. 7), to provide for an increase in the number of slots available at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I wish to catch up the membership on the floor and off the floor a little bit about where we are. We are at midweek for a third week of consideration of the FAA reauthorization bill. Last night, Senator REID filed cloture on this bill. In a perfect world we would have finished this bill already without filing cloture, but we need to finish and that is what cloture motions are for. I will support cloture, needless to say.

Senator HUTCHISON also filed cloture on an amendment that will bring conclusion to a debate on slots at National Airport. I will talk about that issue in more detail later. But I am saying right now slots are very important but they do not need to consume all of the arguments and all of the discussion on the floor about this bill. They are a very small part of the bill—an important part of the bill, recognizing the West has to be served much better than it is being—but it is not the entire bill. It is a very small part of the bill.

Last night we disposed of two pending amendments by voice vote. I believe we have made progress to resolve some of the pending amendments, but votes will be required on several of them and I expect we will have those votes today. Senator HUTCHISON and I are trying to clear a number of other filed amendments. There were at one point 100 of them. I hope we can accept a number of them. I have heard from any number of my colleagues on their amendments and I am trying to be helpful in getting them adopted where they contribute to the bill.

I know Senator HUTCHISON is committed to supporting the bill. We need to resolve the issue of slots. She has been working—we have all been working diligently and almost exclusively on that matter, and we will do this with a vote. We will resolve that issue.

After that vote we will vote on cloture, which I believe will pass and I am extremely hopeful we will reach agreement to get this bill done this week. The farthest possible day and most unhappy thought would be if we had to go through the recess and do it on the day we came back. I think it is far better that we get it done this week. There is no excuse for not doing it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, we now have, I think, a glidepath to passing this important legislation. We worked late into the night, Senator ROCKEFELLER and I did, to try to accommodate needs, concerns, amendments of Members. Now we have the cloture motion in play and hope we can come to a real agreement on the Reagan Airport perimeter issue so we could even do it before cloture is invoked—but hopefully, if we are not

able to come to a complete agreement, we would at least be able to get cloture and move on.

I hope our Members know we are going to continue to work to address everyone's concerns. We have concerns of western Senators and concerns of Senators within the Washington, DC metropolitan area. We have small community concerns and we have eastern seaboard community concerns. We have been working for years, actually—but months and then weeks to address concerns. We are open to do that. But it is time to wind this bill up so we can go to conference with the House with a strong Senate position and do the big picture policy issues that need to be addressed.

We must have the next generation of air traffic control started. We must have a satellite-based system that is for the whole world—for the people coming into our country and the people using our airspace. We need to have the safety and the consumer protections that are in this bill. We need to have a responsible way for people from all over our country to come into Reagan Washington National Airport while also protecting the people around the area from congestion.

We have a lot of concerns. I think this is a good bill and it is getting better every day. I do think we can come up with the right mix that will put our aviation system in the forefront of the world because half of the air traffic of the world comes into and out of the United States. We certainly need to be the best and that is what this bill will put us on the glidepath to do.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTAL CARRIERS

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, the supplemental carriers provide a valuable and unique service to our economy as well as our military's ability to move troops and materiel around the world in a safe and timely manner. Current flight and duty rules for carriers recognize differences in operations and provide the necessary flexibility for supplemental carriers, given the challenging worldwide environments they operate in such as Afghanistan, Kyrgyzstan, Iraq, and other Middle East destinations.

Supplemental carriers have a long track record of safe operations. In more than 15 years, the National Transportation Safety Board, NTSB, has not cited fatigue as a primary cause in any nonscheduled/supplemental airline accident while flying under supplemental rules, 14 CFR Part 121, subpart S. There have been no fatalities attributed to any accident where fatigue was even remotely considered a contributing factor.

In the months preceding FAA's notice of proposed rulemaking, the agency's lack of interest in the operations of nonscheduled carriers led many to believe their unique operating procedures and status as small business entities would be addressed in a separate rulemaking. FAA issued its notice of proposed rulemaking, NPRM, to the public on September 14, 2010, and it was clear supplemental carriers were, indeed, covered by the NPRM, but the impacts of this proposal on supplemental carriers were not taken into consideration. This oversight is unprecedented. The FAA collected data from scheduled carriers to analyze their operations but acknowledged in the Regulatory Impact Analysis that it collected no data from NACA's nonscheduled airlines. FAA has a legal obligation to examine the impacts of this proposed rule on all segments of industry, which they failed to do. In the coming weeks and months I hope you will join me in encouraging the FAA to consider supplemental carriers flying under subpart S separately in the rulemaking proceeding.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I appreciate my colleague's concerns about how supplemental carriers have been treated in the FAA's rulemaking process dealing with pilot flight and duty time. As you are aware, modernizing the pilot flight and duty regulations has been one of the highest priorities of the FAA as well as many in Congress. In fact, when H.R. 5900 was signed into law last year by the President, Congress mandated the FAA complete the final rule overhauling these regulations by August 1 of this year.

I agree that all the regulated parties affected by this and other rulemakings should be treated fairly. I am willing to work with Senator INHOFE, Senator MURKOWSKI, and other interested parties to ensure supplemental carriers receive fair and thorough consideration, and that their industry data be considered, before any new rules for those carriers are promulgated.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator for his gracious commitment to insure that these carriers are treated fairly and in accordance with well established precedent.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Let me catch up a bit on where we are. The Senate has been working on this national slots issue for close to 1 year or it may be 10 years. I don't know. It has been an awfully long time. But we have been unable to achieve a resolution so far on the matter. That is a problem.

When we began consideration of the FAA reauthorization bill, Senator HUTCHISON and I decided we should focus on helping consumers. Everybody was talking about helping airliners. We were talking about people. Airliners fly around. People have to be able to do it. So we decided to focus on them.

So we both believed the growth of Western States must be recognized. I come from an Eastern State, sort of. The Presiding Officer comes from an Eastern State, totally. But the growth is in the West. They are underserved. That cannot be debated. It is embarrassing how few flights there are back and forth between National and them. The National Capital is a fairly important place. People need to go there, either for tourism or for business or whatever, and we need more access to the National Capital to be provided to the citizens from there on a ''bothway'' basis.

So time is running short for the consideration of the FAA package. This bill is too important to the country to let it languish over this issue. It is virtually all we have talked about, and I regret that because it does not reflect the nature and the priorities of the bill.

Unlike the national slot issue, the FAA bill has direct impacts on the whole Nation all the time. It will help our economy now. It will help our economy in the future with immediate job support and long-term impact on our role in the global marketplace.

To move forward on the bill, Senator HUTCHISON offered a slots amendment, a national slots amendment, that I feel offers a fair and reasonable solution on this issue. Over the past 2½ weeks, she and I have worked closely with other Members and their staffs in an effort to achieve a compromise on this issue.

Many of their needs and ideas have been incorporated into her amendment. It still may not be perfect, but it represents an attempt to fairly balance the competing needs of Members and their constituents inside and outside the perimeter. It is fascinating when people have it in their minds that something has to happen. They have to have so many flights or flights have to go to this city or that city or whatever. Then people sort of get attached to airlines. They feel they have to represent an airline.

I sort of thought we were here to represent the people of the States from which we come but, more importantly, in some sense, the entire country, particularly on an issue such as this.

Her amendment will permit some additional beyond-perimeter flights shortly after enactment of the bill. Then this very interesting part about the Department of Transportation, we have introduced that into the bill. It is a very good part of the bill. The Department of Transportation, which is neutral, which is professional, which is fully engaged in all of this, is required to study the effect of those flights over the next year.

Some people will say that is kind of a dodge. It is not kind of a dodge. Because slots are so controversial, it takes the Department of Transportation and their analysis to guide us about whether there is an overload at National, whether there is an underload. My own view is there is an underload at National, lots of slots available. But that is not the prevailing view on the part of some. They

feel we cannot have a single additional flight.

So DOT can study that. If they find there is no negative impact, a limited number can be added at the appropriate time or not, depending on what we want to do.

Specifically, the amendment provides network carriers an opportunity to swap existing flights they conduct within the perimeter and use them for flights to Western States beyond the perimeter. Seven round-trip flights could be converted under this provision.

Under this construct a carrier could use flights to large hub airports within the perimeter where significant service already is provided. This protects States and small communities within the perimeter and limits the number of new flights at the airport as requested by local officials.

The amendment also provides five new flight exemptions that would only be distributed to new entrant or limited incumbent carriers. To provide maximum flexibility for the carriers, these could be used for new flights within or beyond the perimeter. All of this is kind of opaque, like a puzzle, but it does happen to work.

We have had approximately 100 amendments filed to the FAA reauthorization bill. Much of the talk is focused on slots at National Airport. There are lots of airports, but National Airport has received the bulk of the amendments. I don't resent that or regret it. I just wish we could get to the rest of the bill, which I think is probably going to be entirely acceptable to people because it is a very reasonable approach.

Only three other amendments have been filed that directly address the issue of west coast access to National. The Ensign amendment would allow carriers to have unlimited conversions or swaps beyond the perimeter. I believe this proposal goes too far and could have a significant negative impact locally and for small communities serviced within the perimeter. I do think Senators ENSIGN and KYL, with whom I have worked on this issue over the past year, can appreciate this position and will receive opportunities for their constituents through passage of our amendment.

The Merkley and Wyden and Cantwell-Murray-Merkley-Begich amendments are the only other two amendments that have been filed with a focus on the issue of beyond-perimeter flights at National. They would both allow for new flight exemptions at the airport that would favor distribution to limited incumbents or new entrants. The Merkley amendment would provide eight new round-trips for beyond-perimeter service. The Wyden amendment would add 12 new round-trips beyond the perimeter and 4 new round-trips within the perimeter for a total of 16 new flights. While the Hutchison amendment may not provide the same level of opportunity for services to their States that they desire, her amendment does provide ample room for their constituencies to obtain new service with 5 exemptions rather than 12 beyond perimeter.

I believe we must strike an appropriate balance. We have no choice. We can't make everybody happy. Senator HUTCHISON's and my approach has been to go down the middle. People who don't want anything more and people who want a lot more, kind of edge them together and go right down the middle. That is all we can do in a bill of this sort where emotions run very high.

I do believe we must strike an appropriate balance between new service from incumbent carriers and service from limited or new-entrant carriers if we are going to give consumers the greatest options on choice and competition. Consumers are really what this is about. Airlines are obviously important. They are going to fly where the business is. That makes all of us—the Presiding Officer, for part of her State which is not in the New York area—very sensitive to rural situations. West Virginia is entirely rural. It has no city larger than slightly over 50,000 people, that being the State capital. Flights in and out of that State are very important to me. Most of them are done by propeller. Most of them are not particularly comfortable. But they do get one to where one wants to go. Now we have switched to Dulles so we can feed out from Dulles to anywhere in the world. Taking care of rural areas is incredibly important to us.

Again, the DOT study included in the amendment will also provide valuable insight into the impact of additional flights at National Airport on this or any other aspect of it. Under the amendment, if DOT finds that more access is appropriate, it can permit up to four additional flights at National. These would be provided to incumbent carriers to swap service from large hubs within the perimeter, resulting in no new air traffic at the airport. Senator HUTCHISON and I would like to emphasize those words, ''no new flights.'' They have room for flights. A GAO study showed that, really quite a lot of flights. But the prevailing wish is not to have noise and disruption.

The fact is, the planes are getting quieter, and they will get much more quieter as they are entered into all markets.

In total, as few as 12 or as many as 16 additional beyond-perimeter flights could result from the amendment over a 2-year period. If the DOT determines the initial 12 flights have had a direct negative impact on the DC market—I emphasize, we are putting DOT right on the case so they can watch it closely; whatever people might think, they are neutral and professional and they do this for a living—it will limit the likelihood of adding additional flights in future FAA reauthorizations. That makes sense. Let them be the arbiters of that rather than us battling it out here.

This type of review is long overdue and will provide far greater understanding of local needs by any carrier seeking access at National. If DOT finds there is enough room for up to 16 flights, the amendment would seek to balance them among various stakeholders. Eleven of these flights would be swaps or conversions of service to incumbent carriers already providing this, resulting, again, in no new traffic at that particular airport—there are other airports in the country; I have to keep telling myself that, but it is hard to recognize that looking at the debate so far—and minimizing the impacts of flights on a local basis generally.

Five of the flights would be dedicated to new entrants or limited incumbents to receive new exemptions. These could be used for service within or beyond the perimeter so all communities in the country would have an opportunity to obtain a flight.

In closing, I recognize every amendment addressing slots at National will be considered flawed in some corners. That is in the nature of our world. However, I do think it is important that we have votes on these amendments to determine a Senate position on this issue.

I believe the Hutchison amendment is a very reasonable offer. I hope it will obtain the support of the majority of the Senate.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 75, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of the Baucus amendment No. 75, as further modified—this is the amendment for the finance title of the bill we are on which was reported out by the Finance Committee last week—further, that the amendment, as further modified, be agreed to; and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 75), as further modified, was agreed to, as follows:

Strike title VIII and insert the following:

TITLE VIII—AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND PROVISIONS AND RELATED TAXES

SEC. 800. AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 801. EXTENSION OF TAXES FUNDING AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) FUEL TAXES.—Subparagraph (B) of section 4081(d)(2) is amended by striking ''March 31, 2011'' and inserting ''September 30, 2013''.

(b) TICKET TAXES.—

(1) PERSONS.—Clause (ii) of section 4261(j)(1)(A) is amended by striking ''March 31, 2011'' and inserting ''September 30, 2013''.

(2) PROPERTY.—Clause (ii) of section 4271(d)(1)(A) is amended by striking ''March 31, 2011'' and inserting ''September 30, 2013''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on April 1, 2011.

SEC. 802. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 9502(d) is amended—

(1) by striking ''April 1, 2011'' in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting ''October 1, 2013'', and

(2) by striking the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A) and inserting ''or the FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act;''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 9502(e) is amended by striking ''April 1, 2011'' and inserting ''October 1, 2013''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on April 1, 2011.

SEC. 803. MODIFICATION OF EXCISE TAX ON KEROSENE USED IN AVIATION.

(a) RATE OF TAX ON AVIATION-GRADE KEROSENE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 4081(a)(2) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (ii), by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting '', and'', and by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iv) in the case of aviation-grade kerosene, 35.9 cents per gallon.''.

(2) FUEL REMOVED DIRECTLY INTO FUEL TANK OF AIRPLANE USED IN NONCOMMERCIAL AVIATION.—Subparagraph (C) of section 4081(a)(2) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) TAXES IMPOSED ON FUEL USED IN COMMERCIAL AVIATION.—In the case of aviation-grade kerosene which is removed from any refinery or terminal directly into the fuel tank of an aircraft for use in commercial aviation by a person registered for such use under section 4101, the rate of tax under subparagraph (A)(iv) shall be 4.3 cents per gallon.''.

(3) EXEMPTION FOR AVIATION-GRADE KEROSENE REMOVED INTO AN AIRCRAFT.—Subsection (e) of section 4082 is amended—

(A) by striking ''kerosene'' and inserting ''aviation-grade kerosene'',

(B) by striking ''section 4081(a)(2)(A)(iii)'' and inserting ''section 4081(a)(2)(A)(iv)'', and

(C) by striking ''KEROSENE'' in the heading and inserting ''AVIATION-GRADE KEROSENE''.

(4) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Clause (iii) of section 4081(a)(2)(A) is amended by inserting ''other than aviation-grade kerosene'' after ''kerosene''.

(B) The following provisions are each amended by striking ''kerosene'' and inserting ''aviation-grade kerosene'':

(i) Section 4081(a)(3)(A)(ii).

(ii) Section 4081(a)(3)(A)(iv).

(iii) Section 4081(a)(3)(D).

(C) Subparagraph (D) of section 4081(a)(3) is amended—

(i) by striking ''paragraph (2)(C)(i)'' in clause (i) and inserting ''paragraph (2)(C)'', and

(ii) by striking ''paragraph (2)(C)(ii)'' in clause (ii) and inserting ''paragraph (2)(A)(iv)''.

(D) Paragraph (4) of section 4081(a) is amended—

(i) by striking ''KEROSENE'' in the heading and inserting ''AVIATION-GRADE KEROSENE'', and

(ii) by striking ''paragraph (2)(C)(i)'' and inserting ''paragraph (2)(C)''.

(E) Paragraph (2) of section 4081(d) is amended by striking ''(a)(2)(C)(ii)'' and inserting ''(a)(2)(A)(iv)''.

(b) RETAIL TAX ON AVIATION FUEL.—

(1) EXEMPTION FOR PREVIOUSLY TAXED FUEL.—Paragraph (2) of section 4041(c) is amended by inserting ''at the rate specified in subsection (a)(2)(A)(iv) thereof'' after ''section 4081''.

(2) RATE OF TAX.—Paragraph (3) of section 4041(c) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) RATE OF TAX.—The rate of tax imposed by this subsection shall be the rate of tax in effect under section 4081(a)(2)(A)(iv) (4.3 cents per gallon with respect to any sale or use for commercial aviation).''.

(c) REFUNDS RELATING TO AVIATION-GRADE KEROSENE.—

(1) AVIATION-GRADE KEROSENE USED IN COMMERCIAL AVIATION.—Clause (ii) of section 6427(l)(4)(A) is amended by striking ''specified in section 4041(c) or 4081(a)(2)(A)(iii), as the case may be,'' and inserting ''so imposed''.

(2) KEROSENE USED IN AVIATION.—Paragraph (4) of section 6427(l) is amended by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(B) PAYMENTS TO ULTIMATE, REGISTERED VENDOR.—With respect to any kerosene used in aviation (other than kerosene to which paragraph (6) applies), if the ultimate purchaser of such kerosene waives (at such time and in such form and manner as the Secretary shall prescribe) the right to payment under paragraph (1) and assigns such right to the ultimate vendor, then the Secretary shall pay (without interest) the amount which would be paid under paragraph (1) to such ultimate vendor, but only if such ultimate vendor—

''(i) is registered under section 4101, and

''(ii) meets the requirements of subparagraph (A), (B), or (D) of section 6416(a)(1).''.

(3) AVIATION-GRADE KEROSENE NOT USED IN AVIATION.—Subsection (l) of section 6427 is amended by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6) and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

''(5) REFUNDS FOR AVIATION-GRADE KEROSENE NOT USED IN AVIATION.—If tax has been imposed under section 4081 at the rate specified in section 4081(a)(2)(A)(iv) and the fuel is used other than in an aircraft, the Secretary shall pay (without interest) to the ultimate purchaser of such fuel an amount equal to the amount of tax imposed on such fuel reduced by the amount of tax that would be imposed under section 4041 if no tax under section 4081 had been imposed.''.

(4) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Subparagraph (B) of section 4082(d)(2) is amended by striking ''6427(l)(5)(B)'' and inserting ''6427(l)(6)(B)''.

(B) Paragraph (4) of section 6427(i) is amended—

(i) by striking ''(4)(C) or (5)'' and inserting ''(4)(B) or (6)'', and

(ii) by striking '', (l)(4)(C)(ii), and (l)(5)'' and inserting ''and (l)(6)''.

(C) Subsection (l) of section 6427 is amended by striking ''DIESEL FUEL AND KEROSENE'' in the heading and inserting ''DIESEL FUEL, KEROSENE, AND AVIATION FUEL''.

(D) Paragraph (1) of section 6427(l) is amended by striking ''paragraph (4)(C)(i)'' and inserting ''paragraph (4)(B)''.

(E) Paragraph (4) of section 6427(l) is amended—

(i) by striking ''KEROSENE USED IN AVIATION'' in the heading and inserting ''AVIATION-GRADE KEROSENE USED IN COMMERCIAL AVIATION'', and

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''kerosene'' and inserting ''aviation-grade kerosene'',

(II) by striking ''KEROSENE USED IN COMMERCIAL AVIATION'' in the heading and inserting ''IN GENERAL''.

(d) TRANSFERS TO THE AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (C) of section 9502(b)(1) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) section 4081 with respect to aviation gasoline and aviation-grade kerosene, and''.

(2) TRANSFERS ON ACCOUNT OF CERTAIN REFUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 9502 is amended—

(i) by striking ''(other than subsection (l)(4) thereof)'' in paragraph (2), and

(ii) by striking ''(other than payments made by reason of paragraph (4) of section 6427(l))'' in paragraph (3).

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) Paragraph (4) of section 9503(b) is amended by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting a comma, and by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraphs:

''(E) section 4081 to the extent attributable to the rate specified in clause (ii) or (iv) of section 4081(a)(2)(A), or

''(F) section 4041(c).''.

(ii) Subsection (c) of section 9503 is amended by striking paragraph (5).

(iii) Subsection (a) of section 9502 is amended—

(I) by striking ''appropriated, credited, or paid into'' and inserting ''appropriated or credited to'', and

(II) by striking '', section 9503(c)(5),''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to fuels removed, entered, or sold after March 31, 2011.

(f) FLOOR STOCKS TAX.—

(1) IMPOSITION OF TAX.—In the case of aviation-grade kerosene fuel which is held on April 1, 2011, by any person, there is hereby imposed a floor stocks tax on aviation-grade kerosene equal to—

(A) the tax which would have been imposed before such date on such kerosene had the amendments made by this section been in effect at all times before such date, reduced by

(B) the tax imposed before such date on such kerosene under section 4081 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on such date.

(2) LIABILITY FOR TAX AND METHOD OF PAYMENT.—

(A) LIABILITY FOR TAX.—A person holding aviation-grade kerosene on April 1, 2011, shall be liable for such tax.

(B) TIME AND METHOD OF PAYMENT.—The tax imposed by paragraph (1) shall be paid at such time and in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

(3) TRANSFER OF FLOOR STOCK TAX REVENUES TO TRUST FUNDS.—For purposes of determining the amount transferred to the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, the tax imposed by this subsection shall be treated as imposed by section 4081(a)(2)(A)(iv) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) AVIATION-GRADE KEROSENE.—The term ''aviation-grade kerosene'' means aviation-grade kerosene as such term is used within the meaning of section 4081 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(B) HELD BY A PERSON.—Aviation-grade kerosene shall be considered as held by a person if title thereto has passed to such person (whether or not delivery to the person has been made).

(C) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate.

(5) EXCEPTION FOR EXEMPT USES.—The tax imposed by paragraph (1) shall not apply to any aviation-grade kerosene held by any person exclusively for any use to the extent a credit or refund of the tax is allowable under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for such use.

(6) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN AMOUNTS OF AVIATION-GRADE KEROSENE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—No tax shall be imposed by paragraph (1) on any aviation-grade kerosene held on April 1, 2011, by any person if the aggregate amount of such aviation-grade kerosene held by such person on such date does not exceed 2,000 gallons. The preceding sentence shall apply only if such person submits to the Secretary (at the time and in the manner required by the Secretary) such information as the Secretary shall require for purposes of this subparagraph.

(B) EXEMPT AVIATION-GRADE KEROSENE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), there shall not be taken into account any aviation-grade kerosene held by any person which is exempt from the tax imposed by paragraph (1) by reason of paragraph (5).

(C) CONTROLLED GROUPS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(i) CORPORATIONS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—All persons treated as a controlled group shall be treated as 1 person.

(II) CONTROLLED GROUP.—The term ''controlled group'' has the meaning given to such term by subsection (a) of section 1563 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; except that for such purposes the phrase ''more than 50 percent'' shall be substituted for the phrase ''at least 80 percent'' each place it appears in such subsection.

(ii) NONINCORPORATED PERSONS UNDER COMMON CONTROL.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, principles similar to the principles of subparagraph (A) shall apply to a group of persons under common control if 1 or more of such persons is not a corporation.

(7) OTHER LAWS APPLICABLE.—All provisions of law, including penalties, applicable with respect to the taxes imposed by section 4081 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 on the aviation-grade kerosene involved shall, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this subsection, apply with respect to the floor stock taxes imposed by paragraph (1) to the same extent as if such taxes were imposed by such section.

SEC. 804. AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM MODERNIZATION ACCOUNT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9502 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM MODERNIZATION ACCOUNT.—

''(1) CREATION OF ACCOUNT.—There is established in the Airport and Airway Trust Fund a separate account to be known as the 'Air Traffic Control System Modernization Account' consisting of such amounts as may be transferred or credited to the Air Traffic Control System Modernization Account as provided in this subsection or section 9602(b).

''(2) TRANSFERS TO AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM MODERNIZATION ACCOUNT.—On October 1, 2011, and annually thereafter the Secretary shall transfer $400,000,000 to the Air Traffic Control System Modernization Account from amounts appropriated to the Airport and Airway Trust Fund under subsection (b) which are attributable to taxes on aviation-grade kerosene.

''(3) EXPENDITURES FROM ACCOUNT.—Amounts in the Air Traffic Control System Modernization Account shall be available subject to appropriation for expenditures relating to the modernization of the air traffic control system (including facility and equipment account expenditures).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 9502(d) is amended by striking ''Amounts'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (f), amounts''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 805. TREATMENT OF FRACTIONAL AIRCRAFT OWNERSHIP PROGRAMS.

(a) FUEL SURTAX.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter B of chapter 31 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 4043. SURTAX ON FUEL USED IN AIRCRAFT PART OF A FRACTIONAL OWNERSHIP PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby imposed a tax on any liquid used during any calendar quarter by any person as a fuel in an aircraft which is—

''(1) registered in the United States, and

''(2) part of a fractional ownership aircraft program.

''(b) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The rate of tax imposed by subsection (a) is 14.1 cents per gallon.

''(c) FRACTIONAL OWNERSHIP AIRCRAFT PROGRAM.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'fractional ownership aircraft program' means a program under which—

''(A) a single fractional ownership program manager provides fractional ownership program management services on behalf of the fractional owners,

''(B) 2 or more airworthy aircraft are part of the program,

''(C) there are 1 or more fractional owners per program aircraft, with at least 1 program aircraft having more than 1 owner,

''(D) each fractional owner possesses at least a minimum fractional ownership interest in 1 or more program aircraft,

''(E) there exists a dry-lease aircraft exchange arrangement among all of the fractional owners, and

''(F) there are multi-year program agreements covering the fractional ownership, fractional ownership program management services, and dry-lease aircraft exchange aspects of the program.

''(2) MINIMUM FRACTIONAL OWNERSHIP INTEREST.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'minimum fractional ownership interest' means, with respect to each type of aircraft—

''(i) a fractional ownership interest equal to or greater than 1/16 of at least 1 subsonic, fixed wing or powered lift program aircraft, or

''(ii) a fractional ownership interest equal to or greater than 1/32 of a least 1 rotorcraft program aircraft.

''(B) FRACTIONAL OWNERSHIP INTEREST.—The term 'fractional ownership interest' means—

''(i) the ownership of an interest in a program aircraft,

''(ii) the holding of a multi-year leasehold interest in a program aircraft, or

''(iii) the holding of a multi-year leasehold interest which is convertible into an ownership interest in a program aircraft.

''(3) DRY-LEASE AIRCRAFT EXCHANGE.—The term 'dry-lease aircraft exchange' means an agreement, documented by the written program agreements, under which the program aircraft are available, on an as needed basis without crew, to each fractional owner.

''(d) TERMINATION.—This section shall not apply to liquids used as a fuel in an aircraft after September 30, 2013.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (e) of section 4082 is amended by inserting ''(other than an aircraft described in section 4043(a))'' after ''an aircraft''.

(3) TRANSFER OF REVENUES TO AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.—Subsection (1) of section 9502(b) is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively, and by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

''(B) section 4043 (relating to surtax on fuel used in aircraft part of a fractional ownership program),''.

(4) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 31 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 4043. Surtax on fuel used in aircraft part of a fractional ownership program.''.

(b) FRACTIONAL OWNERSHIP PROGRAMS TREATED AS NON-COMMERCIAL AVIATION.—Subsection (b) of section 4083 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''For uses of aircraft before October 1, 2013, such term shall not include the use of any aircraft which is part of a fractional ownership aircraft program (as defined by section 4043(c)).''.

(c) EXEMPTION FROM TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS.—Section 4261, as amended by this Act, is amended by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k) and by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

''(j) EXEMPTION FOR AIRCRAFT IN FRACTIONAL OWNERSHIP AIRCRAFT PROGRAMS.—No tax shall be imposed by this section or section 4271 on any air transportation provided before October 1, 2013, by an aircraft which is part of a fractional ownership aircraft program (as defined by section 4043(c)).''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) SUBSECTION (a).—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to fuel used after March 31, 2011.

(2) SUBSECTION (b).—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to uses of aircraft after March 31, 2011.

(3) SUBSECTION (c).—The amendments made by subsection (c) shall apply to taxable transportation provided after March 31, 2011.

SEC. 806. TERMINATION OF EXEMPTION FOR SMALL JET AIRCRAFT ON NON-ESTABLISHED LINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—the first sentence of section 4281 is amended by inserting ''or when such aircraft is a turbine engine powered aircraft'' after ''an established line''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable transportation provided after March 31, 2011.

SEC. 807. TRANSPARENCY IN PASSENGER TAX DISCLOSURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7275 (relating to penalty for offenses relating to certain airline tickets and advertising) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d),

(2) by striking ''subsection (a) or (b)'' in subsection (d), as so redesignated, and inserting ''subsection (a), (b), or (c)'', and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) NON-TAX CHARGES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of transportation by air for which disclosure on the ticket or advertising for such transportation of the amounts paid for passenger taxes is required by subsection (a)(2) or (b)(1)(B), if such amounts are separately disclosed, it shall be unlawful for the disclosure of such amounts to include any amounts not attributable to such taxes.

''(2) INCLUSION IN TRANSPORTATION COST.—Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit the inclusion of amounts not attributable to the taxes imposed by subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 4261 in the disclosure of the amount paid for transportation as required by subsection (a)(1) or (b)(1)(A), or in a separate disclosure of amounts not attributable to such taxes.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable transportation provided after March 31, 2011.

SEC. 808. TAX-EXEMPT BOND FINANCING FOR FIXED-WING EMERGENCY MEDICAL AIRCRAFT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 147 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The preceding sentence shall not apply to any fixed-wing aircraft equipped for, and exclusively dedicated to providing, acute care emergency medical services (within the meaning of 4261(g)(2)).''

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to obligations issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 809. PROTECTION OF AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND SOLVENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 9502(d) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Unless otherwise provided by this section, for purposes of this paragraph for fiscal year 2012 or 2013, the amount available for making expenditures for such fiscal year shall not exceed 90 percent of the receipts of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund plus interest credited to such Trust Fund for such fiscal year as estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2011.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak about comments I have heard from both the chairman and the ranking member this morning about the FAA bill.

First of all, I wish to thank them for their hard work and diligence on this legislation. This hasn't just come now, this year; this is something the chairman and ranking member have been working on for several years.

I had a chance yesterday to talk about the NextGen system and how many jobs are going to be created from high-wage technology that is going to be used to modernize our transportation system. It is going to deliver flights that are probably 20 percent more on time, it will save us probably 5 or 6 percent on fuel, it is going to lower CO_2, and it is going to improve the experience for passengers. So I am all for the FAA underlying bill and I applaud my colleagues for their hard work in trying to make this legislation a reality and doing so this week.

I have concerns about the proposed Hutchison amendment. I know the Senator from Texas indicated she is still talking with people and working with people in an effort to make everyone happy. In this place I don't think we make everyone happy, but I thank the Senator for her willingness to at least on the floor say she is trying to make everyone happy, and I think she is probably sincere in her efforts.

I have been involved with this issue now for probably 3 or 4 years—not just the FAA bill but the slots issue and air transportation—and my former colleague, Senator Gordon Smith from Oregon, and I were involved with this issue and several years before that with numerous other members of the Commerce Committee. It is probably one of the thornier issues the Congress has to deal with, primarily because the issue is one that is fused both by issues of economic development around airports, as well as transportation interests of the flying public, and probably a little bit of a dose of what Members' own personal experiences and interests are.

For me, getting access to the West, to the Nation's capital, is an important issue. It is not the primary way I come to work every week. I actually fly in and out of the other airport in the region and do so—I don't know if I would say happily because, frankly, I think Dulles Airport—although I don't know what they have done lately, but they got rid of their mobile lounges and now have invested in some transport system where you probably walk as far on that system as you do on the previous system. There are people smiling on the floor. I think they have already been through it. I think they are saying, Yes, I have done that drill, and what is up at Dulles?

Putting that aside, that is the way I fly 80 percent of the time back and forth to the Nation's capital. I am pleased to have that flight schedule that accommodates me and actually accommodates many Washingtonians, because I think there are plenty of my Washingtonians who are coming back to the region to do business on a variety of issues in that corridor and see that as an access point as well.

The issue, though, is about whether the West has enough access to National Airport. In the past two debates we have had on this issue in 2000 and 2003, the Congress decided the West did not have enough access to National Airport. In both of those instances this body passed legislation opening more slots to the West through a process whereby the Department of Transportation basically decided what were the best areas of the West to service, which were the best networks to possibly service those areas, and how to get that traffic from one destination to the Nation's capital. In both instances, in 2000 and in 2003, when that very broad directive was given to the Department of Transportation, each time six new flight paths were opened to the Nation's capital, and I think that process worked very well. It worked very well because the debate was not here on the Senate floor about whose service was going to be delivered, but it was given to the Department of Transportation, the broad outline. In each instance, increasing access from the West to the Nation's capital is about having the flying public gain access to the Nation's capital and it is also about economic interests. That is why I still have concerns about this proposal on the table and about the fair access it may not provide to many people in the West.

In this particular proposal, unlike the two previous access issues in 2000 and 2003, in each point six new slots were given and the Department of Transportation had a fair and open process about it.

This particular proposal focuses on the airlines that already service the Nation's Capital, and in this case over 60 percent of the Nation's Capital slots are controlled by two specific airlines. This proposal would open those carriers's ability to trade out slots they already have with other cities, thereby giving them access to the West. In fact, the proposal of my colleague from Texas, even on those new slots, new incumbent carriers they are saying can give access to the West are carriers that are currently operating even inside the perimeter today. If you think this proposal is about helping access the West, it is primarily about accessing the West by people who already control the real estate at National Airport, which are two carriers.

I noticed the Department of Justice looked at this larger issue. That is because many of my colleagues who do not want to spend a lot of time on this—I guess I am glad I am educated on it, but I wish I had time to work on other things. The issue is, the national interest or policy question comes into play when you have access to what are limited footprint destinations, such as National Airport, such as La Guardia. Those are times when the U.S. Government has said we want to make sure there is a fair process about this because there is a small footprint and, obviously, if somebody controls too much of that footprint, it is an issue.

In the most recent debate, Delta and US Airways have been trying to do a swap exchange between La Guardia and DCA, and the Department of Justice says: Not such a good idea. You already own too much of the market share. If you want to do this, why don't you divest some of the slots you have now. Instead of doing that, the airlines are going to go down a path of continuing to accumulate and dominate in the East.

I hope my colleagues will take into consideration that I know the chairman and ranking member are trying to work in good faith, both on this issue and to move the bill forward. For this Member who wants to see a healthy transportation network, I am very concerned about the existing incumbents at National Airport continuing to dominate, with 60 percent of the market, and perhaps cancelling a lot of flights that they currently have now within this region only to benefit from the more lucrative long-haul flights across the country.

I am for a fair process. I think everybody should be able to bid on any new flights that are going to be put on the table. The two processes Congress followed in 2000 and 2003 were closer to what I believe, personally, is a more fair and open process.

I hope we can continue working and dialoging on these issues. I do think they are important. They are probably more important for the long run of what a transportation network system

looks like in this country, to be sure the consumer interests are taken care of and that there is a fair and competitive price.

I know some of the people who have been involved in this debate—probably not on the floor but out in the public—are talking about the amount of money airlines have invested in these airports, as if somehow that means they own the airports. The facts will show, in both these cases, the majority of money poured into the infrastructure at both these facilities is basically taxpayer dollars through bonding authority. It is not as if some airline owns the rights, owns the ability to control 50 or 60 percent of one of these airports just because they have paid for airport improvements. We all have been paying for airport improvements. As I said, I, personally, think the airport improvements made at Dulles are not so much of an improvement. I am going to continue with that and continue to fly through that particular airport.

I hope my colleagues will keep discussing this issue, and I hope we can get somewhere on it. My concern is that a proposal with conversion in it will mean many of my colleagues on the Senate floor will have their flights canceled to their favorite locations, and basically they will start servicing long-haul across the country with a very big share of the existing national market.

I hope we can do something that will instigate more competition, more diversity, and something that will help get this legislation passed.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A SECOND OPINION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor today because, on Monday, President Obama introduced his new budget. What we saw in that budget is, for the most part, more of the same—more spending, more taxes, more borrowing. We see this budget from a President who doesn't seem to understand the gravity of the Nation's fiscal crisis.

When we start digging down into the budget the President proposed and look into the Internal Revenue Service component of that budget, what we see is the Internal Revenue Service is starting to focus in and audit ObamaCare. There is a glaring difference in the budget this year from previous years because of the President's new health spending law. The IRS now has unprecedented power over health care in America.

In fact, when we take a look at this budget, and specifically the Internal Revenue Service's fiscal year 2012 budget request, over 250 times the Affordable Care Act—known in the budget as the ACA but known by people all across the country as ObamaCare—is mentioned. Over 250 times.

To me, the goal of the health care law has been to let people all across this country get the care they need from the doctors they want at a price they can afford.

As a member of my party, looking at our economy, looking at the deficit, looking at the incredible debt, what I think we need to do is make it cheaper and easier to create private sector jobs in this country. That is the way we get the economy going again. But when I read this budget, and specifically IRS requests, it seems to me it is making it harder and more expensive to create private sector jobs in our country.

The people of this country are not taxed too little. The problem is that the government spends too much. When I take a look at this budget, that is exactly what I see being rejected by this administration because it seems this administration is more interested in taxing, in raising taxes, rather than cutting spending.

When you take a look at what the IRS says in the budget, it says:

> The implementation of the Affordable Care Act of 2010 presents a major challenge to the Internal Revenue Service.

This is the IRS talking about the law that was crammed down the throats of the American people in the middle of the night, written behind closed doors. We are all familiar with it. Now it is presenting a major challenge to the Internal Revenue Service.

The Internal Revenue Service goes on to say:

> This law represents the largest set of tax law changes in more than 20 years, with more than 40 provisions that amend the tax laws.

The Wall Street Journal reported earlier this week that the budget gives the IRS the ability to hire 5,000 new workers. After taking a close look at the IRS's plans, we know they will have to hire over 1,000 new IRS bureaucrats, Washington bureaucrats, to implement ObamaCare measures. What are some of those that we are now going to have IRS agents coming and looking into? One is the tanning tax, the component that promotes compliance with the new excise tax on tanning facilities. The IRS is requesting another $1.5 million and requesting 81 more full-time equivalents to go ahead and implement this tanning tax. For oversight—they call it ''strengthen oversight of exempt hospitals.'' These are tax-exempt hospitals, hospitals that do not pay taxes, but to do an oversight of these hospitals, they want another $9.9 million and another 84 full-time employees. For the new health coverage information reporting, they want $34 million and 100 full-time employees. For something I call ObamaCare 101—assisting taxpayers in understanding the new provisions—the IRS is requesting $22.2 million and hiring another 150 full-time equivalents. And then, of course, for the call centers, IRS call centers—so if someone has a question, they can call and ask a question—they want another $15 million because of the complexity of this new health care law that is going to be difficult for people to understand.

The American people and small business owners—and those are the job creators of this country—want the IRS to make their lives easier, not tougher, not audit their health care choices and health care decisions. But adding hundreds of new jobs and millions of new dollars to the IRS is not going to make health care better. It is not going to make care more available for anyone.

I am going to continue to come to the floor with a doctor's second opinion to fight to repeal and replace this health care law and to do it with patient-centered reforms that help the private sector, not the IRS, create more jobs.

This morning, we had a little event called Wyoming Wednesdays where people from Wyoming who are here come together in Senator ENZI's office, and we have coffee and doughnuts and visit.

One of the people here from Wyoming said: I saw a sign that was worrisome.

I said: What is the sign?

He said that this location where they are putting in offices used to be a parking lot. When you are replacing a parking lot with more offices for more Washington bureaucrats, that is not a good sign for the rest of America.

Here we have the IRS saying they are dealing with a major challenge because of the health care law. It represents the largest tax law change in more than 20 years. More than 40 provisions are being amended in the tax law to go after things. They want this kind of money to implement the tax changes with regard to the indoor tanning services—81 new full-time equivalents—and they say what is involved in this. The IRS says there are as many as 25,000 businesses that provide indoor tanning services they are now going to tax, including about 10,000 businesses that offer tanning services along with other services such as spas, health clubs, and beauty salons.

We are here in the Senate, in Congress, with 9 percent unemployment in this country, with people looking for work, and more government jobs are being created, and these people are creating government jobs to make it harder on small businesses. It gets right to the crux of it right here because the IRS even says these entities, all these tanning entities, typically do not have experience filing Federal excise tax returns. So what is the government going to do? Come in, make them file claims and forms they do not have experience with. It is going to be costly; it is

going to take time; it is going to increase taxes. That is not a way to create new jobs.

They want 10 million more dollars to strengthen oversight on tax-exempt hospitals. These are tax-exempt hospitals. Why are the American taxpayers being asked to pay another $10 million to hire 84 full-time equivalents to deal with tax-exempt hospitals? Because, according to the law that was crammed down the throats of the American people, the IRS is now required to review at least every 3 years the benefit activities of tax-exempt hospital organizations, which number about 5,100 in this country. They actually say in the budget request by the IRS, as part of the President's budget that was submitted on Monday:

> These are new requirements for tax-exempt hospitals which include a majority of hospitals in the United States.

We are going to increase taxpayer dollars going for more IRS auditors and make it harder and more burdensome on the tax-exempt hospitals in terms of paperwork and what they need to do.

It goes on and on. That is why the American people are fed up with what is happening in Washington.

Let's talk a little bit about the CLASS Act because there is a whole component of the budget wanting 30 staff members added to the health department office overseeing implementation of what is called the CLASS Act. That stands for community living assistance services and supports.

The President's own debt commission—remember, the President appointed this commission about a year ago to say: Let's look into the debt. People thought that was a bold move, a bipartisan move, a lot of people coming together to take a look at this debt. For a year, the President said: We have a debt commission looking into this, so he did not deal with the debt. Now that the debt commission came out with its report in December, the President has mostly ignored it. Yet the debt commission—it was bipartisan, chaired by Erskine Bowles, a former Chief of Staff of the White House for Bill Clinton, and Al Simpson, a former Senator from my State of Wyoming—came out, took a look at the health care law, and specifically honed in on this CLASS Act.

One of the Members of this Senate, a colleague on the opposite side of the aisle, someone who voted for the health care law, called it a Ponzi scheme that Bernie Madoff would be proud of.

The President's budget commission, the bipartisan budget commission, looked at it, and they have significant concerns about the sustainability of the program and called for the program to either be repealed or reformed because it is not sustainable. They have raised concerns. People on both sides of the aisle have raised concerns. Yet the Secretary of Health and Human Services has, in her budget, money for 30 additional staff members added to the health department offices. Why? To go over the details of this act that people say ought to be repealed because, as it says, the details of the CLASS Act—they want to spend $93.5 million informing and educating people about the CLASS Act. I can tell them right now it is unsustainable, it is irresponsible, and it is something that should be repealed. Yet the Department of Health and Human Services wants to spend over $93 million of taxpayer money to inform and educate the public about this component of the health care law that people on both sides of the aisle think needs to go away.

Finally, as someone who believes this health care law is bad for patients, bad for providers—the nurses and doctors who take care of those patients—and bad for the taxpayers—what we saw in the President's budget that came out Monday, coming out for next year, is it is asking for over 1,000 new IRS agents to go ahead and implement the various components and responsibilities that have been put on their heads by this health care law. This is only the beginning. The entire health care law does not really come fully into play until 2014. That is when Americans are going to have more IRS agents, more money being spent looking into their own personal lives, looking into what kind of insurance they have.

Is it acceptable to the government? Is it government approved? That is why Senator GRAHAM and I have introduced legislation called the State Health Care Choice Act, to let States decide. Let States decide if Washington ought to be telling the people in their States that they must buy, that every individual must buy government-approved insurance. Let the States make that decision. Let the States opt out if they would like. Let the States decide if all the businesses in their States must provide government-approved insurance to their workers. Let the States decide as to Medicaid, a program for low-income Americans which is being expanded significantly by cramming 16 million more Americans into Medicaid. Governors all across the country in a bipartisan way are saying: Our States cannot afford this.

A New York Times story shows Jerry Brown from California and Andrew Cuomo from New York complaining about the mandates Medicaid is putting on their States, the additional burdens in terms of taxes and the mandates and what it is going to do to the people of the State who are trying to educate their kids and the cost and the pressure on education dollars because they are getting shifted to Medicaid, the cost of dollars shifted away from public safety, from firefighters, police officers, other public safety officers. As to this health care law, I think people at the State level ought to decide that, no, we don't want this to apply to us.

That is why I come today, again as a physician who practiced medicine in Wyoming for a quarter of a century, took care of thousands and thousands of patients and families, trying to help people get better, all in a way that now I think is being taken in the wrong direction by this health care law, and why I think we want to continue to look for ways to make sure people get the care they want from the doctors they need at a price they can afford. The health care law that was passed by this body fails in all of those respects, and now we see, with the President's budget, a request for money for another thousand IRS agents, not to help people get better, not to help people get the care they need from a doctor they want at a cost they can afford—no, not at all—but to audit the health care of the American people.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EFFECTS OF THE RECESSION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise to briefly do three things. No. 1, there are a lot of politicians and pundits and economists who are proclaiming all over the country that the recession is over. They have some economic models by which they determine that the recession is over. I suggest those pundits and economists and politicians take a look at the booklet we recently produced in my office. It is called ''Struggling Through the Recession—Letters from Vermont.''

We have also received letters from other States, people in other States as well. We sent out a request for people to tell us, as we enter the third year of this recession, what is happening in their lives. We got, from my small State, over 400 responses. That is a lot from a small State. We probably received an equal number from around the rest of the country.

The problem I had with these letters, some of them are so painful to read that it is hard to read more than a few at a time because you get sick to your stomach hearing what good and decent and hard-working people are going through.

I wish to take a few moments to read a handful of the letters I am receiving from Vermont, in answer to the question: Is the recession over?

This comes from a young lady from central Vermont. She says:

> I have been fortunate to hold onto my job throughout the past 3 years, especially since I have about $42,000 remaining on my school loans.

One of the recurring themes we hear from all over Vermont—and I suspect it is true in New Mexico and all over the country—is a lot of young people are graduating with a heck of a lot of debt. The jobs they are getting are not sufficient, in terms of pay, to help them pay off that debt.

She writes:

Anyway, what I want to write isn't about me—it's about my boyfriend, a talented mechanical engineer that graduated with about $80,000 in school loans.

We are telling the young people of this country: Go out and get an education. They are coming out with huge loans, having a hard time getting a job.

He was laid off in November 2009 and it has not only caused financial hardship, but it has put all of our future plans on hold. He fortunately has temporary employment now after nearly a year of searching, but my qualm is with the high cost of education and how people in their twenties are supposed to move forward with their lives with school debt lingering over them.

That is a very significant point.

Here is another one. This is a young man from Barre, VT, in the central part of the State.

In 2002, I received a scholarship to Saint Bonaventure University, the first in my family to attend college. Upon graduation in 2006, I was admitted to the Dickinson School of Law at Penn State University and graduated in 2009 with $150,000 of student debt.

That is not uncommon.

In Western New York I could find nothing better than a $10/hour position stuffing envelopes.

Another example of a young person graduating from college, doing all the right things, and yet ending up with very substantial debt.

That is from some of the younger people. Then we got letters from middle-aged people. This is from a woman from the central part of the State.

My husband lost his job in 2002 and has been self-employed as a carpenter ever since due to the lack of jobs in central Vermont.

I should tell you the recession has been less disastrous in Vermont than in other parts of the country. These are stories from a State that has not been hit as hard as other States.

He's had no insurance and we have not saved a cent since 2002. We've depleted our savings account paying for property taxes. We've been burning wood to save money heating the house. The cost of fuel for the house and vehicles puts a huge burden on making ends meet. Being self-employed is extremely challenging due to the economic situation.

Again, she is touching on an issue that millions of people are aware of. The price of gas to get to work is going up. The price of home heating fuel in States such as Vermont is going up. Wages are low for millions of people. How do they survive in that crisis?

We also have stories from older people. This is from a woman named Beth, who lives in the northeastern part of our State, a very rural part of Vermont. She is 69 years of age. She writes:

I don't know what kind of a future my grand kids will have. How will they be educated if we can't help them? It is great there are loans out there for education but they are being charged more for the schools than I paid for my house. They will be in debt their whole lives.

Here is a woman who is worried about her grandchildren. Here is another woman, Ellen, who lives in Rutland County.

All I can say is I still have a job for all it is worth. I feel making $8.81 an hour at 17 hours per week is ridiculous!

This woman is 63 years of age.

I don't bring home enough to help out with the major household expenses I used to pay half on. I'm lucky if my paycheck reaches $130 a week. By the time I pay a few bills gas up and pick up a few needed items I'm lucky if I have any left for spending. I earned less than $8,000 this year. It [is] just about what I made back in the 1970's and lived better.

So the point here is, A, if folks tell you the recession is over, read some of these stories. These stories are available on my Web site: ''Sanders.Senate.gov.'' These are mostly from Vermont, but I think they touch the same themes that exist all over our country. For millions and millions of people, not only those who are unemployed—those who are underemployed, those who are working full time and not making a living wage—trust me, the recession is not over.

The reason I ask people to send me these letters is I think it is important as a Senate to understand we have to address these economic issues. When 16 percent of our people are either unemployed or underemployed or have given up looking for work, when millions more are working with inadequate wages, we cannot say we should not be vigorously going forward in creating millions and millions of jobs that our people desperately need.

SOCIAL SECURITY

I also want to say a word on Social Security. What I want to say is, I get very tired watching the TV or hearing some of my colleagues tell me that Social Security is going bankrupt, that Social Security will not be there for our kids or that Social Security is part of the serious deficit and national debt problem we face. Let me say a few words on that.

No. 1, Social Security has existed in this country for 75 years, and it has been an enormous success. We take it for granted. But for 75 years, Social Security has paid out every nickel owed to every eligible American in good times and bad. When Wall Street collapsed a few years ago, millions of Americans lost all or part of their retirement savings when the stock market crashed. All over America, during the last 10, 20 years, corporations that had promised defined benefit pension plans to their employees rescinded on that promise. People had worked for years, expecting a pension from a company. That pension never came. Yet during all of that period, Social Security has paid out every nickel owed to every eligible American at minimal administrative cost. That is a pretty good record. Our job now is to make sure Social Security is strong and vibrant 75 years from now and continues to do the excellent job it has done in the past 75 years.

People say: Social Security is going broke. Social Security is in crisis. A lot of people believe that because they hear it over and over, and it is repeated in the media again, again, and again.

What are the facts? The facts are that not only is Social Security not going broke, Social Security has a $2.6 trillion surplus—a $2.6 trillion surplus—which, by the way, is going to go up before it goes down.

Social Security, according to the Social Security Administration and the Congressional Budget Office, can pay out every nickel owed to every eligible American for the next 25, 26, 27 years, at which point it will pay out between 75 and 80 percent of all of the benefits. The challenge we face, therefore, is how, in 25 or 30 years, do we make up that 20 percent gap? That is the challenge.

So Social Security is strong and will pay out every benefit owed to every eligible American for the next 25 or 30 years. People say: Oh, yeah, well, that is just worthless IOUs, that Social Security trust fund.

Absolutely not true. The U.S. Government, from the day of its inception, has paid its debt. Social Security is backed by the faith and credit of the United States of America. We have never yet—and I certainly hope we never will—default on our debt.

So the first point I want to make is, Social Security is strong. Social Security will pay out benefits for the next 26 years. For people to come forward and say we have to privatize Social Security, we have to raise the retirement age, we have to lower benefits, is absolutely wrong, to my mind. We made a promise to the American people regarding Social Security, and that is a promise we have to keep.

In the dialog around Washington, people lump the very serious problem of a $1.5 trillion deficit and a $14 trillion national debt with Social Security. So let's ask a very simple question. How much has Social Security contributed to our national debt? How much? The answer is, not one penny—not one penny—because Social Security is not paid out from the U.S. Treasury. Social Security comes from the payroll taxes that workers and employers contribute into the Social Security trust fund. That trust fund today has a $2.6 trillion surplus. So when people say we have a very significant national debt and, therefore, we have to cut Social Security, that is absolutely a wrong thing to say.

Let me say, I will do everything I can to protect a program that has worked extremely well for the American people.

Why are we hearing all of this opposition against Social Security? Where does it come from? It does not come from ordinary people. They know Social Security has been successful, it is worth preserving, worth protecting. By the way, as we all know, Social Security is not just there for the elderly, the retirees; it is there for people with disabilities; it is there for widows and orphans through the survivors fund.

Where is all of this opposition coming from?

It is coming from two places.

No. 1, it is coming from folks on Wall Street—from Wall Street—who are saying: Gee, we could make many billions of dollars if we ended the Social Security system right now and Americans had to invest in retirement accounts on Wall Street. And we can make all kinds of commissions doing that work.

That is one of the areas, one of the sources of the opposition to Social Security.

Second is from many of my very conservative Republican friends. Very honestly, they do not believe government should be playing a role in making sure elderly people have a secure and dignified retirement. They do not believe much in government. They do not think government should be playing a role in those areas, and they want to get government out of those areas.

I understand where they are coming from. It is an honest position. I strongly disagree with them. I think in a civilized, democratic society we have to make sure when you get old it has to be guaranteed—guaranteed—as it has been for 75 years, that you are going to get the help you need. I believe government should be playing that role.

I would remind you, Mr. President, before Social Security was developed in the mid 1930s, 50 percent of the elderly people of our country at that point lived in poverty. Today, that number is too high, but it is 10 percent—50 percent before Social Security; 10 percent today. That is a pretty good record.

So I would respectfully disagree with my Republican friends who say: Well, if people want a retirement account, let them invest in Wall Street, let them do it through the private sector. I do not agree with that. I think Social Security has worked well for 75 years. We have to make sure it works well for another 75 years. I will do everything I can as chairman of the new Defending Social Security Caucus to make that happen.

THE DEFICIT AND NATIONAL DEBT

The last point I want to make: I want to talk a little bit about the deficit and our national debt.

I think it is appropriate for the American people to be reminded about how we got into the very difficult situation we are in right now. I have to tell you, I find it a bit amusing that some of the ''loudest'' deficit hawks in the Congress are precisely the same people who helped drive up the deficit and the national debt—the same people.

Let's try to determine how we got into the recession.

No. 1, in the midst of a recession, by definition, less money is coming in. That is obviously an important part of why we have the deficit and the national debt we have today. But there are other factors.

Mr. President, you will recall that this country, during the Bush administration, began two wars—a war in Afghanistan, a war in Iraq. The war in Iraq is estimated, by the time we take care of the last veteran, to run up a tag of about $3 trillion. Does anybody quite remember how we paid for those wars? Well, the answer is we did not pay for those wars. Those wars were put on the credit card. President Bush said: We are going to go to war, but we do not have to worry about how we pay for them.

The second area: As a result of President Bush's tax policies, which have recently been extended, against my vote, in the Obama administration, we provided many hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires. The wealthiest people in this country are doing phenomenally well. The effective tax rate for the wealthiest people in this country is lower than at any time on record, in many cases lower than what working people are paying. Yet we decided, against my vote, to give them hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks, driving up the deficit.

Congress voted, against my vote, to bail out Wall Street—unpaid for, driving up the deficit. Some years ago, Congress, against my vote, decided to pass an insurance company-written Medicare Part D prescription drug program—very expensive program, unpaid for.

So all of these things are unpaired for. The national debt goes up, the deficit goes up. Then our Republican friends say: Oh, my goodness, we have a very large deficit. What are we going to do? We are going to have to cut back on programs that are important to working people and lower income people.

I think that is absolutely unacceptable.

So the first point I would make is, I regard it as incomprehensible that there are folks who supported hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires and then they tell us they are concerned about the deficit and the national debt. That is absolute hypocrisy.

In my view, the Congress should not be about cutting back on programs for low- and moderate-income people after we have given huge tax breaks to the wealthiest people in this country.

Second of all, I think the time is long overdue that we start ending a lot of the corporate tax loopholes which now are preventing this country and this government from getting the revenue we need. Before we talk about major cutbacks for our kids or for the elderly, maybe we should end the absurdity of the tax havens that exist in the Cayman Islands and Bermuda, where the wealthiest people in this country and large corporations are stashing their money away, to the tune of about $100 billion a year—$100 billion a year—in taxes that are not being paid because of the tax havens that exist.

I would also argue it is somewhat absurd we have a situation where last year ExxonMobil paid no Federal income taxes at all and got a $156 million rebate from the IRS, after earning $19 billion in profits.

What I would say is, yes, deficit and national debt are very important issues. But it is important for us to understand how we got to where we are. It is important for us to understand that the top 1 percent today earn more income than the bottom 50 percent and have enjoyed huge tax breaks. So before we start slashing programs the middle class and working families of this country need, let's take a look at some of those issues as well.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 93, AS FURTHER MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 7, AS MODIFIED

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I have a modification of my amendment at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

The amendment, as further modified, is as follows:

Strike out all after the word ''**SEC**'' and add the following:

____. RONALD REAGAN WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT SLOTS.

(a) INCREASE IN NUMBER OF SLOT EXEMPTIONS.—Section 41718 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

''(g) ADDITIONAL SLOTS.—

''(1) INITIAL INCREASE IN EXEMPTIONS.—Within 95 days after the date of enactment of the FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act, the Secretary shall grant, by order, 24 slot exemptions from the application of sections 49104(a)(5), 49109, 49111(e), and 41714 of this title to air carriers to operate limited frequencies and aircraft on routes between Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport and airports located beyond the perimeter described in section 49109 or, as provided in paragraph (2)(C), airports located within that perimeter, and exemptions from the requirements of subparts K and S of part 93, Code of Federal Regulations, if the Secretary finds that the exemptions will—

''(A) provide air transportation with domestic network benefits in areas beyond the perimeter described in section 49109;

''(B) increase competition in multiple markets;

''(C) not reduce travel options for communities served by small hub airports and medium hub airports within the perimeter described in section 49109;

''(D) not result in meaningfully increased travel delays;

''(E) enhance options for nonstop travel to and from the beyond-perimeter airports that will be served as a result of those exemptions;

''(F) have a positive impact on the overall level of competition in the markets that will be served as a result of those exemptions; and

''(G) produce public benefits, including the likelihood that the service to airports located beyond the perimeter described in section 49109 will result in lower fares, higher capacity, and a variety of service options.

''(2) NEW ENTRANTS AND LIMITED INCUMBENTS.—

''(A) DISTRIBUTION.—Of the exemptions made available under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall make 10 available to limited incumbent air carriers or new entrant air carriers and 14 available to other incumbent air carriers.

''(C) USE.—Only a limited incumbent air carrier or new entrant air carrier may use an additional exemption granted under this subsection to provide service between Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport and an airport located within the perimeter described in section 49109.

''(3) IMPROVED NETWORK SLOTS.—If an incumbent air carrier (other than a limited incumbent air carrier) that uses a slot for service between Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport and a large hub airport located within the perimeter described in section 49109 is granted an additional exemption under this subsection, it shall, upon receiving the additional exemption, discontinue the use of that slot for such within-perimeter service and operate, in place of such service, service between Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport and an airport located beyond the perimeter described in section 49109.

''(4) CONDITIONS.—Beyond-perimeter flight operations carried out by an air carrier using an exemption granted under this subsection shall be subject to the following conditions:

''(A) An air carrier may not operate a multi-aisle or widebody aircraft in conducting such operations.

''(B) An air carrier granted an exemption under this subsection is prohibited from selling, trading, leasing, or otherwise transferring the rights to its beyond-perimeter exemptions, except through an air carrier merger or acquisition.

''(5) OPERATIONS DEADLINE.—An air carrier granted a slot exemption under this subsection shall commence operations using that slot within 60 days after the date on which the exemption was granted.

''(6) IMPACT STUDY.—Within 17 months after granting the additional exemptions authorized by paragraph (1) the Secretary shall complete a study of the direct effects of the additional exemptions, including the extent to which the additional exemptions have—

''(A) caused congestion problems at the airport;

''(B) had a negative effect on the financial condition of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority;

''(C) affected the environment in the area surrounding the airport; and

''(D) resulted in meaningful loss of service to small and medium markets within the perimeter described in section 49109.

''(7) ADDITIONAL EXEMPTIONS.—

''(A) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall determine, on the basis of the study required by paragraph (6), whether—

''(i) the additional exemptions authorized by paragraph (1) have had a substantial negative effect on Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport, Washington Dulles International Airport, or Baltimore/Washington Thurgood Marshall International Airport; and

''(ii) the granting of additional exemptions under this paragraph may, or may not, reasonably be expected to have a substantial negative effect on any of those airports.

''(B) AUTHORITY TO GRANT ADDITIONAL EXEMPTIONS.—Beginning 6 months after the date on which the impact study is concluded, the Secretary may grant up to 8 slot exemptions to incumbent air carriers, in addition to those granted under paragraph (1) of this subsection, if the Secretary determines that—

''(i) the additional exemptions authorized by paragraph (1) have not had a substantial negative effect on any of those airports; and

''(ii) the granting of additional exemptions under this subparagraph may not reasonably be expected to have a negative effect on any of those airports.

''(D) IMPROVED NETWORK SLOTS.—If an incumbent air carrier (other than a limited incumbent air carrier) that uses a slot for service between Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport and a large hub airport located within the perimeter described in section 49109 is granted an additional exemption under subparagraph (B), it shall, upon receiving the additional exemption, discontinue the use of that slot for such within-perimeter service and operate, in place of such service, service between Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport and an airport located beyond the perimeter described in section 49109.

''(E) CONDITIONS.—Beyond-perimeter flight operations carried out by an air carrier using an exemption granted under subparagraph (B) shall be subject to the following conditions:

''(i) An air carrier may not operate a multi-aisle or widebody aircraft in conducting such operations.

''(ii) An air carrier granted an exemption under this subsection is prohibited from selling, trading, leasing, or otherwise transferring the rights to its beyond-perimeter exemptions, except through an air carrier merger or acquisition.

''(F) ADDITIONAL EXEMPTIONS NOT PERMITTED.—The Secretary may not grant exemptions in addition to those authorized by paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that—

''(i) the additional exemptions authorized by paragraph (1) have had a substantial negative effect on any of those airports; or

''(ii) the granting of additional exemptions under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph may reasonably be expected to have a substantial negative effect on 1 or more of those airports.

''(h) SCHEDULING PRIORITY.—In administering this section, the Secretary shall afford a scheduling priority to operations conducted by new entrant air carriers and limited incumbent air carriers over operations conducted by other air carriers granted additional slot exemptions under subsection (g) for service to airports located beyond the perimeter described in section 49109.''.

(b) HOURLY LIMITATION.—Section 41718(c)(2) is amended—

(1) by striking ''3 operations'' and inserting ''4 operations''; and

(2) by striking ''subsections (a) and (b)'' and inserting ''under this section''.

(c) LIMITED INCUMBENT DEFINITION.—Section 41714(h)(5) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''not'' after ''shall'' in subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon in subparagraph (B);

(3) by striking ''Administration.'' in subparagraph (C) and inserting ''Administration; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) for purposes of section 41718, an air carrier that holds only slot exemptions''.

(d) REVENUES AND FEES AT THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS.—Section 49104(a) is amended by striking paragraph (9) and inserting the following:

''(9) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, revenues derived at either of the Metropolitan Washington Airports, regardless of source, may be used for operating and capital expenses (including debt service, depreciation and amortization) at the other airport.''.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized.

THE BUDGET

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we have had sort of a dustup, I guess you could say, in the Budget Committee yesterday with Mr. Lew from the Office of Management and Budget and a very likable individual, but we had a serious disagreement, a fundamental matter that I do not think can be brushed over and needs to be confronted and settled. There is only one way to settle it, I believe; that is, for Mr. Lew and the President to cease saying their budget does not add to the debt and somehow changes the trajectory on which we are going.

Mr. Lew, on a Sunday morning program, said: ''Our budget will get us, over the next several years, to the point where we can look the American people in the eye and say we're not adding to the debt anymore. . . . ''

''Our budget will get us to the point where we can look the American people in the eye and say we're not adding to the debt anymore; we are spending money that we have each year, and then we can work on bringing down our national debt.''

That is my goal. I believe that is achievable. But it is clear this budget does not do that.

Troubling, additionally, was the President, in his radio address Saturday, said the same thing. Then, again yesterday, while we were having this discussion, presumably at a similar time, the President said this: ''What my budget does is to put forward some tough choices, some significant spending cuts so that by the middle of this decade [2015] our annual spending will match our annual revenues. . . . ''

Our annual spending will match our annual revenues. We will not be adding more to the national debt.

That is an unequivocal statement. No matter what, it can have only one meaning to American citizens who hear it, that his budget calls for a situation in which our annual spending will match our annual revenues and we will not be adding to the national debt.

Those of us who have been wrestling with the budget know how hard it is. I believe we can achieve that in 10 years, but it is very hard. I have to admit it. I wish it were not. The Presiding Officer is on the Budget Committee and he

knows how hard that would be. It would be a heroic effort. I think we can do it. I think the American people are ready to do it. But it is not easy.

The President says that is what we are going to do and that is his plan. But, sadly, it is not correct. I asked Mr. Lew, was he not concerned and was not this misleading to the American people who heard it. He refused to say his statement was misleading.

What does the budget do? These are the numbers in his budget, the document they presented to us, written by the White House, the President's budget he is required by law to submit to Congress. This is what happens to the debt. The quote up there again is: ''We will not be adding more to the national debt.''

We add more under his plan, to the national debt, every single year. The numbers are stunning in size. They are consistent and, unfortunately, in the outer years of his 10-year budget, his numbers show the annual debt—annual deficit increasing, not going down. So this is what it amounts to in terms of total debt.

His plan, by his own budget that they submitted to us, would add, without dispute, $13 trillion in new debt, doubling it to $26 trillion. It started out at $13 trillion; in 10 years, it doubles to $26 trillion. How can this possibly be a position in which you will not be adding more to the debt? What world are we living in? What kind of fantastical accounting situation can occur that we can make such a statement as that?

I am going to ask my colleagues in the Senate, any single one of them who can defend this statement, I would like them to come down here and do so. Otherwise we need to call on the President to be honest with the American people. We have a serious debt crisis. To waltz out there in a press conference yesterday, to send out to speak on his radio program Saturday or to have his Budget Director on Sunday, and even at our committee hearing yesterday, insist that somehow they are not adding to the debt is not a way to begin a dialog about how to confront the serious problems this country has. I have to say that.

I do not think it is a little bitty matter. I don't think it is subject to gentlemen's disagreement. I don't think it is subject to anything other than black and white, yes and no. Is that an accurate statement or not? It is not true. The debt is added to every year. In fact, President Bush was criticized for his deficits—and I think rightly so. The highest deficit he ever had was $450, $460 billion. The lowest deficit in the 10 years, by the President's own budget document he sent to us, is over $600 billion—the lowest. It averages $720 billion a year in added debt. This is why we are on a dangerous course.

The essence of what we are talking about is can we get off this wrong road? Can we get on the road to prosperity? Can we get on the road to progress that gets us out of the debt disaster area we are headed toward?

Let me read a couple things because this is the real test of the budget. We can argue over the finer details. But the question is, Can we continue at the rate we are going? What I would say about the budget is that these numbers, this $13 trillion added debt, is what was being predicted before. According to the President, it would have been $14 trillion. He has reduced it to $13 trillion, which is not enough change, if it were to happen. But when the Congressional Budget Office independently scores the President's budget, it is going to show he doesn't have a $1.1 trillion reduction in spending—probably none. There is probably no reduction in the debt.

What I am saying is, this budget keeps us on the course we were on. I do not think that can be disputed. It does not alter the basic debt totals each year from what has been projected, and those are the numbers, the debt totals, that are unsustainable.

For example, in 2009, President Obama called the current deficit spending, on this basic trend, unsustainable—himself—and warned of skyrocketing interest rates for consumers if the United States continues to finance government by borrowing from other countries. This is Bloomberg:

> ''We can't keep on just borrowing from China,'' Obama said at a town-hall meeting at Rio Rancho, New Mexico, outside Albuquerque. ''We have to pay interest on that debt, and that means we are mortgaging our children's future. . . .''

That is correct.

Mr. Bernanke, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, warned in June of last year that ''the federal budget appears to be on an unsustainable path.''

Mr. Geithner, the Secretary of the Treasury, in February—actually February 15—a couple days ago on ABC, said this—this is what the Secretary of Treasury said, Mr. Obama's Secretary:

> Our deficits are too high. They are unsustainable, and left unaddressed, these deficits will hurt economic growth and make us weaker as a nation. . . . We have to restore fiscal responsibility and go back to living within our means.

Peter Orszag, who was President Obama's Director of the Office of Management and Budget, said that the CBO report—he said this in June of last summer:

> . . . concludes that we are on an unsustainable fiscal course. About this, there is no ambiguity.

We are on an ''unsustainable fiscal course,'' there is no doubt about it, said Mr. Orszag last summer.

What I would say to you is, the President's budget does not change that direction and we have to change it. We have to be honest with the American people that we are not changing it, that the President's plan is his plan for the future. He can change the numbers any way he wants to. He can change the trajectory we are on. It is a voluntary thing. The numbers he put forth are his numbers, and they are a call for our country to follow his plan. That is not an acceptable plan. It is not an acceptable plan, and we have to change it.

Briefly, I will add this. The warnings that are out there—Alan Greenspan, our former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, said in December that it is a little better than 50–50, but not much, that we won't have a debt crisis in this country in 2 to 3 years.

Moody's, the organization most famous for rating government debt and private company debt—you know, AAA is the highest rating—Moody's, in December, sent a warning letter that, unless the United States changes its trajectory of debt, our debt could be downgraded from AAA in less than 2 years.

The International Monetary Fund has said we have to reduce our structural deficit more than Greece. They have to go to a 9-percent improvement; we have to go to a 12-percent improvement. Only Japan, says the International Monetary Fund, is worse off than we are and has to take stronger action.

So this budget is no action at all. It is no alteration of the trajectory. It is unacceptable. As Congressman RYAN said, it is debt on arrival.

We cannot pass this budget. It is unthinkable that we would. The American people are ready for change. They are supporting Governors and mayors around the country who are making tough choices, bringing their States and cities up to speed and being more effective. They are doing that. These cities are not ceasing to exist.

We increased discretionary spending, nondefense discretionary spending, in the last 2 years under President Obama's leadership and the Democratic majority in both Houses, 24 percent—12 percent a year, on average. Well, at a 7-percent-a-year increase, the total budget doubled in 10 years. I guess at 12 percent it will probably double in 6 or 7 years. This is the trend we are on. We have to come off of that. We are going to have to reduce those numbers because we do not have the money.

But I will tell you, this economy has vibrancy. It is trying to come out of this recession. If we create some stability and permanence in our rules, eliminate unnecessary regulations, allow our energy prices to be competitive and create more American energy and all of the things that make sense to bring down costs and increase productivity, bring this debt under control, we will be surprised how strong we can bounce back. But this is not the path to do it. This is the unsustainable path that can lead to danger. The closer we get to it, the more dangerous we are.

So I believe it is time to change course. Where we are going to go, I just cannot say. I am rather stunned that the President's budget—I did not expect a very strong budget, but I expected one that would make a lot more progress than this. So I guess we are

all befuddled right now what our choices will be. All of us have to work at it, though, because the future of our country is at stake.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, is there a pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The second-degree Hutchison amendment to the Inhofe amendment is pending.

Mr. COBURN. Thank you. Let me confine my remarks for a few minutes to how I see where we are from my perspective. My hope is that I can offer some amendments, at least get them pending, and then discuss with the chairman—I just discussed them with the ranking member—the disposition of those. I wonder whether the chairman has any comments on that.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I will be objecting to your amendments because you objected to the pending amendments, and there will be no reason to add more unless you lift your objection.

Mr. COBURN. I told them I would be happy——

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I am very happy to listen to what you have to say.

Mr. COBURN. I told Senator LEAHY last night that I would be happy to lift my objection once my amendments were pending, and we can have a debate on his nongermane amendment.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I think the order has to be reversed.

Mr. COBURN. Well, if the chairman will assure me I will have the opportunity to, No. 1, debate Senator LEAHY's amendment——

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I cannot assure that at this point. We have not arrived——

Mr. COBURN. Then I will continue with my objection.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. If you have amendments you wish to offer—I think five—I am constrained to object to them.

Mr. COBURN. It is interesting. We have a nongermane amendment that is outside the bounds of the Constitution, doing something that is not the role of the Federal Government, that we are going to expand the cost at a time when we are bankrupt, and five germane amendments that actually lower the cost of the airport improvement fund, actually help NextGen in terms of money, help preserve the airport trust fund, and we are not going to be allowed to bring them up? If that is the way we are going to operate, then you can count on me, knowing procedure around here, that we will have a very difficult time moving ever to a Leahy amendment.

Mr. President, I came to the floor to discuss what we are trying to do and to be helpful in moving that along. I have now heard that I will not be allowed to offer these amendments or at least bring them up. I am going to discuss each one of them, and I will object to any unanimous consent moving forward on any area until we have an opportunity, as is the Senate tradition, to have a debate and bring up amendments. If we are not allowed to do that, then I am sure we are going to start going backward again.

Passing an FAA authorization bill, as the chairman and ranking member have tried to do, is a significant priority for Congress. We have a system of air traffic control that needs to be modernized. We have monies that we are putting forward to do that. We have not had the oversight, according to the inspector general, that is necessary for those programs.

In this bill, we have authorizations for moneys that are not priorities for this country at a time that we are facing a $1.6 trillion deficit, we have an unemployment rate in excess of 9 percent, and interest rates that are going to rise in the future.

My amendments, which I am happy to have voted on and voted down, lead us to a path that secures and enhances the airport improvement fund and the trust fund, makes common sense that 99 percent of the American people would agree with, excludes Alaska because it is a totally different animal when it comes to the Essential Air Service requirements, and will, in fact, enhance the trust fund. So I am very sorry the chairman refuses to allow my amendments to come up, but I will offer them and have him object in total.

What has to happen with every program in this country is that wasteful spending, low-priority spending, and duplicative spending has to be eliminated. Although I think the chairman and ranking member did a fairly good job on this bill, there are areas where we can eliminate wasteful spending, there are areas where we can eliminate duplicative spending, and there are areas where we can say: This can't be a priority now given the financial fix in which we find ourselves.

During our current budget deficit, the revenues coming into the airport trust fund are lower than expected, and we have this very real need on NextGen development. Congress has to limit somewhere and make a priority next year, and I think they have tried to go in that direction, and these amendments will do such a thing.

The first amendment I would like to talk about is the airport improvement Federal cost share reduction amendment. Across this country, we now have money being spent on low-priority projects in airports that have very little traffic or minimal traffic, and we are not spending money on the airports for safety and for the airports in which we have the vast majority of traffic. We have seen one program in particular where billions of dollars for low-priority projects have been spent.

I would just tell you, if we are ever going to get out of the jam we are in, some common sense has to be applied in that we cannot do everything everybody wants, and there is going to have to be some sacrifice in these areas.

The whole goal of this first amendment is to discourage low-priority, wasteful aviation projects that would not be funded by increasing the non-Federal cost share to just 25 percent over 3 years. In other words, it is 5 percent now, and so it is 95 percent of the government's money, and all we do is, over 3 years, move it to where you have to pay 25 percent. It is going to discourage a lot of low-priority projects because the communities or the States have to have a greater participation.

There is no program in the Federal Government that has a grant process and a funding process where the Federal Government pays 95 percent other than this program—not one. So we are encouraging money to be wasted on low-priority projects by maintaining 95 percent Federal funding. This gives us 3 years to adjust to 75 percent, which probably should be 50 percent but 75 percent given our fiscal issues.

Nonprimary airports could initially have up to 90 percent of their airport improvement projects covered by the Federal Government. In recent years, we raised that, under Public Law 108–176, to 95 percent. This is 20 percent higher than the same cost share for other airports qualifying for this $4 billion program. It is $4 billion a year.

Lest you think I am too critical, let me give you some examples. Two flights a day—two flights a day, noncommercial flights, just two private flights a day—is the average for Kentucky's Williamsburg-Whitley County Airport. We spent $11 million there to build an airport with a 5,500-foot lighted runway, a colonial-style terminal, and hundreds of acres for growth even though it does not have one airline passenger and averages two flights a day. Now, tell me, if you ask the average American: Should we spend $11 million there or should we make sure we can take care of the kids who do not have what they need in this country, should we spend $11 million there or not borrow another $11 million from the Chinese, should we spend $11 million there or should we, in fact, make sure the airport trust fund has the money to do high-priority projects, such as large airports or NextGen, which one would the average American think we should do?

Lest you think I am picking on Kentucky, Halliburton Field in Duncan, OK, got $700,000 for a pilot room and a reception room. We are building for private aviation with taxpayer money—a low priority. We are building a nice pilot room and a reception room for the private pilots who fly there. Now, tell me how that is a priority in our country today. That is my own State.

We are sending money down a hole because we refuse to make tough choices. All this amendment does is say: Let's move it from 95 percent, over 3 years, to 75 percent so we do not get the lower priority projects funded, because we are too generous with what

the Federal Government contributes. The chairman may not like it, but I will bet you the average American thinks it is a pretty smart thing to do given the state we are in.

All bets are off on the politics of this. I have never been accustomed to playing the politics of it at all, but there are just as many people on the left who think we ought to cut spending as there are on the right. America gets it. The only place that does not get it is here. And this does not do anything except enhance what can be done for higher priority issues within our aviation community. That is all it does. It is a small, simple step. And by rejecting or not allowing an amendment such as this to come forward, what we are saying is that we are going to keep kicking the can down the road; we are not going to pay attention to the American public. We are going to hide from the reality that is coming very soon for this country. We will not have any money to put into airport improvement programs. We will not have the money to fund a NextGen program. It will become a low-priority program unless we wake up and start doing what the rest of America recognizes we have to do; that is, start living within our means.

The next amendment is an amendment that is a bipartisan amendment between the Senator from Alaska and myself.

It is an earmark rescission amendment. All it says is the earmarks that have been out there, that the money hasn't been spent for over 9 years, giving 1 year for the agencies to decide whether they think that is so, should be rescinded. It puts $500 million, a half a billion dollars at a minimum, back in the public Treasury. Why would we not want to do that? We have $2.6 million sitting in Atlanta that can't be spent on anything except the 1996 Olympics. Why wouldn't we take back that $2.6 million? It was earmarked. It didn't get spent. But it is sitting out there in a hole. We can reverse that. Estimates are we will save a billion dollars. The conservative estimate at a minimum is $500 million. Yet we are not going to allow this amendment to be considered? It makes no sense.

The next amendment calls on us to sacrifice a little bit. The Essential Air Service Program has multiple subsidies where people can easily drive 1 hour and 20 minutes and get to a regional airport that doesn't require any subsidies. All this amendment does is move it to 100 miles from where it is today, which is 70. It moves it to 100 miles and says if you are less than 100 miles, you ought not be eligible, sometimes to the tune of $4 or $500 per person per flight, to have a subsidized flight when you could drive 70 minutes, 80 minutes, and have access to a ton of flights.

Again, it is priority. Is it priority for us to continue to spend money on a small group of airports, 36, that in no way pay for themselves, that are readily accessible throughout the country to major airports, and spend the kind of money we are spending?

Another amendment says if you have less than 10 emplanements a day, we ought to think about whether we are subsidizing Essential Air Service.

All these amendments are saying is, will we make the tough decisions. We can't do everything we want to do. Is it nice that we have an Essential Air Service Program so some people don't have to drive an hour? I guess so. What are we willing to sacrifice to get our house in order? These are little bitty amendments that will send a wonderful signal to the American public that we get it, we absolutely get it. And because we get it, we are going to make choices about priorities. We are going to enhance the airport trust fund. We are going to enhance the airport improvement program because we are going to take lower priorities off the board, which is exactly what they want us to do. They want us to focus on the big things, the important things, and they want us to cut the spending that is not absolutely necessary.

I can tell my colleagues, it is not absolutely necessary that we subsidize some of these smaller airports that are very close to regional airports or have less than 10 passengers a day. It is not absolutely essential. Would we ask some Americans to sacrifice? Yes. But do you know what will happen? We will all have to sacrifice before we get through this. The problem is the resistance in this Chamber and in this city. We don't want to make the hard choices. It is disappointing that we have not done that. We will have to do that. And we are either going to do it or somebody from the outside is going to tell us what we are going to do.

Then a fifth amendment—and I know the chairman will be against this amendment because it is his program that I am trying to eliminate—in the year 2000, we created another program called the Small Community Air Services Program. This is an amendment to repeal that. It was geared to help smaller communities enhance their air service in addition to Essential Air Service; in other words, make it more effective, to try to promote utilization, which is a good idea except it is not working. When we see the funds from this program, after the grant is over, do you know what happens? The airlines leave. They don't stay. They leave. So we are kind of spending money in a market that won't sustain what we are trying to put there, and then we are putting more money on top of it to try to promote it. When it doesn't work, what happens? We lose the Essential Air Service anyhow. It has happened in Oklahoma.

In this day and time that we live, we have to have an FAA bill. We can't continue to not have an FAA bill. Even if my amendments are voted down, considering that they are going to get a vote, I will probably support this bill. But it should be noted that we haven't gone far enough. We haven't made all the tough choices we need to make. I am highly disturbed that we take amendments that are absolutely germane and say they can't be offered because a time agreement, even though it has been agreed to, isn't disagreed to yet because the Senator from Vermont isn't on the floor.

I am going to offer the amendment and let the chairman object. Then I will utilize the procedures that are available to me as a Member of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 91.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. There is objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I would say to the Senator from Oklahoma, most of the pending amendments which are now pending have been objected to from his side of the aisle. I don't have any objection to looking at some of his amendments and seeing if we can vote on them. But I can't do that right now. I obviously can't give him any kind of consent right now.

It is a difficult situation. It is a sort of rolling veto type of situation. If objection is made, we can't have votes on amendments which are pending. I am willing to look at what he has suggested. As he talked through some of them, they sort of stung pretty hard in my State of West Virginia, but I am willing to look at them. But I can't do that without consent from folks on my side. So for the time being, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. COBURN. I thank the chairman. I will go on and allow him to object to further amendments I have so it will be in the RECORD that I did attempt to offer them.

I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 80.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 81.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 82 and set the pending amendment aside.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. COBURN. I thank the chairman for his words. I will take him at his word and work with him and allow him to look at some of these. There are only two airports in West Virginia that this would have an impact on. Both of them are less than 75 miles from the regional airport. They both have minimal emplanements daily. They are

over 10 but not far over that. The point is, we ought to help who we can help, and it ought to make economic sense. They are not targeted because there are 36 airports in here, actually, where the average American would say, this is nuts to spend the kind of money we are.

I thank him for the time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Madam President, I rise today in order to speak in support of the Essential Air Service Program and explain why the program truly is essential, especially in rural States. In Nebraska, our two largest airports are separated by only 63 miles in a State that covers 77,000 square miles.

This means that thousands of Nebraskans are hours away from a large or even medium-sized airport requiring them to drive several hours to take a flight.

Due to these geographical barriers, many Nebraskans rely on Essential Air Service to keep themselves and their communities connected to the Nation's transportation network.

In Nebraska, we have Essential Air Service airports in many communities including my hometown of McCook, Alliance, Chadron, Grand Island, Kearney, North Platte, and Scottsbluff. Without the EAS Program, you would see the many hours it already takes to get to any type of air service increased significantly for people in rural areas.

The cost to travel on one of these EAS flights would become so cost-prohibitive that many would not even be able to afford to travel. And, quite frankly, there would probably be many cases where EAS airports would struggle to exist.

But the EAS Program isn't simply about cutting hours off a driver's time to make a flight. It is also about economic development in rural areas and job creation.

EAS promotes accessibility and growth in rural communities and in the surrounding rural areas—and I have seen the impact air service can have on a community's ability to attract employers firsthand.

When I was Governor of Nebraska, one of the first questions many companies would ask when they wanted to bring a manufacturing plant or warehouse distribution complex to town would be what is the air service situation in the area.

Because of these EAS airports, I could respond that the area provided an air service transportation option which gave these communities a job creation recruiting edge. But don't just take my word for it. Listen to other Nebraskans who are saying the same things about how important the essential air program is to their communities.

For example, John Chizek, the mayor in Chadron, NE has said:

> As the Mayor and lifetime resident of Chadron I believe it is essential to continue support of the Essential Air Service Program. As a community we are active in the recruitment of new business. I firmly believe we have a unique atmosphere to offer to businesses looking to move or expand. Our county was recently identified as the poorest in the State and any limitations place on us by reducing EAS support will only hinder our hopes of growth.

Darwin Skelton, the airport director at Western Nebraska Regional Airport, has said:

> Essential Air Service is very important to Western Nebraska Regional Airport and Western Nebraska as a whole, without this funding we would not have commercial air service to our community. We have many businesses in this community that use this airport (i.e. Aurora Loan Service, Vertex, Regional West Medical Center, Twin City Development, just to name a few).
>
> When they are told of this plight, I am sure you will be receiving letters of support from many businesses/organizations from around the area . . . small, more rural markets need air service to grow and maintain connections with larger hubs and doing away with Essential Air Service would be saying to rural America that they are not valued as an important part of air service in the United States.

Kyle Pothoff, public works director for the city of McCook, said:

> Having access to commercial air service is critical to the economic stability of communities like McCook and without this service it would make recruiting new businesses very difficult.
>
> A statement that I have recently heard is that economic development does not come by bus or train, it comes by air. This statement could not be more true.

Finally, Dave Glenn, CEO of Pathology Services in North Platte, said:

> With the economy finally showing signs of improvement, loss of EAS funding for airports like North Platte (LBF) would be disastrous. Pathology Services, P.C. serves 18 hospitals and over 50 clinics in Central and Western Nebraska, Northwest Kansas, and Northeast Colorado. To provide the Medicare required pathologist services, we rely on using our general aviation plane based at the North Platte airport.
>
> Our hospital has also recently started a medical helicopter service which helps meet the health care needs of patients. Without EAS funding our business and the health of our citizens would be negatively impacted.

I am well aware that the Essential Air Service does have its critics who are concerned about providing government funding support to keep air service in rural America. Certainly a review of all government supported programs to find efficiencies and ways we can make a program run better and spend less I am always open to. But to simply try and eliminate the Essential Air Service Program which is a driver of economic activity in my State, as you can clearly see from these Nebraskans' stories, is the wrong approach. Essential Air Service truly is essential to rural Nebraska and rural America and why I oppose any efforts to eliminate this important program.

Ms. SNOWE. Madam President, I rise today, with my colleagues, Senator COLLINS, COBURN, and BROWN of Massachusetts to discuss an amendment to the S. 223, the FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act. Currently this bill contains language which adjusts for inflation the personal net worth cap in the Small Business Administration's 8(a) program. This would expand the net worth level established by the SBA in 1989 from $750,000 to approximately $1.4 million. Our amendment aims to strike that language from the bill.

In March of 2010, the Government Accountability Office, GAO, issued a report detailing extensive fraud within the 8(a) program. The report revealed that 14 ineligible firms received $325 million in sole-source and set-aside contracts even though these firms were not eligible for the 8(a) program. As ranking member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I take very seriously our committee's responsibility of vigorous oversight and am concerned with efforts to expand the SBA's 8(a) program when these issues have not been fully vetted through the regular order in the Small Business Committee. Moreover, there has not been a hearing to examine the GAO reports of fraud.

The SBA's 8(a) program is designed to help socially and economically disadvantaged small businesses gain access to Federal contracting opportunities. I support these goals and applaud the Federal Government for consistently meeting the goal for small disadvantaged businesses. However, I am deeply troubled by the program's current vulnerabilities to fraud and abuse which results in legitimate firms being excluded in favor of bad actors who have infiltrated the program. This is not a partisan issue. I recently sent a letter along with SBC Chair MARY LANDRIEU to Administrator Mills' where we stated unequivocally that our first priority in the 112th Congress is to ensure the SBA is taking the requisite steps to purge the contracting programs of any and all fraud and abuse.

When calculating an individual's net worth, the SBA currently excludes the value of their primary residence and the equity in the 8(a) company. The language contained in the FAA bill would result in allowing potential multimillionaires to be considered economically disadvantaged. Therefore, I wonder about the further effects this change would have on the program. I question whether expanding the net worth would result in crowding out of business owners with significantly lower net worth. Additionally, I worry lower income individuals would be at a disadvantage competing with those with substantially more resources.

In light of all these concerns, I fear the current net worth expansion is

fraught with unintended consequences and ignores the recent reports of fraud in the 8(a) program. I urge my colleagues to support the Snowe-Collins-Coburn-Brown amendment to strike this language.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have been working through this bill. I congratulate our manager, Senator ROCKEFELLER, who is one of the most experienced people in the Senate and is a good manager. He has worked well with Senator HUTCHISON, comanager of the bill. We have made significant progress. We have a few amendments on which we are trying to work a way to the end of this. I hope we can work out an agreement to complete this legislation maybe as early as tomorrow morning sometime. If we can't, the first cloture vote is tomorrow, and we will see what happens after that.

Everyone should understand. It is Wednesday. Tomorrow is Thursday. I know a lot of people have arrangements because we have a home work period the following week. We want to go home, if at all possible, late tomorrow night or early Friday morning, but we can't do that if there is work left to be done on this bill. I hope we can work something out so we can finish tomorrow. It would certainly be doable.

We know what we have left. Work on the different issues has been extremely difficult and time-consuming, but we have settled most everything on the Senate floor, as we are supposed to do.

There will be no more rollcall votes tonight. We hope we can move forward to complete work on this most important piece of legislation tomorrow. This legislation is extremely important for our country.

Let's keep in mind, this deals with people. Almost 300,000 jobs will be created or saved with this legislation. I repeat what I have said on the Senate floor once before. McCarran Airport in Las Vegas is the sixth busiest airport in the country. The manager of that airport, Randy Walker, when asked about this bill last week, said: If it passes, we will finally be able to stop using World War II technology to land and have airplanes take off.

It is not just McCarran in Las Vegas. At every airport in the country it is the same thing, World War II technology. We will be able to have a passengers' bill of rights. It is a very fine piece of legislation that has been years in the making. We are too close to the end of this to walk away. We have to finish this bill. It means jobs, real jobs, not make believe jobs.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I now ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Committee on Indian Affairs Rules of Procedure.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rule 1. The Standing Rules of the Senate, Senate Resolution 4, and the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, as supplemented by these rules, are adopted as the rules of the Committee to the extent the provisions of such Rules, Resolution, and Acts are applicable to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE

Rule 2. The Committee shall meet on Thursday while the Congress is in session for the purpose of conducting business, unless for the convenience of the Members, the Chairman shall set some other day for a meeting. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as he may deem necessary.

OPEN HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

Rule 3(a). Hearings and business meetings of the Committee shall be open to the public except when the Chairman by a majority vote orders a closed hearing or meeting.

(b). Except as otherwise provided in the Rules of the Senate, a transcript or electronic recording shall be kept of each hearing and business meeting of the Committee.

HEARING PROCEDURE

Rule 4(a). Public notice, including notice to Members of the Committee, shall be given of the date, place and subject matter of any hearing to be held by the Committee at least one week in advance of such hearing unless the Chairman of the Committee, with the concurrence of the Vice Chairman, determines that holding the hearing would be non-controversial or that special circumstances require expedited procedures and a majority of the Committee Members attending concurs. In no case shall a hearing be conducted with less than 24 hours notice.

(b). Each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall submit his or her testimony by way of electronic mail, at least 48 hours in advance of a hearing, in a format determined by the Committee and sent to an electronic mail address specified by the Committee.

(c). Each Member shall be limited to five (5) minutes of questioning of any witness until such time as all Members attending who so desire have had an opportunity to question the witness unless the Committee shall decide otherwise.

(d). The Chairman and Vice Chairman or the ranking Majority and Minority Members present at the hearing may each appoint one Committee staff member to question each witness. Such staff member may question the witness only after all Members present have completed their questioning of the witness or at such time as the Chairman and Vice Chairman or the Ranking Majority and Minority Members present may agree.

BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA

Rule 5(a). A legislative measure or subject shall be included in the agenda of the next following business meeting of the Committee if a written request by a Member for consideration of such measure or subject has been filed with the Chairman of the Committee at least one week prior to such meeting. Nothing in this rule shall be construed to limit the authority of the Chairman of the Committee to include legislative measures or subjects on the Committee agenda in the absence of such request.

(b). Any bill, resolution, or other matter to be considered by the Committee at a business meeting shall be filed with the Clerk of the Committee. Notice of, and the agenda for, any business meeting of the Committee, and a copy of any bill, resolution, or other matter to be considered at the meeting, shall be provided to each Member and made available to the public at least three days prior to such meeting, and no new items may be added after the agenda is published except by the approval of a majority of the Members of the Committee. The notice and agenda of any business meeting may be provided to the Members by electronic mail, provided that a paper copy will be provided to any Member upon request. The Clerk shall promptly notify absent Members of any action taken by the Committee on matters not included in the published agenda.

(c). Any amendment(s) to any bill or resolution to be considered shall be filed with the Clerk not less than 24 hours in advance. This rule may be waived by the Chairman with the concurrence of the Vice Chairman.

QUORUM

Rule 6(a). Except as provided in subsection (b), a majority of the Members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business of the Committee. Except as provided in Senate Rule XXVI 7(a), a quorum is presumed to be present unless the absence of a quorum is noted by a Member.

(b). One Member shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting a hearing or taking testimony on any measure or matter before the Committee.

VOTING

Rule 7(a). A recorded vote of the Members shall be taken upon the request of any Member.

(b). A measure may be reported without a recorded vote from the Committee unless an objection is made by a Member, in which case a recorded vote by the Members shall be required. A Member shall have the right to have his or her additional views included in the Committee report in accordance with Senate Rule XXVI 10.

(c). A Committee vote to report a measure to the Senate shall also authorize the staff of the Committee to make necessary technical and conforming changes to the measure.

(d). Proxy voting shall be permitted on all matters, except that proxies may not be counted for the purpose of determining the presence of a quorum. Unless further limited, a proxy shall be exercised only for the date for which it is given and upon the terms published in the agenda for that date.

SWORN TESTIMONY AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Rule 8(a). Witnesses in Committee hearings may be required to give testimony under oath whenever the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Committee deems it to be necessary.

(b). At any hearing to confirm a Presidential nomination, the testimony of the nominee, and at the request of any Member, any other witness shall be under oath. Every nominee shall submit a financial statement, on forms to be perfected by the Committee, which shall be sworn to by the nominee as to its completeness and accuracy. All such statements shall be made public by the Committee unless the Committee, in executive session, determines that special circumstances require a full or partial exception to this rule.

(c). Members of the Committee are urged to make public a complete disclosure of their financial interests on forms to be perfected by the Committee in the manner required in the case of Presidential nominees.

CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY

Rule 9. No confidential testimony taken by, or confidential material presented to the Committee or any report of the proceedings of a closed Committee hearing or business meeting shall be made public in whole or in part, or by way of summary, unless authorized by a majority of the Members of the Committee at a business meeting called for the purpose of making such a determination.

DEFAMATORY STATEMENTS

Rule 10. Any person whose name is mentioned or who is specifically identified in, or who believes that testimony or other evidence presented at, an open Committee hearing tends to defame him or her or otherwise adversely affect his or her reputation may file with the Committee for its consideration and action a sworn statement of facts relevant to such testimony of evidence.

BROADCASTING OF HEARINGS OR MEETINGS

Rule 11. Any meeting or hearing by the Committee which is open to the public may be covered in whole or in part by television, Internet, radio broadcast, or still photography. Photographers and reporters using mechanical recording, filming, or broadcasting devices shall position their equipment so as not to interfere with the sight, vision, and hearing of Members and staff on the dais or with the orderly process of the meeting or hearing.

AUTHORIZING SUBPOENAS

Rule 12. The Chairman may, with the agreement of the Vice Chairman, or the Committee may, by majority vote, authorize the issuance of subpoenas.

AMENDING THE RULES

Rule 13. These rules may be amended only by a vote of a majority of all the Members of the Committee in a business meeting of the Committee: Provided, that no vote may be taken on any proposed amendment unless such amendment is reproduced in full in the Committee agenda for such meeting at least seven (7) days in advance of such meeting.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rules of the Committee on the Budget for the 112th Congress be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

I. MEETINGS

(1) The committee shall hold its regular meeting on the first Thursday of each month. Additional meetings may be called by the chair as the chair deems necessary to expedite committee business.

(2) Each meeting of the committee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a portion or portions of any such meeting may be closed to the public if the committee determines by record vote in open session of a majority of the members of the committee present that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such portion or portions—

(a) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(b) will relate solely to matters of the committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(c) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(d) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement; or

(e) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(i) an act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(ii) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person.

(f) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulations.

(3) Notice of, and the agenda for, any business meeting or markup shall be provided to each member and made available to the public at least 48 hours prior to such meeting or markup.

II. QUORUMS AND VOTING

(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this section, a quorum for the transaction of committee business shall consist of not less than one-third of the membership of the entire committee: Provided, that proxies shall not be counted in making a quorum.

(2) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum for reporting budget resolutions, legislative measures or recommendations: Provided, that proxies shall not be counted in making a quorum.

(3) For the purpose of taking sworn or unsworn testimony, a quorum of the committee shall consist of one Senator.

(4)(a) The committee may poll—

(i) internal committee matters including those concerning the committee's staff, records, and budget;

(ii) steps in an investigation, including issuance of subpoenas, applications for immunity orders, and requests for documents from agencies; and

(iii) other committee business that the committee has designated for polling at a meeting, except that the committee may not vote by poll on reporting to the Senate any measure, matter, or recommendation, and may not vote by poll on closing a meeting or hearing to the public.

(b) To conduct a poll, the chair shall circulate polling sheets to each member specifying the matter being polled and the time limit for completion of the poll. If any member requests, the matter shall be held for a meeting rather than being polled. The chief clerk shall keep a record of polls; if the committee determines by record vote in open session of a majority of the members of the committee present that the polled matter is one of those enumerated in rule I(2)(a)–(e), then the record of the poll shall be confidential. Any member may move at the committee meeting following a poll for a vote on the polled decision.

III. PROXIES

When a record vote is taken in the committee on any bill, resolution, amendment, or any other question, a quorum being present, a member who is unable to attend the meeting may vote by proxy if the absent member has been informed of the matter on which the vote is being recorded and has affirmatively requested to be so recorded; except that no member may vote by proxy during the deliberations on Budget Resolutions.

IV. HEARINGS AND HEARING PROCEDURES

(1) The committee shall make public announcement of the date, place, time, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least 1 week in advance of such hearing, unless the chair and ranking member determine that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date.

(2) In the event that the membership of the Senate is equally divided between the two parties, the ranking member is authorized to call witnesses to testify at any hearing in an amount equal to the number called by the chair. The previous sentence shall not apply in the case of a hearing at which the committee intends to call an official of the Federal government as the sole witness.

(3) A witness appearing before the committee shall file a written statement of proposed testimony at least 1 calendar day prior to appearance, unless the requirement is waived by the chair and the ranking member, following their determination that there is good cause for the failure of compliance.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(1) When the committee has ordered a measure or recommendation reported, following final action, the report thereon shall be filed in the Senate at the earliest practicable time.

(2) A member of the committee, who gives notice of an intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views at the time of final committee approval of a measure or matter, shall be entitled to not less than 3 calendar days in which to file such views, in writing, with the chief clerk of the committee. Such views shall then be included in the committee report and printed in the same volume, as a part thereof, and their inclusions shall be noted on the cover of the report. In the absence of timely notice, the committee report may be filed and printed immediately without such views.

VI. USE OF DISPLAY MATERIALS IN COMMITTEE

Graphic displays used during any meetings or hearings of the committee are limited to the following:

Charts, photographs, or renderings:

Size: no larger than 36 inches by 48 inches.

Where: on an easel stand next to the member's seat or at the rear of the committee room.

When: only at the time the member is speaking.

Number: no more than two may be displayed at a time.

VII. CONFIRMATION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

(1) Standards. In considering a nomination, the committee shall inquire into the nominee's experience, qualifications, suitability, and integrity to serve in the position to which he or she has been nominated. The committee shall recommend confirmation if it finds that the nominee has the necessary integrity and is affirmatively qualified by reason of training, education, or experience to carry out the functions of the office to which he or she was nominated.

(2) Information Concerning the Nominee. Each nominee shall submit the following information to the committee:

(a) A detailed biographical resume which contains information concerning education, employment, and background which generally relates to the position to which the individual is nominated, and which is to be made public;

(b) Information concerning financial and other background of the nominee which is to be made public; provided, that financial information that does not relate to the nominee's qualifications to hold the position to which the individual is nominated, tax returns or reports prepared by federal agencies that may be submitted by the nominee shall, after review by the chair, ranking member, or any other member of the committee upon request, be maintained in a manner to ensure confidentiality; and,

(c) Copies of other relevant documents and responses to questions as the committee may so request, such as responses to questions concerning the policies and programs the nominee intends to pursue upon taking office.

(3) Report on the Nominee. After a review of all information pertinent to the nomination, a confidential report on the nominee may be prepared by the committee staff for the chair, the ranking member and, upon request, for any other member of the committee. The report shall summarize the steps taken and the results of the committee inquiry, including any unresolved matters that have been raised during the course of the inquiry.

(4) Hearings. The committee shall conduct a hearing during which the nominee shall be called to testify under oath on all matters relating to his or her suitability for office, including the policies and programs which he or she would pursue while in that position. No hearing or meeting to consider the confirmation shall be held until at least 72 hours after the following events have occurred: the nominee has responded to the requirements set forth in subsection (2), and, if a report described in subsection (3) has been prepared, it has been presented to the chairman and ranking member, and is available to other members of the committee, upon request.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, in accordance with Rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have the rules governing the procedure of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

GENERAL RULES

Rule 1. The Standing Rules of the Senate, as supplemented by these rules, are adopted as the rules of the Committee and its Subcommittees.

MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

Rule 2. (a) The Committee shall meet on the third Wednesday of each month while the Congress is in session for the purpose of conducting business, unless, for the convenience of Members, the Chairman shall set some other day for a meeting. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as he may deem necessary.

(b) Hearings of any Subcommittee may be called by the Chairman of such Subcommittee, Provided, That no Subcommittee hearing other than a field hearing, shall be scheduled or held concurrently with a full Committee meeting or hearing, unless a majority of the Committee concurs in such concurrent hearing.

OPEN HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

Rule 3. (a) All hearings and business meetings of the Committee and all the hearings of any of its Subcommittees shall be open to the public unless the Committee or Subcommittee involved, by majority vote of all the Members of the Committee or such Subcommittee, orders the hearing or meeting to be closed in accordance with paragraph 5(b) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(b) A transcript shall be kept of each hearing of the Committee or any Subcommittee.

(c) A transcript shall be kept of each business meeting of the Committee unless a majority of all the Members of the Committee agrees that some other form of permanent record is preferable.

HEARING PROCEDURE

Rule 4. (a) Public notice shall be given of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be held by the Committee or any Subcommittee at least one week in advance of such hearing unless the Chairman of the full Committee or the Subcommittee involved determines that the hearing is noncontroversial or that special circumstances require expedited procedures and a majority of all the Members of the Committee or the Subcommittee involved concurs. In no case shall a hearing be conducted with less than twenty-four hours notice. Any document or report that is the subject of a hearing shall be provided to every Member of the Committee or Subcommittee involved at least 72 hours before the hearing unless the Chairman and Ranking Member determine otherwise.

(b) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or any Subcommittee shall file with the Committee or Subcommittee, at least 24 hours in advance of the hearing, a written statement of his or her testimony in as many copies as the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee prescribes.

(c) Each Member shall be limited to five minutes in the questioning of any witness until such time as all Members who so desire have had an opportunity to question the witness.

(d) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or Subcommittee or the Ranking Majority and Minority Members present at the hearing may each appoint one Committee staff member to question each witness. Such staff member may question the witness only after all Members present have completed their questioning of the witness or at such other time as the Chairman and the Ranking Majority and Minority Members present may agree. No staff member may question a witness in the absence of a quorum for the taking of testimony.

BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA

Rule 5. (a) A legislative measure, nomination, or other matter shall be included on the agenda of the next following business meeting of the full Committee if a written request for such inclusion has been filed with the Chairman of the Committee at least one week prior to such meeting. Nothing in this rule shall be construed to limit the authority of the Chairman of the Committee to include a legislative measure, nomination, or other matter on the Committee agenda in the absence of such request.

(b) The agenda for any business meeting of the Committee shall be provided to each Member and made available to the public at least three days prior to such meeting, and no new items may be added after the agenda is so published except by the approval of a majority of all the Members of the Committee on matters not included on the public agenda. The Staff Director shall promptly notify absent Members of any action taken by the Committee on matters not included on the published agenda.

QUORUMS

Rule 6. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), eight Members shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business of the Committee.

(b) No measure or matter shall be ordered reported from the Committee unless twelve Members of the Committee are actually present at the time such action is taken.

(c) One Member shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting a hearing or taking testimony on any measure or matter before the Committee or any Subcommittee.

VOTING

Rule 7. (a) A rollcall of the Members shall be taken upon the request of any Member. Any Member who does not vote on any rollcall at the time the roll is called, may vote (in person or by proxy) on that rollcall at any later time during the same business meeting.

(b) Proxy voting shall be permitted on all matters, except that proxies may not be counted for the purpose of determining the presence of a quorum. Unless further limited, a proxy shall be exercised only upon the date for which it is given and upon the items published in the agenda for that date.

(c) Each Committee report shall set forth the vote on the motion to report the measure or matter involved. Unless the Committee directs otherwise, the report will not set out any votes on amendments offered during Committee consideration. Any Member who did not vote on any rollcall shall have the opportunity to have his position recorded in the appropriate Committee record or Committee report.

(d) The Committee vote to report a measure to the Senate shall also authorize the staff of the Committee to make necessary technical and clerical corrections in the measure.

SUBCOMMITTEES

Rule 8. (a) The number of Members assigned to each Subcommittee and the division between Majority and Minority Members shall be fixed by the Chairman in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

(b) Assignment of Members to Subcommittees shall, insofar as possible, reflect the preferences of the Members. No Member will receive assignment to a second Subcommittee until, in order of seniority, all Members of the Committee have chosen assignments to one Subcommittee, and no Member shall receive assignment to a third Subcommittee until, in order of seniority, all Members have chosen assignments to two Subcommittees.

(c) Any Member of the Committee may sit with any Subcommittee during its hearings but shall not have the authority to vote on

any matters before the Subcommittee unless he is a Member of such Subcommittee.

NOMINATIONS

Rule 9. At any hearing to confirm a Presidential nomination, the testimony of the nominee and, at the request of any Member, any other witness shall be under oath. Every nominee shall submit a statement of his financial interests, including those of his spouse, his minor children, and other members of his immediate household, on a form approved by the Committee, which shall be sworn to by the nominee as to its completeness and accuracy. A statement of every nominee's financial interest shall be made available to the public on a form approved by the Committee unless the Committee in executive session determines that special circumstances require a full or partial exception to this rule.

INVESTIGATIONS

Rule 10. (a) Neither the Committee nor any of its Subcommittees may undertake an investigation or preliminary inquiry unless specifically authorized by a majority of all the Members of the Committee.

(b) A witness called to testify in an investigation or inquiry shall be informed of the matter or matters under investigation, given a copy of these rules, given the opportunity to make a brief and relevant oral statement before or after questioning, and be permitted to have counsel of his or her choosing present during his or her testimony at any public or closed hearing, or at any unsworn interview, to advise the witness of his or her legal rights.

(c) For purposes of this rule, the terms ''investigation'' and ''preliminary inquiry'' shall not include a review or study undertaken pursuant to paragraph 8 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate or an initial review of any allegation of wrongdoing intended to determine whether there is substantial credible evidence that would warrant a preliminary inquiry or an investigation.

SWORN TESTIMONY

Rule 11. Witnesses in Committee or Subcommittee hearings may be required to give testimony under oath whenever the Chairman or Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or Subcommittee deems such to be necessary. If one or more witnesses at a hearing are required to testify under oath, all witnesses at such hearing shall be required to testify under oath.

SUBPOENAS

Rule 12. No subpoena for the attendance of a witness or for the production of any document, memorandum, record, or other material may be issued unless authorized by a majority of all the Members of the Committee, except that a resolution adopted pursuant to Rule 10(a) may authorize the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, to issue subpoenas within the scope of the authorized investigation.

CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY

Rule 13. No confidential testimony taken by or any report of the proceedings of a closed Committee or Subcommittee meeting shall be made public, in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless authorized by a majority of all the Members of the Committee at a business meeting called for the purpose of making such a determination.

DEFAMATORY STATEMENTS

Rule 14. Any person whose name is mentioned or who is specifically identified in, or who believes that testimony or other evidence presented at, an open Committee or Subcommittee hearing tends to defame him or otherwise adversely affect his reputation may file with the Committee for its consideration and action a sworn statement of facts relevant to such testimony or evidence.

BROADCASTING OF HEARINGS OR MEETINGS

Rule 15. Any meeting or hearing by the Committee or any Subcommittee which is open to the public may be covered in whole or in part by television broadcast, radio broadcast, or still photography. Photographers and reporters using mechanical recording, filming, or broadcasting devices shall position their equipment so as not to interfere with the seating, vision, and hearing of Members and staff on the dais or with the orderly process of the meeting or hearing.

AMENDING THE RULES

Rule 16. These rules may be amended only by vote of a majority of all the Members of the Committee in a business meeting of the Committee: Provided, That no vote may be taken on any proposed amendment unless such amendment is reproduced in full in the Committee agenda for such meeting at least three days in advance of such meeting.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the Committee on Environment and Public Works has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 112th Congress. Pursuant to Rules XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules for the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Jurisdiction

Rule XXV, Standing Rules of the Senate

1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, and shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed, with leave to report by bill or otherwise on matters within their respective jurisdictions:

* * * * *

(h)(1) Committee on Environment and Public Works, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Air pollution.
2. Construction and maintenance of highways.
3. Environmental aspects of Outer Continental Shelf lands.
4. Environmental effects of toxic substances, other than pesticides.
5. Environmental policy.
6. Environmental research and development.
7. Fisheries and wildlife.
8. Flood control and improvements of rivers and harbors, including environmental aspects of deepwater ports.
9. Noise pollution.
10. Nonmilitary environmental regulation and control of nuclear energy.
11. Ocean dumping.
12. Public buildings and improved grounds of the United States generally, including Federal buildings in the District of Columbia.
13. Public works, bridges, and dams.
14. Regional economic development.
15. Solid waste disposal and recycling.
16. Water pollution.
17. Water resources.

(2) Such committee shall also study and review, on a comprehensive basis, matters relating to environmental protection and resource utilization and conservation, and report thereon from time to time.

RULES OF PROCEDURE

RULE 1. COMMITTEE MEETINGS IN GENERAL

(a) REGULAR MEETING DAYS: For purposes of complying with paragraph 3 of Senate Rule XXVI, the regular meeting day of the committee is the first and third Thursday of each month at 10:00 a.m. If there is no business before the committee, the regular meeting shall be omitted.

(b) ADDITIONAL MEETINGS: The chair may call additional meetings, after consulting with the ranking minority member. Subcommittee chairs may call meetings, with the concurrence of the chair, after consulting with the ranking minority members of the subcommittee and the committee.

(c) PRESIDING OFFICER:

(1) The chair shall preside at all meetings of the committee. If the chair is not present, the ranking majority member shall preside.

(2) Subcommittee chairs shall preside at all meetings of their subcommittees. If the subcommittee chair is not present, the ranking majority member of the subcommittee shall preside.

(3) Notwithstanding the rule prescribed by paragraphs (1) and (2), any member of the committee may preside at a hearing.

(d) OPEN MEETINGS: Meetings of the committee and subcommittees, including hearings and business meetings, are open to the public. A portion of a meeting may be closed to the public if the committee determines by roll call vote of a majority of the members present that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken—

(1) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(2) relate solely to matters of committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure; or

(3) constitute any other grounds for closure under paragraph 5(b) of Senate Rule XXVI.

(e) BROADCASTING:

(1) Public meetings of the committee or a subcommittee may be televised, broadcast, or recorded by a member of the Senate press gallery or an employee of the Senate.

(2) Any member of the Senate Press Gallery or employee of the Senate wishing to televise, broadcast, or record a committee meeting must notify the staff director or the staff director's designee by 5:00 p.m. the day before the meeting.

(3) During public meetings, any person using a camera, microphone, or other electronic equipment may not position or use the equipment in a way that interferes with the seating, vision, or hearing of committee members or staff on the dais, or with the orderly process of the meeting.

RULE 2. QUORUMS

(a) BUSINESS MEETINGS: At committee business meetings, and for the purpose of approving the issuance of a subpoena or approving a committee resolution, one third of the members of the committee, at least two of whom are members of the minority party, constitute a quorum, except as provided in subsection (d).

(b) SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS: At subcommittee business meetings, a majority of the subcommittee members, at least one of whom is a member of the minority party, constitutes a quorum for conducting business.

(c) CONTINUING QUORUM: Once a quorum as prescribed in subsections (a) and (b) has been established, the committee or subcommittee may continue to conduct business.

(d) REPORTING: No measure or matter may be reported to the Senate by the committee unless a majority of committee members cast votes in person.

(e) HEARINGS: One member constitutes a quorum for conducting a hearing.

RULE 3. HEARINGS

(a) ANNOUNCEMENTS: Before the committee or a subcommittee holds a hearing, the chair of the committee or subcommittee shall make a public announcement and provide notice to members of the date, place, time, and subject matter of the hearing. The announcement and notice shall be issued at least one week in advance of the hearing, unless the chair of the committee or subcommittee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of the committee or subcommittee, determines that there is good cause to provide a shorter period, in which event the announcement and notice shall be issued at least twenty-four hours in advance of the hearing.

(b) STATEMENTS OF WITNESSES:

(1) A witness who is scheduled to testify at a hearing of the committee or a subcommittee shall file 100 copies of the written testimony at least 48 hours before the hearing. If a witness fails to comply with this requirement, the presiding officer may preclude the witness' testimony. This rule may be waived for field hearings, except for witnesses from the Federal Government.

(2) Any witness planning to use at a hearing any exhibit such as a chart, graph, diagram, photo, map, slide, or model must submit one identical copy of the exhibit (or representation of the exhibit in the case of a model) and 100 copies reduced to letter or legal paper size at least 48 hours before the hearing. Any exhibit described above that is not provided to the committee at least 48 hours prior to the hearing cannot be used for purpose of presenting testimony to the committee and will not be included in the hearing record.

(3) The presiding officer at a hearing may have a witness confine the oral presentation to a summary of the written testimony.

(4) Notwithstanding a request that a document be embargoed, any document that is to be discussed at a hearing, including, but not limited to, those produced by the General Accounting Office, Congressional Budget Office, Congressional Research Service, a Federal agency, an Inspector General, or a nongovernmental entity, shall be provided to all members of the committee at least 72 hours before the hearing.

RULE 4. BUSINESS MEETINGS: NOTICE AND FILING REQUIREMENTS

(a) NOTICE: The chair of the committee or the subcommittee shall provide notice, the agenda of business to be discussed, and the text of agenda items to members of the committee or subcommittee at least 72 hours before a business meeting. If the 72 hours falls over a weekend, all materials will be provided by close of business on Friday.

(b) AMENDMENTS: First-degree amendments must be filed with the chair of the committee or the subcommittee at least 24 hours before a business meeting. After the filing deadline, the chair shall promptly distribute all filed amendments to the members of the committee or subcommittee.

(c) MODIFICATIONS: The chair of the committee or the subcommittee may modify the notice and filing requirements to meet special circumstances, with the concurrence of the ranking member of the committee or subcommittee.

RULE 5. BUSINESS MEETINGS: VOTING

(a) PROXY VOTING:

(1) Proxy voting is allowed on all measures, amendments, resolutions, or other matters before the committee or a subcommittee.

(2) A member who is unable to attend a business meeting may submit a proxy vote on any matter, in writing, orally, or through personal instructions.

(3) A proxy given in writing is valid until revoked. A proxy given orally or by personal instructions is valid only on the day given.

(b) SUBSEQUENT VOTING: Members who were not present at a business meeting and were unable to cast their votes by proxy may record their votes later, so long as they do so that same business day and their vote does not change the outcome.

(c) PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT:

(1) Whenever the committee conducts a rollcall vote, the chair shall announce the results of the vote, including a tabulation of the votes cast in favor and the votes cast against the proposition by each member of the committee.

(2) Whenever the committee reports any measure or matter by rollcall vote, the report shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to the measure or matter by each member of the committee.

RULE 6. SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) REGULARLY ESTABLISHED SUBCOMMITTEES: The committee has seven subcommittees: Transportation and Infrastructure; Clean Air and Nuclear Safety; Superfund, Toxics and Environmental Health; Water and Wildlife; Green Jobs and the New Economy; Oversight; and Children's Health and Environmental Responsibility.

(b) MEMBERSHIP: The committee chair, after consulting with the ranking minority member, shall select members of the subcommittees.

RULE 7. STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES AND OTHER MATTERS

(a) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS: No project or legislation proposed by any executive branch agency may be approved or otherwise acted upon unless the committee has received a final environmental impact statement relative to it, in accordance with section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act, and the written comments of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in accordance with section 309 of the Clean Air Act. This rule is not intended to broaden, narrow, or otherwise modify the class of projects or legislative proposals for which environmental impact statements are required under section 102(2)(C).

(b) PROJECT APPROVALS:

(1) Whenever the committee authorizes a project under Public Law 89–298, the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1965; Public Law 83–566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; or Public Law 86–249, the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; the chairman shall submit for printing in the Congressional Record, and the committee shall publish periodically as a committee print, a report that describes the project and the reasons for its approval, together with any dissenting or individual views.

(2) Proponents of a committee resolution shall submit appropriate evidence in favor of the resolution.

(c) BUILDING PROSPECTUSES:

(1) When the General Services Administration submits a prospectus, pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, for construction (including construction of buildings for lease by the government), alteration and repair, or acquisition, the committee shall act with respect to the prospectus during the same session in which the prospectus is submitted.

A prospectus rejected by majority vote of the committee or not reported to the Senate during the session in which it was submitted shall be returned to the General Services Administration and must then be resubmitted in order to be considered by the committee during the next session of the Congress.

(2) A report of a building project survey submitted by the General Services Administration to the committee under section 11(b) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, may not be considered by the committee as being a prospectus subject to approval by committee resolution in accordance with section 7(a) of that Act. A project described in the report may be considered for committee action only if it is submitted as a prospectus in accordance with section 7(a) and is subject to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this rule.

(d) NAMING PUBLIC FACILITIES: The committee may not name a building, structure or facility for any living person, except former Presidents or former Vice Presidents of the United States, former Members of Congress over 70 years of age, former Justices of the United States Supreme Court over 70 years of age, or Federal judges who are fully retired and over 75 years of age or have taken senior status and are over 75 years of age.

RULE 8. AMENDING THE RULES

The rules may be added to, modified, amended, or suspended by vote of a majority of committee members at a business meeting if a quorum is present.

TRIBUTE TO EUGENE M. LANG

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am proud, for many reasons, that I am a graduate of Swarthmore College. But among those reasons is the fact that as a graduate of Swarthmore, I am in the same company as Eugene Lang, a 1938 graduate of the college. Few if any of our school's many distinguished graduates have matched Gene Lang's ability and determination to use his talents in the service of his fellow man.

If his resume consisted only of his extraordinarily successful business career, Gene would be an admirable figure. As founder of REFAC Technology Development Corporation, in more than a half a century of work, he has helped foster innovation, particularly in manufacturing, by helping American inventors and entrepreneurs profit from their ideas.

But what he has done with the earnings from that business is truly remarkable.

In 1981, Gene paid a visit to P.S. 121, the Harlem elementary school he had attended as a boy. He was going to speak to a group of sixth graders preparing to move on to middle school. Before his speech, he spoke with the principal, who told him that three out of every four of the students he would address would never finish high school.

To a man who entered college at the age of 14 and had an advanced business degree by his 20th birthday, this was unacceptable. And so he told the students that day: Education has allowed me to follow my dreams, and it can do the same for you too. He promised each and every student that day that if they would work hard, stay in school and

graduate from high school, he would pay their way to college.

Gene's promise became the ''I Have a Dream'' Foundation, and it did not just benefit the 61 students he addressed that day. It inspired similar promises all over the world, more than 200 now, where others who have enjoyed the benefits of education have followed Gene's example and invested in bringing those benefits to others. In my own State, the Kalamazoo Promise, a pledge by a small group of anonymous donors to give every Kalamazoo public school student a chance at a college education, is just one example of the kinds of programs Gene has inspired.

That is not all. Determined to connect America's universities more closely to the societies they serve, in 2001 he founded Project Pericles, which provides funding for more than 20 U.S. colleges and universities to help them include social responsibility and citizenship in their curricula. His donations to Swarthmore, Columbia, the New School University and other institutions have made him one of higher education's most important benefactors. President Clinton honored him in 1996 with the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

This weekend Swarthmore will honor Gene with a celebration of his life and work. Fittingly, this won't just be a celebratory dinner. It will also be a search for answers, for solutions on how to solve problems and improve our society. Symposia will focus on the role of social responsibility in education and on the link between social change and the arts.

I want to add my voice to those honoring Eugene Lang this weekend at Swarthmore. Thousands of American students have achieved their dreams thanks in part to his dedication, persistence and effectiveness. Swarthmore pride in Eugene Lang will be on display this weekend. This Swarthmorean is proud to call him my friend.

REMEMBERING REPRESENTATIVE HOWARD POLLOCK

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Howard Pollock, an Alaskan political pioneer. I am saddened to report that Representative Pollock, a true Alaskan spirit and a greatly respected public servant, passed away at the age of 90 in Coronado, CA, on January 9, 2011.

Twenty-eight members of Howard's family were by his side during his final moments. Like all who knew and loved Howard, they will remember him as both a family man and a fighter for Alaska's best interests. He is respected by the people of my home State for his dedicated service during territorial days, his leadership in Juneau in the early days of Alaska's statehood, and for his continued service in Washington, DC, and other parts of the world. Howard recognized and valued Alaska's untilled potential and true grit spirit, and it was that very spirit that drew him north to Alaska as a young man.

Howard Pollock was born in Chicago on April 11, 1920. As a boy he grew up in New Orleans, and he won a Mississippi State boxing title in junior college. When World War II broke out, he answered his country's call to duty, enlisted as a Navy seaman, and served overseas.

On Easter Sunday in 1944, a grenade exploded during a training exercise and Howard lost his right forearm. This tragedy would be a setback for most, but it didn't slow Howard down one bit. He continued to rise through the ranks and retired in 1946 as a lieutenant commander. This prestigious rank was quite fitting for his distinguished career.

After the war Howard and his first wife Maryanne Passmore Pollock began their trek north to the territory of Alaska on the recently built Alaska-Canadian highway. Howard and Maryanne built a cabin and made their home on 80 wild acres of land south of Anchorage, nothing like the Anchorage we know today.

Alaska quickly became Howard's pride and focus. He juggled school and politics and earned a law degree from the University of Houston and a master's degree from MIT. And it wasn't long before he again answered the call to service. His official entrance into politics began when a friend dared him to run for mayor of Anchorage. Although he lost that race, he would stay involved in the affairs of Alaska—from then on.

Howard's dedication and involvement quickly earned him a seat at the table with the other young movers and shakers of those infamous years leading up to statehood. Teaming up with a passionate group of Alaskans, including a young Ted Stevens, they worked tirelessly to gain statehood and built upon what little infrastructure Alaska had at that time.

Howard also held office—both elected and appointed—for a number of years. He was elected to the territorial legislature in 1955 and served as a State senator for 5 years. In 1966, he became Alaska's sole Congressman, ably serving the Nation's largest State. He served in the U.S. House of Representatives until 1970. He would go on to serve as deputy director of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and, following that, served as part of the American delegation to the Law of the Sea Conference. Also, Howard proudly served as the National Rifle Association president.

Despite his demanding public commitments, Howard never forgot how to have fun. After losing his arm in the war, he taught himself how to shoot left handed and enjoyed hunting. He loved fishing for marlin and traveling the world. He earned a black belt in Tae Kwon Do at the age of 75—the epitome of a man who was ''young at heart.'' If Howard's love of the Last Frontier didn't emulate the pioneer spirit enough already, his hobbies certainly did.

Howard Pollock made a difference not only in Alaskan politics, but also in the lives of Alaskans. He helped set a foundation that has allowed Alaska to become the greatest State in our Union. Last month, the Pollock family lost a loving father and husband. Alaskans lost a pioneer and a leader—a man who always fought for them. And our Nation lost a dedicated servant who had served with great distinction, first in World War II and ultimately in a public career that spanned several decades.

On behalf of all Alaskans, I extend my prayers and deepest sympathies to Howard's five children, his nine grandchildren, his family and friends, most particularly his companion Marina Goodenough, and all who knew and loved him.

ATTACKS IN HUNGARY AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, as cochairman of the U.S. Helsinki Commission, I wanted to bring to the Senate's attention that next week, February 23, will mark a tragic anniversary. Two years ago on that date, assassins gathered outside the home of Robert Csorba. They threw a Molotov cocktail into the house. Although some family members escaped the blaze, five-year-old Robert Csorba and his father did not: as they tried to flee the flames, their attackers riddled them with bullets. The murderers were prepared: if the bomb did not finish them off, their guns would. They were prepared to kill men, women, and children.

The Csorbas were just two of the victims in a wave of racially motivated attacks against Roma that has roiled Hungary. According to the European Roma Rights Center, between January 2008 and July 2010 there were at least two dozen cases where Molotov cocktails, hand grenades or sniper fire were used. The victims included nine fatalities, including two children, and others who were seriously injured.

Among them was the 13-year-old daughter of Maria Balogh. Ms. Balogh was murdered when snipers shot into her home in the middle of the night on August 3, 2009, killing her and leaving her daughter an orphan. Her daughter was also grievously wounded: she was shot in the face, blinded in one eye, and maimed for life. It is no wonder that these attacks led one Romani activist to declare that Roma would need to arm themselves or flee, and another asserted that if these attacks continued, Hungary would be headed toward civil war.

There are some positive developments. The fatal attacks have stopped. Hungary's new government has reached out to the victims to provide support for rebuilding homes that were damaged or destroyed in arson attacks.

Hungary's new Minister for Social Inclusion, Zolton Balog, has demonstrated a rare and welcome compassion for his Romani fellow citizens.

But the wounded and the dead still wait for justice in Hungary. Although four men have been arrested on suspicion of carrying out the serial killings of Roma that occurred in 2008 and 2009, there have been no trials and no convictions.

The Czech Republic has also seen a dramatic rise in anti-Roma rhetoric and violent actions in the past few years. Last October, I joined Helsinki Commission cochairman, ALCEE HASTINGS in welcoming the lengthy sentences handed down in the Czech Republic to four neo-Nazis who firebombed a Romani home in 2009, an act which left an infant, widely known simply as ''Baby Natalka,'' with second and third degree burns over 80 percent of her body and a lifetime of painful rehabilitation ahead of her.

When that judgment was handed down against the four men who firebombed Baby Natalka, I was heartened. I also said I was watching another Czech case—one that is largely unknown.

On November 8, 2008, a roving mob attacked several Roma in the town of Havirov. One teenager was so savagely beaten, he was effectively left for dead. For a prolonged period of time afterwards, he was in a coma, and when he regained consciousness, he was unable to talk. Although he has learned to speak again, he has suffered permanent brain damage. He is paralyzed, was forced to end his studies, and may never be able to work.

A decision in the case is expected to be announced in the Ostrava regional court at 8:30 a.m. on February 24. Behind the high profile murder cases of Roma that make their way into the news, there is an even larger number of cases involving Roma who have been attacked, but not fatally; they do not die but are maimed, disabled, and traumatized for life by the racially motivated violence they have encountered. Their stories are often never told, but each of them stands as a living monument to everyone in their families and everyone in their communities, testifying to the government's failure to protect them. Each of them deserves justice, including Jaroslav Horvath, the teenager attacked in Havirov.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING CLARENCE MITCHELL, JR.

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and pay tribute to a fellow Marylander and civil rights champion, the late Clarence Mitchell, Jr., as we approach the 100th anniversary of his birthday. Clarence Mitchell was the chief lobbyist for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, from 1950 to 1979. He worked alongside the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and NAACP attorney Thurgood Marshall to secure rights and opportunities for African Americans.

Clarence Mitchell had faith. He believed in America's promise and in the democratic process. He believed that the will of the people could become the law of the land, and he believed that equality could be championed without bitterness. He dedicated his life to turning the disappointment and anger of the African-American community into political action. He understood that it was possible to take what was unjust and make it just.

Clarence Mitchell walked the Halls of Congress, lobbying friends and foes to set the wheels of justice in motion. He was quietly forceful as he worked tirelessly to pass comprehensive civil rights laws, including the 1957 Civil Rights Act, the 1960 Civil Rights Act, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the 1965 Civil Rights Act, and the 1968 Fair Housing Act. In fact, his near constant presence in the Senate earned him the nickname the ''101st Senator.'' Former Majority Leader Howard Baker remarked, ''In those days, Clarence Mitchell was called the 101st Senator, but those of us who served here then knew full well that this magnificent lion in the lobby was a great deal more influential than most of us with seats in the Chamber.''

Clarence Mitchell's extraordinary achievements have shaped our lives and our country to this day. In 1980, President Carter appropriately awarded him the Presidential Medal of Freedom. On the centennial of his birth, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the late Clarence Mitchell, Jr., and recognize the enormous impact his life's work has had on our great Nation.•

SNELL LABORATORY'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, it is with the greatest pleasure that today I honor Snell Prosthetic & Orthotic Laboratory on their celebration of 100 years in business. Started in Little Rock, Snell Laboratory has grown from its earliest years and now has nine offices across the State of Arkansas.

Originally called Snell's Limbs and Braces, the company was founded by R. W. ''Pop'' Snell in 1911. With a mission and desire to provide the best possible care to his patients, Pop began handcrafting each custom-fitted artificial limb out of rawhide and red willow. Through both World Wars, the business continued to blossom as standards and practices evolved from the company's earliest days. Both the fields of prosthetics and orthotics have revolutionized since Pop opened his doors 100 years ago, and his company continues to be at the forefront of this industry.

Frank Snell, a great-nephew of the original founder, continues the family commitment to restoring the highest mobility and function to patients as the company's current president. With his eye on the future, Frank moved the company to its current Little Rock location in 1986 and began the expansion across the rest of the State. With more offices, Snell Laboratory was able to expand while providing high-quality customer service to more Arkansas communities.

Snell's commitment to the community extends beyond working in the office. Snell employees frequently donate their time to such worthy organizations as Easter Seals Arkansas, the American Diabetes Association, and the Baptist Health Foundation. Efforts by Snell employees landed the company the 2008 Arkansas Community Foundation Corporate Philanthropy Award. As the company continues to evolve, I know it will continue demonstrating a strong commitment to service in Arkansas both in and out of the office.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in congratulating Snell Prosthetic & Orthotic Laboratory on its 100th anniversary and in wishing the company another 100 years of success.•

RECOGNIZING SAUNDERS BROTHERS

• Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, as we have heard time and time again, the American manufacturing sector is struggling. Manufacturers face a whole host of challenges, from oppressive regulations to increased energy costs to foreign competition. Indeed, it has been predicted that China will surpass the United States in 2011 as the world's biggest manufacturing nation in terms of output. In Maine, wood products manufacturers have been particularly harmed by the effects of unfair competition from overseas countries. Indeed, only three American factories still manufacture wooden dowels, which are often used to join pieces of furniture. When one of those factories that operated in my home State was shuttered last year, a group of Maine investors stepped forward to restart operations and provide economic opportunity to the region. Today I wish to recognize that company—Saunders Brothers—and the individuals who made the purchase of the firm.

Saunders Brothers was founded in 1900 by siblings Harry and Arthur, who built the small woodworking operation from the ground up, making wooden dowels. When the original mill in North Waterford burned down in 1916, the brothers moved their operation to Westbrook, near Maine's largest city of Portland, and finally settled at the present-day site in the western Maine community of Locke Mills, a small village in the town of Greenwood. Its recognizable smokestack is a local landmark, and its doors have welcomes hundreds of workers over the years.

However, with the calamitous economy, the owners were simply unable to

keep the doors opens, and the facility was forced to close last spring, leaving 55 employees without jobs. Yet just a few months later, investors Louise Jonaitis and Steve LaFreniere purchased the mill for $450,000 at a foreclosure auction, and have begun the process of re-employing some of those who lost their jobs. In September, they reopened the factory's doors and began operating the rolling pin line, with seven employees. The owners are also looking at ways to make the plant more energy efficient as well as examine which products and processes will make the factory most successful for years to come. For instance, Saunders Brothers also makes a number of other wood products, including rolling pins sold by companies like Williams Sonoma, in hopes of becoming ''the Rolling Pin Capital of New England.''

Furthermore, Ms. Jonaitis and Mr. LaFreniere have purchased a number of mills across the State during these tough economic times, seeking to bring economic prosperity to Maine's struggling mill towns. Mr. LaFreniere has noted that ''Our goal is to keep them from being torn down during these hard times so when the economy recovers, they can make a profit and be successful again.'' This unbridled optimism is a hallmark of America's entrepreneurial spirit, and I thank them for their actions.

The United States of America is a resilient nation. We know there will always be tough times, but we can never shake the notion that our best days are still ahead of us. That belief is what makes the actions of Louise Jonaitis and Steve LaFreniere so laudable. I sincerely wish everyone at Saunders Brothers much success as they continue their miraculous recovery in support of the company's motto, ''Let's Get Maine Rolling.''●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mrs. Neiman, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:06 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Chiappardi, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution:

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–577. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Bank Secrecy Act Compliance; Fair Credit Reporting; Technical Amendments'' (RIN1557–AD38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 14, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–578. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Office of the Ombudsman'' (RIN2590–AA20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 14, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–579. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''(General Provisions) Contract Appeals and the Acquisition Regulation: General, Acquisition Planning, and Contracting Methods and Contract Types'' (RIN1991–AB81) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 11, 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–580. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Services, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revised Critical Habitat for the Arroyo Toad'' (RIN1018–AV89) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 14, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–581. A communication from the Members of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Congressional Justification of Budget Estimates Report for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–582. A communication from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Budget Justification Report for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–583. A communication from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Disclosure of Medical Information to the Surrogate of a Patient Who Lacks Decision-Making Capacity'' (RIN2900–AN88) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2011; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–584. A communication from the Departmental Freedom of Information and Privacy Act Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Disclosure of Government Information; Responsibility for Responding to Freedom of Information Requests'' (RIN0605–AA22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 14, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–585. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (107); Amdt. 3413'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–586. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (63); Amdt. 3412'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–587. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (69); Amdt. 3410'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–588. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Operations Specifications'' ((RIN2120–AJ45) (Docket No. FAA–2009–0140)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–589. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company (Type Certificate Previously Held by Columbia Aircraft Manufacturing (Previously The Lancair Company))'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2009–1186)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–590. A communication from the Staff Assistant, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Ejection Mitigation'' (RIN2127–AK23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–591. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Materials: Incorporation of Certain Cargo Tank Special Permits into Regulations'' (RIN2137–AE56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–592. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Materials: Harmonization with the United Nations Recommendations, International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code, and the International Civil Aviation Organization Technical Instructions for the Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by Air'' (RIN2137–AE45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 15, 2011; to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–593. A communication from the President and Chief Scout Executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the organization's 2010 annual report; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–3. A petition from the Administrator of the Public Safety Personnel Retirement System, transmitting, pursuant to Arizona law, a report relative to the Arizona Terrorism Country Divestment act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

The Public Safety Personnel Retirement System (''System'') and its affiliated retirement plans, the Elected Officials' Retirement Plan (''EORP'') and Corrections Officer Retirement Plan (''CORP''), and their group trust, the Arizona PSPRS Trust (''Trust'', which together with the System, EORP, CORP are collectively, the ''Plans''), are sending you this letter in accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes (''A.R.S.'') §35–392 (the ''Arizona Terrorism Country Divestment Act'').

The Arizona Terrorism Country Divestment Act requires public pension systems such as the Plans to create process for creating a list of investments in U.S. companies that have violated Section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act (the ''List''), determine a process to engage in certain communications with those companies and appropriate federal officials, including Arizona's congressional delegation, and then determine a process for divestment from companies on the List, all as outlined in the Arizona Terrorism Country Divestment Act. On or about December 17, 2008, the Plans adopted a Terrorism Country Divestments Compliance Policy (the ''Policy'') adopting the processes as required by the Arizona Terrorism Country Divestment Act.

Pursuant to the Policy, the Plans are required to submit a report (''Report'') that includes a copy of the List and an explanation of any planned or actual divestments made pursuant to its Policy to the Governor of Arizona, President of the Arizona Senate, Speaker of the Arizona House of Representatives, the President of the U.S. Senate and Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Director of the Department of Administration, the Arizona Treasurer, and the Arizona State Retirement System. See A.R.S. §35–392(C).

With respect to the List prepared by or on behalf of the Plans as of December 15, 2010, there were no companies appearing on the List and therefore, no formal List was prepared. In addition, since no companies appeared on the List divestment is not applicable and no formal Report is enclosed. Feel free to contact me with any questions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON FEBRUARY 15, 2011

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. BOXER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. Res. 50. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. KOHL, from the Special Committee on Aging, without amendment:

S. Res. 52. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Special Committee on Aging.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 53. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN, from the Select Committee on Intelligence, without amendment:

S. Res. 54. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Select Committee on Intelligence.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BINGAMAN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. Res. 56. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

S. Res. 57. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CONRAD, from the Committee on the Budget, without amendment:

S. Res. 58. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

S. 365. An original bill to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions I report favorably the following nomination list which was printed in the Record on the date indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that this nomination lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Public Health Service nominations beginning with Eric P. Goosby and ending with Jeffrey L. Sumter, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 2, 2011.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. JOHANNS:

S. 359. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the expansion of information reporting requirements to payments made to corporations, payments for property and other gross proceeds, and rental property expense payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. COBURN, Mr. KYL, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 360. A bill to reduce the deficit by establishing discretionary spending caps for non—security spending; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 361. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. LUGAR, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

S. 362. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a Pancreatic Cancer Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 363. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey property of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to the City of Pascagoula, Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, and Mr. KOHL):

S. 364. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a new Small Business Savings Account; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 365. An original bill to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002; from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; placed on the calendar.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. KIRK):

S. 366. A bill to require disclosure to the Securities and Exchange Commission of certain sanctionable activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts (for himself and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. 367. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the work opportunity credit to small businesses which hire individuals who are members of the Ready Reserve or National Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KOHL (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. CONRAD, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 368. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to suspend a limitation on the period for which certain borrowers are eligible for guaranteed assistance; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. ENZI:

S. 369. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Giuseppe Garibaldi, and to Recognize the Republic of Italy on the 150th Anniversary of its Unification; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 370. A bill to require contractors to notify small business concerns that have been included in offers relating to contracts let by

Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 371. A bill to improve the efficiency, operation, and security of the national transportation system to move freight by leveraging investments and promoting partnerships that advance interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 372. A bill to reduce the ability of terrorists, spies, criminals, and other malicious actors to compromise, disrupt, damage, and destroy computer networks, critical infrastructure, and key resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. INOUYE, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 373. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the marketing of authorized generic drugs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KYL, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. WICKER):

S.J. Res. 6. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to regulating the Internet and broadband industry practices; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. JOHANNS):

S. Res. 55. A resolution expressing support for designation of a ''Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs .

By Mr. BINGAMAN:

S. Res. 56. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. Res. 57. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CONRAD:

S. Res. 58. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Budget; from the Committee on the Budget; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. COONS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Con. Res. 6. A concurrent resolution commending the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 102nd anniversary; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 73

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 73, a bill to provide for an earlier start for State health care coverage innovation waivers under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes.

S. 77

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 77, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to reduce pollution and lower costs for building owners.

S. 82

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 82, a bill to repeal the sunset of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 with respect to the expansion of the adoption credit and adoption assistance programs, to repeal the sunset of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act with respect to increased dollar limitations for such credit and programs, and to allow the adoption credit to be claimed in the year expenses are incurred, regardless of when the adoption becomes final.

S. 96

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) were added as cosponsors of S. 96, a bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions.

S. 163

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 163, a bill to require that the Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached.

S. 210

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 210, a bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to eliminate the mandatory printing of bills and resolutions for the use of offices of Members of Congress.

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 210, supra.

S. 256

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 256, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for equity investments in small business concerns.

S. 312

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 312, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits.

S. 328

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 328, a bill to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to clarify that countervailing duties may be imposed to address subsidies relating to fundamentally undervalued currency of any foreign country.

S. 344

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 344, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 358

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were

added as cosponsors of S. 358, a bill to codify and modify regulatory requirements of Federal agencies.

AMENDMENT NO. 46

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 46 intended to be proposed to S. 223, a bill to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 51

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 51 proposed to S. 223, a bill to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 68

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 68 intended to be proposed to S. 223, a bill to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 76

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 76 intended to be proposed to S. 223, a bill to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 83

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 83 intended to be proposed to S. 223, a bill to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. COBURN, Mr. KYL, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 360. A bill to reduce the deficit by establishing discretionary spending caps for non-security spending; to the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we are trying to resolve one of the great problems I am sure my colleagues are sensitive to; that is, the infrastructure of this country. Today we have two witnesses next to each other, the head of the AFL–CIO and the head of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, to show that liberals, conservatives, labor, and industry all feel this should be at least the second highest priority in America.

When I heard the President's budget yesterday and I looked at it, I shook my head in disbelief: $8.7 trillion in new spending, $1.6 trillion in new taxes—all these things. I remembered back when I was complaining in 1996 at this very podium during the Clinton administration. That was his budget. It was $1.5 trillion. Do my colleagues know that the deficit in this President's budget is greater than the entire budget of 1996—to run this whole thing called America. It was a shocker to me. It reminded me about how people talk about entitlements and how we are going to have to do something with that.

Something we can do right now is something I tried to do last year and the House Members are trying to do right now. When the President gave his message, he talked about how he was going to freeze nondefense discretionary spending and everyone applauded, thinking that was a great austerity program. In reality, he is talking about after he has increased it from 2008 levels to 2010 levels and then freezing in those increases. That is what I find unreasonable.

So I am reintroducing S. 360—I have a whole lot of cosponsors—to wind back the discretionary spending to 2008 levels and then freeze it at 2008 levels.

I will just tell you, briefly, what the bill does. It reduces the nonsecurity spending to 2008 levels and will hold it there for 5 years through 2016. After that, spending will be allowed to increase with the CPI of inflation between 2017 and 2021. The amount of money saved by this in that period of time would be over $1 trillion.

If I can put up the chart. This chart shows what is going to happen if we don't do that. The red is what is projected in the President's budget; the blue is what is projected if we are successful in doing this. I am very proud the House of Representatives Republicans in their budget have included my bill I introduced last year and that I am reintroducing today as S. 360 as part of their budget. I think it is responsible. We will be looking forward to getting cosponsors.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 361. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, Americans are resilient. Throughout our Nation's history, we have stood up to every challenge and we have stood together. At this moment in history, we face the challenge of recovering from the worst economic recession since the Great Depression. Through no fault of their own, too many Americans have lost their jobs and continue to struggle to find work in this tough economy. Putting Americans back to work is the key to economic recovery and must be the No. 1 goal for this Congress.

Today, I offer my own seven-point plan to help us reach that goal. This jobs plan recognizes that small businesses are America's job creators and, thus, our efforts must be targeted toward helping small businesses start up, grow, and prosper.

In Maine alone, we have 141,000 small businesses. During the past decade, America's small firms have created about 70 percent of all new jobs. But far too often Congress directs Federal policies and attention toward those businesses deemed too big to fail. Instead, we must redirect our efforts toward those small businesses that are too entrepreneurial to ignore.

The plan I am introducing today is based on extensive conversations I have had with small business owners and workers throughout the State of Maine. It also represents a great deal of hard work by my staff.

While each State has its own particular opportunities and challenges, the fundamentals of a jobs-oriented economic recovery are similar everywhere. As I illustrate my seven-point plan with examples from my home State of Maine, I believe the Presiding Officer and my colleagues will recognize similarities in their own home States.

First, my plan to build a 21st century economy begins with building a 21st century workforce. America's greatest asset is its people. Ensuring that American workers get the education and job training they need to compete in an increasingly global economy must be a top priority.

My plan amends the Workforce Investment Act to place special emphasis on job training programs that assist our manufacturing industry. I am tired of seeing so many manufacturing jobs leave my State and our Nation to go overseas. It is important we have a strategy to work with manufacturers, to work with local community colleges and universities to develop the manufacturing base curriculum, job training

programs, and research opportunities to ensure this generation and the next have the education and skills for the jobs of today and tomorrow. Some of those manufacturing jobs are gone forever. But others are coming online, and America must lead and Congress must support targeted funding to help provide the resources for this education and training.

In addition, we must provide workforce development assistance to those communities harmed as a direct consequence of the closure or realignment of military installations.

For example, the State of Maine is expected to lose more than 6,500 military and civilian jobs following the decisions made by the Base Realignment and Closure Commission in 2005. We are losing the Brunswick Naval Air Station in our State. There are many other States, including Illinois, Missouri, and New Jersey that are facing similar losses. In Virginia, nearly 40,000 jobs will be lost. In such cases where decisions made at the Federal level directly affect local employment, we have a special obligation to make sure displaced workers have the training and education they need to find new employment in their communities. After all, these communities have structured their economies to support military operations for decades, in many cases. Now that that lynchpin of the local economy is being pulled out, surely we have an obligation to help with the adjustment. My plan would redirect Economic Development Administration funds—EDA resources—to those communities most harmed by these decisions.

Targeted Federal funds can also be a catalyst for new economic opportunities. For example, I worked to secure one-time funding for a radiologic technician training program at a Maine community college. This program had broad support from local hospitals and from the college, but they simply couldn't afford the expensive equipment to get the program under way. With that one-time Federal investment, the program is now completely self-sustaining, and it produces between 18 and 20 graduates a year. Job placement has been 100 percent, with graduates earning starting salaries of about $40,000 a year. I am sure similar targeted job training success stories can be found in every State, and we ought to build on them.

We must also fix what has not worked as well as it should. Government agencies must provide more efficient and productive services to the American people. The Department of Labor, for example, should reduce paperwork and redtape associated with Federal job training programs. The Department should identify ways it could cut costs by working more closely with other government entities, such as the Department of Education, and with the private sector. The best programs I have seen at community colleges, for example, combine some job training funds with commitments from private employers to hire the graduates and to help shape those job training programs so we are training people for the jobs that exist or that are going to exist.

The second part of my plan would encourage innovation in Maine's natural resource-based economy. Nowhere is there greater potential than in energy. I want the United States to lead the world in developing renewable energy technologies, and that is going to require significant private and public investments to develop this technology and to make its deployment affordable. For example, deepwater offshore wind has enormous potential to help us meet our Nation's electricity needs, and it presents an exciting opportunity to create thousands of much needed, good-paying, and sustainable green jobs. Estimates show that the development of just 5 gigawatts of offshore wind off the coast of Maine—and that is just a fraction of the overall potential—could power more than 1 million homes, attract $20 billion of investment, and create more than 15,000 green energy jobs that would be sustained over 30 years.

Deepwater offshore wind is the key transformative technology that America needs in order to compete globally. Europe, China, Japan—our technology competitors—continue to make far larger investments in offshore wind R&D than we do. I am proud of the work of the University of Maine and the DeepCwind Consortium private sector investment to deploy loading wind turbines, which would be the first of its kind in the world, placing the United States in a position to lead in deepwater offshore wind technology.

Federal investments in programs to spur the advancement of deepwater offshore wind is an investment in America's future. Federal and State seed funding is expected to yield up to $4 billion in private sector investment over the next 10 years in Maine alone. With these investments, Maine is well positioned to be a global leader in this promising source of alternative energy. We must not lose these jobs to China, as has increasingly occurred with solar technology. Let's not let it happen with deepwater offshore wind technology.

We must also do more to promote agricultural exports. I know this is an issue of great interest to the Presiding Officer. In Maine, blueberries, potatoes, and lobster help create and sustain jobs in our State. Every $1 billion in agricultural exports supports 12,000 jobs. Therefore, increasing exports of our agricultural products could play an important role in reviving our economy. Boosting support for the Department of Agriculture's Foreign Agricultural Services will help promote our homegrown natural products abroad. This effort to increase agricultural exports could be paid for by strengthening our effort to curtail wasteful agricultural subsidies, such as payments to very wealthy corporate farmers who, frankly, do not need Federal assistance.

The corn-based ethanol tax break is another example of an extraordinarily expensive subsidy, costing taxpayers some $6 billion annually, and which has produced a host of problems from higher grain prices to impaired engine performance. We must reevaluate all programs that have not performed as promised and then reallocate their funding to job-creation initiatives and to deficit reduction.

Third, we simply must do more to encourage job creation and investment by small business. My plan includes a series of tax reform proposals targeted at these engines of job growth. The tax package agreed to by Congress and the President in December included a 2-percent cut in the employee portion of the payroll tax, but no cut was provided for the employer portion of the payroll tax.

With unemployment stuck above 9 percent for 21 consecutive months, we must do more to encourage businesses to hire. When I talk to small businesses, they tell me this is something we can do that would directly reduce the cost of hiring and encourage them to bring on more workers. My proposal includes a 2-percent reduction of the employer portion of the payroll tax on the first $50,000 of payroll for 1 year. This reduction in the employer portion of the payroll tax is estimated to lead to the creation of 1.4 million jobs. This will work.

As with the employee-side payroll tax relief we passed in December, my proposal would require the Treasury to reimburse the Social Security trust fund using general revenues. Again, the cost of this payroll tax relief can be offset by eliminating the ethanol and other wasteful subsidies and by implementing budget cuts for discretionary spending.

There are other provisions in my bill that are targeted toward small businesses. For example, section 179 is a provision of the Tax Code that small businesses have found to be very helpful. It allows them to immediately expense equipment purchases rather than depreciate those purchases over many years.

I also propose making permanent the tax provision allowing restaurants to depreciate equipment over 15 years rather than 39½ years. Think about it. If a restaurant is only renovating once every 40 years, that is not going to be very feasible or attractive to its patrons.

The plan would also reduce the depreciation periods on commercial and residential buildings to 15 years to encourage investment and jump-start the economy. We did that back in 1981, and it worked.

My fourth point is one that some small business owners, I know, would put at the very top of the list of what we should do; that is, we need to reduce the redtape that ties them in knots. Let me provide an illustration.

We need to make sure Federal regulations do not impose an unnecessary

burden on job creation. The EPA has proposed a new regulation known as the boiler MACT. This rule, as originally proposed, could cost Maine businesses $640 million to comply with, despite the fact there are less costly approaches to deal with boiler emissions. It also has Federal agencies working at cross-purposes. Here we have the Department of Energy trying to encourage the conversion to biomass boilers at the same time the EPA is putting burdensome new regulations on them.

The result in Maine was the Department of Energy awarded one Maine high school a $300,000 grant to help buy a new wood pellet boiler to reduce the school's use of fossil fuels. But because EPA's proposed regulations would have greatly increased the cost of that boiler, the school board ended up turning down the grant. This is an example of where the right hand did not know what the left was doing.

My point is that Federal agencies should take into account the impact on small businesses and job growth before imposing new rules. Thus, my plan contains several provisions to help reduce onerous regulations and cut redtape.

First, it requires Federal agencies to analyze the indirect costs of regulations, such as the impact on job creation, the cost of energy, and consumer prices.

Second, it obligates Federal agencies to comply with public notice and comment requirements and prohibits them from circumventing these requirements by issuing unofficial rules as ''guidance documents.''

Third, it creates a mechanism to protect small businesses from onerous penalties the very first time they fail to comply with a paperwork requirement as long as no harm comes from that failure. If it is an honest, first-time mistake that causes no harm, why do we want to slap that small business with a heavy fine? That does not make sense.

The fifth point in my plan is aimed at our transportation policies. Getting raw materials to the factory or farm and finished products to market quickly, efficiently, and safely must be a priority. But the inconsistent and inequitable Federal policy on truck weight limits on interstate highways provides a telling example of where we are doing the opposite. The consequences are particularly acute in Maine.

I have spoken on this issue many times, so I am going to briefly describe it. Maine's businesses and trucking firms are currently at a competitive disadvantage because Federal law prohibits the heaviest trucks from using Federal interstates and instead diverts them to downtown streets and secondary roads. This means, for example, that nearly 260 miles of nonturnpike interstates that are the major economic corridors in my State are off-limits. Yet these same trucks are permitted on many Federal interstates in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, parts of New York State, and neighboring provinces in Canada. That makes Maine and Vermont an island of noncompetitiveness. It just does not make sense. The heaviest trucks belong on the roads built for them.

In 2009, I authored a law to establish a 1-year pilot project to allow trucks weighing up to 100,000 pounds to travel on Maine's Federal interstates. This project was an enormous success. It helped to preserve and create jobs because it allowed our businesses to be more efficient. It lowered fuel costs. It resulted in fewer carbon emissions, and it made our roads safer. Working with Senator LEAHY, I am trying to make this permanent.

Point No. 6: We must invest in America's future. Research and development investment is critical to the breakthroughs we need to keep our economy competitive and to create good-paying jobs. The R&D tax credit provides an important incentive, but it needs to be updated so more companies can benefit from it. And there needs to be more certainty. Just having that tax credit from year to year discourages the kind of long-range planning and investment companies need. My plan includes a 5-year extension of the R&D tax credit. That is likely to happen, but by doing it year by year we create all these disincentives for investment.

Finally, the seventh point in my plan would help expand opportunities for small businesses and farmers to do business with the Federal Government. We need to help our small businesses, our farmers tap into markets they have not previously explored. As the former head of the New England Small Business Administration, I know how essential this drive for new markets is for job creation and for our economy.

One approach we are going to take is my Washington and State offices are going to redouble their efforts to help small businesses reach the Federal Government because the Federal Government is the largest consumer of goods and services in our country. I know that disturbs a lot of Americans right now, and it shows the size of the Federal Government. The fact is, the Federal Government purchased more than $535 billion worth of goods and services in this past fiscal year. Some 23 percent of that spending is directed to small businesses, and last year the value of Federal contracts to small businesses in my State alone was more than $250 million. If we can expand the opportunity for small businesses to do business with the Federal Government, that is a brandnew market for their products and services.

Last year, along with my colleague, Senator SNOWE, and in conjunction with the Department of Defense Northeast Regional Council and the Maine Procurement Technical Assistance Center, I sponsored a small business matchmaker conference that brought together government agencies and prime contractors with our small business community to match up the purchasing needs with goods and services. It was a 3-day conference in south Portland. It was a tremendous success. We had about 385 small business owners and representatives from 135 government agencies and prime contractors looking to subcontract work meet face to face, sit down, exchange ideas.

Let me give an example of a successful connection that was made. A representative of a $2 billion aerospace company sat across the table from the owner of a 40-employee Maine machine shop with experience in very high quality, high-end custom work. That first meeting led to a significant business relationship that continues to grow.

I note that at our conference in south Portland, our total number of registrants was 597 people, and that just shows how eager our small businesses are to expand their customer base.

One great benefit of the matchmaker approach is instead of a small business working for weeks or even months to try to find the right person in the vast government bureaucracy or the right prime contractor, our entrepreneurs merely need to sit down across the table with them. It is direct, effective, and efficient.

But, obviously, it is not easy to do business with Uncle Sam. The rules and regulations are often strict, cumbersome, and unfamiliar. That is where our offices can help.

My plan also calls for Congress to work harder to open the Federal marketplace beyond the Washington beltway to entrepreneurs in every State. That will benefit our job creators and the American taxpayer because there will be more competition.

The struggling economy has challenged our Nation's entrepreneurial spirit, but that spirit remains strong in Maine, in your State of New York, Madam President, and across the Nation. We will recover from this deep recession, but the recovery depends on the right policies in Washington to encourage the innovative and bold job creators of America. That means helping our small businesses start up, grow, prosper, sustain, and create good jobs.

My seven-point jobs plan offers a straightforward path forward for Congress to lead rather than impede job creation at this critical juncture in our history and in our recovery.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that letters of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS & ENTREPRENEURSHIP COUNCIL,
Oakton, VA, February 16, 2011.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: The Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council (SBE Council) and its members across the nation appreciate and support your proposed ''Seven Point Plan for Growing Jobs Act.''

As you are aware, entrepreneurs, small businesses and the overall economy have been suffering due to uncertainty and rising

costs when it comes to federal tax and regulatory measures. Your legislation's sections on small business tax relief and regulatory reform thankfully would provide some relief and clarity.

For example, making permanent the expanded expensing levels for capital expenditures made by small businesses would be a plus for investment, creating jobs, and boosting incomes.

In addition, the repeal of the 1099 reporting requirements included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act—i.e., that businesses must issue 1099 forms to all vendors for goods purchased exceeding $600—would remove a big, looming paperwork burden for the small business community.

In addition, the measures to improve upon the federal government's regulatory process are most welcome, including the requirement that agencies submit a cost-benefit analysis for each significant regulation, that this process be open and more transparent to the public, and that small businesses be given opportunities to seek waivers of penalties for first-time, non-harmful paperwork violations.

These are positive tax and regulatory reforms that will help small businesses in their ongoing struggles to deal with the otherwise mounting burdens from government.

Thank you for your leadership Senator Collins. SBE Council looks forward to working with you to ensure this important legislation is advanced into law.

Sincerely,

KAREN KERRIGAN,
President & CEO.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, February 16, 2011.

Senator SUSAN COLLINS,
Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), the nation's leading small business organization, I am writing in support of the Seven Point Plan for Growing Jobs Act. Your bill would help to support a small business recovery by addressing two of their most important problems—taxes and regulations.

Small businesses account for about two-thirds of the net new jobs created, but they continue to struggle. The most recent monthly NFIB Small Business Economic Trends (SBET) Survey, found that small business confidence was up slightly, but still below prerecession levels and not improving fast enough to support meaningful job creation. While sales continues to be the number one problem facing small business, second and third in the survey are taxes and regulations.

The Seven Point Plan for Growing Jobs Act provides both short-term and long-term tax relief for small business. First, the bill would build on last year's payroll tax cut for employees by providing an equal reduction in the portion of the payroll tax paid by employers. Payroll tax relief will help to reduce the cost of hiring, making it less expensive for small businesses to retain and add new workers.

Over the last few years, capital expenditures have been at or near an all-time low in the SBET survey. To address this, the bill includes permanent investment incentives that will help small businesses cover the cost of new investments as they recover from the recession. Specifically, the bill would make permanent the increased and expanded section 179 expensing provision and shorter depreciation periods for business properties such as restaurants and retail spaces, as well as commercial buildings.

The proposal would also repeal the expanded 1099 reporting requirements included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), reducing the tax-filing burden on small businesses. Based on an NFIB Small Business Survey, tax paperwork is already the most expensive paperwork burden placed on small business by the federal government and the new 1099 requirements would increase this cost dramatically.

The Seven Point Plan for Jobs Act also provides important regulatory reforms for small businesses. It allows for a reduction or waiver of penalties on small businesses the first time the business makes a non-harmful mistake on paperwork. Because the paperwork burden often falls on the small business owner—and because small businesses do not have dedicated compliance staff—this relief for innocent mistakes is most welcome.

The bill also provides agencies the ability to better analyze both direct and indirect costs and benefits, which will give the public more accurate information on the economic impact of proposed rulemakings. In addition, the bill requires agencies to treat guidance documents for significant rules as the enforceable standards they are. With this measure, small businesses and the public will have a greater input on these important documents.

Again, thank you for introducing this important legislation, which will help small business and support a meaningful economic recovery and job creation. We look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

SUSAN ECKERLY,
Senior Vice President, Public Policy.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 372. A bill the ability of terrorists, spies, criminals, and other malicious actors to compromise, disrupt, damage, and destroy computer networks, critical infrastructure, and key resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, the Internet has had a profound impact on the daily lives of millions of Americans by enhancing communications, commerce, education and socialization between and among persons regardless of their location. Internationally, we have seen the transformative power of the Internet in places like Egypt. A free and open Internet gives strength and a voice to people worldwide and should be protected from censorship and other forms of suppression. But the Internet and those who engage in communications and commerce across cyberspace must be safe—protected from predators like criminals, terrorists and spies who wish to exploit or compromise information and systems connected to the Internet. Our Nation is vulnerable to such attacks, but working together, in partnership with the private sector, we can find a balance that keeps information flowing freely while keeping us all safe from harm.

I have been focusing on cybersecurity issues for quite some time. More than a year ago, as the former chairman of the Terrorism and Homeland Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, I chaired a Subcommittee hearing titled ''Cybersecurity: Preventing Terrorist Attacks and Protecting Privacy in Cyberspace.'' The hearing included witnesses from key federal agencies responsible for cybersecurity, as well as representatives of the private sector. We reviewed governmental and private sector efforts to prevent a terrorist cyber attack that could cripple large sectors of our government, economy, and essential services.

The cybersecurity expertise that I have developed has convinced me that the Government and the private sector can and should work together to protect the American people in cyberspace. As a result, I am reintroducing the Cybersecurity and Internet Safety Standards Act, CISSA. This bill, which is cosponsored by Senator WHITEHOUSE, will require the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Director of National Intelligence, to conduct an analysis to determine the costs and benefits of requiring internet service providers and others to develop and enforce minimum voluntary or mandatory cybersecurity and Internet safety standards. Under this bill, the Secretary of Homeland Security will be required to report to Congress within one year with specific recommendations. Cybersecurity must be a top priority. This bill will help secure our nation's digital future by keeping the American people and our cyber infrastructure safe without hampering the freedoms inherently found in an open and accessible Internet.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 372

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Cybersecurity and Internet Safety Standards Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COMPUTERS.—Except as otherwise specifically provided, the term ''computers'' means computers and other devices that connect to the Internet.

(2) PROVIDERS.—The term ''providers'' means Internet service providers, communications service providers, electronic messaging providers, electronic mail providers, and other persons who provide a service or capability to enable computers to connect to the Internet.

(3) SECRETARY.—Except as otherwise specifically provided, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) While the Internet has had a profound impact on the daily lives of the people of the United States by enhancing communications, commerce, education, and socialization between and among persons regardless of their location, computers may be used, exploited, and compromised by terrorists, criminals, spies, and other malicious actors, and, therefore, computers pose a risk to computer networks, critical infrastructure, and

key resources in the United States. Indeed, users of computers are generally unaware that their computers may be used, exploited, and compromised by others with spam, viruses, and other malicious software and agents.

(2) Since computer networks, critical infrastructure, and key resources of the United States are at risk of being compromised, disrupted, damaged, or destroyed by terrorists, criminals, spies, and other malicious actors who use computers, cybersecurity and Internet safety is an urgent homeland security issue that needs to be addressed by providers, technology companies, and persons who use computers.

(3) The Government and the private sector need to work together to develop and enforce minimum voluntary or mandatory cybersecurity and Internet safety standards for users of computers to prevent terrorists, criminals, spies, and other malicious actors from compromising, disrupting, damaging, or destroying the computer networks, critical infrastructure, and key resources of the United States.

SEC. 4. COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR ANALYSIS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall conduct an analysis to determine the costs and benefits of requiring providers to develop and enforce voluntary or mandatory minimum cybersecurity and Internet safety standards for users of computers to prevent terrorists, criminals, spies, and other malicious actors from compromising, disrupting, damaging, or destroying computer networks, critical infrastructure, and key resources.

(b) FACTORS.—In conducting the analysis required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall consider—

(1) all relevant factors, including the effect that the development and enforcement of minimum voluntary or mandatory cybersecurity and Internet safety standards may have on homeland security, the global economy, innovation, individual liberty, and privacy; and

(2) any legal impediments that may exist to the implementation of such standards.

SEC. 5. CONSULTATION.

In conducting the analysis required by section 4, the Secretary shall consult with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, the Director of National Intelligence, the Federal Communications Commission, and relevant stakeholders in the Government and the private sector, including the academic community, groups, or other institutions, that have scientific and technical expertise related to standards for computer networks, critical infrastructure, or key resources.

SEC. 6. REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a final report on the results of the analysis required by section 4. Such report shall include the consensus recommendations, if any, for minimum voluntary or mandatory cybersecurity and Internet safety standards that should be developed and enforced for users of computers to prevent terrorists, criminals, spies, and other malicious actors from compromising, disrupting, damaging, or destroying computer networks, critical infrastructure, and key resources.

(b) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. INOUYE, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 373. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the marketing of authorized generic drugs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleagues, Senators SHAHEEN, LEAHY, INOUYE, STABENOW, and SCHUMER, to reintroduce an important piece of legislation, the Fair Prescription Drug Competition Act. Our legislation eliminates one of the most prominent loopholes that brand name drug companies use to limit consumer access to lower-cost generic drugs; it ends the marketing of so-called ''authorized generic'' drugs during the 180-day exclusivity period that Congress designed to provide specific incentives to true generics to enter the market.

An authorized generic drug is a brand name prescription drug produced by the same brand manufacturer on the same manufacturing lines, yet repackaged as a generic. Some argue that authorized generic drugs are cheaper than brand name drugs and, therefore, benefit consumers. However, authorized generics only serve to reduce generic competition, extend brand monopolies, and lead to higher health care costs for consumers over the long-term.

After up to 20 years of holding a patent for a brand name drug—the brand-name manufacturer—which has already been handsomely rewarded for its investment—doesn't want to let go of its profits. So, it repackages the drug and refers to it as a generic in order to extend its market share, while cutting in half the financial incentive for an independent generic to enter the marketplace. This is a huge problem and one that is becoming even more prevalent as patents on some of the best-selling brand name pharmaceuticals expire.

In 1984, Congress passed the Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act, known as the Hatch-Waxman Act, to provide consumers greater access to lower-cost generic drugs. The intent of this law was to improve generic competition, while preserving the ability of brand name manufacturers to discover and market new and innovative products. Specifically, the Hatch-Waxman Act provided for a 180-day marketing exclusivity period for the first generic firm that successfully challenges a brand-name patent under the Abbreviated New Drug Application, ANDA, process—thereby providing a crucial incentive for generic drug companies to enter the market and make prescription drugs more affordable for consumers.

Filing a patent challenge is expensive and requires enormous up-front costs for the generic company. Yet, the 180-day exclusivity incentive to launch a patent challenge is being widely undermined by authorized generics. According to one account, since 2004, ''authorized generic versions have appeared for nearly all drugs with expiring U.S. patents.'' And, because authorized generics are still allowed, an independent generic can get all the way to the end of a patent challenge—even winning in court—but still lose the anticipated reward of 180-day market exclusivity because the brand-name company can, and does, launch an authorized generic. The fact that the brand-name company can launch an authorized generic even if it loses a patent challenge to a generic company gives it an incentive to pursue multiple additional patents on dubious grounds, just for the sake of extending its market share. The fact remains that brand-name firms regularly introduce authorized generics on the eve of generic competition, further extending their hold on the market and chilling competition from independent generic drugs.

Every American agrees on the need to reduce health care costs. Today, generic medications comprise 69 percent of all prescriptions in this country, yet only 16 percent of all dollars spent on prescriptions. Furthermore, in 2007, the average retail price of a generic prescription drug was $34.34, compared to the $119.51 average retail price of a brand name prescription drug. In fact, generic drugs save consumers an estimated $8 billion to $10 billion a year at retail pharmacies. For working families, these savings can make a huge difference, particularly during difficult economic times.

Passage of the Fair Prescription Drug Competition Act would revitalize and protect the true intent of the 180-day marketing exclusivity period created in the Hatch-Waxman Act. This bill does just that by eliminating the authorized generics loophole, protecting the integrity of the 180-day exclusivity period, and improving consumer access to lower-cost generic drugs.

I urge my colleagues to support this timely and important piece of legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 55—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR DESIGNATION OF A ''WELCOME HOME VIETNAM VETERANS DAY''

Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

S. RES. 55

Whereas the Vietnam War was fought in the Republic of South Vietnam from 1961 to 1975, and involved North Vietnamese regular forces and Viet Cong guerrilla forces in armed conflict with United States Armed Forces and the Army of the Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas the United States Armed Forces became involved in Vietnam because the United States Government wanted to provide direct military support to the Government of South Vietnam to defend itself against the growing Communist threat from North Vietnam;

Whereas members of the United States Armed Forces began serving in an advisory role to the Government of the Republic of South Vietnam in 1961;

Whereas, as a result of the Gulf of Tonkin incidents on August 2 and 4, 1964, Congress overwhelmingly passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution (Public Law 88–408), on August 7, 1964, which provided the authority to the President of the United States to prosecute the war against North Vietnam;

Whereas, in 1965, United States Armed Forces ground combat units arrived in Vietnam;

Whereas, by the end of 1965, there were 80,000 United States troops in Vietnam, and by 1969, a peak of approximately 543,000 troops was reached;

Whereas, on January 27, 1973, the Treaty of Paris was signed, which required the release of all United States prisoners-of-war held in North Vietnam and the withdrawal of all United States Armed Forces from South Vietnam;

Whereas, on March 30, 1973, the United States Armed Forces completed the withdrawal of combat units and combat support units from South Vietnam;

Whereas, on April 30, 1975, North Vietnamese regular forces captured Saigon, the capitol of South Vietnam, effectively placing South Vietnam under Communist control;

Whereas more than 58,000 members of the United States Armed Forces lost their lives in Vietnam and more than 300,000 members of the Armed Forces were wounded;

Whereas, in 1982, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial was dedicated in the District of Columbia to commemorate those members of the United States Armed Forces who died or were declared missing-in-action in Vietnam;

Whereas the Vietnam War was an extremely divisive issue among the people of the United States and a conflict that caused a generation of veterans to wait too long for the United States public to acknowledge and honor the efforts and services of such veterans;

Whereas members of the United States Armed Forces who served bravely and faithfully for the United States during the Vietnam War were often wrongly criticized for the policy decisions made by 4 presidential administrations in the United States;

Whereas the establishment of a ''Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day'' would be an appropriate way to honor those members of the United States Armed Forces who served in South Vietnam and throughout Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War; and

Whereas March 30, 2011, would be an appropriate day to establish as ''Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors and recognizes the contributions of veterans who served in the United States Armed Forces in Vietnam during war and during peace;

(2) encourages States and local governments to also establish ''Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day''; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe ''Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day'' with appropriate ceremonies and activities that—

(A) provide the appreciation Vietnam War veterans deserve, but did not receive upon returning home from the war;

(B) demonstrate the resolve that never again shall the Nation disregard and denigrate a generation of veterans;

(C) promote awareness of the faithful service and contributions of such veterans during their military service as well as to their communities since returning home;

(D) promote awareness of the importance of entire communities empowering veterans and the families of veterans to readjust to civilian life after military service; and

(E) promote opportunities for such veterans to assist younger veterans returning from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in rehabilitation from wounds, both seen and unseen, and to support the reintegration of younger veterans into civilian life.

SENATE RESOLUTION 56—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S RES. 56

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized from March 1, 2011, through September 30, 2011; October 1, 2011, through September 30, 2012; and October 1, 2012, through February 28, 2013, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2011, through September 30, 2011, under this resolution shall not exceed $3,924,299.

(b) For the period October 1, 2011, through September 30, 2012, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $6,727,369.

(c) For the period October 1, 2012, through February 28, 2013, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $2,803,070.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2013, respectively.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 57—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 57

Resolved, that, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized from March 1, 2011, through September 30, 2011; October 1, 2011, through September 30, 2012; and October 1, 2012, through February 28, 2013, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2011, through September 30, 2011, under this resolution shall not exceed $6,115,313, of which amount (1) not to exceed $75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed $25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(b) For the period October 1, 2011, through September 30, 2012, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $10,483,393, of which amount (1) not to exceed $75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed $25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(c) For the period October 1, 2012, through February 28, 2013, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $4,368,081, of which amount (1) not to exceed $75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed $25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 29, 2012 and February 28, 2013, respectively.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from March 1, 2011, through September 30, 2011, October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012; and October 1, 2012 through February 28, 2013, to be paid from the Appropriations account for ''Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations.''

SENATE RESOLUTION 58—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. CONRAD submitted the following resolution from the Committee on the Budget; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 58

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget is authorized from March 1, 2011, through September 30, 2011; October 1, 2011, through September 30, 2012; and October 1, 2012, through February 28, 2013, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. (a) The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2011, through September 30, 2011, under this resolution shall not exceed $4,489,241, of which amount (1) not to exceed $35,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946), and (2) not to exceed $21,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(b) For the period October 1, 2011, through September 30, 2012, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $7,695,840, of which amount (1) not to exceed $60,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946), and (2) not to exceed $36,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(c) For the period October 1, 2012, through February 28, 2013, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $3,206,599, of which amount (1) not to exceed $25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946), and (2) not to exceed $15,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2013, respectively.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6—COMMENDING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 102ND ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. COONS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 6

Whereas the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (referred to in this preamble as the ''NAACP''), originally known as the National Negro Committee, was founded in New York City on February 12, 1909, the centennial of the date on which President Abraham Lincoln was born, by a multiracial group of activists who met in a national conference to discuss the civil and political rights of African-Americans;

Whereas the NAACP was founded by a distinguished group of leaders in the struggle for civil and political liberty, including Ida Wells-Barnett, W.E.B. DuBois, Henry Moscowitz, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villard, and William English Walling;

Whereas the NAACP is the oldest and largest civil rights organization in the United States;

Whereas the NAACP National Headquarters is located in Baltimore, Maryland;

Whereas the mission of the NAACP is to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of rights of all people and to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination;

Whereas the NAACP is committed to achieving its goals through nonviolence;

Whereas the NAACP advances its mission through reliance on the press, the petition, the ballot, and the courts;

Whereas the NAACP has been persistent in the use of legal and moral persuasion, even in the face of overt and violent racial hostility;

Whereas the NAACP has used political pressure, marches, demonstrations, and effective lobbying to serve as the voice, as well as the shield, for minorities in the United States;

Whereas after years of fighting segregation in public schools, the NAACP, under the leadership of Special Counsel Thurgood Marshall, won one of its greatest legal victories in the decision issued by the Supreme Court in Brown v. Board of Education (347 U.S. 483 (1954));

Whereas in 1955, NAACP member Rosa Parks was arrested and fined for refusing to give up her seat on a segregated bus in Montgomery, Alabama, an act of courage that would serve as the catalyst for the largest grassroots civil rights movement in the history of the United States;

Whereas the NAACP was prominent in lobbying for the passage of—

(1) the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (Public Law 85–315; 71 Stat. 634);

(2) the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–449; 74 Stat. 86);

(3) the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–352; 78 Stat. 241);

(4) the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973 et seq.);

(5) the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, Coretta Scott King, César E. Chávez, Barbara C. Jordan, William C. Velásquez, and Dr. Hector P. Garcia Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–246; 120 Stat. 577); and

(6) the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.);

Whereas in 2005, the NAACP launched the Disaster Relief Fund to help hurricane survivors rebuild their lives in the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Florida, and Alabama;

Whereas in the 110th Congress, the NAACP was prominent in lobbying for the passage of H. Res. 826, the resolved clause of which expresses that—

(1) the hanging of nooses is a horrible act when used for the purpose of intimidation;

(2) under certain circumstances, the hanging of nooses can be criminal; and

(3) the hanging of nooses should be investigated thoroughly by Federal authorities, and any criminal violations should be vigorously prosecuted;

Whereas in 2008, the NAACP vigorously supported the passage of the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act of 2007 (28 U.S.C. 509 note), a law that puts additional Federal resources into solving the heinous crimes that occurred during the early days of the civil rights struggle that remain unsolved and brings those who perpetrated those crimes to justice;

Whereas the NAACP has helped usher in the new millennium by charting a bold

course, beginning with the appointment of the youngest President and Chief Executive Officer in the history of the organization, Benjamin Todd Jealous, and its youngest female Board Chair, Roslyn M. Brock;

Whereas under the leadership of Benjamin Todd Jealous and Roslyn M. Brock, the NAACP has outlined a strategic plan to confront 21st century challenges in the critical areas of health, education, housing, criminal justice, and the environment;

Whereas on July 16, 2009, the NAACP celebrated its centennial anniversary in New York City, highlighting an extraordinary century of ''Bold Dreams, Big Victories'' with a historic address from the first African-American President of the United States, Barack Obama; and

Whereas as an advocate for sentencing reform, the NAACP applauded the enactment of the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–220; 124 Stat. 2372), a landmark piece of legislation that reduces the quantity of crack cocaine that triggers a mandatory minimum sentence for a Federal conviction of crack cocaine distribution from 100 times that of people convicted of distributing the drug in powdered form to 18 times that sentence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes the 102nd anniversary of the historic founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and

(2) commends the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its anniversary for its work to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of all people.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 95. Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 96. Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 97. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 98. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 99. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 100. Mr. PRYOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 101. Mr. VITTER (for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 102. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 51 proposed by Mr. UDALL of New Mexico to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 103. Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 32 proposed by Mr. ENSIGN (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. HOEVEN) to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 95. Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 320 and insert the following:

SEC. 320. UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall develop a plan to accelerate the integration of unmanned aerial systems into the National Airspace System that—

(1) creates a pilot project to integrate such systems into the National Airspace System at 6 test sites in the National Airspace System by December 31, 2012;

(2) creates a safe, non-exclusionary airspace designation for cooperative manned and unmanned flight operations in the National Airspace System;

(3) establishes a process to develop—

(A) air traffic requirements for all unmanned aerial systems at the test sites; and

(B) certification and flight standards for nonmilitary unmanned aerial systems at the test sites;

(4) dedicates funding for unmanned aerial systems research and development relating to—

(A) air traffic requirements; and

(B) certification and flight standards for nonmilitary unmanned aerial systems in the National Airspace System;

(5) encourages leveraging and coordination of such research and development activities with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense;

(6) addresses both military and nonmilitary unmanned aerial system operations;

(7) ensures that the unmanned aircraft systems integration plan is incorporated in the Administration's NextGen Air Transportation System implementation plan; and

(8) provides for integration into the National Airspace System of safety standards and navigation procedures validated—

(A) under the pilot project created pursuant to paragraph (1); or

(B) through other related research and development activities carried out pursuant to paragraph (4).

(b) TEST SITE CRITERIA.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall take into consideration geographical and climate diversity and appropriate facilities in determining where the test sites to be established under the pilot project required by subsection (a)(1) are to be located.

(c) CERTIFICATION PROCESS.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall expedite the approval process for requests for certificates of authorization at test sites referred to in subsection (a)(1).

(d) REPORT ON SYSTEMS AND DETECTION TECHNIQUES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report describing and assessing the progress being made in establishing special use airspace to fill the immediate need of the Department of Defense to develop detection techniques for small unmanned aerial vehicles and to validate sensor integration and operation of unmanned aerial systems.

SA 96. Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Ms. COLLLINS, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 289, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 291, line 4, and insert the following:

(e) BONDING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 47113 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) PROHIBITION ON EXCESSIVE OR DISCRIMINATORY BONDING REQUIREMENTS.—

SA 97. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 32, strike lines 1 through 14.

SA 98. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 128, strike line 5 and all that follows through page 141, line 9.

SA 99. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 311, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 733. AUTHORITY TO EXTEND THE EMPLOYMENT OF CERTAIN REEMPLOYED ANNUITANTS OTHERWISE SUBJECT TO MANDATORY SEPARATION.

(a) COVERED REEMPLOYED ANNUITANT DEFINED.—In this section, the tem ''covered reemployed annuitant'' means any individual who—

(1) was involuntarily separated as a result of the reorganization of the Flight Services Unit following the outsourcing of flight service duties to a contractor after completing at least 15 years of service as an air traffic controller (as defined in section 8401 of title 5, United States Code);

(2) is in receipt of an annuity awarded under the provisions of section 8414(b)(1)(A) of such title based on such involuntary separation;

(3) was reemployed as an air traffic controller subject to the provisions of section 8468 of such title; and

(4) who has completed or can complete 20 years of service as an air traffic controller within 5 years after becoming reemployed as described by paragraph (3).

(b) EXTENSION OF EMPLOYMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the 5-year period of reemployment required for a recomputation of an annuity under section 8468 of title 5, United States Code, a covered reemployed annuitant shall not serve at the will of the appointing officer.

(c) CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) SEPARATION FOR CAUSE OR LACK OF FUNDS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the involuntary separation of a covered reemployed annuitant for cause or lack of funds.

(2) REASSIGNMENT.—Nothing in the section shall be construed to prohibit a covered reemployed annuitant from being reassigned to a position other than as an air traffic controller after completing 20 years of service as an air traffic controller if the covered reemployed annuitant's rate of pay is not reduced.

SA 100. Mr. PRYOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 733. IMPLEMENTATION BY THE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO CONTRACTS FOR SUPPORT SERVICES; ASSESSMENT OF CERTAIN PROCUREMENT POLICIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) shall implement the recommendations set forth in the report of the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security entitled ''Transportation Security Administration's Acquisition of Support Services Contracts'' (No. OIG-10-72), dated March 2010.

(b) MONITORING BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security shall—

(1) monitor the implementation of the recommendations described in subsection (a); and

(2) conduct an assessment of the process of the Transportation Security Administration for procuring technology and equipment for screening passengers at airports that includes an assessment of—

(A) the effectiveness of procurement procedures used by the Administration to obtain airport screening technology and equipment, including—

(i) the cost-benefit analysis utilized by the Administration; and

(ii) the resulting cost-effectiveness of technologies and equipment acquired by the Administration since 2007;

(B) the human health and personal privacy protection considerations that are taken into account in acquiring each type of screening technology and equipment;

(C) the efforts being made to improve procurement policies and reduce expenditures on screening technologies and equipment;

(D) the extent to which trends or patterns in procurement activity, and how those trends or patterns are impacted by evolving security breaches or threats, are being analyzed and considered;

(E) which events and circumstances prompt the procurement of new screening technology or equipment and how frequently such events or circumstances occur; and

(F) the process by which screening technology and equipment is assessed after being deployed, including the frequency of assessments and the metrics used during those assessments.

(c) REPORT BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) assesses the progress made by the Transportation Security Administration in implementing the recommendations described in subsection (a); and

(2) contains the results of the assessments required by subsection (b)(2); and

(3) makes recommendations with respect to how the Transportation Security Administration can better address the issues assessed under subsection (b)(2).

SA 101. Mr. VITTER (for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SUBSISTENCE CLAIMS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BARTER.—The term ''barter'' means the exchange of natural resources taken for subsistence uses for—

(A) other natural resources; or

(B) other food or for nonedible items other than money, if the exchange is of a limited and noncommercial nature.

(2) COMMUNITY USE.—The term ''community use'' means the sharing of natural resources with or among individuals (including among members of a family) who, collectively, are substantially dependent on, or substantially engaged in, the taking of natural resources for subsistence or to meet economic or social needs.

(3) FAMILY.—The term ''family'' means all individuals who—

(A) are related by blood, marriage, or adoption; and

(B) live within the same household on a permanent basis.

(4) NATURAL RESOURCES.—The term ''natural resources'' includes crustaceans, mollusks, fish, game, and wildlife, and parts of those species.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the National Pollution Funds Center.

(6) SUBSISTENCE USE.—The term ''subsistence use'' means the customary and traditional use of any natural resource by an individual for—

(A) personal, family, or community consumption as food; or

(B) barter or sharing for personal, family, or community use.

(b) DAMAGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In adjudicating a claim for loss of subsistence use of a natural resource that has been injured, destroyed, or lost in connection with the explosion on, and sinking of, the mobile offshore drilling unit *Deepwater Horizon*, the Secretary shall fix the amount of damages available for the claim at an amount equal to the reasonable wholesale value of the quantity of the natural resource that would have been taken by the claimant for subsistence use at a place where such natural resources are sold to a retailer for resale, as of the date on which the natural resource would have been taken, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) ADDITIONAL AWARD.—Damages awarded for the loss of subsistence use of a natural resource may be in addition to damages awarded for any other economic loss that a claimant sustains.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Administrator of the Gulf Coast Claims Facility, in adjudicating a claim for loss of subsistence use of natural resources that have been injured, destroyed, or lost in connection with the explosion on, and sinking of, the mobile offshore drilling unit *Deepwater Horizon*, should calculate the value of damages in the same manner as described in subsection (b).

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committees on Homeland Security and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that describes—

(1) the number of claims filed for loss of subsistence use of natural resources that have been injured, destroyed, or lost in connection with the explosion on, and sinking of, the mobile offshore drilling unit *Deepwater Horizon*;

(2) the number of those claims that have been adjudicated during the preceding period; and

(3) the amount of damages claimed and awarded for each claim adjudicated.

SA 102. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 51 proposed by Mr. UDALL of New Mexico to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, strike lines 12 through 22 and insert the following:

''(A) ADVANCED IMAGING TECHNOLOGY.—The term 'advanced imaging technology'—

''(i) means a device that creates a visual image of an individual showing the surface of the skin and revealing other objects on the body; and

''(ii) may include devices using backscatter x-rays or millimeter waves and devices referred to as 'whole-body imaging technology' or 'body scanning'.

SA 103. Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an

amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 32 proposed by Mr. ENSIGN (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. HOEVEN) to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 2 of the amendment, strike line 11 and all that follows through page 3, line 10, and insert the following:

(6) addresses both military and nonmilitary unmanned aerial system operations;

(7) ensures that the unmanned aircraft systems integration plan is incorporated in the Administration's NextGen Air Transportation System implementation plan; and

(8) provides for integration into the National Airspace System of safety standards and navigation procedures validated—

(A) under the pilot project created pursuant to paragraph (1); or

(B) through other related research and development activities carried out pursuant to paragraph (4).

(b) SELECTION OF TEST SITES.—

(1) INCREASED NUMBER OF TEST SITES; DEADLINE FOR PILOT PROJECT.—Notwithstanding subsection (a)(1), the plan developed under subsection (a) shall include a pilot project to integrate unmanned aerial systems into the National Airspace System at 6 test sites in the National Airspace System by December 31, 2012.

(2) TEST SITE CRITERIA.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall take into consideration geographical and climate diversity and appropriate facilities in determining where the test sites to be established under the pilot project required by subsection (a)(1) are to be located.

(c) CERTIFICATION PROCESS.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall expedite the approval process for requests for certificates of authorization at test sites referred to in subsection (a)(1).

(d) REPORT ON SYSTEMS AND DETECTION TECHNIQUES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report describing and assessing the progress being made in establishing special use airspace to fill the immediate need of the Department of Defense to develop detection techniques for small unmanned aerial vehicles and to validate sensor integration and operation of unmanned aerial systems.

NOTICES OF INTENT TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I submit the following notice in writing: In accordance with rule V of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend rule XXII, including germaneness requirements, for the purpose of proposing and considering the following amendment no. 64 on S. 223.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I submit the following notice in writing: In accordance with rule V of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend rule XXII, including germaneness requirements, for the purpose of proposing and considering the following amendment no. 80 on S. 223.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I submit the following notice in writing: In accordance with rule V of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend rule XXII, including germaneness requirements, for the purpose of proposing and considering the following amendment no. 81 on S. 223.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I submit the following notice in writing: In accordance with rule V of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend rule XXII, including germaneness requirements, for the purpose of proposing and considering the following amendment no. 82 on S. 223.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I submit the following notice in writing: In accordance with rule V of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend rule XXII, including germaneness requirements, for the purpose of proposing and considering the following amendment no. 91 on S. 223.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet on Thursday, February 17, 2011, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct its organization meeting for the 112th Congress.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Lynden Armstrong at the Rules and Administration Committee on (202) 224–6352.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 16, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building. The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, ''Safeguarding Our Future: Building a Nationwide Network for First Responders.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 16, 2011, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 16, 2011, at 10 a.m., in Dirksen 406 to hold a hearing entitled, ''National Leaders' Call to Action on Transportation.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 16, 2011, at 10 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''The President's Budget for Fiscal Year 2012.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 16, 2011, at 10:30 a.m., in SD–430.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 16, 2011, at 9:15 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Value of Education Choices: Saving the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 16, 2011, at 11:30 a.m. in Room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 16, 2011, at 10 a.m. in Room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Targeting Websites Dedicated To Stealing American Intellectual Property.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized

to meet during the session of the Senate on February 16, 2011, at 3 p.m. in Room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 16, 2011.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 16, 2011, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, THE FEDERAL WORKPLACE, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 16, 2011, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Improving Federal Employment of People with Disabilities.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMENDING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to S. Con. Res. 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) commending the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 102nd anniversary.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss this concurrent resolution that honors the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, on the occasion of its 102nd anniversary. I thank Senators GRASSLEY, LEAHY, and others for joining me in submitting this bipartisan resolution and would like to note that this resolution is particularly timely not only because the NAACP just celebrated its 102nd anniversary, but also because we are celebrating Black History Month.

The NAACP was created amidst great adversity. In 1905, a group of African American civil rights activists came together to discuss prominent issues that they and many others faced in our Nation. Among those discussed issues was disenfranchisement. Despite passage of the 15th amendment to the U.S. Constitution in 1870, African Americans throughout the country were denied their right to one of the fundamental methods of civic engagement: the right to vote. In many circumstances Jim Crow State laws. These discussions were held on the Canadian side of the Niagara Falls because hotels across America remained segregated. On February 12, 1909, the centennial of President Abraham Lincoln's birth, distinguished leaders in the struggle for civil and political liberty, which included W.E.B. DuBois, Ida Wells-Barnett, Henry Moscowitz, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villard, and William English Walling, created the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. It is now the oldest and largest civil rights organization in the United States.

Its national headquarters is located in my home city of Baltimore, MD, and its mission is one that I hold dear; that is, to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of the rights of all persons and to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination.

Over the years, the NAACP has advanced its mission of racial equality and has achieved concrete goals to that effect by nonviolent means through sheer moral force and legal persuasion. The NAACP initially focused on ending the use of lynching, bringing equality into the job market, and ensuring voting rights for all. Many of the significant legal victories came under the leadership of Charles Houston and his protégé and fellow Marylander, Thurgood Marshall. Houston is remembered for stating, ''[A] lawyer is either a social engineer or a parasite on society.''

The duo of Houston and Marshall successfully argued Murray v. Maryland, 1936, which resulted in the desegregation of the University of Maryland's Law School and in 1938 Missouri ex rel. Gaines v. Canada the Supreme Court ordered the admission of a Black student to the Law School at the University of Missouri. When Thurgood Marshall served as the NAACP's special counsel, the organization continued to fight for equality in cases such as Smith v. Allwright, 1944, where Marshall challenged ''White primaries,'' which prevented African Americans from voting in several Southern States. In Morgan v. Virginia, 1946, the Supreme Court struck down a State law that enforced segregation on buses and trains that were interstate carriers. In Shelley v Kraemer, 1948, the NAACP won a battle to end the enforcement of racially restrictive housing covenants, which denied access for African Americans to homes in what was considered White neighborhoods.

In 1950, the NAACP provided the legal resources to contest both Texas and Oklahoma laws allowing segregated graduate schools in Sweatt v. Painter, 1950, and McLaurin v. Oklahoma, 1950. Marshall and the team of lawyers argued and won unanimous decisions in the U.S. Supreme Court, stating the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment required those States to admit African-American students to their respective graduate and professional schools. These court rulings supported and led to the landmark decision in Brown v. Board of Education, 1954, which ended racial segregation in our public schools. Marshall went on to become the Nation's first African-American Solicitor General, and then the Nation's first African-American Supreme Court Justice.

Additionally, the NAACP has worked tirelessly to win passage of important legislation that protects the fundamental rights of all Americans. This legislation includes the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act. More recently, the NAACP played an integral role in ensuring passage of important contemporary civil rights bills that I was proud to cosponsor, including the Civil Rights Act of 2008, the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act, and the landmark Fair Sentencing Act, which reduced the gross racial disparity inherent in our sentencing laws for crack cocaine.

One of America's greatest strengths is its rich diversity. From Rosa Parks and the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. to Marylanders Harriet Tubman, Frederick Douglass and Thurgood Marshall, strong African-American men and women have become role models for our Nation and others around the world who struggle for freedom. During the month of February, we all should take a moment to reflect upon the achievements and sacrifices of the African-American community—achievements that might not have been possible without the hard work and tireless effort of the NAACP. It also is a time to rededicate ourselves to the ideals enshrined in the U.S. Constitution—the ideals of equality, freedom and justice—and making sure they are protected for future generations. Because in the words of the late Senator Ted Kennedy: ''Civil rights is the unfinished business of the Nation.''

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table, there be no intervening action or debate, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 6

Whereas the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (referred to in this preamble as the ''NAACP''), originally known as the National Negro Committee, was founded in New York City on February 12, 1909, the centennial of the date on which President Abraham Lincoln was born, by a multiracial group of activists who met in a national conference to discuss the civil and political rights of African-Americans;

Whereas the NAACP was founded by a distinguished group of leaders in the struggle for civil and political liberty, including Ida Wells-Barnett, W.E.B. DuBois, Henry Moscowitz, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villard, and William English Walling;

Whereas the NAACP is the oldest and largest civil rights organization in the United States;

Whereas the NAACP National Headquarters is located in Baltimore, Maryland;

Whereas the mission of the NAACP is to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of rights of all people and to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination;

Whereas the NAACP is committed to achieving its goals through nonviolence;

Whereas the NAACP advances its mission through reliance on the press, the petition, the ballot, and the courts;

Whereas the NAACP has been persistent in the use of legal and moral persuasion, even in the face of overt and violent racial hostility;

Whereas the NAACP has used political pressure, marches, demonstrations, and effective lobbying to serve as the voice, as well as the shield, for minorities in the United States;

Whereas after years of fighting segregation in public schools, the NAACP, under the leadership of Special Counsel Thurgood Marshall, won one of its greatest legal victories in the decision issued by the Supreme Court in Brown v. Board of Education (347 U.S. 483 (1954));

Whereas in 1955, NAACP member Rosa Parks was arrested and fined for refusing to give up her seat on a segregated bus in Montgomery, Alabama, an act of courage that would serve as the catalyst for the largest grassroots civil rights movement in the history of the United States;

Whereas the NAACP was prominent in lobbying for the passage of—

(1) the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (Public Law 85–315; 71 Stat. 634);

(2) the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–449; 74 Stat. 86);

(3) the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–352; 78 Stat. 241);

(4) the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973 et seq.);

(5) the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, Coretta Scott King, César E. Chávez, Barbara C. Jordan, William C. Velásquez, and Dr. Hector P. Garcia Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–246; 120 Stat. 577); and

(6) the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.);

Whereas in 2005, the NAACP launched the Disaster Relief Fund to help hurricane survivors rebuild their lives in the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Florida, and Alabama;

Whereas in the 110th Congress, the NAACP was prominent in lobbying for the passage of H. Res. 826, the resolved clause of which expresses that—

(1) the hanging of nooses is a horrible act when used for the purpose of intimidation;

(2) under certain circumstances, the hanging of nooses can be criminal; and

(3) the hanging of nooses should be investigated thoroughly by Federal authorities, and any criminal violations should be vigorously prosecuted;

Whereas in 2008, the NAACP vigorously supported the passage of the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act of 2007 (28 U.S.C. 509 note), a law that puts additional Federal resources into solving the heinous crimes that occurred during the early days of the civil rights struggle that remain unsolved and brings those who perpetrated those crimes to justice;

Whereas the NAACP has helped usher in the new millennium by charting a bold course, beginning with the appointment of the youngest President and Chief Executive Officer in the history of the organization, Benjamin Todd Jealous, and its youngest female Board Chair, Roslyn M. Brock;

Whereas under the leadership of Benjamin Todd Jealous and Roslyn M. Brock, the NAACP has outlined a strategic plan to confront 21st century challenges in the critical areas of health, education, housing, criminal justice, and the environment;

Whereas on July 16, 2009, the NAACP celebrated its centennial anniversary in New York City, highlighting an extraordinary century of ''Bold Dreams, Big Victories'' with a historic address from the first African-American President of the United States, Barack Obama; and

Whereas as an advocate for sentencing reform, the NAACP applauded the enactment of the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–220; 124 Stat. 2372), a landmark piece of legislation that reduces the quantity of crack cocaine that triggers a mandatory minimum sentence for a Federal conviction of crack cocaine distribution from 100 times that of people convicted of distributing the drug in powdered form to 18 times that sentence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes the 102nd anniversary of the historic founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and

(2) commends the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its anniversary for its work to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of all people.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces on behalf of the Committee on Finance, pursuant to section 8002 of title 26, U.S. Code, the designation of the following Senators as members of the Joint Committee on Taxation: the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY).

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:30 p.m. tomorrow Senator COATS be recognized for up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, February 17; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 223, the Federal Aviation Administration authorization bill, that there then be 2 hours of debate prior to a cloture vote on the Inhofe amendment, as modified, with the time equally divided and controlled between the proponents and opponents; finally, the filing deadline for second-degree amendments to S. 233 be 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senators should expect the first vote of the day tomorrow to begin about 11:30, with additional votes occurring throughout the day in an effort to complete action on the FAA bill.

As I announced here a couple of hours ago, we can complete this FAA bill tomorrow. If not, we are going to have to work into the next day. We have two cloture votes that are set up and we are going to finish this bill before we leave. That could mean some extended time. Everyone knows that. Everyone has been alerted to that. There is no reason that we do that. All the issues have been laid before us. We know the votes we have. If people want to cooperate and finish this important piece of legislation, we can do that. If they do not, then they can sit around with the rest of us.

We will not accomplish anything by not finishing the bill tomorrow except use up a lot of time. I know next week is the President's Day recess. As I have said on a number of occasions, this is not a time that we go back to our States and hang around the swimming pool or take steam baths. The fact is, we go home to meet with constituents. We need to be home during the week so we can go to places of business, meet with government officials who are not working during the weekends.

I hope everyone will work toward that goal. If not, our first obligation is to complete legislation and we may have to be here longer than just tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent we adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:26 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, February 17, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

TIMOTHY M. CAIN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA, VICE P. MICHAEL DUFFY, RETIRED.

SCOTT WESLEY SKAVDAHL, OF WYOMING, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF WYOMING, VICE WILLIAM F. DOWNES, RETIRING.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOSEPH L. VOTEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. KAFFIA JONES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

STACY J. TAYLOR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

TEMIDAYO L. ANDERSON
ALISON F. ATKINS
ANDREW R. ATKINS
MICHAEL E. BAHM
NATHAN J. BANKSON
AIMEE M. BATEMAN
JEFFREY K. BLANK
ANDREW T. BOCHAT
LOUIS J. BOSTON, JR.
CATHERINE L. BRANTLEY
LYNN Y. BRUCKELMEYER
PATRICK L. BRYAN
ERIK J. BURRIS
PAUL S. BUTLER
ERIK CLAUDIO
JASON A. COATS
CLAY A. COMPTON
MICHAEL C. CUSACK
TIFFANY K. DEWELL
JASON M. ELBERT
SHELLEY R. FARMER
REBECCA L. FARRELLKLIEM
NICOLE L. FISH
THERESA R. FORD
SEAN D. FOSTER
MELISSA E. GOFORTHKOENIG
NATHAN T. GOLDEN
MICHAEL P. GORDON
ALISON L. GREGOIRE
SAMUEL E. GREGORY
ROBERT A. GUILLEN, JR.
KARI L. HADLEY
CHARLES D. HALVERSON
ERIC K. HANSON
CHRISTOPHER S. HARRY
JOHN F. HARWOOD
JOE N. HILL
DANA M. HOLLYWOOD
ERIC C. HUSBY
LEWIS V. KLIEM
JOE B. KOBS
DAVID J. KRYNICKI
JAMES P. LEARY
ANDRE LEBLANC
NANCY J. LEWIS
LEAH D. LINGER
JOHN R. LONGLEY III
MATTHEW H. LUND
TYLER J. MCINTYRE
TRACY MORRIS
CHRISTOPHER P. MORSE
PAUL F. MUETHING III
DANIEL J. MURPHY
JENEVIEVE R. MURPHY
SEAN T. NGUYEN
EMEKA NWOFILI
THOMAS W. OAKLEY
MARK S. OPACHAN
MARK J. OPPEL
BOBIE B. OSEI
BRIAN B. OWENS
MARLIN D. PASCHAL
SHAWN L. PATTEN
KEITH A. PETTY
JEFFREY H. ROBERTSON
HANA A. ROLLINS
JUAN M. ROMAN, JR.
LAURA R. ROMAN
JESSE J. RONGITSCH
LISA M. SATTERFIELD
ALEXANDER R. SCHNEIDER
EVAN R. SEAMONE
EDWIN H. SHIN
CORY S. SIMPSON
SHAY STANFORD
JEREMY W. STEWARD
JOCELYN C. STEWART
JOSEPH L. STRAWN
LUCIUS E. TILLMAN
ELIZABETH A. TURNER
JENNIFER L. VENGHAUS
JOSEPH K. VENGHAUS
THEOLOGOS A. VOUDOURIS
WILLIAM D. WARD III
JASON C. WELLS
EAN P. WHITE
CANDACE N. WHITEHALVERSON
WAYNE H. WILLIAMS
SARAH E. WOLF
ALLEN P. ZENT

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JOE H. ADKINS, JR.
JOHN L. ALBERS
TRAY J. ARDESE
JON M. AYTES
JAMES M. BAKER
ANTHONY S. BARNES
SCOTT F. BENEDICT
PAUL F. BERTHOLF
ANTHONY J. BIANCA
STEFAN E. BIEN
JASON Q. BOHM
WILLIAM J. BOWERS
MARK T. BRINKMAN
THOMAS A. BRUNO
GLEN G. BUTLER
CHRISTIAN G. CABANISS
MICHEL C. CANCELLIER
JOHN J. CARROLL, JR.
MITCHELL E. CASSELL
BRIAN W. CAVANAUGH
CLIFFORD D. CHEN
JEFFREY S. CHESTNEY
JAMES D. CHRISTMAS
VINCENT E. CLARK
SHAWN J. COAKLEY
SHANE B. CONRAD
MATTHEW H. COOPER
MATTHEW R. CRABILL
CHARLES M. CROMWELL
ROBERT D. CURTIS
DONALD J. DAVIS
MATTHEW A. DAY
TODD S. DESGROSSEILLIERS
JEFFREY J. DILL
TODD S. ECKLOFF
KATHERINE J. ESTES
JOHN P. FARNAM
ANTHONY A. FERENCE
ROBERT A. FIFER
JOHN S. FITZPATRICK
MICHAEL D. FLYNN
TODD D. FORD
JAMES S. FRAMPTON
TYSON B. GEISENDORFF
SEAN D. GIBSON
GREGORY G. GILLETTE
FLAY R. GOODWIN
GERALD C. GRAHAM
VERNON L. GRAHAM
STEVEN J. GRASS
THOMAS E. GRATTAN III
JESSE L. GRUTER
GLENN R. GUENTHER
WAYNE C. HARRISON
RYAN P. HERITAGE
JAMES B. HIGGINS, JR.
JONATHAN W. HITESMAN
TODD A. HOLMQUIST
CHRISTOPHER W. HUGHES
JAMES T. JENKINS II
JEFFREY J. JOHNSON
PAUL H. JOHNSON III
RICHARD E. JORDAN
GARY F. KEIM
BRIAN M. KENNEDY
GLENN M. KLASSA
ERIC R. KLEIS
TIMOTHY A. KOLB
ANDREW J. KOSTIC, JR.
ERIK B. KRAFT
DANIEL T. LATHROP
KEVIN J. LEE
STEPHEN E. LISZEWSKI
TODD W. LYONS
ARTURO J. MADRIL
BRIAN L. MAGNUSON
JOHN A. MANNLE
ANTHONY J. MANUEL
GREGORY R. MARTIN
RICARDO MARTINEZ
DOUGLAS S. MAYER
ROBERT E. MCCARTHY III
DEBORAH M. MCCONNELL
BRANDON D. MCGOWAN
ARCHIBALD M. MCLELLAN
CHRISTOPHER A. MCPHILLIPS
JOHN S. MEADE
JOHN P. MEE
MARK J. MENOTTI
JOHN E. MERNA
ANDREW R. MILBURN
LAWRENCE F. MILLER
MICHAEL A. MOORE
JOSEPH M. MURRAY
CHRISTOPHER L. NALER
TODD J. ONETO
DUANE A. OPPERMAN
CHRIS PAPPAS III
TIMOTHY M. PARKER
ARTHUR J. PASAGIAN
DOUGLAS R. PATTERSON
RICHARD W. PAULY
JOHN M. PECK
VON H. PIGG
WILLIAM N. PIGOTT, JR.
TRAVIS M. PROVOST
STEPHEN E. REDIFER
JOHN M. REED
KEITH D. REVENTLOW
GEORGE W. RIGGS
DONALD J. RILEY, JR.
DAVID W. ROWE
JOSEPH J. RUSSELL
KEITH E. RUTKOWSKI
MARK G. SCHRECKER
STEPHEN S. SCHWARZ
ROBERT R. SCOTT
CHARLES L. SIDES
STEVEN A. SIMMONS
ROBERT B. SOFGE, JR.
MARK E. SOJOURNER
JOSEPH P. SPATARO
CLAY A. STACKHOUSE
ROGER D. STANDFIELD
SCOTT F. STEBBINS
JAMES A. STOCKS
DANIEL M. SULLIVAN
MICHAEL W. TAYLOR
DAVID C. THOMPSON
ALPHONSO TRIMBLE
MATTHEW G. TROLLINGER
JEFFREY D. TUGGLE
LORETTA L. VANDENBERG
MICHAEL E. WATKINS
SEAN D. WESTER
DWAYNE A. WHITESIDE
TIMOTHY E. WINAND
JOSEPH A. WOODWARD, JR.
JAMES B. ZIENTEK

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING WILLIAM J. DAVIS

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to fellow Minnesotan William J. Davis in honor of his twenty years of service as President and CEO of Community Action of Minneapolis.

At the helm of Community Action of Minneapolis, Mr. Davis has advocated tirelessly for underserved communities; ensuring the concerns of so many, which are often overlooked, are heard. During his twenty years of dedication, innumerable citizens have received critical services vital to their well being: children and family development, weatherization, home electric savings and energy services. Under Mr. Davis' calculated and efficient stewardship, Community Action of Minneapolis has not only grown, but thrived.

Mr. Speaker, the stability of our cherished American life is contingent upon a functional and educated populace. Public servants such as Mr. Davis continue to ensure that opportunities to contribute at any level within our nation are extended throughout our society. The continued pursuit of equality has become a cornerstone of which we, as Americans, are tremendously proud. Our pride would be unwarranted without the profound contributions of public servants such as William J. Davis.

CONGRATULATING BARBARA CLOVER

HON. RODNEY ALEXANDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to congratulate Mrs. Barbara Clover on being named the 2010 National Secondary Art Educator of the Year by the National Art Education Association. She is truly deserving of this honor for her exemplary contributions toward the promotion of art education.

Mrs. Clover has been an art teacher at Holy Savior Menard Central High School in Alexandria, La., for 16 years where she has challenged and inspired students to explore their creative sides.

Beyond the classroom, Mrs. Clover serves as president of the Louisiana Art Education Association. She views this affiliation as a means to further her advocacy for the arts and art education.

In addition, Mrs. Clover has been featured at numerous local art events and has chaired the Youth Art Month program for the Louisiana Art Education Association.

For her dedication to enhancing art education, she has been honored nationally five times for her work with Youth Art Month, including four awards of Excellence and one Claire Flanagan Memorial Grand Award, which is the highest award presented by the Council for Art Education, Inc.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mrs. Barbara Clover for being named the 2010 National Secondary Art Educator of the Year. As an excellent teacher and promoter of the arts, she is deserving of this laudable recognition.

RECOGNIZING MRS. LAJUANA MALLOY AS THE 2011 WASHINGTON COUNTY TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. LaJuana Malloy as the 2011 Washington County Teacher of the Year. For nearly two decades, Mrs. Malloy has been an inspiration to her students, motivating and inspiring them to succeed at the highest levels, and I am honored to recognize her achievements.

Mrs. Malloy is a lifelong resident of Washington County, Florida. After receiving her Bachelor of Science Degree in Elementary Education, she worked as a Protective Services Caseworker in the Florida Department of Children and Families. Mrs. Malloy was born to make a positive impact on her community. After her time as a caseworker, she decided to enter into the teaching profession.

Mrs. Malloy sought to motivate her students to succeed and to reach their full potential. With this goal in mind, she decided to continue her education at Florida State University, where she earned a Master's degree and a certification in Exceptional Student Education. She taught at Kate Elementary School for fourteen years and at Vernon Elementary School, where she also served as Reading Coach. For the past three years, Mrs. Malloy has served as a language arts and reading teacher at Roulhac Middle School, where her dedication to her students inspires them to pursue excellence in language arts.

Mrs. Malloy and her husband, Wesley, are the proud parents of two college students. Eli is a junior at Chipola College, and Elizabeth is a sophomore at the University of South Alabama. Mrs. Malloy also spends her weekends teaching at her church's Preschool Sunday School, where she is also the church's pianist.

Mrs. Malloy believes that teaching is a true calling, and that her work as an educator makes an invaluable and lasting impact on her students and community. The Washington County Teacher of the Year award is evidence of her enormous impact; however, her achievement is even better illustrated through the lives of her exceptional students. I am privileged to have her as a constituent in Florida's First Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am proud to recognize LaJuana Malloy for her accomplishments and her continuing commitment to excellence at Roulhac Middle School. My wife Vicki joins me in congratulating Mrs. Malloy, and we wish her all the best.

HONORING ALFENETTE ROBINSON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Alfenette Robinson, born July 10, 1957, to Mr. and Mrs. William Henry Robinson, Jr., a lifelong Bolton, Mississippi, native. She graduated from Sumner Hill High School in 1975 and furthered her education by obtaining her Associate Degree in Education from Hinds Community College. Alfenette has been in education for the past 31 years. She served as an assistant teacher for the Trainable Mentally Retarded classroom in the Clinton Public School District for 20 years. She presently serves as Branch Supervisor at the Annie L. Thompson-Jeffers Branch of the Hinds County Public Library System, where she has been employed since 1987. People in general have been Ms. Robinson's life and passion. She helps all kinds of people on and off the job. She is Chairman of the Bolton Christmas Parade committee, Secretary of Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church Sunday School, lifelong member of Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church, active member of the Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church Choir, active member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, and has dedicated her time towards many local campaign elections. She loves helping the elderly members of the community, no matter how big or small the task. She is known for running errands and assisting the elderly with understanding and completing important documents and forms. In addition to her love for the elderly, she is gifted in working with special-needs children and superbly knowledgeable and passionate in overseeing the operation and functionality of the Bolton community's only library. Alfenette has a twin sister and one brother, along with many community-adopted children.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. DAN BENISHEK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and

the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chairman, it is my strong belief that the pre-eminent reason a majority of Northern Michigan's citizens selected me to be their representative in Washington was to do everything possible to rein in out-of-control Federal spending. My focus has been to support such efforts while working to ensure that policies coming out of the Nation's Capital—tax, monetary, and regulatory—serve to encourage private enterprise so Northern Michigan has the chance to experience economic growth.

My first 44 days in office have taught me a great deal about the budget process and the "spending ways of Washington." Each day we have been in session I have typically had 5–10 meetings with organizations, companies and Washington reps all seeking to keep their programs free of any spending cuts. No one in Washington has asked me to spend less. In fact, it seems in every Washington meeting while there occasionally is a recognition of the doom America faces if the current spending continues, each meeting usually closes with an expected refrain ". . . yes we need to spend less but not our program."

By contrast, during my first visit home, just about everyone in the First District asked me to make sure the Federal Government spends less. In Northern Michigan there seems to be a strong consensus that Federal budget red ink can no longer continue at record pace.

Here are my guiding "spend less" principles in this 112th Congress:

Shared Responsibility: Before there is any comprehensive entitlement reform effort, every Federal department should be prepared to live with less money in 2012 than it received in 2011.

Sunlight and Transparency: All spending decisions should be made in a fully transparent legislative process. No backdoor earmarks, no special interest amendments. If a program has merit its supporters should defend the program in public floor debate.

Tighten the Revenue Spigot: Simply sending more money to Washington is not going to solve the problem of unchecked spending; every year the U.S. Treasury receives more money; every year the Federal Government spends more than it takes in. Consequently, increasing taxes is not the answer.

If not now, when? I have publicly promised to limit my career in Congress to just three terms. America's future is more important than any one of us in Congress, certainly more important than any political job. I'd rather do what I think is right than simply keep this position. I trust the voters.

In my view, the debt is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue. It is an American issue.

The failure of previous Congresses to act means America now faces a $14 trillion debt. For every dollar Congress allocates the U.S. Treasury has to borrow up to $.40 to pay for it. That means indebting ourselves to countries like China and mortgaging our children's future.

Let me be clear, this will not be easy. To stem the tide, many tough decisions will need to be made. Northern Michigan—like the entire country—has a backlog of worthy projects and its people have benefited from admirable public programs. The reductions in H.R. 1 affect every community in the nation. These are hard decisions for Congress to make, and not everyone will be happy with everything that has been proposed. This is understandable, but I believe these reductions are necessary to show that Congress is serious about returning our country to a sustainable financial path.

The Continuing Resolution to be considered on the House Floor this week is just the first step. Fortunately, the President's budget proposal is merely a suggestion that Congress can improve upon. In my view, Congress needs to offer a more fiscally sound budget for FY 2012.

Additionally, it is my view that Congress will need to consider reforming entitlements programs. Social Security and Medicare are important programs that millions of Americans depend on. Without reform, both of these programs face bankruptcy. In my opinion, Congress needs to consider solutions to avoid this crisis that ensures benefits under Social Security and Medicare are not reduced for those Americans currently receiving benefits.

And I think most of my colleagues agree this is not a time to play politics. The inflamed rhetoric and scare attacks on cutting grandma's benefits have no place here. This week's vote will not take away benefits for anyone receiving benefits. Instead, Congress will have completed the first step and as the Constitution dictates, the Senate and the President will have their say.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM "BILLY" LYON

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a longstanding business leader in South Alabama, Mr. William "Billy" Lyon, who recently passed away at the age of 80.

A native of Mobile, Mr. Lyon graduated from Murphy High School in 1944 and attended the Citadel in Charleston, South Carolina before joining the Navy in 1945, where he served on the USS *Chicago*. Following the end of the war, he attended Auburn University and the University of North Carolina.

A natural entrepreneur, Mr. Billy became a homebuilder with a lifelong passion for commercial and residential real estate development in Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida and Georgia.

He developed scores of local residential subdivisions, including Brookwood, Blacksher Downs, Tuthill Lane Estates and Carriage Hills, and sold lots to nearly every builder in Mobile. He also partnered and developed numerous commercial shopping centers, including Mobile's Bel Air Mall, which opened in 1966.

He was one of the founding board members of Commercial Guaranty Bank in Mobile, which later became SouthTrust Bank, and also served on the Boards of Bel Air Corporation, Mobile Gas Company, First Southern Federal, Altus Bank, the Drug Education Council, and the Alabama School of Math and Science.

Mr. Billy was the longest active member of the Home Builders Association of Mobile and received the E. L. Jones award in 2002. He witnessed and played a vital role in Mobile for many years, helping countless individuals, bankers, builders, realtors, friends and associates along the way.

On behalf of the people of South Alabama, I extend my condolences to his wife, Patricia; their two sons, BJ and Jimmy; their four daughters, Tricia, Nancy, Victoria and Ashley; nineteen grandchildren and their entire family. You are all in our thoughts and prayers.

HONORING DR. MICHAEL COLLINS

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished career of Dr. Michael Collins. For more than 25 years, he has exhibited a drive and work ethic on and off the ice that serves as inspiration to his colleagues and friends.

Dr. Collins, a Chicago native, attended the University of Notre Dame. In South Bend he played varsity hockey and shoveled furnaces to pay the bills, but still graduated in three and a half years. Upon graduation, Michael spent several years driving a cab, and working construction before entering medicine. After returning to college for another two years to take pre-med courses, he attended the Loyola University Stritch School of Medicine followed by five years at the Mayo Clinic. He is now a full-time, board-certified orthopedic surgeon.

In addition to his medical practice, he has written professionally for more than 30 years. His first book, Hot Lights, Cold Steel, continues to be a best-seller in the medical memoir field. Since its publication, Michael has lectured extensively on topics relating to medicine and writing.

Dr. Collins' hard work and accomplishments have earned him national attention, and in 2010 he received the American Hockey Coaches Association Lou Lamoriello Award. The Lamoriello Award recognizes a former college hockey player or coach who goes on to a distinguished career in or out of hockey.

Michael and his wife, Patti, have raised 12 children and today he still plays hockey twice a week. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dr. Michael Collins and his life of achievement. His career has inspired many and continues to impress.

RECOGNIZING TIFFANY McKINNIE AS THE 2011 WASHINGTON COUNTY EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT PERSON OF THE YEAR

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tiffany McKinnie as the 2011 Washington County, Florida Educational Support Person of the Year. I am honored to recognize her achievements and her dedication to the students of Northwest Florida.

Mrs. McKinnie is an Exceptional Student Education (ESE) paraprofessional at Roulhac Middle School. ESE paraprofessionals serve an integral role in the development of ESE

students. They are responsible for assisting teachers in a variety of ways to implement the instructional program. They work directly with children in small groups or on a one-to-one basis, and through this close interaction, they foster strong bonds that motivate pupils to develop the knowledge needed to provide a solid educational foundation.

Mrs. McKinnie and her husband, Albert, have three sons and one daughter, and her time outside the classroom is spent enjoying quality time with her family. She is currently enrolled at Chipola College, where she is pursuing a degree in Exceptional Student Education.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am proud to recognize Tiffany McKinnie for her accomplishments and her continuing commitment to excellence at Roulhac Middle School. My wife Vicki joins me in congratulating Mrs. McKinnie, and we wish her all the best.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York, the Honorable CAROLYN MCCARTHY, to provide needed funding for the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, or NICS. The intent of the amendment is for the Department of Justice to use $20 million appropriated in the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance account to provide grants to States and tribal areas to implement the NICS Improvement Amendments Act, Public Law 110–180.

Representative MCCARTHY and I have worked together to improve the national instant check system since 2002. It was obvious to us at the time that the National Instant Check System was not working as Congress had intended it should. However, it was the tragedy of Virginia Tech that spurred Congress to act unanimously to update the instant check system. The perpetrator of that violent attack was adjudicated a danger to himself and others—therefore, legally prohibited from possessing a firearm—but was able to pass a background check because his name was not in the NICS database.

It is estimated that there are still millions of qualifying records that should be in NICS but are not. A study by the National Center for State Courts found there should be roughly twice as many mental-health records in NICS as there currently are, based on responses from 42 of 56 States and territories.

At the time we enacted the NICS Improvement Amendments Act, we found that there were two primary reasons there were delays in NICS background checks: the lack of updated and available State criminal disposition records and insufficient automated access to records pertaining to mental illness, restraining orders, and misdemeanor convictions for domestic violence.

The NICS Improvement Amendments Act sought to address these inadequacies by authorizing grants to States and tribal areas to upgrade their electronic records and technologies, enhance their capacities to perform background checks, supply accurate and timely criminal history disposition records, and improve reporting and transmitting to the NICS database. This amendment would allow the Department of Justice to continue making these grants. Adequate funding for NICS must be part of the equation to improve it. Between FY 09 and FY 11, the NICS Improvement Amendments Act authorizes appropriations of over $900 million. Yet, in FY 09 and FY 10, just $30 million has been appropriated.

Mr. Chair, all Members of Congress can agree that we must confront our budget and deficit. However, at a time when States' budgets are more strained than ever, the federal government must be ready to help protect public safety, enforce the laws on the books, and in turn, serve our national interest.

Funding for NICS is not only an important tool to keep firearms out of the hands of criminals and those mentally unfit to possess them, but also to ensure individuals' Second Amendment rights are protected, as States are required to remove obsolete or erroneous records from the database. This commonsense amendment is supported by the National Rifle Association, an organization whose top priority is protecting the Second Amendment rights of Americans. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

HONORING MINNIE B. YOUNG

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Minnie B. Young. Mrs. Minnie B. Young was born on March 11, 1937, outside of Leland, Mississippi. She is the youngest of five children. Mrs. Young was married twice; both husbands are deceased. Mrs. Young is the proud mother of five children.

Mrs.Young attended elementary school in Dunleith, MS, then on to Abraham Lincoln Attendance Center in Leland, MS.

In 1965, Mrs. Young and others went on a strike for a pay increase from A.L. Andrew Plantation, located in what was then Tent City, MS. It was called Tent City because they lived in tents. However, there were no raises and the strikers eventually quit their jobs at the Plantation. The strikers then changed the name of the town from Tent City to what we now know as Strike City in 1966. Also, she was one of the marchers in Greenville, MS, during the Civil Rights Era in 1966.

Mrs. Young worked in the Head Start program from 1966–1980. She went from Head Start to Witte Memorial Hospital, in Leland, MS, from 1980–1985.

Mrs. Young enjoys writing poems. She considers this a hobby, which she has been doing since she was a little girl. Both she and her daughter, Maxine Johnson, call themselves "Strike City's Finest Poets." They published a book of poems called Real Talk. Mrs. Young considers herself a religious poet. Today, she still writes poems, mostly for her church, Greater St. Matthew M.B. Church, located in Strike City, MS.

HONORING THE CHELSEA AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BUSINESS LEADERSHIP AWARD WINNERS

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor The Chelsea Area Chamber of Commerce, 2010 Business Leadership Award winners. The Large Business Award winner is Cleary's Pub and the Small Business Award winner is True North Jerky Co. These annual awards are presented by the Chelsea Area Chamber of Commerce and the Ambassador Club of the Chamber.

The formal presentation of each award will be during the February 17, 2011, Annual Meeting for the Chelsea Chamber of Commerce. Each of these award winners was judged in several areas that include; displaying innovative ideas and services, demonstrated leadership in the Chelsea business community, support of the Chelsea Area Chamber of Commerce, and contributing to the economic impact of the City of Chelsea.

Cleary's Pub is owned by Pat Cleary, Meg Boomer, and Joan Henry. This brother and sister team of owners has been in business for 20 years in their familiar Main Street location in downtown Chelsea.

True North Jerky Co. is owned by Phil and Jennifer Tolliver. Phil and Jennifer also are the franchisee for Bearclaw Coffee Drive-Thru located adjacent to the Jerky Co.

These local businesses in the 7th Congressional District have established themselves as true leaders and entrepreneurs who continue to spur economic growth even during these tough economic times.

I would like to commend and congratulate these businesses owners on their successful business ventures that have contributed greatly to the City of Chelsea, Michigan, and the 7th Congressional District.

HONORING JOHN DAVID MERCER FOR HIS HEROIC ACTION IN SAVING LIVES

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of the House the heroic efforts of a constituent of mine whose quick thinking saved lives during a recent pre-dawn Mobile, Alabama motel fire.

On the early morning of December 21, 2010, John David Mercer, a staff photographer with the Mobile Press-Register, was driving home after shooting the historic lunar eclipse when his eye caught sight of another target. While glancing over at the battleship USS Alabama, a local landmark, Mr. Mercer noticed

thick white smoke billowing from a nearby motel roof. He quickly headed to the building in hopes of capturing some news photos when he realized no one else was aware of the blaze. At that point, he alerted the motel manager, sounded the fire alarm and sprinted upstairs to awake the motel guests. At one point the flames reached 40 feet in the air, yet Mr. Mercer continued to knock on doors.

Fire and police soon arrived and the motel was fully evacuated avoiding any injuries in the fire. The motel owner credited Mr. Mercer with saving lives and helping to prevent further damage to the building.

For his heroic action, Mr. Mercer was presented the Citizen Valor Award by the Mobile Fire-Rescue Department. Additionally, he was given the National Press Photographers Association's Humanitarian Award.

A recent Press-Register editorial honoring Mr. Mercer said it best: "These days, the title 'hero' is tossed about too casually and too often. However, we consider it fitting in this case. John David Mercer is a hero because he got into the game when he didn't have to, and because he placed the welfare of others above his own without being asked."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those who have praised Mr. Mercer's selfless act on that early December morning. He truly deserves to be called a hero.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Department of Defense Mentor-Protégé Program. This successful program was created in fiscal year 1990 to develop the technical capabilities of small disadvantaged businesses by allowing major contractors to transfer and develop technology with them. The Mentor-Protégé Program has been essential to diversifying our defense supplier industrial base by expanding the number of qualified small businesses that can realistically compete for DOD contracts.

Current estimates show that protégé businesses make up 12 percent of all small disadvantaged business awards from DOD. However, a sunset clause in the original bill set the program to expire in 2010, and language extending the authorization to 2015 was removed from the FY11 National Defense Authorization Act. At a time when our small businesses and defense industrial base are both struggling, this program, which has a successful track record, is a critical tool for keeping our defense industrial base and our national security strong. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House to ensure we reauthorize this critical program in fiscal year 2012.

HONORING MR. AND MRS. WILFORD AND MARIE NORTON, COMMUNITY ACTIVISTS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Mr. Wilford Norton, Sr., and Mrs. Marie Norton of Rolling Fork, MS, who were instrumental in the Civil Rights Movement during the origin of civil rights in Mississippi. Both Mr. and Mrs. Norton played significant roles in the success of voter registration and equality for local citizens in Sharkey County and surrounding counties. In 1965–66, Mr. Wilford and Marie Norton worked hand in hand with the late Mr. Sidney Alexander, Sr. (who was a strong advocate for civil rights) and other brave and resilient citizens to ensure all eligible and those that were of age were registered to vote. They spent many hours traveling throughout the counties visiting families to encourage them; this was during an era when many families were afraid of consequences and feared their safety. With much persuasion and long hours of labor, voters were registered.

In 1964, Marie and Wilford Norton also assisted in housing white students who traveled from Massachusetts and Ohio to assist the community in organizing the Head Start Program and other community programs. During this time the Nortons resided at 507 Magnolia Street, a small house with only three bedrooms. The Norton children sacrificed their beds for the comfort of their guests.

Shortly after the Massachusetts and Ohio visitors departed Rolling Fork, the Ku Klux Klan burned a cross in the center of the field that stood across the street from 507 Magnolia Street. During this time (1964 or 1965) the field was vacant with no houses. The burning cross was center field directly in front of the Norton's home and center to the newly organized Head Start Center (Ms. Francis Alexander's home until her passing) adjacent to Magnolia Street on Poplar Street. This did not deter the Nortons or the Alexanders in the cause for justice and equality; their will to end bigotry and injustice continued strong in both families.

This was a time when some in the community were making it known that they wanted an end to inequality and made a stand as they formed Picket Groups; the Norton and Alexander children 10 years of age and above were taken out of school to assist in a weeklong of picketing all local merchants in Rolling Fork; they were joined by a few other Rolling Fork families and families from surrounding counties. In 1966, two of the Norton girls were amongst the first to integrate the former Fielding L. Wright School (currently Rolling Fork High School) in Rolling Fork. Though this was not an easy transition for the participating Norton children and others, it was a sacrifice that families made to end segregation in the public school system.

In 1963, Mr. Wilford Norton, Sr., joined Mr. Sydney Alexander, Sr., and a few other men of Rolling Fork, MS, with much support from their wives to participate in the March on Washington with Martin Luther King, Jr., that occurred on August 28, 1963, to rally for freedom, jobs, justice and equality for all at the Lincoln Memorial where Dr. King gave his awesome "I Have a Dream" speech. Mr. Norton could not have been any prouder when he returned to his family; he told of how this was one of the most incredible events and days of his life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 33 regarding H. Res. 72, "Directing certain standing committees to inventory and review existing, pending, and proposed regulations and orders from agencies of the Federal Government, particularly with respect to their effect on jobs and economic growth." Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1. While I agree with my Republican colleagues that we need to address our nation's deficit, the budget cuts being proposed would do more harm than good for our economy. Specifically, the legislation's cuts to science and technology research would impair our ability to compete globally.

H.R. 1 would dramatically reduce investments in the Department of Energy's Office of Science, the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST). These agencies conduct cutting-edge science and technology research that keeps America innovative and competitive. The budget cuts will not only create significant job losses today but also stagnate our economic growth in the future.

As a resident of Silicon Valley, I know firsthand what investments in science research and development can do for our economy, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 1.

HONORING MR. ROBERT COTTON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Robert L. Cotton of Sallis, Mississippi. Mr. Cotton has always

stood out as a community leader. In 1987 Mr. Cotton helped to build New Bethel M.B. Church. He established the Beat 4 Community Club and served as president for several years. Mr. Cotton has raised funds for different organizations. He is a strong supporter of the McAdams High School Football team.

Under the leadership of Mr. Jerry Lewis, President of the NAACP Attala County Chapter, Mr. Cotton is the leader in soliciting memberships for the chapter. Mr. Cotton has worked diligently in the political arena, helping his community stay abreast of political issues. He has served as a Trustee of New Bethel M.B. Church for the past 30 years, where he has helped to secure needed funds for the Church's many programs. Mr. Robert Cotton is a World War II Veteran and served 3 years and 8 months overseas. On November 10, 2010, Mr. Cotton celebrated his 91st birthday.

FEBRUARY IS JEWISH DISABILITY AWARENESS MONTH

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Jewish Disability Network, a coalition of over 20 Jewish organizations, for its advocacy on behalf of the rights of disabled Americans. This February marks the third Jewish Disability Awareness Month, organized to push for greater recognition of the needs and concerns of disabled Americans.

Jewish tradition recognizes the importance of inclusion and prizes the ability of every person to participate fully in their community. Today, over fifty million Americans are living with a disability. Tragically, too many of them face barriers that lock them out of employment, housing, education, or health care. They are denied the opportunity to be productive and our society is denied the benefits of their abilities.

Only 21 percent of people with disabilities are employed full or part-time. One in six people with disabilities has not completed high school, 28 percent live in poverty, 19 percent have gone without needed health care at least once during the past year, and 34 percent lack access to adequate transportation. We are making progress through legislation like the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and through continued investments in IDEA, job training, health care and technology assistance. Those commitments must continue and we should reject budget cuts that would reverse the gains we have already made.

We must strive for inclusion. A 2010 survey by the Kessler Foundation and the National Organization on Disability found people with disabilities are less likely to socialize with friends and family, to go to restaurants or to attend religious services on a regular basis. Jewish Disability Awareness Month seeks to focus on the barriers that create isolation and remove them. The Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, a leader of the Jewish Disability Network, puts it this way: "Stumbling blocks come in many forms, from less-than-accessible buildings, Shabbat services, prayer books and web pages to health care that is harder to access or isn't sufficient for people with disabilities. We are obligated to remove these stumbling blocks."

Jewish Disability Awareness Month is an opportunity not just to highlight problems but to promote solutions. Doing so is not that difficult, nor does it need to be costly. One-third of disabled workers can be accommodated for no cost, and 80 percent of job accommodations cost less than $500. The average added cost for homes built with accessibility features is between $100 and $600, while retrofitting a home can cost several thousand dollars. Enactment of legislation like my Inclusive Home Design Act can help bring and keep people with disabilities in our communities.

Today, the Jewish Disability Network will hold a Congressional briefing on ways to expand access to employment and education and protect the civil rights of the disabled. This month, congregations across the country will undertake activities to engage people with disabilities in their communities: taking disabled seniors to a meal or museum, providing lunch and learning sessions for parents of disabled children, or helping young disabled adults develop leadership skills in a social context. Throughout the year, the Jewish Disability Network works to put its principles of participation and inclusion into practice.

I am proud of those efforts, and I encourage my colleagues to learn more about them. Again, I want to congratulate Rabbi Lynne Landsberg, senior adviser for disability issues at the Religious Action Center; David Feinman, senior legislative associate of the Jewish Federation of North America; and the many others who are leaders in this critical initiative.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chair, I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to Rep. HOLT, for serving as my designee, and offering Amendment No. 12 during consideration of the Commerce Justice Science title of HR. 1. The amendment seeks to ensure that there is consistent funding included in the CR to implement the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007, which became law in January 2008. In addition, I would like to thank Rep. DINGELL for his unfailing support for NICS and support for this amendment. He has been a long time NRA member, and a long time supporter of responsible gun laws.

The National Instant Criminal Background Check System, or "NICS", is a national database system that keeps track of individuals disqualified under current law from purchasing and possessing firearms. The NICS Improvement Amendments Act, signed into law in January 2008, requires all states to provide NICS with the relevant records needed to conduct effective background checks.

The NICS Improvement Act provides grants to states and territories to update their records and transmit the records to the NICS database. Since the law was enacted, several states have benefitted from the grant program including Nevada, Oregon, Idaho, Illinois, New Jersey, Texas, Wisconsin and my home state of New York.

This law imposes no new restrictions on gun owners and does not infringe on the 2nd Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens. It simply makes improvements to a program that saves lives, and the bill was supported by the NRA.

In FY11, the law was authorized at $375 million, and the appropriation level was $20 million in FY10 and carried into FY11 through the current CR. While I believe that this program is a vital component in our fight against crime and should receive the fully authorized funding, I understand that tough decisions have to be made in this economic environment. That is why I am not seeking the fully authorized funding level, but instead am simply asking that we remain consistent and continue to fund the program at the FY10 level.

We need to give this program a chance to work and provide adequate funding to ensure that NICS has up to date records. Millions of criminal records are currently missing from the databases that make up NICS due to funding restrictions and technology issues at the state level. As a result, people who should not be obtaining guns, do.

This point is underscored by the circumstances surrounding the shootings at Virginia Tech. Under current law, the shooter in the Virginia Tech massacre should not have been able to purchase a firearm, but tragically he did. His information never made it into the national NICS system. He slipped through the cracks and he was able to purchase two handguns, and used them to brutally murder 32 individuals. Sadly, this same scenario happens every day.

The NICS Improvement Act has been effective. Since the NICS Improvement Act was signed into law, the number of state records of prohibited gun purchasers in the system has increased dramatically. According to Dept of Justice data, in Jan 2008 there were about 402,000 disqualifying mental illness records submitted from the states and territories to NICS. In August 2010, that number had more than doubled with 930,000 records submitted. The National Center for State Courts estimate that more than 2 million disqualifying mental illness records should be in the NICS, based on responses from only 42 of 56 U.S. states and territories.

Based on this data we are missing more than half of the records that should be in the NICS system. Clearly there is more work to be done and by continuing to fund this program at FY10 levels, we will continue the effort to keep guns out of the hands of people who should not have them. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and express that it is the intent of Congress that funding for the NICS Improvement Amendments Act be maintained at the FY10 level.

IN RECOGNITION OF SHREWSBURY YOUTH & FAMILY SERVICES, INC.

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Shrewsbury Youth & Family Services, the only private, non-profit social service agency in Shrewsbury, Massachusetts. Shrewsbury Youth & Family Services has provided programs and services to help Shrewsbury residents reach their full potential and has promoted the best quality of life for over 27 years.

Shrewsbury Youth & Family Services was founded in 1983, and has since grown to serve over 1,500 children and families each year. They strive to provide a wide range of counseling, empowerment services and youth development programs in order to strengthen children, families and individuals in Shrewsbury. Shrewsbury Youth & Family Services is also committed to ensuring that no one, including the many low income families they serve, is turned away based on an inability to pay for services.

On February 26, 2011, Shrewsbury Youth & Family Services will be holding their 7th Annual Fundraising Gala, and I would like to take a moment to recognize the individuals being honored for their service to the community: the Irving J. Donahue Family, recipients of the Harry S. Cutting Jr. Award; and Hannah Boudreau, John McBride, Sara Pederson and Leland Smith, recipients of the 2011 Outstanding Youth of Shrewsbury Awards.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the United States House of Representatives joins me in recognizing Shrewsbury Youth & Family Services for their dedicated and invaluable work in my district. I sincerely hope that they are able to continue their generosity and serve the Shrewsbury community far into the future.

TRIBUTE TO VERNON MINTON, DIRECTOR OF THE ALABAMA MARINE RESOURCES DIVISION

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Vernon Minton, one of the best friends of Alabama's Gulf Coast recreational and commercial fishermen, who recently passed away at the untimely age of 61. Vern Minton was a major force behind protecting and building Alabama's coastal fisheries and his loss will be sorely felt.

A graduate of Auburn University where he earned a master's degree in biology, Vern Minton began his life's work as a steward of Alabama's coastal fisheries in 1978 at the state Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. For the next 32 years, Mr. Minton would have increasing impact upon the science and the quality of Alabama's marine life. He assisted in the development of techniques for raising many species of fish and authored papers on raising marine animals in captivity.

By December 1990, Vern Minton was appointed director of the Marine Resources Division of the Alabama Department of Conservation which manages estuaries and saltwater resources along the state's Gulf Coast. He is credited with both the modernization of his department's enforcement methods as well as the creation of the state's inshore and offshore artificial reef programs.

Although Alabama has the smallest seacoast of the Gulf states, fish stocks in our state waters are robust, thanks to the leadership of Vern Minton. As a member of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, he was a consistent voice for the need of updated data to accurately calculate red snapper populations and set snapper fishing limits.

On behalf of the people of Alabama and the Gulf Coast who have benefitted from Vern's efforts to enhance and protect our marine life, I wish to extend my condolences to his wife Sharon; their children, Randal and Kristen; grandchild, T.J., and all their family and friends. You are each in our thoughts and prayers.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, Congressional Republicans often assert that their aggressive budget cutting is in line with the desires of the American people. The cuts Republicans propose for the remainder of Fiscal Year 2011 include eliminating support for homeless veterans, cutting nearly a billion dollars from programs for law enforcement and first responders, and gutting environmental protections that keep our air, water and food safe. As House Republicans continue their march to weaken our communities, kill jobs, and make our most vulnerable citizens bear the burden for tax cuts for the wealthiest citizens, there is another target for cutting—the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, CPB.

In this bill, House Appropriations Chairman HAROLD ROGERS (R–KY) is working to eradicate all funding for CPB and eliminate federal support for public media. This attack on unbiased reporting, cultural programming, and educational television and radio would have dire consequences in my home State for Minnesota Public Radio and Twin Cities Public Television, not to mention the Minnesota taxpayers who rely on public broadcasting every day.

CPB's funding is directed to local public broadcasting stations, which provide commercial-free, high-quality programming to millions of Americans every day. Public broadcasting outlets target underserved audiences, children, minorities, and low-income Americans with non-biased news and cultural programming.

Public broadcasting is one of the most valuable community assets, and it is a prime example of the numerous benefits that come from investment from the federal government. Every month, over half of all Americans utilize public broadcasting—170 million people—through 368 public television stations, 943 radio stations, and hundreds of online services. Federal funding for CPB costs $1.35 per American ever year, while the rest of the funding comes from private donations. Public broadcasting is a vital educational resource for teachers, parents, and children.

In addition to providing a valuable community good, a majority of Americans value public media and advocate that the federal government continue its support. Last year, Americans rated public broadcasting as an "excellent" use of taxpayer dollars, coming in second to defense spending. Eighty percent of those who were surveyed believe that funding for public broadcasting is money "well spent."

A vote in support of CPB funding is a vote for the American people. Public broadcasting is what our citizens want, and Chairman ROGERS and the rest of the Republicans should listen.

Members from the Fourth District have contacted me to speak out in support of public broadcasting and against this egregious attack.

A St. Paul student, age 14, just called me today to tell me that she is the voice of the future and very supportive of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

A resident from St. Paul told me, "Thank you for standing up for public broadcasting. You are right when you say the Tea Party would like nothing better than to eliminate the one place where we go to find balanced reporting. I am a sustaining member of both public television and radio and find it to be a source of hope in this media-fallow country."

A college student in St. Paul wrote me to say, "I am deeply concerned about proposed legislation in the House that would eliminate federal funding for PBS and NPR. It is vital to our country and our public discourse that we have some forms of independent journalism that are unbiased and free from corporate interests. Not only does public media provide a trusted news and entertainment source for adults around the Nation, but the educational children's programming helps get youngsters from all backgrounds off to a good start. I grew up watching Sesame Street, Mr. Rogers, and Nova on what was then Channel 2 (now TPT). Now, as a college student at the University of Minnesota–Morris, I still depend on PBS and NPR every day. I fear that cuts to federal funding for public media will have an especially adverse effect on smaller and rural stations, like Pioneer Public TV, which are more dependent on federal money. It pains me to imagine a time when public media isn't available to future generations of Americans as a source of nonpartisan information available to all."

Another St. Paul resident said, "I am a current supporter of the MN TPT, and would hate to see this wonderful service eliminated because someone in Congress thinks it is unnecessary. Many people can't afford cable or satellite television—I can only afford the lowest basic service—and the programming on TPT is educational, entertaining and innovative. Please fight to keep the funding! Thank you!"

As you can see, residents of the 4th District of Minnesota are strong supporters of this essential service. Federal support for CPB keeps

our citizens informed, educates our children, and makes our communities stronger. I will fight against these ''dumb-cuts'' because Minnesota Public Radio and Twin Cities Public Television are critical community assets that deserve federal support.

Given Republicans' frantic attempts to slash federal spending in even the most detrimental ways, eliminating CPB is a very real possibility. In my position on the House Appropriations Committee, I will do everything in my power to prevent public broadcasting stations nationwide from being forced to shut their doors, but I cannot do it alone. I urge my colleagues to protect this valuable public good and vote against H.R. 1.

HONORING MINNIE CARTER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Minnie Carter. Ms. Carter grew up in Tunica County, Mississippi and is extremely proud to continue her work in her community. She is a graduate of Rosa Fort High School and Jackson State University. She is a member of the Zeta Phi Beta Sorority.

In 1987, Minnie was hired by the Tunica County Department of Human Services in Tunica, Mississippi. Her responsibilities included determining the initial and continuing eligibility of applicants and recipients for welfare assistance and provide other services related to the programs of the county offices.

When not busy at work Minnie has volunteered at community pride fairs, community health fairs, schools and churches. She has served several years as a member of various community and civic groups such as the Tunica County United Voters League, Tunica County PUSH, Concerned Citizens of Tunica, Leaders of Tomorrow, and African-Americans for A Better Tunica County and Tunica County NAACP. In her spare time she enjoys traveling, reading, walking and working out.

Minnie has been recognized and honored for her work. She has received numerous awards and accolades. She has been a recipient of the Community Service Award, Woman of the Year Award, and the Distinguished Citizen of the Year Award.

Minnie has over 24 years experience in community organizing, program implementation and nonprofit management. She is presently the Executive Director of Tunica County Housing Project, Inc. Since its beginning Tunica County Housing Project, Inc. (TCHP) has had as its goal, ''to provide decent affordable housing for families with low incomes living in Tunica County, Mississippi.'' For 19 years, Tunica County Housing Project, Inc. has been a leader in promoting affordable housing in Tunica County. ''Minnie Carter believes that homeownership contributes to the Tunica County economy, builds strong communities and is a powerful tool for building economic stability and self-esteem for families.'' Tunica County Housing Project, Inc. is especially committed to improving the quality of life for the people of Tunica County.

One of TCHP greatest accomplishments has been the creation of a subdivision, Nellie Johnson Village in Tunica County. This subdivision consists of sixty-one affordable houses owned by families with low and very low incomes.

In 2004 TCHP assumed the Tunica County Housing Rehabilitation Program. This program is designed to bring a person's house up to compliance with the Standard Housing Code published by International Residential Code as adopted by Tunica County and all other relevant codes adopted by the local governing bodies. TCHP has repaired and rehabilitated 146 homes for families with low incomes. It has provided replacement mobile homes for 23 families whose homes were beyond repair.

In 2007 TCHP received a Housing Preservation Grant in the amount of $117,921.71. This program is designed to assist homeowners with low and very low incomes with the repair and rehabilitation of their homes to bring their dwellings up to development standards. The HPG funds were used to complement the funds committed by Tunica County. TCHP has repaired and rehabilitated an additional 24 homes for families with low and very low incomes utilizing these funds.

In 2008 TCHP assumed the Tunica County Mortgage Assistance Program (TMAP) which provides up to $25,000 to first time homebuyers purchasing a home in Tunica County. The grant may be used for down payment and/or closing costs.

Since 2010 Minnie has been a mentor for the Tunica County Mentoring Program. She plans to help mentees make positive connections between the world of work, school and the community. She believes this will help mentees develop personal skills and career awareness in order to make better life-long decisions.

A LIFE OF SERVICE: SERGEANT MAJOR JAMES BOWLING

HON. JOSEPH J. HECK

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and honor the life of Sergeant Major James Franklin Bowling, Jr., United States Marine Corps (Retired). Sergeant Major Bowling was born the son of a marine on July 21, 1952, in Quantico, Virginia. He served his nation as a marine for over 30 years, retiring in 2001, but remaining active in his local community.

Sergeant Major James Franklin Bowling joined the United States Marines Corps in 1970 where he served for 31 years. He completed tours in Okinawa, Saudi Arabia, Desert Storm and Desert Shield. Jim's true passion in the Marine Corps was serving as a Drill Instructor. He served as a Drill Instructor for two tours at Quantico for Officers Candidacy School and three tours at Parris Island. At Parris Island he met a then-Sergeant in the Marine Corps who would become his wife; Gunnery Sergeant Jacqueline Bowling (née Milon), USMC (Retired).

Sergeant Major Bowling was truly a dedicated marine. His drive to serve leaves a positive impression on his family, his community, and his country. His exceptional tour of service saw the end of the Vietnam War, the end of the Cold War and the beginning of the Global War on Terror.

After retiring from the Marine Corps almost 10 years ago, the Bowlings moved to Henderson, Nevada. Sergeant Major Bowling became active with veterans in Henderson. He joined the Black Mountain Detachment of the Marine Corps League and served as its Detachment Commandant from 2007 to 2009. He served as an officer with the Devil Dogs, an honorary degree within the Marine Corps League. The Sergeant Major also dedicated part of his life to the Devil Pups Youth Leadership Program of America, serving as a sponsor and Volunteer PT Instructor with them. At the Department of Nevada level of the Marine Corps League, he served as Junior Vice Commandant from 2008 to 2009, and was serving as Detachment Junior Past Commandant and Detachment Chaplain when he passed away.

Sergeant Major Bowling's career is also distinguished by the many decorations and awards he received during his service: Meritorious Service Medal (2nd Award); Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal; Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal; Navy Unit Commendation; Meritorious Unit Commendation; Good Conduct Medal (9th Award); National Defense Service Medal (2nd Award); Southwest Asia Service Medal (2nd Award); Sea Service Deployment Ribbon; Overseas Service Ribbon; Drill Instructor Ribbon (4th Award); Kuwait Liberation Medal (Saudi Arabia); Kuwait Liberation Medal (Kuwait); Rifle Expert Badge (3rd Award); and the Pistol Sharpshooter Badge.

Sergeant Major Bowling is survived by his wife of 22 years, Gunnery Sergeant Jacqueline Bowling (née Milon), USMC (Retired). He also leaves behind his son, Jonathan; his mother, Hattie Trombley; two sisters, Becky Bird and Lode Silcox; and two brothers, David Bowling and Stephen Bowling.

Sergeant Major Bowling will be remembered for his sacrifice and willing service, and for the extraordinary qualities he displayed as a husband, father, and friend. His personal warmth, sense of humor, and unfailing optimism brightened the lives of everyone around him. We will long remember the great impact he made on us all—he will be truly missed.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to Sections 1628 through 1634, and 1648 of the bill, which cuts funding to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

I oppose these provisions because they are unwise, irresponsible, and undermine our nation's ability to prepare, respond, or mitigate natural and man-made disasters and terrorist attacks. In short, I oppose the bill because it puts the security of our homeland at risk.

This bill that the Republicans are bringing to the floor today is reckless not only to our

economy and American workers, but also to our national security.

The terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 revealed the catastrophic consequences of the inability of first responders, fire, police, and rescue personnel to communicate with each other via radio during emergencies.

Communication glitches also occurred during the response to Hurricane Katrina. Yet the Republicans want to terminate grants for interoperable emergency communications. Have we not learned anything from the communications failure during 9/11?

These draconian cuts will put our first responders at risk and slow down the response to terrorist attacks and natural disasters. I cannot in good conscience accept these cuts to interoperable emergency communications.

The irresponsible Republican plan also put our nation's fire fighting ability at risk. I am from California and we know about fires. The bill eliminates the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response Grant program, (SAFER), which is why it is strongly opposed by the InternationalAssociation of Fire Fighters (IAAF).

The IAAF estimates that these cuts will result in the loss of 5,200 jobs on top of the 5,000 fire fighter jobs lost since 2008. These cuts will put our communities at risk.

The City of Compton in my district is home to an Emergency Operations Center operated by FEMA. My district is also home to several major oil refineries, gas treatment facilities, and petro chemical facilities. California's 37th Congressional District is also home to the Port City of Long Beach and is located on the outskirts of Los Angeles. A centralized emergency response center is vital to my district and the surrounding communities.

This Republican job-destroying continuing resolution seeks to eliminate these Emergency Operations Centers. Not only will the elimination of these centers result in the loss of jobs, they will put my constituents and other Americans across the country at risk. This Emergency Operations Centers are needed to coordinate the necessary resources during an emergency.

I cannot support depriving first responders, firefighters, and police officers of the tools needed to respond to public emergencies, natural or man-made. Why would we want to risk a repeat of the disaster we witnessed in the response to Hurricane Katrina? How are we better off by depriving our first responders the ability to communicate with each other during an emergency? It defies common sense.

Terrorists that are trying to attack our country are modifying their techniques to try to find our nation's vulnerabilities. Unfortunately, the Republican's bill reduces Federal, State, and tribal capabilities to secure our nation against terrorist and other catastrophic threats. This bill also diminishes our ability to protect our borders and significantly scales back our ability to detect chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear threats.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1 continues the Republican avoidance of bringing job creation bills to the floor. Since the Republican's have been in control of the House, they have not brought one job creating bill to the floor. Not one. Worse, the bill before us today will actually kill jobs. Thousands of Americans will lose jobs under this Republican bill. Instead of our keeping our economy moving forward as was the case during the Clinton Administration and during the 111th Congress, this bill will reverse the economic progress we have seen for the last several months.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 1. Let's work together to ensure our first responders have the tools and resources needed to respond to natural and man-made disasters and terrorist attacks.

HONORING RIA JUDGE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Ria Judge was born on January 23, 1968 in Vicksburg to Ms. Lucinda Williams and reared by her grandparents Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Williams.

Mrs. Judge graduated from Vicksburg High in 1986 and furthered her education by obtaining a Bachelor in Elementary Education from the University of Southern Mississippi, followed by a double Masters in Administration and Education from Alcorn State University.

Mrs. Judge has been teaching in the Vicksburg-Warren Public School system for the last 17 years and presently serves as Assistant Principal at Beechwood Elementary School.

Children and the elderly have always been Mrs. Judge's passion. She has been the assistant troop leader for Girl Scout Troop #5119 since 2005, dedicated Sunday School teacher, served on Mountain of Faith Restoration Shelter for Homeless Women and Children Board, volunteers at local nursing homes and has worked in many local campaign elections because of the concern she has for her community.

Mrs. Judge is married to Terry Judge and they have two children, Tavarius and Isla.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE FLOYD BUCKNER

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable public servant who has served the people of South Carolina's lowcountry for more than four decades. Mr. Floyd Buckner has been a member of Colleton County Council for 28 years, and was an educator in Colleton and Dorchester County School Districts for 39 years. He has earned the praise and respect of his fellow citizens and is deserving of this recognition.

Floyd Buckner graduated from Colleton County's Ruffin High School in 1960. He went on to earn a bachelor's degree from Benedict College in 1964, and a master's degree in Education from South Carolina State University in 1970.

He began his teaching career in the mid–1960s in Dorchester County schools and rose to the position of principal of Jenkins Hill Middle School in Harleyville in 1972. The following year, his home county hired Mr. Buckner to serve as Principal of Forest Hills Elementary School in Walterboro. In 1975, Mr. Buckner became the director for the Title I Program in the Colleton County School District, a position he held until his retirement in 2002. In this capacity, he instituted a classroom on wheels designed to serve the educational needs of pre-school children, and received recognition from the U.S. Department of Education for the program's effectiveness. His commitment to the Colleton County School District was rewarded with the dedication of the Floyd Buckner Title I Parent Center in Walterboro in 1995.

Mr. Buckner also contributed to the education of young people statewide. Governor Dick Riley appointed him as a member of a state committee tasked with drafting legislation for the Education Improvement Act. He also served as President of the South Carolina State Association of Elementary Secondary Education Act Board in 1980–1981.

In addition to serving our youth in the schools, Mr. Buckner felt called to run for elective office. In 1982, he ran for a seat on Colleton County Council, and the race earned him the distinction of being the first African American to win a run-off election in that county. Mr. Buckner has served on Colleton County Council since his swearing-in on January 1, 1983.

During his service on County Council he has been committed to delivering the best service to the people of Colleton County with limited resources. He is known for ensuring equitable treatment in areas such as education, access, and quality of life. He is an expert on policy, protocol and procedures, having spent a number of years serving as the County Council Chairman. He also helped lead the restoration of the historic Old Jail into the building that houses the current County Council Chambers. His tremendous service has been recognized by Colleton County with the naming of the building at North Jefferies Boulevard in Walterboro in his honor.

Mr. Buckner has also been a committed member of the community. He has served on a number of boards including the Lowcountry Council of Governments, the Lowcountry Community Action Agency, and the South Carolina Migrant Workers Board. He is currently a member of the Walterboro-Colleton County Regional Airport Board and the Hollings Cancer Center Disparities Advisory Board at the Medical University of South Carolina. Mr. Buckner is the first president of the Arabian Temple #139, the Walterboro Shrine Club. With his appointment to the First Federal Savings and Loan Board, he became the first African American in Colleton County to serve on a bank board. He is also the first African American to own and publish a newspaper in Colleton County.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in commending Floyd Buckner for his outstanding lifetime of public service. He is a trailblazer and a role model for so many in South Carolina's lowcountry, and I am proud to call him a friend.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1, which takes America a step backward, jeopardizes our fragile economic recovery, and does absolutely nothing to create jobs.

This funding plan leaves American working families behind.

You'll hear promises of ''fiscal discipline'' and ''down payment on the debt'' from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but these promises are empty. This bill does little more than strike at the heart of critical programs that invest in our communities, our workers, and our children.

Moreover, by irresponsibly taking a slash and burn approach to budget cutting, this bill fails to present a thoughtful blueprint that we can use to slowly but surely chip away at the budget deficit while still allowing us to out-educate, out-innovate, and out-build our foreign competitors.

We often compare building the federal budget to balancing a family budget. There are certainly some relevant similarities. But I know one thing, if I found my family's budget in as serious trouble as the federal budget, I would not simply take a machete to my various expenditures.

I would carefully study them, and continue most or all of my productive and useful investments while eliminating unnecessary items and carefully paring back in other areas until I knew enough about how the cuts would affect my future income.

Would a family with money troubles immediately pull their children out of college? I don't think so. Then why does this proposal reduce Pell grants that make college more affordable and kick 200,000 children out of Head Start?

Why does it reduce investments in science research, job-creating high-speed rail, and the popular COPS program to assist local police?

Why does it cut worker training when unemployed Americans—especially those in places like Lynwood and South Gate in my district—need new skills now more than ever?

It is shameful that the House Republican Majority proposes to eliminate a program for homeless veterans, those who have selflessly served our nation.

Certainly, to get the federal budget on the path toward balance, we must find cuts we can all agree on. Tough decisions will have to be made. But these are not those cuts. Just as our economy is starting to recover is no time to leave our children, our veterans, or our workers behind.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this funding bill and reject its priorities. We must do better for American families.

HONORING ROBERT A. DENNIS

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Robert A. Dennis, Assistant Director for Macroeconomic Analysis of the Congressional Budget Office, upon his retirement after 32 years of outstanding service to CB0 and the Congress. Bob has been instrumental in providing the Congress with analyses of macroeconomic issues throughout his exceptional career at CBO. His extraordinary analytical skills and leadership ability were recognized early in his CB0 career. While serving in his first position as a Principal Analyst in the Macroeconomic Analysis Division during the early 1980s, Mr. Dennis received a CBO Director's Award in recognition of outstanding performance. He was later promoted to the position of Deputy Assistant Director of the Macroeconomic Analysis Division in 1988 and to the position of Assistant Director of the Division in 1992, the position he has held until his retirement at the end of February, 2011.

Bob's versatility and skill as an economist are evident in the Division's high-quality and prescient work on an extraordinarily diverse range of issues. Those issues included, for example, the macroeconomic effects of the savings and loan crisis, possible terrorist disruptions of U.S. ports, flu epidemics, trade agreements, financial crises, housing policies, economic stimulus policies, changes in tax policy, and climate policy, as well as the determinants of long-term economic growth. Bob has been central to the development of the procedures the Macroeconomic Analysis Division has used to prepare the economic outlook for the budget baseline. He even wrote the computer software that the Division used for many years to analyze current economic developments and prepare charts for CBO publications.

Bob has performed his various duties within the Congressional Budget Office with objectivity, non-partisanship, and a high level of professionalism. I commend him for his many years of dedicated, faithful, and exemplary service to the United States and the Congress. This nation is fortunate enough indeed to have outstanding and dedicated public servants like Bob Dennis at CBO. Bob's presence will be missed but his legacy of commitment and superlative service will carry on.

TRIBUTE TO CPL. JOSEPH C. WHITEHEAD

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater sacrifice one can make for his country than to lay down his life in defense of our freedom. It is with a heavy heart that I inform this House that one of our own from South Alabama, Cpl. Joseph C. Whitehead, recently lost his life in the service of America.

Cpl. Whitehead, a native of Axis, Alabama, was a 2007 graduate of Satsuma High School where he was a talented and versatile player. Upon graduation, he joined the United States Marine Corps, where he was assigned to the 2nd Combat Engineer Battalion, 2nd Marine Division II Marine Expeditionary Force based in Camp Lejeune, North Carolina.

Last month, Cpl. Whitehead was conducting combat operations with his fellow Marines in Afghanistan's Helmand province when he encountered an improvised explosive device. According to reports, Cpl. Whitehead was performing a sweep when the IED took his life.

Cpl. Joe Whitehead was not only the embodiment of the Marine, tough and devoted to his comrades and his country, he was known to his family and friends as ''always smiling and loved everyone and everyone loved him.''

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this House, on behalf of a grateful nation and on behalf of the people of Alabama, I wish to extend heartfelt condolences and support to the family of Cpl. Joe Whitehead including his mother, Melanie Miller; fathers Mark Goodhue and Keith Miller; sister, Jessica Whitehead; brothers Destin Goodhue and Jeffrey Miller; grandparents Roy and Wanda Patrick, Willie Whitehead and Joan Sasser, Jackie Norwood, Devon and Lucille Miller; great grandparents Don and Barbara Johnson; and, his entire family and friends. You are all in our thoughts and prayers.

HONORING MARION LEROY HAYES, EDUCATOR

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Marion Leroy Hayes, Mississippi's Second Black Superintendent of Education and Jefferson County's First Black Superintendent of Education. He was married to the late Mrs. Louise B. Hayes who was a Jefferson County Elementary Retired School Teacher during 1976–1977.

Mr. Marion Leroy Hayes is the son of Mrs. Irene Hayes and the late L.J. Hayes, born and reared in Jefferson County, Mississippi where he attended public schools in Jefferson, Claiborne and Warren counties. He received his Bachelor of Science (B.S.) Degree from Alcorn State University in Lorman, Mississippi; Master's Degree from Southern University Baton Rouge, Louisiana. He furthered his studies at Mississippi College in Clinton, Mississippi, University of Southern Mississippi in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, Atlanta University in Atlanta, Georgia and The University of Mississippi.

Mr. Marion Leroy Hayes served in the United States Air Force and Army for seven and one-half years during the Korean Conflict where he received an honorable discharge. During that time he served overseas in Guam, North Africa and Germany.

Mr. Marion Leroy Hayes believes in the Lord and is a member of the East Mount Olive M.B. Church. He is also a member of the Prince Hall Masons, Board of Trustees of Copiah-Lincoln Junior College; Chairman of the American Red Cross Fund Raising Advisory Committee; Boy Scouts of America; Jefferson County Board of Directors; Chamber of Commerce; Advisory Committee, National Youth Sports Program, Alcorn State University, State Advisory Committee of Teacher Certification; Director of Title III ESEA; American Association of Administrators, Mississippi Association of Schools Superintendents; and Mississippi Association of School Administrators.

Mr. Marion Leroy Hayes is listed in Who's Who Biographical Records—School District Officials 1976, 1st Edition; Who's Who in Educational Administration, 1976–1977; and Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1977–1978.

Mr. Marion Leroy Hayes has been given many awards in his lifetime. He has received such notable awards as Star Teacher in 1970,

1971, 1972, Presidential Citation—National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education in 1984, Service to the Community Directory of Distinguished Americans in 1981, District Award of Merit—Natchez Trace District for the Boy Scouts of America in 1987, For Service to Scouting as Vice Chairman of Natchez Trace District in 1976 and Certificate of Appreciation—Co-Lin Junior College Board of Trustees in 1987.

RECOGNIZING MRS. MILLIE KINDIG AS THE 2011 WASHINGTON COUNTY ROOKIE TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Millie Kindig as the 2011 Washington County Rookie Teacher of the Year.

A graduate of Florida State University, Millie Kindig received her degree in 2002 and moved with her husband to Alachua County, Florida where she began her teaching career. Four years ago, Mrs. Kindig and her family moved back to Northwest Florida, and she began teaching at Chipley High School in Washington County.

Our many great teachers inspire their students to pursue excellence and to achieve greatness. During her short time in Washington County, Mrs. Kindig has proven to be an inspiring instructor. She helps mold the leaders of our future by providing a mathematical education that will give them the tools needed to succeed. She currently teaches Algebra, Geometry and Analysis of Functions. Her expertise is invaluable to her students.

Mrs. Kindig's success in the classroom shows that with hard-work and commitment, young educators can be just as successful as their more senior colleagues. Her recognition as the Washington County Rookie Teacher of the Year is a reflection of her undeniable excellence in the classroom. She is among the great teachers in Northwest Florida, and Washington County is honored to have her as one of their own.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am proud to recognize Millie Kindig for her accomplishments and her continuing commitment to excellence at Chipley High School. My wife Vicki joins me in congratulating Mrs. Kindig, and we wish her all the best.

HONORING STEWARD ROSENGRANT

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my constituent, Mr. Steward Rosengrant, on the occasion of his 80th birthday. Steward was born on February 11, 1931 on a farm in Elmhurst, Lackawanna County, Pennsylvania.

Steward, one of eight children, spent all of his childhood on the family farm. He graduated in 1949 from the Lake Vocational High School. Upon his graduation, Steward was hired full-time as a milk tester in Bradford County. He attended Pennsylvania State University classes focusing on milk testing and feed management. Steward is also a veteran, having served our country for two years in the United States Army.

In 1957, Steward became a Dairy Herd Improvement Association tester and he served as President of the Association for two terms and retired from the Association after 44 years of dedicated service.

Steward Rosengrant is deeply committed to his community in Bradford County. He held the position of Bradford County Manager for 28 years. He served as Treasurer of the Bradford County Dairy Promotion Board for 32 years. And he was actively involved in the Troy Fair where he worked at the promotion booth, dipped ice cream, made milk shakes, and retrieved supplies for the booths. Steward served as the President of the Wysox Volunteer Fire Company for 10 years in addition to serving on several committees. He has also been a member of the Wysox Ambulance Association for 15 years and currently serves as the Director. Steward has been a member of the Towanda Methodist Church for 40 years and served on many committees.

Steward married his wife, Barbara, on November 11, 1965. The couple has lived in their home in Bradford County since 1965 where they raised 4 children and now have 11 grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to honor Steward Rosengrant on his 80th birthday and ask my colleagues to join me in praising his commitment to his family, his community, and our nation.

EDWARD A. RAPS TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Edward Raps, of Del Norte, Colorado. Undersheriff Raps was recently appointed Rio Grande undersheriff.

Undersheriff Raps served in the U.S. Army for four years, where he served in the Airborne as a military traffic accident investigator, and as a traffic division leader. His military experience provided an ideal backdrop for his transition to civilian law enforcement.

Undersheriff Raps' expansive career in law enforcement includes work in Missouri, El Paso County, Kit Carson County, and the Colorado Corrections Association. He served as Kit Carson County Sheriff for a number of years as well. Attending numerous classes, certificate programs and schools over the past few decades, Edward's law enforcement pedigree is well-rounded and extensive.

He has a passion for agriculture and the outdoors. Aside from having an extensive knowledge and background in farming and agriculture, Edward is a supporter of wildlife habitat preservation, and also teaches youth courses in hunter safety.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Undersheriff Raps for his service to the law enforcement field. Any organization is lucky to have him, and I would like to thank him for decades of service in both the civilian and military law enforcement fields.

HONORING OSCAR PRICE, JR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Oscar Price Jr. Mr. Price who was born in Robinsonville, MS on July 24, 1953 to the late Oscar, Sr. and Dora. Encouraged by his parents, Oscar Jr., learned the value of education at an early age. Oscar attended school at Christian Spring Church where he was taught by the late Edna Pullam Carpenter. Soon after, Oscar attended school at Shallow Baptist Church and later transferred to Rosa Fort Elementary during the early 60s. Price furthered his education, attended grade school, middle school, and completed his coursework in 1972. He worked on farms and returned to school to graduate from Rosa Fort High School, Class of 73. Oscar completed various technical courses and educational training to advance in a competitive job market.

Oscar, at an early age, confessed Christ at Good Hope #1 Baptist Church under the leadership of Reverend R. Douglas. Price participated in various church activities that taught good morals, sound values, and respect for others. Price earned the role of becoming a junior deacon at his church. He served his church family and community through volunteering and participating in events. Later, Price became a Deacon at Good Hope where he continues to worship. In addition, to this spiritualistic accomplishment, Price has now served as the Chairman of the Deacon Board for over twenty years.

Oscar's employment career began on local farms. Later, he became a student bus driver. Leaving high school in December 1972, Oscar was employed as a laborer at Amax Aluminum in Hernando, MS. Price was promoted to the maintenance department. Shortly after that promotion, Price's hard work paid off. He was promoted to one of the few tool and die repairmen. Price later ended his employment journey at Amax and began employment at Texas Gas Transmission in 1978. Oscar continued his work at Texas Gas Transmission as a maintenance man and plant operator. Price recently retired after 32 years of employment at Texas Gas Transmission.

Oscar married Mary Ann Camper on May 20, 1975. He is the proud father of four children: Markuette, Oscar III, Gureka, Toynga. Price is also the proud grandfather of Oscar IV and Taunta Price.

From 1981 to 1983 Oscar served as the Parent Teacher Association (PTA) President for Tunica County School District. Later, he was elected to the Tunica County School Board where he served as Secretary for many years, and later became President of the School Board. Oscar served a total of eighteen years on the School Board of Tunica County. One of his most prize honors is when he worked with families, his community, and Tunica County's faculty, staff, and administrators to remove their students from corrective action. Price received numerous awards for being a proactive band parent, athletic booster, and community volunteer and representative. He also worked with community leaders

and other board members to build two of Tunica's new schools: Robinsonville Elementary and Tunica Middle School.

In addition to his service, Price joined the NAACP and was elected as the President of the Robinsonville Chapter. Also, Price served as Jr. Warden at Lake Cormorant Masonic Lodge.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, upon further examination of the Weiner amendment, I find myself unable to support the measure. I am committed to full funding of the COPS program, but as I mentioned last night, I cannot countenance the dramatic cut to NASA. Without a clear enough pathway to restore the NASA funds that would be used in the offset, I will focus instead on defeating the broader attack on COPS in the continuing resolution itself.

HONORING MS. JACKIE SHORTER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Jackie Shorter born July 25, 1960 to Mr. and Mrs. Willie and Robbie Shorter in Vicksburg, Mississippi. She graduated from Warren Central High School in 1978 and furthered her education by receiving a Bachelor's Degree and a Master's Degree in Elementary Education from Alcorn State University.

Ms. Shorter has been in education for 23 years and presently teaches at South Park Elementary School. She has dedicated all of her life to helping others. She has been the Girl Scout Troop Leader of Troop # 5119 for 12 years and serves as an active member of the Vicksburg Alcorn State Alumni Chapter for 18 years. She is also an active member of her church, Locust Grove M.B. Church, Vicksburg Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Negro Business and Professional Women Club, member of Eastern Star, Lady of Knight, Daughters of Sphinx, Heroines of Jericho, Warren County Sunday School Institute and a member of the NAACP.

While most of her passion is volunteering at nursing homes and the summer program at the local library, Ms. Jackie Shorter still finds time to share her love throughout the community helping others.

KOHLER McINNIS TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Kohler McInnis of Durango, Colorado, for his courage in the face of a direct threat of his life. His recent actions protected the lives of his fellow classmates, teachers, and St. Columba Catholic School staff. Kohler's actions were celebrated with the Citizen Commendation Award, presented by Durango Police Chief David J. Felice.

Last April, Kohler was a seventh-grader at St. Columba Catholic School, when a fellow student told Kohler that he was planning on using a gun he had brought to school to harm one of the teachers. Despite a death threat from the student if Kohler told anyone, Kohler put aside his own well-being for the sake of others and informed a staff member of his classmate's intention. After a quick search of the student's belongings, a .22 caliber pistol was found.

Kohler's actions show his strong inclination to do the right thing regardless of consequence or outcome. Kohler not only protected the lives of those around him, but gave a misguided child a second chance at a successful life.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Kohler McInnis for his exceptional conduct in the face of personal harm. I thank him for his ability to stand strong for what he believes right.

HONORING REVEREND PAUL E. LUCKETT

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Paul E. Luckett. Reverend Luckett proudly serves as Elder in the Mississippi Conference of the United Methodist Church. Currently, he serves as pastor of Saint Paul United Methodist Church and Blessed Trinity United Methodist Church. His divinely anointed duties encompass serving as Chairperson of the West Jackson Vicksburg District Board of Ordained Ministry, member of the Conference Board of Ordained Ministry, member of the Bishop and Superintendent Advisory Committee, and supporting Elder of the Ethnic Ministry Church Committee.

Reverend Luckett received his formal education from Jackson State University, where he obtained a Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology. He later obtained his Master's of Divinity degree in Pastoral Care and Christian Education from the Interdenominational Theological Center in Atlanta, Georgia. With a sound educational background and a spirit rich with love for helping others, Reverend Luckett has devoted his life to uplifting those less fortune in his community. He is a strong advocate and member of the Clinton Branch of Habitat for Humanity, works adamantly with Campus Ministry (organization designed to assist students with financial aid and Christian guidance), and helps to enrich the lives of the elderly and underprivileged through his volunteer work at the Clinton Christian Community Cooperation.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support for the amendment to H.R. 1 to restore funding for the Pell Grant and stand in firm opposition to the underlying bill.

The Pell Grant is extremely vital to help economically disadvantaged students pay for higher education. In fact, over 55,000 students in my congressional district use the Pell Grant to pay for their higher education costs.

I am highly disappointed that after years of hard work by previous Congresses to increase the maximum Pell Grant award to $5,500, the Republican Continuing Resolution today would cut Pell Grant resources by $5.6 billion reducing the maximum Pell Grant award by $845. Indeed, this cut would translate into a loss of tens of millions of dollars in financial aid for students in my congressional district alone.

As Congress looks to enact the full year Continuing Resolution for fiscal year 2011, H.R. 1, I urge my colleagues to oppose amendments that seek to cut critical education funding and severely impact the future of our students, communities, and nation. While cutting the deficit is important, doing so at the expense of special education grants for local school districts, Head Start for children, and Pell Grants to underserved college students, among other educational initiatives, is the wrong approach and unacceptable.

As it stands, H.R. 1 would not only make it more difficult for college students to afford a higher education, but it also would make it difficult for K–12 schools to provide beneficial services like after school tutoring, or much needed literacy, math and science supplemental education. In fact, as written, H.R. 1 will cut:

Head Start by over $1 billion, leaving an estimated 127,000 poor children without access to early childhood education, health, and social services and the potential loss of over 14,000 jobs;

ESEA Title IA funding by $693 million, eliminating critical resources that help schools assist educationally underserved children in high-poverty schools and by some estimates would reduce or eliminate services for 957,000 high-risk children and result in the loss of over 9,000 education jobs;

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, state grants by $557 million, leaving already struggling states and school districts with fewer resources to meet the needs of over 324,000 students with disabilities and resulting in the loss of another 7,000 education jobs;

Job Corps by $300 million and eliminate any advance funding appropriated in FY 2010 for use in FY 2011, resulting in a $900 million cut to the program. These cuts will force the closure of 75 out of 124 Job Corps centers, the loss of over 21,000 jobs, and leave 36,000 at-risk-youth without the mentoring and educational services of Job Corps, and;

Hispanic Serving Institutions by $100 million, leaving many outstanding universities without the needed funds to educate and prepare the fastest growing demographic group in the country.

Every child deserves a quality education. H.R. 1 threatens America's progress and vision to remain competitive in the global arena. While the deficit should be a top priority, I urge my colleagues to ensure that this bill provides schools and universities the necessary resources to prepare our students for the future.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak against language in the underlying bill that would prevent HUD from spending money on a Sustainable Communities Initiative. The language in the bill would end a very successful HUD program that has helped communities plan for growth and halt a successful partnership between HUD, DOT, and EPA that promotes redevelopment and new transportation infrastructure. Secretaries Donovan, LaHood, and Administrator Jackson and their agencies have spent the last year cutting red tape and coordinating investments to meet multiple economic, environmental, and community objectives. Northern Virginia is already benefitting from these investments, by winning a TIGER grant to expand bus service dramatically, including in the congested I–95 and Route 7 corridors. The Sustainable Communities Initiative actually represents a conservative principle, because it emulates longstanding efforts by developers and local governments around the country. In Northern Virginia, Fairfax and Arlington counties have led the way with Transit Oriented Development years before the Federal Government figured it out. In Northern Virginia, developers led the way with visionary replanning proposals for Tysons Corner Center Mall, Merrifield Town Center, and numerous other Transit-Oriented Development proposals. These grants go to communities all around the country, large and small, urban and rural. The interest in these has been extraordinary. In 2010, when HUD announced their challenge grants, to be awarded jointly with DOT, a total of 630 communities requested $1.2 billion in funding. HUD was able to award 61 grants worth $69 million. HUD's sustainable communities regional planning grants were as popular: 225 regions applied for $450 million, and HUD was able to award 45 regions a total of $98 million. It is high time the Federal Government emulated our local efforts in Northern Virginia, and I therefore strongly oppose Republican efforts to repeal this program and prevent federal support of our local programs.

HONORING VERN MOSS

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Madera County Supervisor Vern Moss on his retirement from the Madera County Board of Supervisors; and to thank him for his dedicated, life-long spirit of community service.

Vern Moss was the first child of hard working parents who set an example Vern would adhere to his whole life. Vern grew up working in the fields picking cotton and cutting grapes. After graduating high school and briefly attending the College of the Sequoias, Vern enlisted in the U.S. Air Force in 1963.

Vern served honorably in both the U.S. Air Force and the U.S. Army before his retirement in 1983 as a Lieutenant Colonel. His military service included a tour in Vietnam as the Executive Officer of the MACV 16, and an assignment to the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Pentagon. For his service, he has received countless honors, including a Bronze Star. During his military service, he earned a Bachelors and a Masters Degree.

In addition to a long and successful career in the banking industry, Vern has participated actively in his community. He served twice as the Mayor of Chowchilla, as well as President of the Chowchilla Rotary Club and Chamber of Commerce. The Chowchilla Chamber of Commerce has named him Citizen of the Year and Business Person of the Year. During his three terms as a member of the Madera County Board of Supervisors, Vern committed his time to various commissions and projects aimed at improving the life and welfare of Madera County citizens. While his retirement is well-deserved, his dedicated leadership on the Board of Supervisors will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Madera County Supervisor Vern Moss on his retirement and wishing him the best of luck and health as he moves on from this role.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, our country is in deep fiscal trouble, and cutting wasteful or low-priority spending is part of getting back to fiscal balance. But there is nothing low-priority about the firefighters who protect our communities, our families, and our homes. It is another example of Republicans' short-sighted and reckless approach to cutting spending that they are willing to take 2,400 firefighters off of the streets by passing this spending bill. To prevent that blow to public safety, I support Rep. PASCRELL's amendment, which would protect funding for the vital FIRE and SAFER grant programs.

FIRE and SAFER help fire departments across America recruit, train, and retain skilled firefighters, and help departments equip them with the up-to-date tools they need to protect property and save lives. These grant programs have helped our community firefighters afford protective equipment that helps them enter burning buildings, backup power generators that keep their stations running during emergencies, and full staffing, so that fire departments are not sitting empty or underprepared when disasters strike. In an independent study, the U.S. Fire Administration found that grants like these are making fire departments across the country more prepared for emergencies, and better equipped to do their job.

The Republican spending bill would not only cost us the jobs of thousands of public servants who risk their lives for our safety—it would put communities across the country at greater risk. I urge my colleagues to pass this amendment and restore these vital investments in public safety.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the dangerous and irresponsible cuts to the State and Foreign Operations budget. This short-sighted budget slashing generates petty savings at the expense of America's long-term national security and economic growth.

There are no two ways about it: Our national security depends on investments in development, diplomacy, and defense. As Department of Defense Secretary Robert Gates has said, "The challenges confronting our nation can't be dealt with by military means alone." But this legislation and many of the amendments to it are tone deaf to this common sense.

Mr. Speaker, this fiscal negligence will come back to haunt us if we cripple our efforts to prevent conflict, promote rule of law, and support the creation of stable allies.

I am particularly upset that the Peace Corps, one of our government's most cost-effective tools of peacebuilding, is slashed by $70 million. Do you know what Peace Corps could do with that money? Send 1,400 Americans to high-priority countries in the Middle

East, Africa, and around the globe to work on critical projects like education, agricultural development, and HIV/AIDs relief, while promoting goodwill towards America.

Similarly, I am concerned about amendments to defund the U.S. Institute of Peace. Our country is fighting a multi-billion dollar war. And as General Petraeus affirmed, USIP works closely with the military in both Afghanistan and Iraq to promote on-the-ground peacebuilding efforts and bring an end to conflict. Yet, as my colleagues propose to increase funding for the war, some have also proposed to eliminate funding for USIP, the only independent government actor that is dedicated solely to conflict prevention and resolution. That makes absolutely no economic sense.

Rather than make smart investments in civilian instruments of security, this bill and a lot of the amendments to it cut many other excellent foreign assistance programs with strong returns on investment. These include international family planning, poverty and infectious disease alleviation, and the Inter-American Foundation.

As Secretary Gates said, ''Development is a lot cheaper than sending in soldiers.'' If we want to be better stewards of taxpayer dollars, then why are we ripping resources away from the low-cost, high-return international programs that create strategic alliances and prevent multi-billion dollar wars?

The foreign aid budget is less than two percent of our total federal budget. This boils down to about $126 per American. That's about $100 bucks less than an army service uniform. So, for just $126 a head, America remains the beacon of democracy in the world. Now, that makes good economic sense.

Our job in this body is to serve the American people. But what kind of public servants are we if we vote to jeopardize America's national security so we can save a few bucks this year?

These cuts to foreign assistance masquerade as fiscal responsibility. But the reality is that this is a short-sighted proposal that endangers our long-term security, stability, and economic health. I strongly oppose this misguided legislation.

THE CORAL REEF CONSERVATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND ENHANCEMENT AMENDMENTS OF 2011

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroducted a bill to enhance and reauthorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000. In the 111th Congress, I sponsored this legislation as H.R. 860, the ''Coral Reef Conservation Act Reauthorization and Enhancement Amendments of 2009'', which the House of Representatives passed by voice vote on September 22, 2009. The bill I have introduced today, with 12 of my colleagues, strengthens H.R. 860 without changing its original intent.

The conservation of coral reef ecosystems is essential to protect public health, ensure environmental sustainability, support thousands of American jobs, and guarantee the long-term economic progress of coastal regions across the nation. United States waters contain some of the world's greatest coral reef biodiversity. From the waters off the coast of Guam and islands in the Pacific, to Florida and the U.S. Territories in the Caribbean, our reefs provide habitat and shelter for fisheries and food and recreation for our residents. These ecosystems also protect us from storm waves and are the basis for marine tourism industries.

Today, however, our coral reefs, and the numerous ecosystem services that they provide, are under threat from pollution, climate change, and overharvesting, among others stressors. Unless the United States acts in conjunction with the global community to support focused, long-term action on coral reef education, research, and management, the state of our coral reefs will continue to deteriorate.

Since its enactment, the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000 has sparked a greater commitment to protect, conserve, and restore coral reef resources within our waters. We now have improved our understanding of the condition of our coral reefs, and have better focused our management capabilities. The Coral Reef Conservation Act Reauthorization and Enhancement Amendments of 2011 would further strengthen the original legislation by improving the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's, NOAA, ability to respond to emergency or disaster-related situations and minimize the likelihood of vessel impacts on coral reefs. Specifically, the legislation would establish community-based planning grants for states and territories to support projects that address emerging threats to corals. In addition, the legislation would promote international cooperation by authorizing NOAA to engage with international partners to protect coral reef ecosystems.

This bill would also codify the United States Coral Reef Task Force established in 1998 by President Clinton through Executive Order 13089. The work of the Task Force, and its mission to coordinate the efforts of the United States in promoting conservation and the sustainable use of coral reefs internationally, is vital to our interests and coastal economies.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to advance this legislation, enhance and conserve our coral reef ecosystems, and protect coastal jobs.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the significant cuts to community health centers included in this bill. The Continuing Resolution proposes to reduce funding to community health centers by $1 billion, a nearly sixty percent reduction from FY2010 levels. Over the past few years, millions of families lost their health insurance due to job losses, and they now depend on community health centers to receive health care. If these cuts are signed into law, 192,834 people in Texas alone would lose access to health care.

These cuts are especially harmful to the people of my district. Border communities face unique health concerns and challenges, and community health centers play a critical role. The cuts will have devastating effects on the communities and patients who most need access to care—patients with diabetes, heart disease, and HIV/AIDS, as well as children and pregnant women. Community health centers provide access to quality health care to those who would otherwise forgo a doctor's visit or seek treatment in an emergency when it's too late.

In my congressional district for example, Centro San Vicente, one of many community health centers, provides health services for over 10,000 people a year. The irresponsible cuts contained in the Continuing Resolution will merely shift the burden to local communities, such as the district I represent, where local property taxpayers have already spent more than $500,000,000 since 1998 to pay for those who could not afford to pay for health care at our public hospital.

Republicans cannot merely ignore the problems that arise when 50 million people in the United States lack basic health coverage. They have voted to repeal the health insurance reform law, and now want to cut the very clinics that help lower health care costs by encouraging uninsured patients to seek treatment in a doctor's office, not in an emergency room, where the costs are substantially higher.

I understand the need for fiscal discipline, but drastically funding to a cost-effective program that has improved countless lives makes little sense from both a moral and fiscal perspective.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill which strips funding for community health centers.

THE LOWEY AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this amendment to restore funding to Title X family planning.

By slashing Title X family planning services in the budget, Republicans risk the lives and safety of millions of American women. These proposed cuts to family planning represent the opening salvo in an all-out war on women's health. I ask you to join with me and with my colleagues to restore this vital funding to Title X family planning.

Five million men and women depend on Title X providers for important preventive health care. Among other services, they received 2.3 million breast exams, 2.2 million cervical cancer screenings, and nearly 1 million HIV tests. These services prevent fatal illness; and for those who do have the misfortune to contract HIV/AIDS or cancer, Title X providers ensure that they receive life-saving

treatment early, when it has the greatest potential for good.

The proposed cuts in H.R. 1 would eviscerate these life-saving services.

While these cuts to family planning were proposed under the guise of being ''fiscally responsible,'' that is far from the truth.

For every dollar invested in Title X family planning services, taxpayers save just under $4. Cutting family planning is not fiscally responsible, and will not reduce the bottom line.

Moreover, this cut has nothing to do with ending funding for abortions, despite claims to the contrary. Title X family planning funds simply do not fund abortions. If we want to reduce the number of abortions in this country, the methodology is clear—empower women to prevent unintended pregnancies through education and access to contraception. And, that is precisely what family planning funding does.

In my home State of New York, cuts to Planned Parenthood would impact 209,410 patients. Just last year, Planned Parenthood provided 70,490 screenings for cervical cancer in New York, detecting 7,931 abnormal results requiring medical action. Another 67,957 women received breast exams. 138,501 tests for chlamydia helped to avert the leading cause of preventable infertility in America today. New Yorkers stand to lose valuable health services.

Instead of cutting vital health care services, we should focus on rebuilding our economy and creating jobs.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I strongly support the Blumenauer, Lowey, Markey amendment to restore our commitment to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Public broadcasting provides an essential service, providing millions of Americans with educational and cultural programming. In my district, and throughout the entire Washington, DC metropolitan region, we have been admirably served by public broadcasting stations like WETA on television and WAMU on the radio for many years.

Support for public broadcasting was first provided in 1967, and has been maintained for more than 40 years—it is an American institution. Whose children have not grown up learning their A,B,Cs from Sesame Street? Who has not enjoyed one of the many rich musical performances or riveting documentaries, including Ken Burns' historic 1990 series on the American Civil War, and a recent series on America's national parks, shown exclusively on PBS?

In America, unlike many countries around the world, the media industry always has been a completely commercial enterprise. Public broadcasting was not designed to supplant private media—and given the explosion of private television channels it clearly has not. Instead it merely provides viewers with a broad selection of educational and cultural programs that are available for free in every household in every community. I myself did not subscribe to cable television until just a few years ago and routinely watched PBS using rabbit ears on my old television set. Millions of Americans choose PBS, and they support it with their own money by donating to local stations during pledge drives. This has been a successful partnership, leveraging public investment with private funds for decades. That's why the proposed Republican cut is all the more surprising, given their alleged reverence for respecting the popular will expressed on You Cut. The number of Americans who support public broadcasting with their private contributions exceeds all of the participation in You Cuts by tens of multiples.

I recognize the need to control federal spending and reduce the deficit, and I support responsible reductions to that end. However, eviscerating public broadcasting is not responsible budgeting and flaunts any pretense of respect for popular support.

While less than twenty percent of its funding comes from the federal government, any reduction in support would result in significant degradation of the educational and cultural programming it provides. Public broadcasting is an extraordinarily cost-effective investment in America's cultural and educational advancement. For more than 40 years, PBS has brought the world to our living rooms, regardless of our financial means or where we lived. A PBS is to broadcasting what the Internet is to the digital revolution, and like the Internet democratizes and makes universal access to information. We must not sever access to such a unifying public resource at the short-sighted altar of fiscal dogma. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Blumenauer, Lowey, Markey amendment. Support the American institution of Public Broadcasting.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chair, I rise today to oppose the drastic and reckless cuts my colleagues in the Majority have included in H.R. 1. This legislation includes cuts that will destroy jobs, pollute our environment, damage our schools, threaten public safety and impact nearly every aspect of our economy. They will not strengthen our nation, they will negatively impact our natural resources and inhibit future generation's ability to compete and innovate in the global economy.

Specifically, H.R. 1 would reduce NOAA's operating budget by more than $450 million dollars, severely diminishing NOAA's ability to protect marine ecosystems, manage our nation's fisheries and provide weather monitoring data to weather sensitive industries. In addition, it will cut programs that provide life-saving services in every state and district. These irresponsible cuts will jeopardize thousands of jobs, threaten public safety and have lasting effects on our national and regional economies.

Of particular concern to coastal regions like Guam, are threats to coral reef ecosystems and the fisheries and tourism industries they support. The US commercial fisheries industry alone accounts for more than $100 billion in annual sales and supports 1.5 million jobs, while the coastal recreation and tourism industry serves as one of the nation's largest employers. These industries are critical to the long-term economic success of coastal regions however they are significantly threatened by coral reef degradation due to pollution, and climate change. Without healthy coral reefs, fishery levels plummet, and tourism declines.

Reducing NOAA's operating budget will further jeopardize these important industries. Without sufficient funding, NOAA cannot adequately protect our coral reef resources and could be forced to reduce public access to National Marine Sanctuaries and other recreational areas. In addition, H.R. 1 would significantly deteriorate NOAA's law enforcement abilities against illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing. The weakening of these programs would cause both immediate and long term job losses within the commercial fisheries and tourism industries. I strongly oppose all proposed cuts to NOAA's operating budget, it is too important to our economy and preserving our marine resources for future generations.

Another reckless cut included in H.R. 1 is more than $217 million to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA). NIFA provides critical grants to universities around the nation, supporting food and agriculture research promoting economic growth and environmental protections. The research yields national value and is especially significant to food security, nutritional health, and increased agricultural production.

Specifically important to Guam, is the Tropical and Subtropical Research program, T–STAR. In 2010, the T–STAR program supported 46 research projects at the University of Florida, the University of Hawaii, the University of Puerto Rico, the University Guam, the University of the Virgin Islands, and at American Samoa Community College. These projects are critical to sustainable agriculture, pest control, and disease research. Funds provided by T–STAR are leveraged by a commitment of local resources, further improving public health, protecting agro-ecosystems, and saving taxpayer dollars over time. They offer a high yield on investment and funding for the NIFA and T–STAR programs should be made a priority. I strongly oppose the majority's irresponsible cuts to these programs.

IN SUPPORT OF TITLE X FUNDING

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of the Lowey amendment to restore funding for Title X family planning programs. My colleagues have spoken about the achievements of Title X, so I want to focus on what elimination of this highly successful program would mean to the citizens of California.

As you all know, California has been hit extremely hard by this recession and is struggling just to meet the basic needs of its residents. In 2010, Title X funded health care services for over 1.2 million people—which represent 20 percent of all Title X participants. In my district alone, over 33,000 people relied on Title X-funded clinics for their primary health care needs. Eliminating Title X funds would result in a critical loss of vital health care services to an already struggling state with limited resources.

My district has been profoundly affected by the Medicare reimbursement issue because, while we are a high cost area comparable to San Francisco, the reimbursement rate reflects rural costs. As a direct result of doctors no longer accepting Medicare patients, many seniors have been forced to turn to Title X clinics for their basic health care needs. Older adults, both men and women, are able to receive immunizations, physicals, diabetes testing, and STD testing and treatment, in addition to typical gynecological services. If Title X funds are eliminated, these seniors will lose the only access to health care that is available to them.

A vote in support of this amendment is a vote in favor of allowing millions of Americans access to vital health care services. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Lowey Amendment to restore funding to Title X.

IN OPPOSITION TO STEARNS AMENDMENT (#10) TO H.R. 1

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. Stearns, an amendment which seeks to hamstring the EPA's ability to do its job.

A job which Congress determined was the responsibility of the EPA.

A job which the Supreme Court ruled was the responsibility of the EPA.

And, a job, which is necessary to save thousands of lives, and millions in healthcare costs.

Contrary to what some of my colleagues have been saying on the House floor, Americans support the mission of the EPA.

Americans also support the tenets of the Clean Air Act.

Recently, polls have been conducted in Congressional districts across the country, in districts that are home to coal and power plants, that are in the heart of steel towns and industry.

When questioned, 60 and 70 percent of people in these districts answered with a resounding, ''yes, the EPA can and should do more to hold polluters accountable and to protect our land, air and water.''

Those same folks did not support Congress deciding how those rules should be promulgated, as this amendment strives to do.

There's a reason that rules are written by agencies—they've got the resources, and the knowledge, to write regulations that will do what's best for American citizens and communities.

Our job is to support these rules.

I stand here in support of the EPA, the EPA's ability to regulate coal combustion wastes and against the proposed amendment.

Our lives depend on it.

IN SUPPORT OF MARKEY AMENDMENT #213 TO H.R. 1

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, America has always been at the forefront of medical innovation—with the National Institutes of Health (NIH) making us the leader at creating life-saving technology.

Millions of Americans live healthier, more productive lives as a result of our medical research funding

The innovative and cutting-edge research funded by the NIH has also given the United States thousands of good jobs and contributed to creating a strong middle class.

Now we're voting on a budget that will cut over $1.5 billion from one of the key engines of American innovation.

H.R. 1 is a set back to medical research and a set back to our economic recovery.

Vote for amendment number 213 to preserve critical NIH funding.

IN SUPPORT OF QUIGLEY AMENDMENT (#520) TO H.R. 1

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with an amendment that would, quite simply, allow the President to continue to consult an Advisor on Energy and Climate Change.

Section 1535 of this bill, which forbids the President from hiring such an advisor, wouldn't save taxpayers a penny.

Section 1535, which my amendment would strike, is a misguided attempt to tell the President who he can and cannot consult.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, would any member of this body allow us to deny them counsel on energy and climate issues?

This is NOT a rhetorical question—every member of this body that employs a staffer on energy or climate issues should carefully consider whether they would deny the President that same counsel.

Whether or not you agree with the President on energy and climate issues, I would ask you—is it appropriate to silence those with whom you disagree?

I would also remind my colleagues that Section 1535 of this bill, which my amendment would strike, does not save taxpayers any money at all—not even a penny.

All it does is deny the President the ability to consult with a certain type of advisor.

Section 1535 is an unprecedented intrusion into the President's ability to retain and consult advisors on issues of national importance.

And energy and climate change are issues of national importance.

In light of recent catastrophes like the BP oil spill, ongoing efforts to prevent the EPA from doing its job, and rising rates of mortality and morbidity due to unhealthy air, land, and water—it is more important than ever that we support increased resources for the President and the Administration to do their job of keeping us, and our environment, safe and healthy.

I've stood on this House floor many times, some of them in recent days, and talked about decreasing wasteful government spending.

I've written whitepaper reports, both in Congress and while a Cook County Commissioner, detailing the importance of streamlining and reinventing government.

But, the crux of those arguments is predicated on the fact that I believe that what the government does matters—that government's mission matters.

What we do here today, and tomorrow, and the day after that, matters.

But this CR, which combines ideologically driven cuts with pretend cuts, like Section 1535, is not the answer.

Taking a sledgehammer to non-defense discretionary spending is not the answer.

We've got to talk about what programs are working and support them at the same time we cut the ones that don't work.

We're facing a climate crisis—a climate crisis that has become political and polarizing, pushing leaders into opposite corners of this debate.

But the facts aren't a debate if they're based on science.

And science says that for decades and centuries to come we're going to be dealing with rising temperatures, acidic oceans, extinct species, and skyrocketing healthcare costs due to dirty air.

In these trying times, we're trying to tell the President of the United States he doesn't have the right to counsel on energy and climate change?

With all due respect, Section 1535 is an unserious attempt to achieve some measure of fiscal responsibility.

But the truth is, it hacks away at the constitutional separation of powers and doesn't save taxpayers any money at all.

How we address energy and climate change issues will matter for our children, and our children's children.

We must not hamstring our ability to do so.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose

of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, February 17, 2011 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 1

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine U.S. Special Operations Command and U.S. Central Command in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session.

SD–106

10 a.m.

Budget

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 for education.

SD–608

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine breaking the cycle of North Korean provocations.

SD–419

2 p.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings to examine a legislative presentation from Disabled American Veterans.

345, Cannon Building

2:15 p.m.

Foreign Relations

Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, subcommittee membership and jurisdiction, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress, and the nominations of Sue Kathrine Brown, of Texas, to be Ambassador to Montenegro, Daniel L. Shields III, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to Brunei Darussalam, David Lee Carden, of New York, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, and Pamela L. Spratlen, of California, to be Ambassador to the Kyrgyz Republic, all of the Department of State, and Eric G. Postel, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

S–116, Capitol

MARCH 2

9:30 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine national security and foreign policy priorities in the fiscal year 2012 International Affairs Budget.

SD–106

10 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of the Interior.

SD–366

10:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012.

SR–418

MARCH 3

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the Department of the Army in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD–106

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 for the USDA Forest Service.

SD–366

2:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine navigating a turbulent global economy, focusing on implications for the United States.

SD–419

MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SH–219 following the open session.

SD–G50

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings to examine the legislative presentation from Veterans of Foreign Wars.

345, Cannon Building

MARCH 9

10 a.m.

Finance

To hold hearings to examine the President's 2011 trade agenda.

SD–215

MARCH 16

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings to examine the legislative presentations from AMVETS, Jewish War Veterans, Military Officers Association of America, Gold Star Wives, Blinded Veterans Association, Non Commissioned Officers Association, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, Fleet Reserve Association.

SDG–50

MARCH 30

10:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings to examine the legislative presentations from Paralyzed Veterans of America, Air Force Sergeants Association, Military Order of the Purple Heart, National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs, Wounded Warrior Project, Vietnam Veterans of America, The Retired Enlisted Association, American Ex-Prisoners of War.

SD–106

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S765–S805

Measures Introduced: Fifteen bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 359–373, S.J. Res. 6, S. Res. 55–58, and S. Con. Res. 6.

Pages S791–92

Measures Reported:

S. Res. 56, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

S. Res. 57, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

S. Res. 58, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Budget.

S. 365, to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002. **Page S791**

Measures Passed:

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People 102nd Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 6, commending the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 102nd anniversary. **Pages S803–04**

Measures Considered:

FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S768–83**

Adopted:

Rockefeller (for Baucus) Further Modified Amendment No. 75, of a perfecting nature. **Pages S770–77**

Pending:

Rockefeller (for Wyden) Amendment No. 27, to increase the number of test sites in the National Airspace System used for unmanned aerial vehicles and to require one of those test sites to include a significant portion of public lands. **Page S768**

Inhofe Modified Amendment No. 7, to provide for an increase in the number of slots available at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

Page S768

Rockefeller (for Ensign) Amendment No. 32, to improve provisions relating to certification and flight standards for military remotely piloted aerial systems in the National Airspace System. **Page S768**

McCain Amendment No. 4, to repeal the essential air service program. **Page S768**

Rockefeller (for Leahy) Amendment No. 50, to amend title 1 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include nonprofit and volunteer ground and air ambulance crew members and first responders for certain benefits, and to clarify the liability protection for volunteer pilots that fly for public benefit. **Page S768**

Reid Amendment No. 54, to allow airports that receive airport improvement grants for the purchase of land to lease the land and develop the land in a manner compatible with noise buffering purposes.

Page S768

Udall (NM) Modified Amendment No. 49, to authorize Dona Ana County, New Mexico, to exchange certain land conveyed to the County for airport purposes. **Page S768**

Udall (NM) Modified Amendment No. 51, to require that all advanced imaging technology used as a primary screening method for passengers be equipped with automatic target recognition software.

Page S768

Paul Amendment No. 18, to strike the provisions relating to clarifying a memorandum of understanding between the Federal Aviation Administration and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. **Page S768**

Hutchison Further Modified Amendment No. 93 (to Modified Amendment No. 7), of a perfecting nature. **Pages S768, S777–83**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, February 17, 2011; that there then be 2 hours for debate prior to the cloture vote on Inhofe Modified Amendment No. 7 (listed above), with the time equally divided and controlled between the proponents and opponents,

and that the filing deadline for second-degree amendments to the bill be 10 a.m. **Page S804**

Appointments:

Joint Committee on Taxation: The Chair, announced on behalf of the Committee on Finance, pursuant to section 8002 of title 26, U.S. Code, the designation of the following Senators as members of the Joint Committee on Taxation: Senator Baucus, Senator Rockefeller, Senator Conrad, Senator Hatch, and Senator Grassley. **Page S804**

Senator Coats—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 1:30 p.m., on Thursday, February 17, 2011, Senator Coats be recognized for up to 30 minutes. **Page S804**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Timothy M. Cain, of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina.

Scott Wesley Skavdahl, of Wyoming, to be United States District Judge for the District of Wyoming.

2 Army nominations in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Army and Marine Corps.

Pages S804–05

Messages from the House: **Page S790**

Executive Communications: **Pages S790–91**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S791**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S791**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S792–93**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S793–S800**

Additional Statements: **Pages S789–90**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S800–02**

Notices of Intent: **Page S802**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S802**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S802–03**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:26 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 17, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S804.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Budget: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee.

Also, committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 112th Congress.

NATIONWIDE NETWORK FOR FIRST RESPONDERS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine safeguarding our future, focusing on building a nationwide network for first responders, after receiving testimony from Representative King (NY); Delaware Governor Jack Markell, Dover, on behalf of the National Governors Association; Raymond W. Kelly, New York City Police Commissioner, New York, New York; Al H. Gillespie, North Las Vegas Fire Department Chief, Las Vegas, Nevada, on behalf of the International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC); and Joseph L. Hanna, Directions, Garland, Texas.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Energy, after receiving testimony from Steven Chu, Secretary of Energy.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee.

Also, committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 112th Congress and announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Energy: Senators Cantwell (Chair), Wyden, Johnson (SD), Landrieu, Sanders, Udall (CO), Shaheen, Franken, Manchin, Coons, Risch, Barrasso, Lee, Paul, Coats, Portman, Hoeven, and Corker.

Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests: Senators Wyden (Chair), Johnson (SD), Landrieu, Cantwell, Udall (CO), Shaheen, Franken, Coons, Barrasso, Risch, Lee, Paul, Portman, and Hoeven.

Subcommittee on National Parks: Senators Udall (CO) (Chair), Landrieu, Sanders, Stabenow, Franken, Manchin, Coons, Burr, Barrasso, Paul, Coats, Portman, and Corker.

Subcommittee on Water and Power: Senators Shaheen (Chair), Wyden, Johnson (SD), Cantwell, Sanders, Stabenow, Manchin, Lee, Risch, Coats, Hoeven, and Corker.

Senators Bingaman and Murkowski are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

CALL TO ACTION ON TRANSPORTATION

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine national leaders' call to action on transportation, after receiving testimony from Thomas J. Donohue, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Richard Trumka, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL–CIO), both of Washington, D.C.

BUDGET

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012, after receiving testimony from Timothy F. Geithner, Secretary of the Treasury.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 112th Congress and announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Health Care: Senators Rockefeller (Chair), Bingaman, Kerry, Wyden, Stabenow, Cantwell, Menendez, Carper, Cardin, Ensign, Grassley, Kyl, Roberts, Enzi, Cornyn, and Coburn.

Subcommittee on Taxation and IRS Oversight: Senators Conrad (Chair), Baucus, Kerry, Schumer, Wyden, Cantwell, Nelson (FL), Menendez, Carper, Cardin, Kyl, Snowe, Crapo, Roberts, Ensign, Enzi, Cornyn, and Thune.

Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Infrastructure: Senators Bingaman (Chair), Rockefeller, Conrad, Kerry, Cantwell, Nelson (FL), Carper, Cornyn, Grassley, Roberts, Enzi, and Thune.

Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness: Senators Wyden (Chair), Rockefeller, Kerry, Schumer, Stabenow, Nelson (FL), Menendez, Thune, Hatch, Grassley, Crapo, and Roberts.

Subcommittee on Social Security, Pensions, and Family Policy: Senators Stabenow (Chair), Rockefeller, Schumer, Cardin, Coburn, Hatch, and Kyl.

Subcommittee on Fiscal Responsibility and Economic Growth: Senators Nelson (FL) (Chair), Baucus, Conrad, Bingaman, Crapo, Ensign, and Coburn.

Senators Baucus and Hatch are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

D.C. OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine saving the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, including S. 206, to reauthorize the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program, after receiving testimony from Mayor Vincent C. Gray, Kwame R. Brown, Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, Kevin P. Chavous, Black Alliance for Educational Options, and Virginia Walden Ford, D.C. Parents for School Choice, all of Washington, D.C.; and Patrick J. Wolf, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

IMPROVING FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia concluded a hearing to examine improving Federal employment of people with disabilities, focusing on barriers to the employment of people with disabilities in the federal workforce and leading practices that could be used to overcome these barriers, after receiving testimony from Yvonne Jones, Director, Strategic Issues, Government Accountability Office; Christine Griffin, Deputy Director, Office of Personnel Management; Kathleen Martinez, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Disability Employment Policy; and Chai Feldblum, Commissioner, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress, an original bill entitled, ''Technical Amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act'', and Public Health Service nominations.

Also, committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 112th Congress.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee.

Also, committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 112th Congress.

WEBSITES DEDICATED TO STEALING AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine targeting websites dedicated to stealing American intellectual property, after receiving testimony from Tom Adams, Rosetta Stone Inc., and Thomas M. Dailey, Verizon Communications Inc., both of Arlington, Virginia; Scott Turow, Authors Guild, New York, New York; Christine Jones, The Go Daddy Group, Inc., Scottsdale, Arizona; and Denise Yee, Visa Inc., San Francisco, California.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Jimmie V. Reyna, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit

Judge for the Federal Circuit, who was introduced by Senators Cardin and Cornyn, John A. Kronstadt, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, who was introduced by Senator Feinstein, Vincent L. Briccetti, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and Arenda L. Wright Allen, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, and Michael Francis Urbanski, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia, who were both introduced by Senators Webb and Warner, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

WORLDWIDE THREAT

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the worldwide threat, after receiving testimony from James R. Clapper, Director of National Intelligence; Robert S. Mueller, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; Michael Leiter, Director, National Counterterrorism Center; Leon Panetta, Director, Central Intelligence Agency; Lieutenant General Ronald L. Burgess, Jr., Director, Defense Intelligence Agency; and Philip Goldberg, Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 18 public bills, H.R. 733–750; and 6 resolutions, H.J. Res. 37–40; and H. Res. 95–96 were introduced. **Pages H1038–40**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H1040**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Nunnelee to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H937**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:25 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H949**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Bill Shuler, Capital Life Church, Washington, DC. **Page H949**

Extending expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 93, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 514, to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 relating to access to business records, individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers, and roving wiretaps until December 8, 2011. **Pages H951–57**

Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy: Representative Shimkus. **Page H957**

Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011: The House resumed consideration of H.R. 1, making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, February 17th. **Pages H957–H1036**

Agreed to:

Rooney amendment (No. 2 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that reduces Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy by $225,000,000 and reduces Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force by $225,000,000 and increases Defense by $450,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 233 ayes to 198 noes with 1 voting "present", Roll No. 46); **Pages H957–58**

Michaud amendment (No. 153 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that increases funding, by offset, for the Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration, Economic Development Assistance Programs by $80,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 305 ayes to 127 noes, Roll No. 50); **Pages H960–61**

Flake amendment (No. 368 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that eliminates funding for the National Drug Intelligence Center (by a recorded vote of 262 ayes to 169 noes, Roll No. 51); **Page H961**

Weiner amendment (No. 125 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011), as modified, that was debated on February 15th that increases funding, by offset, for the Department of Justice, Community Oriented Policing Services by $298,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 228 ayes to 203 noes, Roll No. 53); **Pages H962–63**

Pascrell amendment (No. 223 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that increases funding, by offset, for the Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Firefighter

Assistance Grants by $510,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 318 ayes to 113 noes, Roll No. 60); **Page H967**

Burton (IN) amendment (No. 30 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that reduces funding for the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Management of Lands and Resources by $2,000,000; **Pages H968–70**

Pompeo amendment (No. 84 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that reduces funding for the Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Programs and Management by $8,458,000 (by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 64); **Pages H988–89, H996**

Reed amendment (No. 379 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that reduces funding for the Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants by $10,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 228 ayes to 203 noes, Roll No. 65); **Pages H989–90, H997**

Whitfield amendment (No. 108 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that reduces the funding for greening of the Capitol by $1,500,000; and **(See next issue.)**

McClintock amendment (No. 291 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that reduces funding for the Department of the Treasury, Debt Restructuring by $20,000,000. **(See next issue.)**

Rejected:

Jones amendment (No. 95 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to eliminate funding for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (by a recorded vote of 135 ayes to 294 noes, Roll No. 47); **Pages H958–59**

Holt amendment (No. 237 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to eliminate funding for the Iraq Security Forces Fund (by a recorded vote of 133 ayes to 299 noes, Roll No. 48); **Page H959**

DeFazio amendment (No. 97 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to increase funding, by offset, for the Organic Transition Program by $5,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 136 ayes to 296 noes, Roll No. 49); **Pages H959–60**

Latta amendment (No. 260 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to reduce funding for the Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Construction of Research Facilities by $10,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 184 ayes to 247 noes, Roll No. 52); **Pages H961–62**

Duncan (SC) amendment (No. 110 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to reduce funding for the Legal Services Corporation by $324,400,000 (by a recorded vote of 171 ayes to 259 noes, Roll No. 54); **Page H963**

Biggert amendment (No. 192 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to reduce funding for the Department of Energy, Energy Programs, Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy by $50,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 170 ayes to 262 noes, Roll No. 55); **Pages H963–64**

Inslee amendment (No. 395 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to increase funding, by offset, for the Department of Energy, Energy Programs, Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy by $20,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 159 ayes to 273 noes, Roll No. 56); **Pages H964–65**

Tonko amendment (No. 4 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to strike the prohibition on Weatherization and State Energy Program funding (by a recorded vote of 208 ayes to 223 noes, Roll No. 57); **Page H965**

Latta amendment (No. 259 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to reduce funding for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy by $70,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 137 ayes to 293 noes, Roll No. 58); **Pages H965–66**

DeFazio amendment (No. 98 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 15th that sought to eliminate the funding for the Selective Service System (by a recorded vote of 130 ayes to 301 noes, Roll No. 59); **Pages H966–67**

McClintock amendment (No. 295 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to reduce funding for the Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Resource Management by $7,537,000; **Pages H981–82**

Lummis amendment (No. 193 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to reduce funding for land acquisition under Title VII—Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies by $35,055,000 (by a recorded vote of 213 ayes to 216 noes, Roll No. 61); **Pages H976–81, H994–95**

Moran amendment (No. 338 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to increase, by offset, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, North American Wetlands Conservation Fund by $50,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 73 ayes to 352 noes with 2 voting ''present'', Roll No. 62); **Pages H982–84, H995**

Flake amendment (No. 376 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to reduce funding for the Environmental Protection Agency, Science and Technology by $64,100,000 (by a recorded vote of 199 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 63); and **Pages H986–87, H995–96**

Polis amendment (No. 68 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to

create an exception for TIFIA projects within ARRA reductions. **(See next issue.)**

Withdrawn:

Barletta amendment (No. 111 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased funding, by offset, for Low Income Home Energy Assistance by $42,676,000 and **Pages H1014–20**

Franks (AZ) amendment (No. 481 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have added language regarding the fulfillment of the Egypt-Israel treaty. **(See next issue.)**

Point of Order sustained against:

Pearce amendment (No. 556 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011), as modified, that sought to reduce funding for construction and land acquisition under Title VII—Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies by $239,045,000; **Pages H970–76**

Lummis amendment (No. 194 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to change the date for the final rule published by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the endangered status of wolves; **Pages H984–86**

Hall amendment (No. 407 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to direct the EPA to enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences to perform a comprehensive review of non-mercury hazardous air pollutants emitted by electric generating units and industrial boilers; **Pages H987–88**

Edwards amendment (No. 415 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to increase funding for the Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants by $2,816,446,000; **Pages H990–92**

Braley (IA) amendment (No. 521 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to add language stating that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not be prohibited from implementing or enforcing section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act; **Pages H992–94**

Markey amendment (No. 160 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to increase Low Income Home Energy Assistance by $390,328,000 and add new sections at the end of the bill; **Pages H1007–14**

Chu amendment (No. 490 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to increase the funding level in the bill for Pell Grants to $4,860; **Pages H1024–25**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 239 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to increase the funding level in the bill for Pell Grants to $4,860; **Pages H1025–28**

Blumenauer amendment (No. 436 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to provide funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; **Pages H1028–31**

Tonko amendment (No. 15 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to strike section 1844 which provides a limitation on Administrative Expenses for the Social Security Administration; **Pages H1032–33**

Tonko amendment (No. 16 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to strike section 1846 which provides a limitation on Administrative Expenses for the Social Security Administration; **Pages H1033–36**

Lee (CA) amendment (No. 221 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to add a new section regarding rules related to additional weeks of first-tier emergency unemployment compensation; and **Page H1036**

Nadler amendment (No. 511 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to add back all transportation funding. **(See next issue.)**

Proceedings Postponed:

Pompeo amendment (No. 85 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for the Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, State and Private Forestry by $7,400,000; **Pages H999–H1001**

Walberg amendment (No. 196 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, National Endowment for the Arts, Grants and Administration by $20,594,000; **Pages H1001–02**

Canseco amendment (No. 249 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs by $4,500,000; **Pages H1002–03**

Reed amendment (No. 381 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to eliminate the Presidio Trust Fund; **Pages H1003–07**

Bass (NH) amendment (No. 565 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services by $98,000,000; **Page H1007**

Flake amendment (No. 457 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for making payments under the Community Service Block Grant Act by $100,000,000; **(See next issue.)**

McMorris Rodgers amendment (No. 276 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011)

that seeks to increase IDEA state grants to FY 2010 levels and reduce school improvement grants and teacher quality grants by necessary amounts to fully offset outlays; **Pages H1020–23**

Young (AK) amendment (No. 532 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that seeks to restore the education funding authority for Alaskan and Hawaiian Native Americans; **Pages H1023–24**

Price (GA) amendment (No. 410 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that seeks to eliminate funding for the National Labor Relations Board; **Pages H1031–32**

Weiner amendment (No. 100 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for the United States Institute of Peace by $42,676,000; **(See next issue.)**

Canseco amendment (No. 248 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for the East-West Center by $10,716,000; **(See next issue.)**

Heller amendment (No. 29 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding under Title XI—State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs by $211,244,700; and **(See next issue.)**

Sessions amendment (No. 43 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for Amtrak by $446,900,000. **(See next issue.)**

H. Res. 92, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to yesterday, February 15th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. today. **(See next issue.)**

Amendment: Amendment ordered printed pursuant to the rule appears on page H1041.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and twenty recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H956–57, H957–58, H958–59, H959, H959–60, H960–61, H961, H961–62, H962–63, H963, H963–64, H964–65, H965, H965–66, H966–67, H967, H994–95, H995, H995–96, H996 and H997. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 3:43 a.m. on Thursday, February 17th.

Committee Meetings

REGULATORY BURDENS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Nutrition and Horticulture and the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure held a joint hearing to consider reducing the regulatory burdens posed by the case National Cotton Council v. EPA (6th Cir. 2009) and to review related draft legislation. Testimony was heard from Steven Bradbury, Director, Office of Pesticide Programs, EPA; and public witnesses.

NATIONAL DEFENSE FY 2012 BUDGET

Committee on Armed Services: Held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2012 national defense authorization budget request from the Department of Defense. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Robert M. Gates, Secretary; and ADM Michael G. Mullen, USN, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

TREASURY FY 2012 BUDGET

Committee on the Budget: Held a hearing on the Department of the Treasury Fiscal Year 2012 Budget. Testimony was heard from Timothy F. Geithner, Secretary of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR POLICIES AND PRIORITIES

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Held a hearing on Policies and Priorities at the U.S. Department of Labor. Testimony was heard from Hilda L. Solis, Secretary of Labor.

NET NEUTRALITY AND INTERNET REGULATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, held a hearing entitled ''Network Neutrality and Internet Regulation: Warranted or More Economic Harm Than Good?'' Testimony was heard from the following officials of the FCC: Julius Genachowski, Chairman; Mignon Clyburn; Michael J. Copps; Meredith Attwell Baker; and Robert M. McDowell, all Commissioners.

HEALTH CARE AND THE CENTER FOR CONSUMER INFORMATION AND INSURANCE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Health Care Issues Involving the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight.'' Testimony was heard from the following officials of Department of Health and Human Services: Jay Angoff, Senior Advisor, Office of the Secretary; and Steve Larsen, Deputy Administrator and Director, Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

FINANCIAL CRISIS INQUIRY COMMISSION

Committee on Financial Services: Held a hearing entitled ''The Final Report of the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission.'' Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission: Phil Angelides, Chairman; Bill Thomas, Vice Chairman; Douglas Holtz-Eakin, Commissioner; Brooksley Born, Commissioner; Peter Wallison, Commissioner; and Bryon Georgiou, Commissioner.

HOUSING MARKET RECOVERY

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity held a hearing entitled ''Are There Government Barriers to the Housing Market Recovery?'' Testimony was heard from David Stevens, Assistant Secretary, Housing and Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development; Theodore ''Ted'' Tozer, President, Government National Mortgage Association (Ginnie Mae); Phyllis Caldwell, Chief, Homeownership Preservation Office, Department of the Treasury; Douglas Holtz-Eakin, former Director, CBO; and public witnesses.

HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2011

Committee on the Judiciary: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 5, Help Efficient, Accessible, Low-cost, Timely Healthcare (HEALTH) Act of 2011.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE

Committee on the Judiciary: Held a hearing on the Constitutionality of the Individual Mandate. Testimony was heard from Kenneth T. Cuccinelli, II, Attorney General, Virginia; and public witnesses.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL REPORTING MODEL

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Organizations, Efficiency and Financial Management, hearing on Making Sense of the Numbers: Improving the Federal Financial Reporting Model. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE STIMULUS: TWO YEARS LATER

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, Stimulus Oversight and Government Spending held a hearing on the Stimulus: Two Years Later. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FAA FY 2012 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BUDGET

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics held a hearing on a review of the Federal Aviation Administration's Research and Development Budget for Fiscal Year 2012. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Transportation: Victoria Cox, Air Traffic Organization, FAA; and Calvin Scovel, III, Inspector General; and public witnesses.

PUTTING AMERICANS BACK TO WORK

Committee on Small Business: Held a hearing entitled ''Putting Americans Back to Work: The State of the Small Business Economy.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 362, to redesignate the Federal building and United States Courthouse located at 200 East Wall Street in Midland, Texas, as the ''George H.W. Bush and George W. Bush United States Courthouse and George Mahon Federal Building;'' H.R. 658, amended, FAA Reauthorization and Reform Act of 2011; H.R. 690, amended, Federal Trade Commission and National Gallery of Art Facility Consolidation, Savings, and Efficiency Act of 2011; and H.R. 662, Surface Transportation Act of 2011.

The Committee also approved a Committee resolution to reduce facility costs by consolidating the National Gallery of Art and Federal Trade Commission operations in the District of Columbia.

PRESIDENT'S FY 2012 BUDGET PROPOSAL

Committee on Ways and Means: Continued hearings on the President's Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Proposal. Testimony was heard from Kathleen Sebelius, Secretary of Health and Human Services; and Jacob J. Lew, Director, OMB.

Joint Meetings

LITHUANIA'S LEADERSHIP OF THE OSCE

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine Lithuania's leadership of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), focusing on the challenges that the Lithuanian chairmanship faces, after receiving testimony from Audronius Azubalis, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania and OSCE Chair-in-Office for 2011, Vilnius.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: To hold hearings to examine agriculture and growing America's economy; to be immediately followed by an organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress, 2:30 p.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Armed Services: To hold hearings to examine the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, subcommittee assignments, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine the Dodd-Frank implementation, focusing on a progress report by the regulators at the half-year mark, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on the Budget: To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 and revenue proposals, 10 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Peace Corps and Global Narcotics Affairs, to hold hearings to examine United States policy toward Latin America, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: To hold hearings to examine President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Homeland Security, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, subcommittee membership and jurisdiction, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress, S. 193, to extend the sunset of certain provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act, S. 49, to amend the Federal antitrust laws to provide expanded coverage and to eliminate exemptions from such laws that are contrary to the public interest with respect to railroads, and the nominations of Sue E. Myerscough, and James E. Shadid, both to be a United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois, Susan L. Carney, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Michael H. Simon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon, and Mae A. D'Agostino, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York, and Timothy J. Feighery, of New York, to be Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures for the 112th Congress; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine Senate committees that have presented budgets above guidelines for the 112th Congress, 3:30 p.m., SR–301.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 112th Congress, Time to be announced, Room to be announced.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine reauthorization of the SBIR and STTR programs, 10 a.m., SR–428A.

Select Committee on Intelligence: To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, hearing on reviewing the state of the farm economy, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2012 national defense authorization budget request from the Department of the Air Force, 1 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, hearing entitled "A Review of CPSIA and CPSC Resources," 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled "Impact of Medical Device Regulation on Jobs and Patients," 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled "Understanding the Federal Reserve's Proposed Rule on Interchange Fees: Implications and Consequences of the Durbin Amendment," 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, hearing entitled "The President's FY 2012 Budget Request for the Department of Homeland Security," 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing on the Going Dark: Lawful Electronic Surveillance in the Face of New Technologies, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, hearing on Waste and Abuse: The Refuse of the Federal Spending Binge, 9:30 a.m., 210–HVC.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, hearing on An Overview of the Administration's Federal Research and Development Budget for Fiscal Year 2012, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, hearing on Sitting on Our Assets: Rehabilitating and Improving our Nation's Rail Infrastructure, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, hearing on Department of Veterans' Affairs Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2012, 9:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, to mark up the following measures: H.R. 4, Small Business Paperwork Mandate Elimination Act of 2011; and the Comprehensive 1099 Taxpayer Protection and Repayment of Exchange Subsidy Overpayments Act of 2011.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, hearing on FY 2011 Budget Overview, 10 a.m., 304–HVC.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, February 17

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 223, FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act, and after a period of debate, vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Inhofe Modified Amendment No. 7, at approximately 11:30 a.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, February 17

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Continue consideration of H.R. 1—Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Alexander, Rodney, La., E237
Beniskey, Dan, Mich., E237
Bonner, Jo, Ala., E238, E239, E242, E245
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E249, E250
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E244
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E248, E250
Davis, Susan A., Calif., E251
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E240
Denham, Jeff, Calif., E248
Dingell, John D., Mich., E239
Ellison, Keith, Minn., E237
Farr, Sam, Calif., E248, E251
Heck, Joseph J., Nev., E243
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E248
Langevin, James R., R.I., E240
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E240
McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E241
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E242
McGovern, James P., Mass., E242
Marino, Tom, Pa., E246
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E237, E238, E246
Quigley, Mike, Ill., E238, E251, E251
Reyes, Silvestre, Tex., E247, E249
Richardson, Laura, Calif., E243
Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E244
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E241
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E247
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E249
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E237, E239, E240, E240, E243, E244, E245, E246, E247, E247
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E246, E247
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E245
Walberg, Tim, Mich., E239

(House proceedings for today will be continued in the next issue of the Record.)

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are 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 the U.S. Government Printing Office at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. 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.