United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 5, 2011 No. 60

House of Representatives

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

PRAYER

Reverend William Byrne, St. Peter's Catholic Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Gracious and loving God, thank You for the blessings You have bestowed upon this Nation. Most especially, we thank You for the rights which You alone grant to all men and women, in particular, the gift of life and the right to pursue happiness.

Bless the men and women of this country who work to ensure that all men and women may enjoy these rights. Watch over those who protect our Nation, both military and civilian, at home and abroad.

Guard and protect those who have been devastated by storms and tornados this past week. Keep them safe and assist those who are working for relief. Comfort those who mourn, and welcome those who have died.

Bless these Representatives. May all they do begin with Your inspiration and find completion in Your love.

We ask this in Your holy 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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

TEXAS WILDFIRES AND PAKISTAN

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, wildfires have raged in Texas because of a long drought this year. The town of Possum Kingdom, Texas, population 5,500, has burned up. This is one of the many photographs showing the raging fires throughout the State.

Statewide, two firefighters have been killed; 400 homes have been destroyed. The 9,000 fires have covered over 2,200,000 acres—this is the size of Rhode Island and Connecticut put together—and the costs of the devastating destruction are enormous.

The Governor has asked FEMA for a Federal disaster declaration because of the extensive fires, but the Governor has been turned down by the White House—no more additional help for Texas.

Too bad Texas isn't a foreign country like Pakistan. The Federal Government has shelled out over $500 million for disaster aid to Pakistan citizens for the flooding in their country.

When Washington considers aid, if any, for disaster relief, it should at least consider Americans in Texas just as important as Pakistanis, but that doesn't appear to be the case. Meanwhile, the fires continue to burn in Texas.

And that's just the way it is.

REIN IN THE SPECULATION

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. American families and small businesses are being crushed by $4 a gallon gas at the pump.

Now, the Republicans tell us, oh, it's plain old supply and demand; drill here now and fast in the future and that will solve the problem.

Well, actually supply is up—U.S. crude inventories are 12.6 million barrels over the 5-year average—and demand is down. So what's really going on?

Well, it's Big Oil and it's Wall Street. Goldman Sachs—no one less than Goldman Sachs—said that the culprit for inflating oil prices $20 higher than what supply and demand dictate is excess speculation. Now, we wouldn't want to rein in the speculators because that's Wall Street and they're very generous to Republicans. And we wouldn't want to take on Big Oil, who's manipulating the market prices, because they contribute big-time to Republicans.

So let's just play pretend. Let's pretend we're doing something for consumers while hiding the culprits in plain sight. Speculation on Wall Street. They traded 189,000 contracts—that's 189 million barrels—by computer in 1 day last week, driving up the price for all Americans. Useless speculation.

Rein in the speculation. And take on Big Oil.

CONGRATULATIONS, CANADA

(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, this week's historic election in Canada brought to power a conservative majority for Parliament. By winning a full majority of the 167 conservative seats, Prime Minister Stephen

Printed on recycled paper.

Harper will now have 4 years of uninterrupted government. Plans to create jobs without increasing taxes and paying down the national deficit are top priorities of this new majority.

The relationship of Canada and South Carolina has been strong for many years. This year marks the 50th annual Canadian-American Days Festival at Myrtle Beach, which celebrates the partnership between our citizens. We welcome Canadian vacationers. We are grateful that former South Carolina Speaker of the House, David Wilkins of Greenville, served as the United States Ambassador to Canada from 2005 to 2009. Canada is our leading trade partner, which I know firsthand and appreciate, with the Michelin Tire Corporation of Lexington producing earthmover tires for recovery of oil sands resources in Alberta.

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

TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in observation of Teacher Appreciation Week, which commenced on May 2 and will end tomorrow. It's not only appropriate to recognize our hardworking and dedicated educators, it is necessary.

In honor of Teacher Appreciation Week, I would like to recognize all the teachers in my district. I have visited every school back home, and I feel fortunate to have the classrooms filled with passionate teachers who are committed to every student by addressing their needs and guaranteeing their academic success.

I would specifically like to recognize the 2011 Teacher of the Year recipients from the school districts in Anaheim and Santa Ana, California. Mr. Erick Rossman, Ms. Anne ''Mac'' Devine, Ms. Sylvia Immanuel, Ms. Michelle Majewski, Mr. John Lombardi, and Ms. Valencia Davis, thank you. Thank you for your passion and your outstanding success and work with our students.

DRILLING EQUALS AMERICAN JOBS

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

Mr. PALAZZO. I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in strong support of H.R. 1230.

As the Congressman from Mississippi's gulf coast, I have seen firsthand the damaging effect of the administration's decision to delay lease sales for offshore oil exploration. I also have worked offshore myself as a rigger, a roustabout, and a materials manager. I understand the positive economic impact offshore jobs have on the local and regional economies. By the administration's own admission, we have already seen 12,000 jobs lost with a direct salary impact of $500 million. To prevent these jobs from permanently being sent to other countries, we need firm timelines for considering permits to provide certainty to investors and employers.

I not only support the passage of the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act, but I urge the administration to undo their record of blocking and delaying energy production and to proceed with scheduled lease sales promptly. We must not continue to unnecessarily sideline a vibrant industry that is critical to our economic and national security.

BIG OIL

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

Ms. CHU. In my home county of Los Angeles, hardworking, middle class families are struggling every day to put gas in their cars so that they can get to work and take their children to school. But I did a double take recently when I saw that a gas station in my district had the highest price per gallon in the country—almost $5 a gallon.

What is the Republican response? They just released their budget. It gives more tax breaks to Big Oil. They don't want to reward you for working hard. They want to reward ExxonMobil which made $34 billion last year in pure profits, more money than any other company in the world.

You are stuck paying over $4 a gallon for gas and the Republicans also want you to pay $4 billion in tax breaks for Big Oil?

Stop the $4 billion Republican giveaway. Let's make smart investments that will lower gas prices and put Americans back to work. It is time to say ''no'' to the GOP, the Grand Oil Party.

GAS PRICES

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. I rise today to express the frustration of the good people of Missouri's Fourth District with our Nation's gas prices. As I traveled around the Fourth District last week speaking at eight town hall meetings, the one comment I heard everywhere I went was that gas prices are crippling our families and our businesses.

One over-the-road trucker that I visited with from El Dorado Springs told me that just a couple of years ago he would bring $1,000 in cash on the road with him for a week's worth of diesel, but now he has to come up with $2,500 in cash before climbing in the cab. This is extremely hard for someone just trying to make ends meet, and carrying so much cash is dangerous, too.

Every extra dollar in gas prices means one less dollar for a family's food, clothes, or spending time together at a ball game. For the average driver, the increased cost of gas since the President took office is nearly $1,100 a year.

We must stop the government from standing between its citizens and reasonable gas prices. This country has been blessed with some of the most abundant resources on the face of the Earth, but this administration has stood in the way of exploring and utilizing them at every turn. It's time for the President to get out of the way and let us get to work developing our own sources of energy.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE RECOVERY EFFORTS IN NORTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express appreciation for the good work on the part of local emergency responders, FEMA, the Division of Emergency Management, the American Red Cross, and the many other agencies that have been helping survivors in my congressional district recover from the devastating tornados that hit North Carolina on April 16.

I represent, Mr. Speaker, one of the hardest hit communities, Bertie County, where 12 people lost their lives, 50 were injured, and dozens are now homeless. I am grateful that President Barack Obama was very quick to announce that 19 counties were eligible for Federal disaster assistance, and the hard work toward recovery is now under way. More than 4,700 people in North Carolina have applied for State and Federal disaster assistance. We are a generous and resilient people, and I know we will recover.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in applauding the recovery efforts and in expressing deep sorrow for the victims and their families.

CONGRATULATING INDIANA ON ITS ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THEIR LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the State of Indiana, Governor of Indiana Mitch Daniels, and Indiana State Legislature's accomplishments this past session that just ended.

I believe it is important to reflect momentarily on the achievements made in Indiana to give promise and hope that the same can be done here in Washington. Something I'm particularly proud of is the fact that Governor Daniels and the legislature have passed the fourth straight gimmick-free balanced budget for the State of Indiana which will give Indiana a budget in the black 8 years running. We can do the same here in Congress.

This legislative session in Indiana has also produced real education reform that was passed to usher in real choice for students and parents. Governor Daniels led the charge for full funding for kindergarten, the Nation's most expansive voucher program, more charter schools, and rewarding our teachers based on their effectiveness. We can do the same here in Congress.

As we discuss tax reform and how to do it here in Washington, Indiana's already done it. They have done it by lowering corporate tax rates, lowering property taxes to give a great place for businesses to do work. We can do the same here in Congress.

As a former State legislator in Indiana under the Daniels administration, I rise today because, in the midst of despair and partisan bickering, I know we can do the same here in Congress. We must do better.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1229, PUTTING THE GULF OF MEXICO BACK TO WORK ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1230, RESTARTING AMERICAN OFFSHORE LEASING NOW ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 245 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 245

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1229) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to facilitate the safe and timely production of American energy resources from the Gulf of Mexico. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1230) to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain offshore oil and gas lease sales, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. In the engrossment of H.R. 1229, the Clerk shall—

(1) add the text of H.R. 1230, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 1229;

(2) conform the title of H.R. 1229 to reflect the addition of H.R. 1230, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(4) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

□ 0920

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 245 provides for the consideration of two very important bills, H.R. 1229, the Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act, and H.R. 1230, the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act, both under a structured rule. With many amendments, all of which are Democrat amendments having been made in order, this is a very fair rule.

I commend the sponsor of the two bills, the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, for his leadership in bringing both of these bills to the House.

H.R. 1229 is a bill that goes to the heart of the bureaucratic delays, which are preventing the approval of drilling permits within the Gulf of Mexico; and it modifies the standards and procedures governing Federal leases and permits in order to streamline the process, making the development of these domestic resources a reality instead of the status quo of paying lip service to drilling and then stifling drilling through bureaucratic inaction.

H.R. 1230 is a bill that would direct the sale of oil and gas leases within the Outer Continental Shelf, reversing a failed administration policy of canceling and delaying those processes.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 years, many Republicans have come to this floor and have sung the same refrain of ''show us the jobs.'' It was, indeed, a nice song and a catchy tune—so catchy that the minority of today seems to have been picking up on that kind of song as well. I don't expect to hear that today, or at least we ought not to hear it today, because the two bills before us under this rule are real bills that create real jobs for people.

Unlike the bills we have seen over the past couple of years which have led us to a situation where today there are twice as many workers in the government as there are in all of manufacturing in this Nation, which is an exact reverse of the situation this Nation was in in 1960, these are not going to be government jobs which attack the taxpayers and suck the money out of their wallets to fund them. These are going to be real jobs that grow the private sector, that expand the economy, that provide wealth, and that will provide, actually, millions of new government revenues coming into this country.

The situation we find ourselves in today with regard to energy is one that is detrimental to everybody. Everyone who goes to the pump to fill their cars recognizes the cost is increasing and will continue to increase. They recognize that the situation we are in puts all our jobs in jeopardy, and it is because of the inaction of this particular administration. The President has continually said that he wants to do action, to move forward, to develop American energy, but the actions of his administration have, quite frankly, failed to meet the rhetoric of the administration.

The problem has always been a fundamental flaw in our Nation's energy plan. Last May, the Deepwater Horizon accident occurred, which was a tragedy; and we must thank all of those who helped to solve that particular problem; but, unfortunately, the administration's response to that tragedy has turned it into a catastrophe and one which destroys jobs.

Immediately, a moratorium on all sorts of development was put into place. Prior to that moratorium being put into place, there were 52 approved and pending permits, and that moratorium was lifted in October; but of those 52, only 10 permits have been issued since that time. Two of them are new in deepwater and are eight of the 52 that were originally done. That means there are over 40 still approved and still stalled in what has become a de facto moratorium, caused by a foot-dragging of this administration that, what one columnist said, is moving at a glacial pace. More rigs have left our shore—12—to go to other places in the world where they are welcomed and where they are developing energy sources, where they don't have to face the red tape and the foot-dragging than have actually been approved by this administration.

A perfect example is Seahawk Drilling, a company that had over 500 jobs and 20 rigs that went into chapter 11 bankruptcy. The president of that company stated only one reason for that bankruptcy and that loss of jobs, which was the de facto moratorium of inaction done by this administration in this area in 2008 in a response to an arbitrary drilling ban that was lifted by both the President and Congress. It created a 5-year plan. Virginia was supposed to start the exploration process in 2011, but the Secretary of the Interior delayed that until 2012 and then later delayed all exploration on the Atlantic coast until after 2017.

In the Gulf of Mexico, two other sales were canceled and moved out from this year, which was when they were supposed to begin, once again into next year. It became so bad that a judge in New Orleans gave the administration 30 days to start moving on these projects, saying that what was happening by this administration was increasingly inexcusable and that not acting at all is not a lawful action.

The result of this has simply been catastrophic for jobs in America. The Obama administration has admitted in its official memorandum that, for those days of its official moratorium, 12,000 jobs were lost; but what is more significant is the de facto moratorium there. An LSU study simply said, if this were sustained for 18 months in the gulf area, there would be 24,532 jobs lost and in the Nation 36,137 jobs lost simply because of what we are not doing in the Gulf of Mexico.

It is very simple to understand how this works. Each platform that is out there drilling has 90 to 150 employees. If you add the production team as well as the exploration team, you can multiply that by a factor of four. So you have almost per every drilling up to 1,400 jobs that are tied to that particular project with $1,800 a week as the average wage.

That means for every one of those drills that is not put back into production, it is $5 million to $10 million per month per platform that is lost to this economy; and the ripple effect within the economy for our energy uses as well as jobs is, once again, staggering as this administration is, indeed, going at a glacial pace. In Virginia alone, 2,000 jobs will be estimated to be lost if the de facto moratorium that pushes everything to 2017 is allowed to take place.

Now, this action, or inaction, by the administration costs every American. It costs us at the gas pump as we see the cost of running our cars increasing almost daily, and this hurts the poor worse than anyone else. It is estimated that every American will pay $700 more this year for gasoline than least year. Obviously, those at the lower end of the economic scale are the ones who are hurt the most. For every cent that is increased in gas at the pump, that is $1 billion that is taken out of household incomes in this country; and it makes sure that Americans are then put at the mercy of foreign oil development and foreign energy sources, which may not necessarily like us, and sometimes they're just flat out bad guys.

It also has other areas in which it has affected everyone—once again, those at the lower end of the income scale the most. For every dime that diesel goes up, that is $400 million that is added to the agricultural industry, which is what we eat, which is tacked onto our food prices. You have to have oil for fertilizer. As that goes up, the cost of fertilizer goes up; the cost of running machinery goes up; the cost of food goes up; the cost of pharmaceuticals, plastics. If you go into the emergency room, everything that is not metal has some element of oil that developed it, and all of those are increasing.

Now, there are only two ways that we can handle this situation. First, you can go with the old concept of supply and demand and simply increase production, which is what these two bills are trying to do; or you can go to the approach that this administration seems to be asking us to do, which is to cut our standard of living, accept gasoline prices at the European level, and beg Saudi Arabia to be nice to us—to put our futures in the hands of OPEC and then amazingly say we can also solve these problems simply by taxing oil companies at a higher rate.

Since 2010, the domestic production of energy in this country has decreased 16 percent. In this year, next year and the year after that, we estimate, unless we make changes, that a quarter of a million barrels of oil will be decreased in our production rate in each of those years. The only area in which any energy production has been increasing is on private property. Unfortunately for this country, almost all of the energy that we have, most of the energy that we can develop, is on public lands, which is controlled by the government, which is doing nothing now to help develop that.

This is a time where pragmatism is much better than a failed ideology of restrictions. Now, what these two bills do is to simply reverse the job-killing delays that have been taking place. In H.R. 1229, it reforms the law to require leaseholders to receive permits to drill before they start drilling; and it will do it for the first time by law, not simply by a regulation. It demands that the Secretary of the Interior conduct and approve safety revenues, once again, for the first time in history.

More importantly, it ends the de facto moratorium by demanding prompt guidelines and action. It says that the Secretary of the Interior will have 30 days in which to deal with these issues and then can have up to two 15-day extensions—a total of 60 days to do the review.

Now, while that may seem to some as a quick path, it's not when you look at the history of what has been done. Before the moratorium went into effect, it was taking 5 to 15 days to do the drilling leases and permits.

□ 0930

One company was done in nine days just recently. What the problem is is that most of these are simply not being done simply because of inaction. It also says for those that were approved prior to the May 27 moratorium, you've got 30 days to get them going again. This is plenty of time to do the work.

It also does something else for the first time. It provides an expedited hearing process so that legal rights are not lost—they are protected—but you will not go back into a concept of a never-ending lawsuit moratorium.

In 1230, the bill recognizes that this year will be the first time since 1958 that we have a possibility of no offshore lease sales. And it wants to reverse that action to proceed promptly with the 5-year plan so that things, for example, in Virginia will be in effect within 1 year, and those that were scheduled in the gulf can be done within 1 year of the passage of this bill.

This bill simply will create billions in Federal Reserve revenues coming in, and it will create billions in our economy, and it will create jobs.

I hate to say this, but under President Obama, the cost of energy has skyrocketed. The administration has actively blocked and delayed energy production. It's cost jobs. It's raised energy prices. It's made the United States more reliant on unstable foreign countries for our energy. Through the American Energy Initiative, this House is actively working to increase American energy production to lower gas prices, to create American jobs, to generate revenue to help reduce the deficit, and to decrease our dependence on foreign energy.

The United States Government has had a long history of sporadic attempts to respond to oil and gas prices. Usually, we have missed the mark. But, unfortunately, oil is still the lifeblood of the world and will be for most of our lives. That is why 70 countries and 31 States in the United States are involved in the process. Prices are influenced by the signals that are given by worldwide circumstances and also by government policy.

These two bills are the first of several signals that this House wants to send to the world and to the economy that says our goal should be to come as close to economic and energy self-sufficiency and independence as possible. We are not an energy-poor Nation; and we need to be developing the resources in every way possible, including in the gulf, including in the Outer Continental Shelf, and including on our land sources. That is our future if we want to do anything to create jobs and help the American people. That is specifically what these two bills are aimed to do.

With such, Mr. Speaker, this is a good rule and a fair rule; and the underlying piece of legislation is entirely worthy of our support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, today the House considers the BP respill bills. That might not be what they are officially called, but it's a much more accurate title for this legislation. It's clear that the authors of these BP respill bills did not learn any lessons from the Deepwater Horizon disasters. These bills would make offshore drilling more dangerous for offshore workers, 11 of whom died on the Deepwater Horizon. These bills would make offshore drilling more dangerous for the environment, which was coated with 4.1 million barrels of oil along the Gulf Coast and is killing fish and wildlife in the area to this day as a result of BP's recklessness.

These bills would make offshore drilling more dangerous for our national security because they reinforce the complete myth that America can somehow drill our way out of dependence on oil. And these bills are more dangerous for the economy, risking destroying fishing and tourism jobs in affected areas.

But one thing these bills do not do is make filling up at the pump any more affordable at all for American families. According to the American Petroleum Institute itself, the main advocacy group for oil interests, even if we opened all Federal land to oil drilling, including offshore areas, including Alaska's wildlife refuge and all Federal land that is in the national parks, they can't even say that it would reduce gas prices or oil prices. In fact, the cheap oil analyst at the Oil Price Information Service, which calculates gas prices for AAA, the motorist organization, said: ''This drill, drill, drill thing is tired. It's a simplistic way of looking for a solution that doesn't exist.''

So if this legislation isn't about reducing the price at the pump, what is it about? It's about exploiting our legitimate concerns about high gas prices to deliver another huge giveaway to Big Oil, an industry that made over $35 billion in profits in the last quarter alone. Meanwhile, the majority refuses to end Big Oil's nearly $50 billion of special interest tax breaks.

Yesterday in the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN brought forth a bill that would have ended the giveaway of tax revenue to Big Oil. Unfortunately, the Republican majority chose not to allow that amendment in this rule.

Had that been allowed under the open rule that Mr. MCGOVERN proposed, I would have brought forth an amendment on the floor to use those $50 billion of revenue to reduce the corporate tax rate to help create jobs in America. Instead, the Republican majority is continuing to seek to keep American taxes high, to keep corporate taxes high, and this is another example of a job-destroying bill that keeps taxes high while picking winners and losers in the economy and using government subsidies to aid an industry that is one of our most profitable industries.

We should allow American businesses of all sizes to compete. The America corporate tax rate of 35 percent is higher than most of the rest of the world, which is why many companies continue to engage in operations overseas. If we can reduce it from 35 percent to 30 or 28 or 26 percent—and we could have done had Mr. MCGOVERN's amendment passed in the Rules Committee yesterday, and that is one of the reasons I oppose this rule today—that would create an enormous engine of economic growth.

While frequently the Republicans give lip service to lower taxes, they continue to use special interest tax breaks to keep taxes high on small- and middle-sized American companies that don't have the same lobbyists here in Washington to lobby us for special interest tax breaks.

We know that Big Oil would rather do without the fuss of showing that they can drill safely; but that's what this bill, in fact, delivers. This legislation states that the Interior Secretary must act on any drilling permit within 60 days, or it's automatically approved. What should be a very serious process to ensure safe drilling, to ensure that there aren't further disasters, and to ensure that jobs are not destroyed turns into little more than a rubber stamp, a rubber stamp for the further degradation of our economy and of our environment.

The second bill this rule makes in order claims to restart the process, or issuing, of oil and gas leases. Now, what the majority is doing in this is essentially validating what the administration has already done. The administration has already restarted offshore drilling in February. In fact, the administration has announced plans to offer all three Gulf of Mexico lease sales that are mandated in this bill this year or early next year. Again, this particular policy is one that I don't agree with fully with the administration, but I am glad to see that the Republican majority is validating President Obama's leadership on this energy issue.

Together, these bills will not relieve pain at the pump, but they will increase the chances of another Deepwater Horizon disaster, costing lives, livelihoods, and hurting some of our precious natural resources. Why? Because that's what Big Oil wants. If Big Oil wants to keep taxes high for American companies, if Big Oil wants to destroy jobs, then the Republican majority is giving them that. In fact, even the problem the majority purports to be addressing with these bills, the speed of permitting in the gulf and restarting offshore oil drilling, doesn't even exist.

Here are the facts: Following the temporary pause on deepwater drilling last year, what Secretary Salazar listed in October, the oil industry wasn't able to demonstrate that it possessed the capacity to contain a deepwater blowout until February 2011. Once oil companies demonstrated that they had the capability to contain a blowout, the first permit was issued 11 days later, February 28, 2011. There have now been a total of 10 deepwater drilling permits issued since that time. In addition, there have been 39 shallow water permits approved since last October, matching the number from before the spill. Let me repeat that: matching the number of permits from before the spill. If anything, the majority, by acting through this bill, is effectively congratulating the administration on its leadership for speedily approving permits.

In addition, in the gulf region, the number of jobs that depend on tourism and fishing is five times the number of jobs related to the oil and gas industry. Gulf jobs related to oil and gas and other resource extraction total about 154,000. The total number of jobs for tourism and fishing are 777,000 jobs. So with this bill, the majority is putting at risk those 777,000 jobs for the benefit of 154,000. We should not put them at risk just to make the permitting process easier for Big Oil to exploit.

□ 0940

Passage of these bills is not good for the gulf coast's economy or its ecology, although it is best for Big Oil.

Again, while I appreciate the Republican majority's efforts to validate the leadership of President Obama on energy issues, this rule could be a lot better. Rather than keeping corporate taxes high, we could help make America more competitive by reducing corporate taxes and helping make American businesses more competitive, including the critical tourism and fishing industries in the gulf coast.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, let me just make a couple of very quick points, if I could.

Once again, the purpose of these two bills is to start our process going towards Americans having adequate energy supplies to live their lives. And it's one of the things that you either increase production or you try to cut back. Our goal is to increase the production.

The idea that what we are doing is in some way making safety less significant is silly. There are new safety rules that have been in place. They are ready. They are prepared. They are ready to go forward.

The myth of subsidies to Big Oil is one of the things also that we need to talk about because even my fellow Democrats have admitted that the President's plan to push a tax hike on energy taxes does result in the loss of American jobs and higher taxes on independent oil and gas companies.

I love the fact that we always spin things by talking about Big Oil. But the nonpartisan Politifact.com noted that a majority of the U.S. oil production comes not from the biggest multinational oil companies but from independent firms. American production activities are dominated by these independent producers who drill 95 percent of the Nation's natural gas and oil wells, accounting for as much as 67 percent of the total U.S. natural gas and oil production.

Often we try to find some kind of straw man which to attack, and the idea of Big Oil is one of those easiest ones to do. But in reality, if those tax hikes were to go into place on production, you would not be hitting the Big Oil companies; you're going to be hitting small companies which have 100 or fewer employees, not only offshore, but on the shore as well. That is the attack.

I'm sorry. I am not validating President Obama's leadership on this issue. To me, leadership means you do something. Inaction is not leadership.

It's not the government picking winners and losers. What this administration is doing by the de facto moratorium, the inability to move forward on this issue is simply picking losers, losers in the field, losers for America, losers in jobs, and that is wrong.

This tries to get us going ahead in an area and in a way in which we can do it, we should do it, we have the capability of doing it. All we simply need to do is do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule because my constituents in the State of Rhode Island can no longer wait for action to reduce the price of gas at the pump, and this bill does nothing at all to address this issue today.

Just last week the price of gasoline shot up to more than $4 and, as we all know, this is an increasingly familiar story for States all across this Nation, hurting families and small businesses. And it really underscores what I heard from my own constituents, hundreds of men, women, and families all throughout Rhode Island in recent weeks. We have got to find immediate solutions to lower the price of gas.

But the legislation before us this morning calling for domestic drilling will not provide the short-term relief that's needed right now. At the same time, it will make drilling more dangerous for our environment, for our economy, and for our national security.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have refused to take up the recommendations of the independent commission convened after the Deepwater Horizon oil spill and instead, continue to fight to protect Big Oil and continue to fight to protect subsidies while the American people are struggling with higher gasoline prices.

We've got to find solutions to lower the cost of fuel now. We've got to find solutions and ways to end the $4 billion in tax breaks that pad the profits of Big Oil.

And the way to do that, Mr. Speaker, is to bring legislation already drafted, already introduced to the House floor for a vote immediately that would address the issue of the rising cost of gas. Legislation to release oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and legislation aimed at preventing Big Oil from engaging in price-gouging schemes which drive up the price of oil at the pump would go much further than anything that's in this bill and would help to ease the pain at the pump that American families are experiencing.

We need to do those two things. End the subsidies, and begin to address this urgent problem now. And stop taking measures that continue to advance the interests of Big Oil rather than the American people.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. For the moment I will reserve the balance of my time and enjoy the spin.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill. We all understand the desire to do something about high gas prices, and we all sympathize with families in this economy who are struggling with $4 a gallon gasoline.

But these bills will do nothing to provide American families with relief. They could threaten coastal ecosystems and the millions of Americans who rely on them.

It's been a year since we watched the horror in the gulf coast. We found that the agencies who oversee offshore drilling and the oil companies that engage in it were not prepared for the disaster. And Americans will be paying for that failure for years.

The administration has taken a number of steps to prevent future spills. Unfortunately, these bills undermine that process, making drilling less safe.

Instead of pretending as if one of these terrible environmental disasters never happened, Congress should implement the recommendations of the oil spill commission. We should be pursuing legislation that will reduce our dependence on oil by investing in things that give American commuters choices, in terms of more efficient vehicles, transportation alternatives, alternative fuels.

This bill, fortunately, will never be enacted into law. But I'm disappointed that the Rules Committee did not make in order any of the amendments to repeal unnecessary tax subsidies to the oil industry. At a time of record profits, it's adding insult to injury that billions of dollars are going to flow to the largest oil companies and make no difference to the consumer, no difference in the production of oil. It just adds to the bottom line of these international corporations.

I hope that at some point the House will be able to deal with these subsidies, which, even our Republican Speaker recently said, should be examined. And I've had legislation ready and ready to go for months now, and I hope it gets a chance to be voted on on this floor.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the subsidy issue, the simple fact of the matter is that the Republicans are not for free markets. But what they are for is Big Oil co-opting free markets. In fact, 70 percent of all energy-related subsidies go to fossil fuels like oil and coal. Less than 5 percent of subsidies go to renewable energies like wind and solar.

The gentleman from Utah pointed out that many of these subsidies help small drillers, and, in fact, that can be true. But it is easy to apply changes only to the Big Oil companies and not even affect independent producers.

There's simply no excuse not to end this corporate welfare which keeps taxes for all Americans who pay their taxes artificially high. In fact, at the same time that BP was reaping sizable tax benefits from leasing the Deepwater Horizon rig, it turned out that the company was using the tax break for the oil industry to write off 70 percent of the rent for Deepwater Horizon. That tax subsidy cost American taxpayers $225,000 a day since the lease for Deepwater Horizon began. And that's just one example of many.

I also want to address some misperceptions regarding President Obama's policies regarding oil resources. The Obama administration is allowing, on average, more drilling than the Bush administration did. In fact, the Obama administration approved more leases in 2010 than the Bush administration did in any year except one of his presidency.

Again, in moving forward and reissuing permits, which the administration has already begun to do, this bill helps validate President Obama's leadership on this issue.

The real issues at hand are the subsidies that the industry continues to receive. As long as we continue a policy of using taxpayer dollars to artificially pick winners and losers in the economy, the winner here being Big Oil, the loser being American taxpayers, we will continue to hurt energy security, destroy jobs, and continue to put our environment at risk.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0950

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman, Mr. BISHOP.

I am from Louisiana, and of course these leasing issues, the issues of drilling and oil production are very important to my State. And certainly any issue with regard to oil spills affects my State the most in the last year or so because of the Deepwater Horizon.

But here is the point I want to make: The President has said that oil production in the United States and offshore in the gulf is the highest it has ever been. When I asked Secretary Salazar in the Natural Resources Committee, he said the same thing. Then I asked Mr. Bromwich and he gave the same answer.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that the oil production off the Gulf of Mexico peaked at 1.7 million barrels a day. It is now down to 1.5 million barrels a day, and in the next year it will decrease by another 225,000 barrels a day. And even if we restore drilling permits at the level they have been previously, it will continue to decline over the next several years.

So I think we can ill afford, Mr. Speaker, at a time when our gas prices continue to go up, to continue this activity that we have, this ruse, where we have a slowatorium off the Gulf of Mexico.

I think we are up to about 12 permits in the deep water at this point. And I was speaking with the gentleman, an expert on this, yesterday. He said that we normally pace about 40 or 50 permits a year. So that means that we are at a fraction of what the actual permitting process would normally be in the best of times.

Now, some would say, well, we haven't proven that it is safe. Well, if that is true, why is the administration releasing permits? Obviously that is proof that the administration is comfortable that we can again drill in the deep water off the Gulf of Mexico.

So I say today that with America being at gas prices that will soon approach $5 a gallon and the USGS now saying that we now have more coal, natural gas, and oil than we have ever thought we would have, really more than any other country in the world, including Russia, and many more times than what Saudi Arabia has, 1.3 trillion barrels of oil equivalent if you add coal, natural gas, and oil, why in the world are we pulling back on the exploration and production of these vital resources that we have?

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman.

I will say in summary, I am from the Fourth District of Louisiana where we have a veritable Saudi Arabia of natural gas in my district, the most natural gas in North America and the fourth largest deposit in the world, and we didn't even know about it 4 years ago. That just goes to show you how new technologies in the area of exploration and development are creating many more resources than we ever thought we had, and it will help stabilize our prices.

So I ask that we pass this bill today and that we finally get this country back onto stable footing.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide that, immediately after the House adopts this rule, we will bring up H.R. 1689, the Big Oil Welfare Repeal Act of 2011.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. The nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation, in its analysis of the administration's budget, stated that the repeal of oil and gas preferences are ''likely to have no effect on the world price of fossil fuels, and any increase in prices for domestically consumed fossil fuels are likely to be attenuated.''

Again, when we talk about ending the giveaway to Big Oil and Gas, it will have no effect with regard to actual energy prices.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, the Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this very important issue, important in having an immediate impact on America's families.

They are feeling the pain at the pump. Our families, our workers, our small businesses, every day it gets worse for them, the price at the pump. So what can we do about it? Well, we can do a number of things, and we will, that we have been advocating for.

Of course we must increase domestic production, and there is a way to do that. But that is not all that we have to do. The American people understand that their tax dollars are going to subsidies for Big Oil. If we ended those subsidies, we could save over $30 billion for the American people.

To put it into context, my colleagues, for the first quarter of this year, the Big Five oil companies made profits of over $30 billion. Why are we, the taxpayers, subsidizing their drilling of oil when they are making huge profits, doing it in the free market?

President Obama has written to leaders in Congress asking to bring a bill to the floor to end these subsidies. I have written to Speaker BOEHNER asking him to do so. He has said the oil companies should pay their fair share. Mr. RYAN, the chair of the Budget Committee, has acknowledged that in his own district. And yet, in the budget that is proposed by the Republicans, Big Oil still gets a big subsidy from the taxpayer. It would mean a great deal to us, in a situation where we are saying to seniors, We are going to cut Medicare; you are going to have to pay $6,000 a year more, at a minimum, for fewer benefits because we want to cut Medicare at the same time we are giving tax cuts, big tax breaks to Big Oil.

So here we are today. Just last week, ExxonMobil reported $10.7 billion in profits during the first quarter of 2011. Over $10 billion in profits, a 69 percent jump from last year. In fact, this quarter marked some of the largest oil profits since 2008.

Democrats are introducing comprehensive legislation. Mr. TIM BISHOP is going to be leading us on the previous question, which we urge our colleagues to vote ''no'' on so that we can bring up Mr. BISHOP's legislation.

Much of what that does is to eliminate tax breaks for the five largest oil companies, saving over $31 billion over 10 years. Think of it. We are trying to just save $31 billion over 10 years, when the oil companies made $31 billion in profits in the first quarter of this year. That is so unfair to the taxpayer.

Legislation to ensure that oil companies are paying the royalties that are due the American taxpayer. Hold Big Oil and the industry accountable for price gouging at the pump. Use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to increase the oil supply and combat price hikes. In addition to that, we must end the harmful speculation which Wall Street tells us accounts for a large percentage of the increase in the price at the pump.

We also will have measures that increase American energy production. It is very important. We don't disagree that we have to have production, but we do agree that we have to do other things that have a more immediate effect on the price at the pump. And we can do that. And we must invest in our clean energy future, which will reduce our dependence on foreign oil, which is a national security issue, which will enable us to create new green jobs in our country, a jobs issue which is a moral obligation we have to the American people to create jobs.

But what the Republicans are proposing today has blinders on it. It does not recognize that what it is doing does nothing to reduce the price at the pump in the short term; that there are

many other avenues that we can proceed down in addition to increasing domestic production; and that the American people need something fresher and newer on this than being sabotaged every few years about the price at the pump while we, the taxpayers, are giving subsidies to Big Oil to drill while they are making profits in the first quarter of 1 year that are almost more than what we would save for the taxpayer.

□ 1000

They don't need a subsidy to drill. They don't need an incentive. They have the profit motive, and it has served them well.

We in this Congress have to be thinking about the future. How do we prevent this from happening again, but also how do we have the most immediate effect on the price at the pump? Congressman TIM BISHOP gives us that opportunity today, recognizing that we want to have the full diversity of energy possibilities available to us so that the American taxpayer and the American consumer are well-served.

So I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question, to allow Mr. TIM BISHOP to bring up an initiative that he will talk about that addresses concerns of the American people that they know about, that they want to end subsidies on Big Oil, especially when we are talking about it in the context of we must cut investments in Medicare, seniors must pay more, but don't ask us to cut subsidies to Big Oil.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), who lives in this area and understands the situation firsthand.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my colleague from Utah for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't disagree more with the comments that were made by the minority leader from California. What we are talking about here are high gas prices that people are paying at the pump today and why we are in this situation. We are in this situation because of this administration's policies that have shut off the American energy supply.

This is supply and demand. Why do prices go up? Well, gee-whiz, if the President of the United States says by policy we are going to close off billions of barrels of known reserves in America, what do you think that does to prices? Do you think that actually lowers prices? Of course, as you are seeing prices skyrocket at the pump, it is because of these policies. That is why we have seen the price of gasoline more than double since Barack Obama has been in office.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we are bringing today and what this rule addresses is the ability to start opening up some of those known areas here in America, because, again, our demand continues to increase for oil here in this country, and while the President is out tilting at windmills, the prices at the pump continue to skyrocket because the President is saying run those jobs off to foreign countries, like Brazil.

He is bragging that he wants to create more energy jobs in Brazil. We are saying, Mr. President, we have thousands of jobs here in America that we can create today. We have got billions of dollars that are being sent to foreign countries, many of whom don't like us, by the way. We can bring those dollars back. And, by the way, that can also help us pay down the national debt that is out of control right now. And that is what this bill addresses.

And what's their answer on the other side? The President is talking about raising taxes on American energy, and the minority leader from California just emphasized it. She talked about a $30 billion tax increase on American energy production. You want to talk about a warped policy? Look at what their plan is.

We're saying let's open up supply. Let's create jobs in America. I have seen it in south Louisiana. We have lost over 13,000 jobs in the energy industry just because of the President's policies in the last year, where he shut down production and said you can't go back to work drilling safely for known oil in America. But he wants to run those jobs off to foreign countries. So that is what is happening.

We saw one of the deepwater rigs go to Egypt just in the last few months. So an employer is saying, I want to take a thousand jobs and it's better to do business in Egypt because of these radical American policies on energy right now. So we are trying to turn that around and say let's actually explore for energy here in America, creating thousands more jobs in America and bringing in billions more dollars that pay down our deficit.

Their answer is raise $30 billion in taxes and, you know, go talk about Big Oil. Big Oil is not going to pay that. Big Oil is leaving. They are going to foreign countries. It is our local energy producers here in America who will pay that tax. And you know what that ends up equating to? That means higher prices at the pump, $30 billion in higher prices at the pump, because of their policy.

And they're bragging about it. They're saying, let's raise taxes on American energy. By the way, their bill doesn't apply to energy that is produced in Saudi Arabia. So what do you think is going to happen?

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SCALISE. Now more oil is going to be coming in from Saudi Arabia because of their policies.

We have got to reverse this radical approach and actually create jobs in America, create energy in America and bring down the skyrocketing price of gasoline at the pump, and it can all be accomplished with this legislation here today that I strongly support.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman very much.

The oil companies are making windfall profits right now. Look at what just happened in the last 3 months: ExxonMobil made $10 billion; Shell, $8 billion; BP, $7 billion; $6 billion for Chevron; $3 billion for Conoco. Yet the Republicans oppose allowing the Democrats to bring out here a motion that will take away tax breaks that are meant for companies that make toasters or aluminum foil, but not the oil industry.

The oil industry does not need a subsidy from the American taxpayer as they are tipping consumers upside down at the pump every single day. We need to take back those tax breaks and use them; use them to reduce the deficit, use them to help grandma with Medicare, use them for things that are important, but not for oil companies at this time.

So, what have the Republicans decided to do? The Republicans instead have decided to squeeze—to squeeze Medicare, to squeeze the program for grandma, so that they can find the revenues to give tax breaks for oil companies. I will tell you, the GOP has set up a legislative drill rig on top of the Medicare program to poke holes in our seniors' safety net. That is right, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are building a pipeline into the pocketbooks of our seniors so that they can pump them dry. No money for Medicare, but plenty of breaks for the oil companies. And they are going to deny the Democrats the ability to have a vote here on the House floor on those tax breaks for oil companies here today.

There is one thing that we can do in order to ensure that the speculators in the marketplace are told there is a cop on the beat, and that is to deploy the Strategic Petroleum Reserve right now. In 1991, Bush the First used it. The price went down 33 percent. In 2000, the President used the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, President Clinton. It went down 18 percent. Bush the Second used it in 2005 after Katrina. The price went down 9 percent. That is the weapon we can use right now, and send a message to Big Oil, to OPEC, and to the speculators that we mean business.

What the Republicans are saying here today is we are going to cut Medicare in order to have tax breaks for the wealthiest oil companies in the history of the world. That is not what the American people want to hear at this time of high energy prices in our country, with a dagger pointed right at the heart of the American economy, and that is what OPEC and the speculators and Big Oil are doing to our country.

Vote ''yes'' today on the previous question to give the American taxpayers the relief they need from these

gifts which we give to Big Oil. Vote ''no'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the previous question.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman, and I rise to ask in particular that we have a reasoned debate on this question.

I come from the gulf region and was appalled at the horror of the BP oil spill. My constituents are still suffering from that spill. I recognize that we have a dual responsibility, and that is to ensure that those individuals are made whole—and I might add that a better compensation system needs to be in place—but also that we restore jobs.

A civil discussion is what is needed. As an oil and gas lawyer and also a member of the Homeland Security Committee which addresses the question of our own safety and security, we have to find a way to restore offshore deepwater drilling in a safe and secure manner.

□ 1010

I am disappointed that the Rules Committee did not take an amendment that I offered that would have modified the processing procedures of H.R. 1229, to restart that leasing process to extend the time for the Department of the Interior to review safely and securely and to eliminate the deemed provision, though I am supporting the Holt amendment and, of course, the Moran amendment.

But, frankly, I think the issue is, energy at this time is multitasking, from nuclear energy to solar, to wind, to biofuels and fossil fuels (oil and gas). If we are in agreement with Brazil to do offshore deepwater drilling off the coast of Brazil, we need to restart that deepwater drilling here in the United States, safely and securely. As relates to the expanded lease sales, the question has to be whether States are prepared for that offshore drilling and whether or not we have secured the kind of technology that will allow us to do it safely and securely. I believe new containment processes are being put in place to help deepwater drilling to lower costs for the America people.

Energy companies have organized something called a containment group to develop that new technology. What I would say is that this discussion should not be captured by special interests where we try the ''get you'' politics for the Department of the Interior or ''get you'' politics for President Obama. This is the time to get the best politics for the American people, to bring down gasoline prices, invest in energy which includes deepwater drilling and oil and gas, and let's get going on helping the American people to boost energy resource and to create jobs.

I ask for a reasoned discussion on this important issue.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we heard from our friend from Massachusetts the allegation that we over here on this side of the aisle were squeezing Medicare. Good grief. Even now has the gentleman from Massachusetts not read the ObamaCare bill? It cuts $500 billion out of Medicare.

We heard from Minority Leader PELOSI that we have a moral obligation to create jobs. Then what this administration has done under her definition is immoral, because this administration has been killing jobs. We hear so much from the other side about the working poor. Coming from an area in Texas where we have lots of hardworking poor folks, that's who is being hurt by this administration's policies. When you shut off the jobs in the Gulf of Mexico, when you come out and say we're going to tax these American companies even more, we're going to take away their subsidies, they're called business deductions, the cost of drilling, the cost of doing business.

And who will be taxed? American companies. We will be putting further tariffs on, not foreign products but American companies. We drive ourselves more and more to foreign oil, and that's a mistake. Price controls is what President Carter did. He was going to show the energy companies, and as a result we had no gas, we ran out of gas, it was a disaster. Salazar has shut down leases that were let after a 7-year process that could have produced as many as a trillion barrels of oil.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GOHMERT. You could have an immediate effect if you would encourage your party's President to change course and start creating jobs. The energy industry would create a million jobs across the country if we opened up the OCS. We've heard the testimony a million jobs if ANWR is opened. A million jobs if the North Slope is opened.

What is more, we've also heard from people that know that a dollar out of four is most likely attributable to speculation. The speculators look at what we do. And we make it harder and harder to produce our own energy, the speculation keeps going up. You could turn around a dollar out of four overnight if we showed the world, we're going to use our own energy.

This country has been blessed with more natural resources when you put them all together, and this administration and the former majority has done more to put them off-limits. It's time to get back to what the former Speaker said was our moral obligation. You lower energy prices by using more of our own energy, you create jobs, and you bring down the price that is killing the working poor. And that's a moral obligation.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida, a former member of the Rules Committee, Ms. CASTOR.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my colleague from Colorado.

I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. In the State of Florida, we are still recovering from last year's BP oil blowout disaster. We're recovering economically and environmentally from the policies of the past that elevated oil company profits over safety.

To add insult to injury, every summer the price of gas goes up, and we see it in Florida because our economy is largely tied to tourism, and we see it and it pains us and consumers know that they are messing around with the American consumer. They understand that the Wall Street speculators are making a profit, maybe 20 percent in the price of gas, and that is not fair.

Why don't we start with a meaningful energy policy that addresses those speculators? Instead of continuing oil company giveaways, why don't we start with ending the taxpayer subsidies to the big oil companies? Just in the first quarter of this year, BP has made over $5 billion in profit. Exxon has made over $10 billion in profit. With the skyrocketing debt and deficit, why is it fair for the American taxpayer to be subsidizing the most profitable companies in the world? That is where we should begin this debate today, ending those oil company subsidies to bring down the price of gas and tackling the outrageous profits that go to the oil companies while the consumer is paying through the nose at the pump.

My Republican friends are on the wrong track when it comes to energy policy. We've got to prohibit Wall Street speculators from artificially inflating prices. We've got to adopt the oil spill commission's recommendations to make drilling safe before we charge ahead and open up new areas to drill. There are millions of acres to drill. Millions of acres. All we're asking is fairness and safety as they proceed in doing so so the American taxpayer will not have to pay any more.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY). He is a member of the Resources Committee that provides a great deal of insight from his personal background.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, what amazes me is that the gentlelady from Florida must have missed the AP report a couple of weeks ago when it said that Florida was getting ready to experience another oil crisis and it was in the fact that the price at the pump is going to impact tourism.

Tourism. That's what I hear here all the time. Our tourism jobs. Jobs that normally pay minimum wage. When in my State, oil and gas jobs pay much better than that.

If we want to get this economy rolling, we have to provide that economy

with affordable energy, not make-believe energy, not energy that comes in possibly 40 or 50 years from now. We need to apply affordable energy to this economy now. It will not get any better in this country until we give middle class Americans affordable energy, so that they can get to and from their job.

Repealing section 199 will endanger 600,000 barrels per day, 10 percent of our domestic production by 2017. Boy, that's really going to lower the price at the pump.

They're concerned about Medicare and Medicaid. Well, where do you think those profits to shareholders go? Do you know who those shareholders are? They're the American people. Do you know how many pension plans hold those shares of Exxon and Chevron in their portfolio?

Why are we picking those winners and losers? As a freshman, it's hard for me to understand how we continue in this town to reward failure and punish winners. It just amazes me.

□ 1020

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, one thing we do know is that our constituents are paying about $4 a gallon for gas. What they have to ask is: Where's all this money that they're paying going? Well, as you have seen, it's going in profits to the biggest oil companies. In fact, almost $30 billion went just in the last 3 months to the top three oil companies—about $11 billion to Exxon, about $9 billion to Shell, and over $7 billion to BP. Remember BP? And that's after they've taken $5 billion in subsidies from the taxpayer and as in the case of ExxonMobil paid zero corporate taxes.

Well, what are they doing with that profit? What they're doing is spending 90 percent of it on stock buy-backs so that, of course, the remaining stock outstanding becomes even more valuable, thus enabling their executives to become even wealthier, and to stock dividends for their shareholders. And the remaining 10 percent goes to oil and gas exploration and to TV advertising so they can convince the American public otherwise.

What this bill will do is to enable those who own oil company stock and run oil companies to grab up our last remaining oil reserves at a cost of $30 to $40 a barrel so that they can then sell it at $100 a barrel to make more profit. The motivation for this bill is more about scoring political points and currying favor with the oil and gas industry that the current House majority can't seem to coddle enough. And they're betting that the next oil spill disaster that this legislation could enable through a return to weaker regulation—weaker regulation than we had before the gulf oil spill disaster, will not occur on their watch. That oil spill disaster that spilled 200 million gallons into the Gulf Coast waters occurred at a time of even tougher regulation than this bill will create.

They are counting on the oil companies remembering and the consumers and taxpayers forgetting.

This bill should be defeated.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), the ranking member of the Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, this rule brings forward two bills that are the first of the majority party's ''amnesia acts,'' which ignore the safety and environmental concerns that were laid bare last spring and summer by the largest oil spill in United States waters. For the sponsors of this bill, it's as if the worst and most costly oil spill in history never happened. Last week, the Big Five oil companies reported $32 billion in profits. That's just for the first 3 months of this year. Yet the majority's solution is to protect the billions of dollars of tax breaks each year for these companies.

Just to give you an idea, Exxon pays an effective tax rate of 0.4 percent. I imagine every person in America would like to have a tax rate of essentially zero. Yet the majority's solution is to protect these tax breaks. Furthermore, they deem the environmental and safety regulations that existed before this accident in the gulf as satisfactory. And let's be clear: How much will these bills reduce gas prices for the American people? Zero dollars and zero cents.

Scientists, engineers, and our best energy analysts say we cannot drill our way to lower gas prices. This won't do it. Let's address the financial speculation that we've heard about—the real cause of high gasoline prices. Exxon, with those huge prices, what do they do? They buy back their stock.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. HOLT. These actions needlessly endanger the lives of offshore workers, imperil the resources and livelihoods of fishermen. This legislation is designed to give Big Oil more handouts. These companies are not being responsible citizens.

Vote ''no'' on the rule, vote ''yes'' on my amendment, vote ''no'' on the bills.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. I rise to oppose this rule.

Americans are feeling pain at the pump. Rising gasoline prices—and they're rising, folks—it's going to cost the average person another $800 per year at the rate of these increases. That wipes out the tax breaks that most Americans have just received, and it's going to hurt our economy, and it's hurting our national security. These oil companies are making increased profits as the money in our wallets flies right into the gas tanks.

Now is the time to consider a sensible energy policy and to strip subsidies from oil companies. It shocks every American taxpayer to know that they're required to fork over an additional $40 billion-plus over the next decade to give tax subsidies and giveaways to these enormously profitable companies. What are they doing with that money? They're taking up to 90 percent of that and buying their stocks back, increasing their own personal wealth.

So let's be clear. Oil companies don't need it. If you don't believe me, ask them. The former CEO of Shell oil says, ''With higher oil prices, the subsidies aren't necessary.''

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say they're for the all-of-the-above strategy when it comes to oil. Let's be clear. They support oil above all—above Medicare, above putting police on the streets, above increasing reading teachers, and above protecting our coastal communities.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), another great new member of the Resources Committee.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. This isn't about oil company profits. This is about supply and demand. We don't have the supply necessary to meet the energy needs in this country. But the American people know that we've got the resources here in this country, whether it's offshore, on the Outer Continental Shelf, or on Federal lands that have currently under this administration been taken off the table for energy production. Supply and demand drives the price. We are reliant on foreign sources of oil, and a foreign group known as OPEC determines the price of that oil they sell to us. We've got the resource in this country. This legislation will put the gulf back to work, meeting the energy needs for the American people.

I'm a small business owner. I doubt many people that serve in this body have ever run a business, met a payroll, and tried to meet their overhead. I can tell you what $4.85 a gallon in August of 2008 meant to my small business only running two trucks on the road. I can only imagine what the loggers, what the truckers, what the farmers, and the other industries in the Third Congressional District of South Carolina are feeling today with the experience of rising oil prices.

The gentlelady from Florida said that in the summer, prices go up. We're not in summer yet. Prices are going up because of supply and demand. We have the opportunity to meet our demand right here by harvesting American resources for our American energy needs.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining.

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

With regard to the last comment, it is the oil cartels that drive prices, not the normal functions of the market and supply and demand.

With regard to the oil subsidies, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity here today to see where the Republicans and the Democrats in the House stand on deficit reduction. Mr. Speaker, by defeating the previous question, we can and we will reduce the deficit by over $12.8 billion. We have the chance to have the discussion around the continuing resolution, around the budget, around deficit reduction. And here we have an opportunity, without impacting the price of oil, without impacting what consumers pay at the pump, to reduce the deficit by $12.8 billion by defeating the previous question. I think that's what the American people want to see.

The American people spoke out in the last election. Let's reduce the deficit. Let's work across the aisle to see what we can do to cut unnecessary government expenditures, to make those decisions to help make sure that we can leave something other than a legacy of debt to the next generation.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is an easy one. Let's defeat the previous question and reduce the deficit by $12.8 billion.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a document from the Treasury Department which states that the manufacturing deduction for oil and gas effectively provides a lower rate of tax with respect to a favored source of income. In fact, it distorts the market by encouraging more investment in the oil and gas industry than would occur under a neutral system.

Again, by returning to the free market, we are able to reduce the deficit by over $12.8 billion instead of having Big Government trying to pick winners and losers in the economy with regard to tax policy.

GENERAL EXPLANATIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S FISCAL YEAR 2012 REVENUE PROPOSALS—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, FEBRUARY 2011

REPEAL DOMESTIC MANUFACTURING DEDUCTION FOR OIL AND NATURAL GAS COMPANIES

CURRENT LAW

A deduction is allowed with respect to income attributable to domestic production activities (the manufacturing deduction). For taxable years beginning after 2009, the manufacturing deduction is generally equal to 9 percent of the lesser of qualified production activities income for the taxable year or taxable income for the taxable year, limited to 50 percent of the W–2 wages of the taxpayer for the taxable year. The deduction for income from oil and gas production activities is computed at a 6 percent rate.

Qualified production activities income is generally calculated as a taxpayer's domestic production gross receipts (i.e., the gross receipts derived from any lease, rental, license, sale, exchange, or other disposition of qualifying production property manufactured, produced, grown, or extracted by the taxpayer in whole or significant part within the United States; any qualified film produced by the taxpayer; or electricity, natural gas, or potable water produced by the taxpayer in the United States) minus the cost of goods sold and other expenses, losses, or deductions attributable to such receipts.

The manufacturing deduction generally is available to all taxpayers that generate qualified production activities income, which under current law includes income from the sale, exchange or disposition of oil, natural gas or primary products thereof produced in the United States.

REASONS FOR CHANGE

The President agreed at the G–20 Summit in Pittsburgh to phase out subsidies for fossil fuels so that the United States can transition to a 21st-century energy economy. The manufacturing deduction for oil and gas effectively provides a lower rate of tax with respect to a favored source of income. The lower rate of tax, like other oil and gas preferences the Administration proposes to repeal, distorts markets by encouraging more investment in the oil and gas industry than would occur under a neutral system. This market distortion is detrimental to long-term energy security and is also inconsistent with the Administration's policy of supporting a clean energy economy, reducing our reliance on oil, and cutting carbon pollution. Moreover, the tax subsidy for oil and gas must ultimately be financed with taxes that result in underinvestment in other, potentially more productive, areas of the economy.

PROPOSAL

The proposal would retain the overall manufacturing deduction, but exclude from the definition of domestic production gross receipts all gross receipts derived from the sale, exchange or other disposition of oil, natural gas or a primary product thereof for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011. There is a parallel proposal to repeal the domestic manufacturing deduction for coal and other hard mineral fossil fuels.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to submit for the RECORD a July 3, 2010, New York Times article regarding oil subsidies.

Again, this talks of the oil subsidies that continue to benefit this industry to the detriment of the American taxpayer and to the detriment of future generations of Americans who will continue to suffer under an increasing mountain of debt unless we defeat the previous question here today.

[From NY Times, July 3, 2010]

ON SUBSIDIES

But an examination of the American tax code indicates that oil production is among the most heavily subsidized businesses, with tax breaks available at virtually every stage of the exploration and extraction process.

According to the most recent study by the Congressional Budget Office, capital investments like oil field leases and drilling equipment are taxed at an effective rate of 9 percent, significantly lower than the overall rate of 25 percent for businesses in general and lower than virtually any other industry.

And for many small and midsize oil companies, the tax on capital investments is so low that it is more than eliminated by various credits. These companies' returns on those investments are often higher after taxes than before.

Efforts to curtail the tax breaks are likely to face fierce opposition in Congress; the oil and natural gas industry has spent $340 million on lobbyists since 2008, according to the nonpartisan Center for Responsive Politics, which monitors political spending.

Some of the tax breaks date back nearly a century, when they were intended to encourage exploration in an era of rudimentary technology, when costly investments frequently produced only dry holes. Because of one lingering provision from the Tariff Act of 1913, many small and midsize oil companies based in the United States can claim deductions for the lost value of tapped oil fields far beyond the amount the companies actually paid for the oil rights.

Other tax breaks were born of international politics. In an attempt to deter Soviet influence in the Middle East in the 1950s, the State Department backed a Saudi Arabian accounting maneuver that reclassified the royalties charged by foreign governments to American oil drillers. Saudi Arabia and others began to treat some of the royalties as taxes, which entitled the companies to subtract those payments from their American tax bills. Despite repeated attempts to forbid this accounting practice, companies continue to deduct the payments. The Treasury Department estimates that it will cost $8.2 billion over the next decade.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year after the national tragedy of Deepwater Horizon, the majority party has decided not to address a single problem that led to this economic and environmental tragedy. Instead, the majority is pushing through these bills, simply rubber-stamping offshore drilling and maintaining taxpayer subsidies and giveaways to Big Oil, which increase the deficit.

During a Special Order speech just the other night, a Member on the other side of the aisle said all you need is an eighth grade understanding of supply and demand to understand why gas prices are high and how we can lower them by drilling more. Fortunately, for those of us who have more than an eighth grade education, like economists and other experts, we know that America cannot drill its way out of high gas prices. Even the American Petroleum Institute, the mouthpiece for Big Oil, is saying that we cannot drill our way out. ''Drill, Baby, Drill'' may look good as a bumper sticker, but it's not a serious energy policy.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the bill and to defeat the previous question so we can reduce the deficit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the minority is asking us to walk down a tangent issue by using negative cue words like ''subsidy,'' so let me walk down that for 30 seconds.

Please realize the U.S. oil and natural gas industry does not receive subsidized payments from the government. The word ''subsidy'' is inaccurate. Tax deductions should in no way be confused with the concept of subsidies. There are, though, tax deductions that go to all industries. Section 199, which has been talked about by the Democrats, is the domestic manufacturers'

deduction. Every industry—manufacturing, producing, growing, extracting—gets a 9 percent of earned income deduction, not a credit, except for oil and gas; but they are limited to just 6 percent. There is similarity.

They've also asked us to try and walk down a tangent in talking about safety, but the ideas of safety are codified in the legislation before us. They then say let's increase our production by raising taxes. What a non sequitur. Even if you raise taxes against somebody else and try to create some kind of straw man to attack, that is simply a non sequitur, because we do not have a tax problem in this country. We have a production problem; we have a jobs problem. These two bills go directly to that problem. They increase production and increase jobs.

We are not trying to pick winners and losers. We want the Americans to be winners, and that's what our choice is to be. These are two good bills in a time of $4 and $5 gasoline prices that are devastating jobs and our economy. These bills surely should be something that every Member should support.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1229 and H.R. 1230.

We like to stand on this floor and talk about the things we can't agree on.

On this issue, there's more common ground than you might think.

We all seek to end our dependence on foreign oil because it endangers our environment, hurts our economy and weakens our national security.

Our disagreement lies in potential solutions.

In order to lower gas prices we can and must crack down on oil speculators, end big oil handouts, invest in public transit and electric vehicles and increase corporate average fuel economy standards.

The other side of the argument, the one that is presented today and that we will be voting on, would have you believe that all we need to do is increase our domestic oil resources and remove regulations.

Regulations that have purportedly forced us to look outside our nation's borders for oil.

Our answers do not lie in more oil—our answers lie in conservation and smart investments.

They do not lie in increasing our oil supply, because, let's face it, oil prices are based on a global market, and one nod from OPEC would make any increase in U.S. domestic supplies irrelevant.

Our answers cannot be found by damaging the ecosystems the industries along our coast rely on.

And, our answers will not be solutions that defy our military experts who are saying oil ain't the answer.

Earlier this week, I offered an amendment that was not made in order by the Rules Committee—an amendment that said we must look at the damage we could incur before we extract oil and gas.

This same common sense must be applied to our energy plan.

We can proactively move our nation toward reducing our dependence on foreign oil so that we take control of our energy future, protect our nation, our economy and our environment—and we must.

But, these are not our solutions.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills, H.R. 1229 and H.R. 1230.

Mr. Speaker, these bills aren't serious solutions to bring down high gas prices.

Instead, these are nothing more than a political exercise meant to keep the big oil companies happy.

Big oil companies have every reason to be happy these days.

Last week, ExxonMobil announced first-quarter profits of nearly $10.7 billion.

Let me repeat that—$10.7 billion. That's a 69% increase over the same three month period last year.

American taxpayers are paying nearly $4 dollars a gallon for gasoline and we're still giving $4 billion in subsidies to Big Oil?

Give me a break.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment—as a standalone bill—that would eliminate subsidies for big oil. My amendment would have done nothing to prevent these drilling bills from moving forward.

Ending subsidies for corporations that are making money hand over fist while gouging Americans shouldn't be controversial.

Apparently, my Republican colleagues on the Rules Committee didn't see it the same way. My amendment wasn't made in order.

Instead, here we are today debating legislation that would boost Big Oil's profits even more without doing anything to lower gas prices for American families.

More drilling won't lower gas prices. It's that simple.

Even with an expedited permitting approval process—that ignores any environmental impact assessment—we wouldn't see any of this additional supply in the market for years.

And the notion that we've run out of areas to drill because we've exhausted all current offshore drilling sites is ludicrous.

Oil companies currently have access to nearly 80 million acres to drill for oil, including 38 million acres offshore. But they produce oil on only 4 percent of those acres.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues are so fond of saying these days that people should be able to pull themselves up by their bootstraps.

I wish they would apply that same "tough love" to the record profit-making oil companies at a time when American families are being gouged at the pump.

I oppose this Rule and the underlying bills and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 245 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1689) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow the deduction for income attributable to domestic production activities with respect to oil and gas activities of major integrated oil companies. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 4 of this resolution.

The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he

then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adopting the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 171, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

YEAS—241

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
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
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
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
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
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
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
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)
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—171

Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
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
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman
Bilbray
Cantor
Clyburn
Crowley
Emerson
Engel
Giffords
Gonzalez
Johnson, Sam
King (NY)
Meeks
Nadler
Olver
Pascrell
Rangel
Reichert
Rothman (NJ)
Van Hollen
Weiner

□ 1059

Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. HAYWORTH and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 293, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 167, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—245

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
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
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
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
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer

Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
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
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
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
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)

NOES—167

Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
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
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman
Bilbray
Cantor
Clyburn
Crowley
Emerson
Engel
Giffords
Gonzalez
Johnson, Sam
King (NY)
Meeks
Nadler
Olver
Pascrell
Rangel
Reichert
Rothman (NJ)
Van Hollen
Weiner

□ 1106

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 294, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1230.

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

There was no objection.

RESTARTING AMERICAN OFFSHORE LEASING NOW ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCALISE). Pursuant to House Resolution 245 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1230.

□ 1106

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1230) to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain offshore oil and gas lease sales, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the national average price of gasoline has gone up 10 cents in just the last week, and is now about 1½ cents nationally from $4 a gallon. By comparison, the price was $1.84 a gallon when President Obama was sworn into office.

In my home district in Central Washington last week, I heard from farmers, the foundation of our region's economy, who are finding it harder and harder to pay these high energy prices. And I have no doubt that my colleagues from other parts of the country have heard similar stories from their constituents.

The pain being felt today has been exacerbated by the actions of this administration, this administration which, for the past 2 years, has repeatedly blocked, hindered, and raised the cost to access to our American energy resources.

The House Natural Resources Committee recently passed three bills, H.R. 1229, 1230, and 1231, with bipartisan support, all of which reverse specific actions taken by the Obama administration to block offshore energy production. These bills will increase American energy production. They will create jobs, and they will lower energy prices. These are the first of an array of bills that will be introduced by our committee as part of the American energy initiative that will focus on expanding renewable energy, onshore production, hydropower, coal, critical minerals, and address offshore drilling revenue sharing and other needed reforms.

Today we are debating H.R. 1230, the Restarting America Offshore Leasing Now Act. This bill requires the Secretary of the Interior to conduct oil and natural gas lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico and offshore Virginia that have been delayed or canceled by this administration.

□ 1110

The Virginia lease sale, for example, was scheduled to happen this year; but due to the Obama administration actions, the earliest this lease sale could occur is now 2017.

This bill will create thousands of jobs and, according to CBO, it will generate $40 million in new revenue to the Federal Government over the next 10 years.

I will note that very soon after this bill passed out of committee, with bipartisan support, the Obama administration announced that it would move forward on one gulf lease sale. Prior to this sudden action, the Obama administration was on course to make 2011 the first year since 1958 that the Federal Government would not have held an offshore lease sale.

Squeezing one conveniently timed offshore lease sale does not undo the Obama administration's long track record of blocking and delaying American energy production. This bill that we are considering today is necessary to hold their feet to the fire and to ensure that these lease sales move forward.

Americans instinctively understand the pain inflicted by rising gasoline prices, but yet we continue to hear the same excuses on why we shouldn't act. And let me give you several examples.

My colleagues across the aisle will say that expanding drilling will do nothing to lower gasoline prices. The truth is, and this is the important part, it will send a strong signal to the world markets that the U.S. is serious about

producing our own resources and bringing more production, American production, online. Furthermore, this argument has been used by opponents to American energy production for decades. We can no longer delay and prevent access to our own American resources.

My colleagues will also propose increasing taxes on American energy production. Let me repeat that, Mr. Chairman. They will also propose increasing taxes on American energy production. I have to ask: When has raising taxes lowered the price of anything? And of course the answer to that is never. And it won't happen with energy. Whether it is taxing American energy producers or imposing a cap-and-trade national energy tax, the Democrats' plan will only further increase the price at the pump and ultimately cost jobs.

We are also likely to hear my colleagues reiterate the old ''use it or lose it'' myth, claiming that there are thousands of acres of nonproducing leases. Mr. Chairman, in reality, ''use it or lose it'' is already the law of the land. The moment a company pays for and receives a lease, the clock starts ticking. Leases have a time line. If action doesn't occur on that lease, the lease is lost, according to the lease.

In addition, and this is important, too, only about one-third of the leases contain oil or natural gas. Sometimes we think we are very powerful, but one thing we can't do is mandate production where there is no oil or natural gas.

And, finally, my colleagues will undoubtedly attempt to claim that these bills ignore the need to ensure safety in offshore drilling. Nobody has forgotten the tragic Deepwater Horizon accident. And I hear that especially from Members of the gulf, and, Mr. Chairman, I heard that when I was down at the gulf at a hearing only 2 weeks ago. However, we must not forget the fact of the economic threat that high gasoline prices have to our economy and our need to move forward.

The administration has slowly started to issue deepwater permits in the Gulf of Mexico, which is in direct recognition, by the way, that it can be done safely and responsibly or they wouldn't have done it. Yet my colleagues act as if nothing has changed at all as far as safety reforms. But by doing so, they are completely ignoring reality and the actions of their own party's administration.

They are ignoring the facts that regulations have been enhanced and strengthened; that standards have increased; and that new technologies have been developed, tested, and deployed. And, I might add, Mr. Chairman, we heard this at the hearing that I alluded to a moment ago in Houma, Louisiana, 2 weeks ago.

Furthermore, H.R. 1229, which we will debate next week, improves safety by making two reforms to current law. Number one, it requires that the Secretary issue a permit to drill; and, two, requires that the Secretary conduct safety reviews. Neither of those provisions are in current law today.

In 2008, the last time gasoline prices reached $4 a gallon, Congress stepped up to the challenge and took bold action to end a decades-long ban on new offshore drilling. Although this administration has effectively reimposed that ban, the American people are once again calling on Congress to act. By passing H.R. 1230 today, Congress can show the American people that we have heard their concerns and that we are taking actions.

So I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill that will create American jobs, lower gasoline prices, and strengthen energy independence.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

One year ago today, we were 2 weeks into the BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. We were 2 weeks into what would ultimately become the worst environmental disaster in our Nation's history, with more than 4 million barrels of oil spilling into the Gulf. And since that disaster, we have learned many things about the safety of offshore drilling.

We learned that the blowout preventer that the oil industry touted as fail-safe could in fact be sure to fail if an actual blowout was under way. We learned that the only technology the oil industry had been relying upon in the event of a spill was a Xerox machine. The spill response plans for major companies were so similar that they contained plans to evacuate walruses from the Gulf of Mexico even though the walruses had not called the Gulf home in more than 3 million years. And they were such dead ringers for each other that they contained the same name and phone number of the same long-deceased expert.

We learned that the oil companies had neither the resources nor the ability to stop a deepwater blowout. BP spill response included an attempt to shoot golf balls and bits of rubber into the well. When we were told that the industry was relying on the most sophisticated technologies, we assumed that they meant technologies developed by MIT and not the PGA.

And we learned from an independent BP spill commission that the root causes of the Deepwater Horizon disaster were ''systemic'' to the entire oil and gas industry.

And yet here we are debating legislation that would do nothing to improve the safety of offshore drilling and could actually make drilling less safe. The legislation before us represents a return to the pre-spill mentality of speed over safety.

H.R. 1230 would force the Interior Department to rush to hold new lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico by ''deeming'' the shoddy environmental analysis conducted by the Bush administration's Mineral Management Service before the BP spill as sufficient for future lease sales in the Gulf.

Just looking at some of the conclusions contained within the Bush administration's 2007 environmental analysis exposes the absurdity of deeming this work as sufficient for new leasing in the wake of the Deepwater Horizon disaster.

In its 2007 multisale Environmental Impact Statement completed in April of 2007, the Interior Department determined, ''The most likely size of an offshore spill greater than or equal to 1,000 barrels that is predicted to occur is 4,600 barrels'' of oil. The BP Deepwater Horizon disaster led to more than 4 million barrels spilling into the Gulf. That is 1,000 times the size of the largest spill this analysis concluded was likely to occur.

In 2007, MMS analysis concluded that the total volume of oil that would be spilled from all spills in the central and western Gulf over the next 40 years would be roughly 47,000 barrels of oil. That is less than what was spilled in the Deepwater Horizon in 1 day.

MMS concluded that, in 2007, a worst-case scenario, only 19 to 31 miles of Gulf coastline would be impacted by a spill. The Deepwater Horizon disaster resulted in oil reaching over 950 miles of Gulf coastline.

□ 1120

And MMS determined that a deepwater blow-off would not present a cleanup problem because the oil would rise in the water column, surfacing almost directly over the source location, but in fact the oil spewing from the ocean floor remained in enormous subsurface plumes that spread across the Gulf.

The Obama administration is already moving forward to hold these lease sales in the Gulf later this year and early next year, and they are going to be more responsible. Even the Congressional Budget Office analysis of H.R. 1230 concludes, ''CBO estimates that implementing the bill would have no significant impact on proceeds from lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico because the proposed schedule is similar to the plan included in the DOI's budget for 2011.''

So, really, all the majority is accomplishing with this legislation is ensuring that we don't do any new environmental review of the impacts of these lease sales. Instead of actually reviewing the lessons of the BP spill, the majority wants to lessen the environmental review.

In addition, this legislation would force the Department to move forward with a lease off of the coast of Virginia within one year. Well, I have very bad news for the majority. The overwhelming majority of the area that would comprise this lease sale would infringe on critical training areas for the U.S. Navy. The Department of Defense concluded that 78 percent of the area offered in the Virginia lease sale would occur where military operations would be impeded by drilling structures and related activities. Moreover,

much of the remaining area is comprised of a major shipping channel.

This bill is really a solution in search of a problem. The bottom line is that oil production is at its highest level in nearly a decade and natural gas production is at record levels. We should instead be debating legislation that would protect the lives and the livelihoods of the people in the Gulf and that could actually help consumers at the pump this summer.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the chairman in a colloquy.

Chairman HASTINGS, as you know, I am committed to ensuring that revenue-sharing of the benefits of OCS development are returned to those coastal States where drilling is occurring or may occur, like Virginia. Can you share with me and other Members of this body whether this will be addressed by the committee?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The answer is that it will absolutely be a focus and a priority. When I first introduced the bill before us today, I stated that these are only the first steps in this Congress' efforts to increase American energy production.

The committee will continue to move forward on an array of bills that will be introduced in advance as part of the American Energy Initiative. Coming soon will be bills focused on expanding renewable energy, offshore production, onshore production, hydropower, coal, critical minerals and revenue sharing.

Today, only a few select States receive revenue sharing from OCS activities. This committee will be working to reform OCS revenues to ensure that there is a fair treatment to all States that produce oil and gas in the OCS. Revenue sharing will be a priority, and action will be forthcoming.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the chairman for his comments. I commend him for this legislation, and I support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. At this time, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Most Americans understand the concept of supply and demand, and in fact a third of oil now comes from the gulf. The Department of Energy's information agency tells us that last year's production in the gulf was 20 percent less than projected in 2007, and in 2012 we are going to be getting a half a million barrels a day decline in production from 2010.

What happens when the production goes down and the demand goes up? The price goes up—way up. Add to that the uncertainty and the unrest in the Middle East, and there is no surprise that we have gas prices at $4 and $5 now in this country, and who knows where they are headed.

This legislation, if we pass it today and get it enacted, helps turn the key to unlocking the door on domestic energy production. This legislation is not about new lease sales. It is simply catches up with the leases already approved.

Let's pass it.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1230.

This is the first in the Republican ''amnesia acts'' that ignore what happened last year in the Gulf of Mexico. It would force the Department of Interior to rush into holding new lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico and off the coast of Virginia, not far from New Jersey, I might add, even though Congress has not enacted a single piece of legislation to improve the safety of offshore drilling.

The President's spill commission reported that offshore drilling in U.S. waters is four times more deadly than drilling elsewhere in the world, even for the same companies. Clearly there is a safety problem that must be addressed.

And I must emphasize, because they have talked about it again and again, they are talking about high oil prices, high prices at the pump. We feel it. Everybody in America feels it. Do they address it? No, they do not address gasoline prices. It actually accelerates handouts to Big Oil, this legislation does.

In addition to being silent on safety concerns, this prohibits any further environmental review in the gulf based on the lessons learned from the Deepwater Horizon last year. That tragedy exposed the woefully inadequate ways in which the environmental reviews had been done in the Gulf of Mexico.

Need I remind the Speaker or the majority that there are no walruses to protect in the Gulf of Mexico? As you heard from Mr. MARKEY, that is the level of quality in the environmental review that they want to apply from here on out. The analysis assumed that blowout preventers were capable of preventing blowouts. We know now, we have learned, they are not. The post-spill investigations have clearly demonstrated that the assumptions of the environmental review are not sufficient. I will offer an amendment shortly to drop the language that would deem this environmental review to be adequate.

Despite the poor safety and environmental record accumulated in the gulf, H.R. 1230 recklessly puts the Atlantic coast at risk.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. HOLT. H.R. 1230 recklessly puts the Atlantic coast at risk of experiencing an oil spill such as what we have seen before. That is why I call this an ''amnesia act.'' There are two more bills we will be seeing here on the floor that are similar.

This is not in the interest of the U.S. consumer, it is not in the interest of fishermen, it is not in the interest of coastal residents. This is not in the interest of America.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with this legislation.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This bill is the first step for Republicans to bring a new energy policy to this country, the American Energy Initiative. Look at this chart. It says it all. Under Barack Obama and his regulators, the average price of gasoline in this country has gone up from $1.84 a gallon when he took office to just under $4. Under his watch, gasoline has more than doubled. We need more supply, and everyone agrees it should be our own energy, not foreign. Under the law of supply and demand, which my friends across the aisle have not found a way to repeal, more supply means lower prices, in addition to thousands of more jobs for Americans and billions of revenue dollars for the Treasury.

H.R. 1230 requires that four promising lease sale areas, three in the gulf and one off Virginia, must be opened up for production. No more stonewalling by this administration and extreme environmentalists. After this bill came out of my committee and the full Natural Resources Committee, this administration belatedly said it would start action on one of these four lease areas. If the only way we can get action is to shame them into it, Republicans will do so. If the administration still refuses, we will do our best to force action by changing the law.

This bill is the first step to get gasoline prices down. The American people deserve no less.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. We are headed toward $4.25, $4.50 a gallon by Memorial Day, the usual oil company run-up when the driving season starts, crushing the dreams of American families, small businesses, and our economic recovery. But, hey, the profits are up. It's good.

□ 1130

Republicans say, It's just supply and demand. It's simple. So if we add a small increment to future domestic supply, 5 or 10 years from now, that will bring down the price.

No, it won't. Remember, it's a world price commodity. In fact, supply is up. The U.S. has 12.6 million more barrels in storage than the 5-year average. Demand is down. Americans can't afford the price and the economy is depressed. Libyan lost production has been made up by the Saudis. Every gallon of that has been made up.

So what is really going on? Well, it's market manipulation, price gouging, profiteering and speculation. But the Republicans won't take on their benefactors from Big Oil and Wall Street. Even Goldman Sachs says that $20 a barrel is excessive speculation. Twenty dollars a barrel. That's 60 cents a gallon. We could stop that tomorrow. Put a tax on speculators. Or encourage the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to regulate what you're trying to block. But you're not going to do that because, hey, that would upset the speculators on Wall Street who are making a fortune.

On the NYMEX Exchange, 45 percent of the trades in one day were driven by computers. They traded twice the world's daily oil consumption, by computer, in one day, driving up the price, and the Republicans say, Oh, it's supply and demand.

It's not supply and demand. It's market manipulation. It's price gouging. It's speculation. Do something about it. Those tools are before us.

Yeah, if you want to have a debate about future domestic supply from natural gas or offshore drilling or biodiesel or whatever, let's have that debate. If you want to get people relief this year, save our economic recovery, save American families, then take on Wall Street, take on Big Oil, take on the speculators. Or I guess you're afraid they won't contribute to your next campaign.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, fortunately the vast majority of the American people and the majority of this House recognize that it is long past time to put American energy independence and prosperity first.

By opening up these resources, we assure energy abundance for the next generation. We begin to arrest the ruinous increase in prices at the pump. We assure productive, high-paying jobs, not only for the thousands of American workers directly employed in the industry but for many times more the employees in support and spin-off jobs. We assure billions of dollars of oil royalties paid directly into this Nation's Treasury at a time when the Treasury is empty. We assure that our growing reliance on foreign sources is reversed.

To those who are clamoring for more tax revenues, this is the healthy way to get them, by removing the impediments that have prevented a prosperous and expanding economy. It is prosperity and prosperity alone that creates tax revenues.

With this measure, we begin to change the policies that have produced the pathetic and self-inflicted spectacle of the most energy rich nation in the world importing most of its energy.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Well, we certainly know that our constituents are paying too much at the pump, but we also know where that money's going. Almost $30 billion, just in the last 3 months, went to the top three oil companies, Exxon, Shell and BP. Remember BP? Over $7 billion just this quarter in profit, not revenue, pure profit. And that's after the American taxpayer, which we say we're so concerned about, shelled out $5 billion in subsidies to the oil and gas companies. That's profit of more than $100 billion on an annual basis. That's where the money's going.

And within that profit, not revenue, profit, we're talking about, what do they do with it? Ninety percent of it is used for stock buybacks and dividends to enrich the executives and the shareholders and to spend on TV advertising to convince the American public they're spending on just the opposite. Ten percent is going for drilling exploration.

Now what this legislation would do is to bring us back to a period of even weaker regulation than we had before the gulf oil spill. Imagine, it just happened, 200 million gallons of oil spilled into the Gulf Coast waters, and now we want to make the governing regulations weaker than they were before the spill. And then we want to open up the area off the shore of Virginia where thousands and thousands of jobs are dependent upon the naval operations that take place in those waters which would not be able to be conducted if we go ahead and drill in these waters. Plus much of the remaining 22 percent is devoted to shipping lanes for two of our busiest commercial ports, Hampton Roads and Baltimore. Do we really want to jeopardize those thousands of jobs, not to mention the thousands of jobs in fishing and tourism in places like Virginia Beach?

We should be about creating jobs, not jeopardizing jobs and protecting our environment, not despoiling it. Defeat this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would just note that the two Democrat Senators from Virginia and the Governor of this State are in favor of this legislation.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I am more than happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act.

Last night, I held a telephone town hall with hundreds of my constituents. The overwhelming concern was about the high price of gas. Seniors, students, working families and small business owners want to know what we're doing to help lower fuel costs. They want us to stop being dependent on foreign energy and start really developing America's resources. Today, we're doing that.

Unfortunately, our colleagues across the aisle believe that raising taxes on oil companies will somehow lower the price of gas. This defies both logic and common sense. Not only would raising taxes ensure job losses in America but it would also result in the increase of America's dependence on foreign sources of oil. Raising taxes on American energy companies would give a competitive advantage to the Russian, Chinese and OPEC countries that are operating without anti-growth, anti-self-sufficient energy policies.

Mr. Chairman, my constituents in southeastern and eastern Ohio understand the negative impact that these proposed tax increases would have on gas prices and they oppose these efforts. I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to support the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act that will help put our country on the path to energy security.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Santa Barbara, California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this oil spill amnesia bill that threatens our coastal communities.

H.R. 1230 is a collection of bad ideas. It mandates that the administration offer new lease sales, even though they say they're not prepared to properly oversee them. The bill sidesteps safety and environmental reviews, acting as if the Nation's worst oil spill in history never happened. And, it pushes a failed energy plan that pours billions of dollars into already overstuffed oil industry coffers.

The only thing it adds up to, Mr. Chairman, is a false promise. The truth is the Republican majority is hoping to delude the public into believing that this rush to new offshore drilling will provide a quick fix to high gas prices, but the harsh reality is this: The U.S. is never going to have control over world oil supplies or gas prices through drilling. We simply don't have the oil reserves, no matter how much we drill. What we do have is the ability to control prices by lowering our consumption, and that's just what we're starting to do.

For example, the EIA's latest report says we're lowering oil usage thanks in part to the President's fuel savings standards. We will get control over our energy future by making more cars that go further on a gallon of gas and bringing new types of fuel supplies to the table. If in 10 or 20 years oil and gas are still the focus of our energy debate, then we have miserably failed. We will have followed the path that George W. Bush and Dick Cheney charted, and we've seen where that leads: high gas

prices and billions in oil company profits.

It's about time we break free from our addiction to oil. I urge a ''no'' vote on this misleading bill that accelerates new dirty and dangerous drilling.

□ 1140

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The gentleman from Washington has 16¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1230, a bill that will restart American jobs.

The current 5-year lease plan would have allowed for the sale of four leases, one off the coast of Virginia and three in the Gulf of Mexico. The President and his agencies are continuing to block these sales. It's time to stop that blocking.

We're talking about jobs. The Nation is faced with 8 to 9 percent continuing unemployment. The jobs offshore are good, high-paying jobs—$400 a day, $50,000 per year. Recently, the President had strong rhetoric to Georgetown University, saying that he's going to increase oil and gas production in America. Yet the administration's actions are moving us the opposite direction.

Tax increases kill jobs. That's an economic truth. Our friends across the aisle want to kill American jobs by raising taxes at a time when unemployment is too high, when we're dependent on too much foreign oil. In his speech last month at Georgetown, President Obama said, ''The fact of the matter is, is that for quite some time, America is going to be still dependent on oil in making its economy work. We're exploring and assessing new frontiers for oil and gas developments from Alaska to the Mid- and South Atlantic States.''

Mr. Chairman, we are with this bill giving the President the bill that he is saying that he's going to implement. Now let him sign it.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Imagine what we could do for the American consumer at the pump if we stopped lobbing rhetorical grenades back and forth and decided to focus on the concrete things that it is within our power to do today that would lower the price at the pump. There's three things.

One, why are we giving tax breaks to oil companies? You do have to wonder. A trillion dollars in profits. Nothing wrong with that. But do they really need to reach into the pocket of the American consumer and get $40 billion on top of that? That's number one.

Number two, have the futures market be about protecting the consumer, not enriching the hedge fund Wall Street speculator. It is astonishing what's going on. And it's so bad that even Goldman Sachs acknowledges that at least $27 on the price of a $110 barrel of oil is about speculation. Why in the world do we allow that? Because every time you and I go to the pump, our constituents go to the pump, they're paying for Wall Street and they're paying for tax breaks to oil companies.

The third thing we can do, and we can do it short-term, is go into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Two Republican Presidents and one Democratic President have done that with great effect—lowering the price 33 percent, 19 percent, and 9 percent. It gives immediate relief to the consumer at the pump.

We can do this together if the agenda is about doing something for your constituent and mine and not just having this political food fight. End speculation, end the tax breaks, and go into that asset belonging to all of us, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and bring prices down immediately.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership on this issue.

Our friends across the aisle here want us to use this debate today to demagogue this issue and demonize American energy producers. Let us refocus on what this debate is really about today.

Mr. Chairman, this administration's policy of drill there, not here, has helped produce the record gas prices that we are facing today. Rather than fueling our economy with American energy independence, this administration has fueled overseas oil producers by shutting off domestic exploration. And now, today, we hear the other party tell us that raising taxes on American energy production will somehow make prices go down. This is insane, Mr. Chairman, as any economist can tell you.

We need to end the de facto moratorium in the Gulf of Mexico on the permits there. We need to reopen the West to exploration. We need to open up ANWR for exploration. We need to allow American entrepreneurs to do the work of the free market and get this economy moving again.

Energy production is a segue to job creation. This bill will begin the process of releasing the potential of American energy. This means tens of thousands of American jobs producing American energy for American households and businesses.

I urge my colleagues to help this economy. Pass this bill, and let's put Americans back to work producing American energy.

God bless you. God bless America.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself 3 minutes.

This is the wrong debate to be having here today. The Republicans are debating more drilling without more safety even though the BP spill commission that examined what went wrong last year concluded that there was a ''systemic'' failure in our country to deal with the safety issues that confront the offshore drilling industry. In fact, they concluded that there are four times greater fatalities in drilling for oil off the shores of the United States than there are in Europe—four times more fatalities. We should be number one in drilling but we should be number one in safety as well.

What the Republicans are doing here today is they are saying that they believe in ''all of the above.'' But the truth is that with this bill they are saying once again it is really an agenda of ''oil above all.'' They have nothing out here on renewable energy resources—wind, solar, biomass, geothermal, plug-in hybrids, all-electric vehicles. None of that is part of their debate. They just go back to the same old agenda of oil above all.

And do we need to give more to the oil industry? We have $10 billion in profits for ExxonMobil in January, February, and March—$10 billion they made. Shell, $8 billion; BP, $7 billion; Chevron, $6 billion; ConocoPhillips, $3 billion. Shouldn't we talk a little bit about safety as we're talking about new drilling off of our shorelines? But no, that's not the Republican agenda.

Should we be talking about taking away the tax breaks from the oil industry, the $40 billion which the American taxpayer gives to the oil industry? Do we really need to have the oil industry in the consumers' pocket at the gas pump and then in their other pocket as taxpayers to give even more money to ExxonMobil? That's what the Republicans should bring out here for a debate. They do not do that.

The New York Mercantile Exchange, that's where they trade for oil futures. Computerized Program Trading is now 45 percent of the oil futures trading on the commodities-futures trading floor of the New York Mercantile Exchange.

What do the Republicans do to deal with the fact that it has turned into a crude oil casino where gambling is going on as the speculators of our country and the world look at Saudi Arabia, look at Libya, as the price of oil skyrockets, as Goldman Sachs concludes that $20 a barrel in the increase of the price of oil just comes from the speculation, from the gambling that's going on in the NYMEX? You might as well put ''Las Vegas'' over the New York Mercantile Exchange. It is a crude oil casino, ladies and gentlemen. What do the Republicans do? They have slashed the budget for the Commodities Futures Trading Commission, who are the cops on the beat. They're

saying we need fewer cops to police these speculators. They slash the wind and solar budget by 70 percent in their budget that just passed last month.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

This is their agenda. Nothing on safety; nothing on wind and solar; nothing on corralling the speculators. And what do they say? What they say is they're going to in fact go into the Medicare budget of Grandma and Grandpa and cut their programs and then put an oil rig on top of Medicare to suck out the money like a pipeline out of the pockets of Grandma and Grandpa and put it into the profits of the oil industry with more tax breaks for them, even as they report the greatest profits in the history of any companies in the history of the world.

Ladies and gentlemen, vote ''no'' on this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes I am absolutely baffled by the rhetoric that I hear here. Let me remind my colleagues that 2½ years ago, in 2008, when gasoline prices went to $4 a gallon, we Republicans came into the House, even though we weren't in session, and talked about the potential resources that we have in this country to make America self-sufficient. And the American people got it. They got it and they said, you know, we ought to utilize those resources. And they said we should drill; we should drill in the Outer Continental Shelf and we should drill onshore.

□ 1150

The American people get it. Yet the rhetoric we're hearing here is entirely different from the economic issues that we face. Here is the whole point:

When America ended the moratoria on offshore drilling, the prices went down. See, that has never been explained by the other side, but it's pretty darned obvious. When you send a signal to the markets that you're serious about becoming less dependent on foreign energy, the markets respond. They responded 2½ years ago, and they will respond the same way. Yet all we hear from this side is you have to have a bogeyman. There has to be a bogeyman. Everybody is against us.

Baloney. The market is what drives the price of oil, and it's in our best interest in this country to become less dependent on foreign energy, and that's what these three bills do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and for yielding me time.

Let there be no doubt, Americans are worried about the price of gasoline; and its recent spike has, once again, put us on notice. Yet this bill that relieves regulation provides the wrong tools.

Americans know we can do better. We cannot afford to mindlessly give billions of dollars to Big Oil companies while they make record profits. In the short term, we must ensure that speculators and Wall Street quit playing games with the price of oil. Finally, we must provide motorists with fueling options at the pump. It is unconscionable that we would give $4 billion of taxpayer money to Big Oil companies this year alone while they're on track to make nearly $100 billion in profits in 2011. With prices this high, does Big Oil really need even more money? Taxpayers know they don't, and taxpayers are hit twice with taxes on gasoline—once at the pump and once on tax day. This must end.

We can help consumers at the pump by going after Wall Street speculators who drive up the cost of oil. We can increase mileage standards, and it's entirely reasonable that they could reach 60 miles per gallon by the year 2025. Also, we can invest in fueling options so that consumers can choose the lowest alternative.

High gas prices are painful. They are painful to American families; they are painful to seniors living on fixed incomes; and they are painful to small businesses; and the Big Oil subsidies that accompany them are painful for our Nation's economy as it recovers from the Bush recession. Let's end these Big Oil giveaways to some of the most profitable companies in the world, and let's provide drivers with alternatives—fueling options, better vehicles—and create the clean-energy jobs of the future.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), a valuable member of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chairman, this morning, a gallon of gasoline in my hometown of Iron River, Michigan, was $4.29. Unfortunately, most people are plagued with the fact of knowing that prices are going to go up even further in the next few weeks.

I believe that we in Congress know that there is no silver bullet that is going to lower prices at the pump. However, we have a responsibility here to craft policy and to pass legislation that will increase the supply of crude oil that will be produced here at home. As Members of Congress, it is our duty to take these actions to help lessen the pain of these prices on our families in Michigan and throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, we need to find a long-term solution to high fuel prices. I believe that the full-day markup we held in committee last month was the first step and that passing this bill today will be the next step, but we have many further steps to take.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), one of the most thoughtful members of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I oppose the legislation, which would really open in a wholesale fashion very sensitive areas to offshore drilling. We have to take a lot of care when it comes to doing this offshore drilling, and I don't think that this bill exercises that care.

During the committee's consideration of the bill, I put forward an amendment that would strike that section of the bill that authorizes drilling off the coast of Virginia. I did this because of my concern of the potential impact of a spill in the Chesapeake Bay, which, of course, is a treasure for Marylanders and for all those who live in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. The Chesapeake Bay is really the soul of my State of Maryland. It's a national treasure in so many ways.

As for the Virginia parcel, which is called Lease Sale 220 and is a lease parcel that the Republicans would like to put back into play with their bill, when you look at it, about 78 percent of that parcel you have to immediately take off the table because it would occur in areas where military operations would be impeded.

I want to thank my colleague, GERRY CONNOLLY from Virginia, for putting forward an amendment on this bill which would shift the burden and say the Department of Defense has to affirmatively conclude that you will not impede these kinds of military operations in order to drill.

So you take that out of the equation. Then when you take another chunk of it out because you need to keep commercial shipping lanes open, what you're left with is about 10 percent of the parcel that you could actually drill on, and what you could get from that would only supply the demand of the country for one day. So you'd be putting at risk this valuable, sensitive Chesapeake Bay and all of the surrounding areas for getting one day's worth of energy production.

That just doesn't make sense, and I think it undermines the bill on a wholesale basis. It shows that this is not put forward in a way that is sensible. For that reason, I oppose the legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to another valuable member of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. I would like to thank the chairman of the committee for his leadership and work and for making sure we are addressing the energy needs of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, Virginia has the opportunity to develop offshore energy in an environmentally friendly and responsible manner. Like any industrial or commercial activity, energy production has its risks. However, those risks have been significantly mitigated, and offshore energy production can be conducted in a safe and responsible manner. Unfortunately, the administration

has halted any further oil and gas development in the Atlantic Ocean.

Our economy continues to struggle, and any further increase in energy prices will exacerbate that struggle to regain its footing as unemployment hovers at 9 percent. The unrest in the Middle East and in North Africa continues to threaten this Nation's energy security. The failure to promptly address our energy needs could negatively impact the U.S. economy, could stall any recovery, and continue to affect national security.

Energy production offshore of the Commonwealth would create thousands of jobs and generate much needed revenue to reduce the deficit. The Department of the Interior has calculated that Virginia could produce 500 million barrels of oil and 2.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, natural gas being one of the most economically viable and environmentally friendly sources of fossil fuels. A recent study by ICF International concluded that offshore energy production in Virginia would create 1,888 new jobs and generate $19.5 billion in Federal, State, and local revenues.

I can tell you, in Virginia, as we struggle to find dollars to clean up the Chesapeake Bay and as we struggle to find dollars for transportation, those dollars are much needed. Virginia can lead the Nation in improving our energy security and in reducing our reliance on foreign oil. To do that, we must reinstate the planned offshore oil and natural gas lease sale.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

□ 1200

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to say it, but what we're hearing here on the floor of the House of Representatives in defense of this legislation is snake oil. Somehow the hard-pressed commuters and consumers of gasoline in this country are supposed to believe that if today we unleash all possibility of oil drilling, gas drilling offshore the continental United States, we're going to be producing thousands of barrels of oil. False. We're going to reduce the price of oil today? Equally false. In fact, there's plenty of evidence that the market that drives oil is relatively inelastic.

We heard earlier today on the floor of this House, driving is down, demand is down, supply is up, but so are prices. In fact, if you look at this chart, there's an eerie correlation between oil profits and the spike in the price of gasoline charged to our hard-pressed consumers in the United States.

The other side wants you to believe in a smokescreen that somehow their tax subsidy being changed or lifted by our side of the aisle would, in fact, further increase the price of oil. They have low taxes. They have low royalties. They have record profits. How has that worked out for the average driver in America? It's produced record gasoline prices.

The Republican policy that will be enshrined today in this legislation has produced these profits and those costs for the average consumer in America. It is wrong, and to argue otherwise is selling snake oil.

I urge the defeat of this legislation on behalf of the consumers of America.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chair, we should oppose this bill not because it is too strong, but because it is too weak. Americans do need relief from $4 a gallon gasoline, and they are not going to get it from this bill either in the short term or the long term. The reason they won't get relief in the short term is we're not drilling in the right places. We need to drill speculators, not just wells. Even Goldman Sachs recognizes that a significant portion of the huge spike in prices is due to rampant speculation in the market, but this bill doesn't do a single thing about that short-term reason for this short-term price. We need to drill speculators, not just wells.

But, secondly, in the long term, this bill does not give us what we need. My friends across the aisle told us they were going to give us an all-of-the-above energy strategy. They haven't given us an all-of-the-above strategy. They are just giving an all-of-the-below strategy, because the only thing they are thinking about are these archaic technologies of drilling holes in the ground.

We use 25 percent of the world's oil. We only have 3 percent of the world's oil supply, even if we drill in Yellowstone National Park. The dinosaurs just didn't die underneath our feet. We need new supplies of energy, of electricity, camalena-based biofuels from Targeted Growth in Seattle, advanced forms of algae-based biofuels from Sapphire Energy and General Atomic and other companies.

We need new sources of energy, not just below our feet but above our feet, and in our minds where we get the intellect to invent these technologies. That's an all-of-the-above strategy. Let's do what we can do to give real short-term relief. Defeat this bill, and we will get a comprehensive energy policy for this country.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I won't take 2 minutes.

I've been listening to part of the discussion here, and it just strikes me that when you see graphics with an oil rig sucking money out of Social Security or Medicare or whatever that was, you know that you have gone beyond the realm of what is logical for a debate or the real facts about what this legislation does.

The bottom line is that it will make it easier for us to become more energy independent, not completely energy independent—it can't go that far—but it will make us more independent than we were before. It will create an environment where jobs can be created by the private sector. It will help, over time, to lower the price of gasoline because it will create more supply in the end. That's what it does. It doesn't put a big oil rig on the top of Medicare and suck money from our seniors. Come on.

This is just a measure to help the situation, to make it better. We've locked off too many areas to oil drilling, and we've not exploited our own supply enough to help bring down price and to help consumers out there in the world.

So that's all this does, and I commend the gentleman for bringing it forward. I urge support for it.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend, Mr. MARKEY, for yielding.

This is about Big Oil handouts, pure and simple. There are no lessons learned, no lessons applied with regard to safety or protection of the environment. You know, if these companies were energy companies, as they like to say, they would invest more in producing sustainable, clean energy alternatives.

In the long run, we all know it. We've got to face the facts. We've got to break our addiction to oil; and if the majority, the authors of this legislation, really wanted to help the motorists, the consumers, they would address speculation. They would end the speculation. They would end the tax giveaways. They would use the strategic oil reserve to short-circuit speculation. The oil companies are not energy companies. They are fleecing machines.

The greatest profits of any corporation in history—and you heard me say a few minutes ago—that the biggest of them, Exxon, had an effective tax rate of about 0.4 percent. This will not help the consumer.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I ran down here to thank my colleagues in this Chamber for finally doing what the American people have been asking them to do and to start the process of stopping to kick the energy problem can in this country down the road. Finally, we're going to take the steps necessary to put people back to work and to start America down a path of affordable domestic energy.

Now, they say that we're robbing Grandma and Grandpa. Grandma and

Grandpa hold stock in those energy companies. Down in Louisiana, Grandma and Grandpa's grandsons and grandchildren work in an industry that provides that energy. Right now, they don't have a job. They're being laid off, or they're being sent to Brazil or Africa or the Middle East to drill for oil out there, while we have spent over $1 trillion of taxpayer money funding the Department of Energy to wean us off foreign oil.

I just rise to say thank you, Mr. Chairman, thank you to my colleagues who have come today in support of this amendment.

Mr. MARKEY. I would defer to the chairman of the committee. If he is the concluding speaker on his side, I am prepared to close on our side.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I advise my friend I am the concluding speaker, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

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

So here's where we are. Republicans take over, Republicans say they're ready to put together a plan for our country. It's 1 year after the BP catastrophe in the Gulf of Mexico, the worst environmental disaster in our Nation's history.

□ 1210

Last year, the Republicans blocked passage of any safety legislation that would learn the lessons of what happened in the Gulf of Mexico. The BP spill commission has come back. They now say that fatalities on U.S. rigs are four times higher than those on European rigs. We should be number one in drilling, and we should be number one in safety. The Republicans refuse to deal with the endemic, systemic problems with safety that have been identified in the American oil industry.

The oil industry is now garnering the largest profits any corporations in the world have ever been able to enjoy, but the Republicans refuse to bring out here legislation which will take away their tax breaks. Oil companies don't need to have tax breaks to do something they are doing anyway. It's like subsidizing a fish to swim or a bird to fly. We don't have to give them taxpayers' money. The Ryan budget slashes benefits for grandma and grandpa, then takes that money and gives it away in tax breaks to millionaires and to the oil industry. Do we really need to tell grandma we're cutting back on her medicare benefits and then taking that money and giving it in oil breaks to the biggest companies in our country? They don't need tax breaks.

And finally, what we should be talking about is the deployment of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. The Strategic Petroleum Reserve was used by both President Bushes. It was used by President Clinton. It does work. The New York Mercantile Exchange is where oil futures are traded. It is a casino of crude oil right now. On one day back just 2 months ago, 45 percent of all of the oil futures trades were computer-generated trades. Those trades were twice the value of all of the oil consumed in the world on a single day. That's what we need to do, to deal with those speculators. And the way to do it is what we have done in the past, deploy the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, deploy it now. Send the fear of losing fortunes into the hearts of those speculators, and you will see the price of oil drop like a rock. That's what we need to do. That's what the consumers need as they are heading into the Memorial Day weekend. That's what people all across our country are wondering—what is going to happen to our economy?

Ten of the last 11 recessions in our country are tied to the rise in the price of oil. That is 10 of the last 11 recessions, ladies and gentlemen. What we saw in 1990 was, President Bush won the war in Iraq in '90 and '91, but because he never deployed the Strategic Petroleum Reserve until it was too late, a mini-recession went through our economy, and President Clinton was able to defeat him. Let's learn this lesson of the link between the rise in the price of oil and recessions that are created in our economy. Deploy the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Ignore this agenda of the Republican Party.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a very interesting debate, and there's been a lot of rhetoric thrown around, some of which doesn't even apply whatsoever in any remoteness to the bill that's before us today. H.R. 1230, which we are debating today, simply tells this administration to go through with the lease sales that were already authorized by a previous administration. In other words, all of these lease sales had gone through whatever process they had gone through. Three of them were in the Gulf of Mexico. One of them was off the coast of Virginia.

We are simply saying with this legislation, let's send a signal to the international markets that America is serious about becoming less dependent on foreign oil. And we do that by saying, this administration should go through with these lease sales, which, I might add, Mr. Chairman, we have heard about loss of revenue from the other side of the aisle. These lease sales themselves would provide the general fund with $40 million over the next 10 years. So what we're doing is really kind of ironic: We are telling this administration to do something it should be doing by law anyway. That's what the scope is. So I urge my colleagues to vote on this bill. We can have other discussion on the other bills in the ensuing days.

As far as the discussion talking about Big Oil, I could probably count the number of colleagues on the other side of the aisle that didn't say something about Big Oil rather than those that did. But what is interesting, you would be led to believe that the only Big Oil in the world apparently are American companies. I would suggest that that is entirely not true. In fact, when you talk about Big Oil, Mr. Chairman, really who you should be focusing on is OPEC, because crude oil is an international product, or is a global product. There's no question about that.

Yet OPEC controls 45 percent of the market. It is a cartel, Mr. Chairman; there is no question about that. We all know simple economics. If there is a cartel on any commodity, on any commodity, the way that you break the cartel is by increasing the supply. And that's what the combination of these three bills do. It simply sends a signal to the markets—and I have said this over and over—that we are serious about utilizing the resources we have. Several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said, The United States doesn't have any resources. Well, nothing could be further from the truth because if you look at government data on what the potential resources are in the Outer Continental Shelf—and I'm going to say onshore because it's all American potential resources—the potential resources of oil equivalent per barrel, when you combine OCS and onshore, the potential resources are in excess of 2 trillion barrels of oil. That far exceeds what one of my colleagues earlier, Mr. FLEMING from Louisiana, said. It far exceeds what they have in Saudi Arabia. In fact, in other OPEC nations.

This is rhetoric about trying to blame somebody when the issue is really something as basic as having a supply out there that consumers can utilize. What we are saying here is threefold. One of them relates directly to American jobs. Energy sector jobs are good-paying jobs. So let's encourage the energy sector in this country to expand so we can have those good-paying jobs. That's good to get the funk out of our economy. Secondly, we become less dependent on foreign sources because energy is an important part of our growing economy. And if we have a stable source of that in the future, our economy can grow with the surety we will have a stable source of energy.

But probably more important in the long term, Mr. Chairman, the reason why we should pass these bills to send the signal to the market is a national security issue. I mentioned OPEC. There are some countries in OPEC that are outwardly hostile to the United States. One of them is in South America, Venezuela. Why are we relying on them for the supply of our energy when we have these resources that I just pointed out to you in excess of 2 trillion equivalent barrels of oil?

So, Mr. Chairman, this is the first step. This is the first step of starting the process of becoming less dependent on foreign energy, and it is the first step to get our economy recovering by creating good American jobs. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1230.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, on April 20, 2010, the Deepwater Horizon exploded in the Gulf of Mexico, killing eleven crewmen and causing over 4 million barrels of oil to spill into the gulf. Now, barely a year after the worst offshore oil spill in U.S. history, the majority is rushing three reckless offshore drilling bills to the floor as if the Deepwater Horizon disaster never happened.

Under the guise of combating high gasoline prices, today's legislation proposes to mandate the sale of three leases in the Gulf of Mexico and a fourth lease off the coast of Virginia—whether or not appropriate safeguards are in place. Astonishingly, the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act actually requires the Secretary of the Interior to rely on demonstrably unrealistic environmental reviews conducted under the Bush Administration for purposes of approving these four leases. For example, these pre-spill analyses assumed that the worst case scenario for a Gulf oil spill would involve 4600 barrels of oil—or about 1/1000 the actual amount of oil spilled by the Deepwater Horizon.

Fortunately, the Obama Administration is taking a more responsible approach. Using the lessons we have learned from the Deepwater Horizon disaster, the Obama Administration has announced that it is prepared to move forward with the three Gulf lease sales by the middle of 2012—after rigorous, post-spill safety and environmental standards have been put into place. Additionally, the Administration has in my judgment correctly concluded that the Virginia lease should be cancelled as posing too great a risk to the economies and environment of the mid-Atlantic states.

Mr. Chair, this bill does nothing to lower gasoline prices. It does nothing to end the billions in wasteful taxpayer subsidies going to oil companies already reporting record profits. It does nothing to invest in America's clean energy future or strengthen America's energy security. In fact, this legislation doesn't even contain a requirement that the oil produced from these leases be sold in the United States rather than exported. The only thing this bill really does is undermine the improved well design, workplace safety and environmental standards the Obama Administration is trying to put in place in order to avoid another Deepwater Horizon disaster.

This legislation is irresponsible, and it deserves a "no" vote.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1230, "Restarting American Offshore Leasing now Act" which will require four specific offshore oil and gas lease sales within the next year. Three of these lease sales will be for locations in the Gulf of Mexico and one will be off the Coast of Virginia.

Although I have reservations about certain aspects of this bill, I nevertheless support it as a step in the right direction for America in our efforts to achieve energy independence. The central issue is promoting oil and gas related American jobs in the Gulf Coasts and to fill our Nation's oil and gas needs as we search for alternative energy sources.

THE NEED FOR FAIRNESS AND BALANCE

We must have fair and balanced discourse that considers our safety, national security, and our environment and does not place oil & gas producers at an unfair disadvantage when these very companies produce vital American jobs and contribute greatly to our economy. I am informed that there is an amendment or legislative proposal under consideration which will tax the top 5 oil and gas producers more heavily than other producers of such energy (who will receive a tax credit).

We must ensure that we afford fair and equal tax treatment of oil and gas producers and that we do not unduly single out and punish the top 5 oil and gas producers (three of which are U.S. companies: Exxon-Mobil, Chevron and Conoco Phillips). This discriminates against large oil and gas producers who provide valuable American jobs and contribute greatly to our national and local economies; while at the same time we give a tax break and preference to foreign oil companies who do not fall within the top 5 producers. This is neither fair nor balanced and allows oil companies owned by, for example Hugo Chavez and Venezuela, to receive better tax treatment than the top 3 U.S. companies. This hurts American jobs and our economy. I appeal for us to use common sense to avoid disturbing outcomes such as this as we consider oil and gas drilling, permitting and lease sale issues.

Energy is the lifeblood of every economy, especially our local economies on the Gulf Coast. Producing more of energy leads to job creation, cheaper goods and greater economic and national security. However, the U.S. is more than 60 percent dependent on foreign sources of energy, twice as dependent today as we were just 30 years ago.

Although energy is the lifeblood of America's economic security, this growing and dangerous dependence has resulted in the loss of hundreds of thousands of good American jobs, skyrocketing consumer prices, and vulnerabilities in our national security.

The attacks of September 11, 2001 and the current instability in the Middle East places further highlights our need for legislation that will lead to our energy independence. It has always been risky to rely on unstable and unfriendly nations as the source of so much of our domestic oil supply. Currently, offshore petroleum is a source for roughly a third of domestic oil production. Any increase in our own production will place us one step closer to decreasing our dependence on foreign oil.

Energy imports now make up one third of America's trade deficit. Through this bill, America could improve the supply-demand imbalance, lower consumer prices, and increase jobs by producing more of its own energy resources.

According to the U.S. Minerals Management Service, MMS, estimates, America's deep seas on the Outer Continental Shelf, OCS, contain up to 115.3 billion barrels of oil and up to 565 trillion cubic feet of natural gas (the U.S. consumes at least 23 TCF per year) and 86 billion barrels of oil (the U.S. imports 4.5 billion per year). Even with all these energy resources, the U.S. sends more than $300 billion (and countless American jobs) overseas every year for energy we can create at home.

Given the aftermath of the BP Oil spill, it is easy to understand the importance of addressing all safety concerns prior to the issuance of oil and gas lease sales. Since the disaster, federal safety regulations have been tightened, spill containment response capability has been enhanced and lessons have been learned. The yearlong moratorium on offshore drilling activity gave the Administration the time they needed to carefully evaluate current practices and create an effective regulatory regime.

We must make sure that as we effectively lift the offshore drilling moratorium that we properly fund that department of interior to do its job more quickly rather than cutting their budgets. I have offered an amendment to H.R. 1230 to provide for necessary and proper levels of staffing and training of technical engineers and other personnel as are necessary to review permits for drilling in the outer continental shelf land and offshore gas and oil leasing sales activities.

It is the job of the Department of the Interior to ensure that all lease sales meet the highest reasonable standards for safety. My concern is that H.R. 1230 would require the Department of Interior to act more quickly in their review of lease sale applications than their current resources allow. If the Department of the Interior moves to quickly, no one will benefit from unsafe and inadequate standards.

The Administration has already aggressively restarted drilling the outer continental shelf. To continue drilling safely, the Department of the Interior must be properly funded and staffed with technical engineers to review permits, examine lease sales, and ensure that each application is afforded proper consideration.

As a Representative of an oil and gas producing District and state, I am aware that offshore drilling is an important component of the nation's energy supply and provides many Gulf communities with jobs and income.

We can protect the environment while drilling the outer continental shelf. Providing adequate resources for review will prevent permits from being declined due to time constraints.

Responsible offshore drilling with proper funding and staff for the DOI is a good solution, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to compromise and help the hard working people in Gulf Coast communities get back to work.

We must get the American Gulf Coast oil and gas community back to work. Many people in the oil and gas industry in my district and the people and businesses of the Gulf Coast rely on oil and gas industry jobs and this benefits local economies and our national economy.

Through this bill, America could improve its energy supply and demand imbalance, lower consumer prices, and increase jobs by permitting the United States to produce more of its own energy resources as we pursue forms of alternative energy for the stability of our national energy production and our national security itself.

Mr. Chair, I believe it is very important to allow these oil and gas lease sales and properly fund the Department of the Interior to do its jobs. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1230.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, I rise to express my strong opposition to H.R. 1230. Just over one year ago, the Deepwater Horizon rig exploded and sank, taking the lives of 11 workers and releasing millions of barrels of oil into the Gulf of Mexico. Instead of learning from the catastrophic economic and environmental consequences of last year's spill, H.R. 1230 would speed up leasing without introducing new safety standards and throwing environmental review to the wind.

One of these leases would be located off the shore of Virginia, just 75 miles from the shores of my home state of New Jersey. Drilling operations could potentially devastate the economy of New Jersey in the event of a spill,

since the tourism and fishing industries support hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of economic activity across the state and region.

Furthermore, this legislation does nothing to address rising gasoline prices. Instead of giving more handouts to Big Oil, we need to crack down on speculators and oil companies who post record profits on the backs of the American public. We should be investing in alternative energy sources such as wind power to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, not subsidizing Big Oil.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, all Americans are concerned about high gas prices and the growing cost they are imposing on our families. We should also be concerned that those high prices might stall our economic recovery. So what can we do to reduce the burden, both for families and for our economy as a whole?

I support safe, responsible drilling. So does President Obama: his administration has already set us on course to re-issue three out of four of the leases in question in this bill. Domestic drilling is definitely part of the solution to meeting our energy needs.

But I also know that offering drilling as the only solution is simply not up to the scale of the challenge we face. Consider that the United States already produces about 1.5 million more barrels of oil per day than it did in 2005. And last year under President Obama's watch, domestic oil production rose to its highest level since 2003. If Republicans were right, that increased production would lower prices—but in fact, oil reached a record of $147 per barrel during the same period.

Consider the fact that Canada, unlike the U.S., produces about 1.1 million more barrels of oil than it consumes each day. Canada produces far more oil than we do—and if Republicans were right, Canadian gas prices wouldn't be rising at the same rate as ours. But they are—they're feeling the effects, just as we are.

So while I am a strong supporter of drilling, and making use of our natural resources, the fact remains that the issuing of four leases, even in the very near term, will have little to no impact on gas prices today.

In the wake of the devastating BP Gulf oil spill, we need to focus on responsible drilling as we work to increase production. We should not auction off more leases to oil companies without adequate consideration of whether offshore drilling in those locations is safe and without environmental consequences.

That's a reckless course to take, especially when the effect on today's gas prices is essentially nonexistent. While the American people want us to do everything in our power to lower gas prices, they also don't want us to set up a process that could lead to another BP Gulf oil spill.

I believe we can drill and do so responsibly, and we can expedite leases responsibly. Rather than Republicans' one-dimensional approach of simply issuing new leases, let's also ensure that oil and gas companies are diligent about producing on the leases they already own. Let's expedite leases without disregarding the environmental impacts. Let's invest in clean energy technology and efficiency to break our oil addiction—not defund those investments, as Republicans demand. Let's crack down on the financial speculation that drives gas prices up for American families.

And—when even Speaker BOEHNER agrees that the oil companies "ought to be paying their fair share"—let's end unjustifiable subsidies to some of the world's most profitable companies, subsidies that are only driving our nation deeper into debt.

That's what a real, responsible energy policy would look like—not this bill. I would have supported it if amendments had passed to ensure environmental and safety reviews to prevent another oil spill, and to ensure that offshore drilling does not conflict with military training operations off our coasts. But because Republicans rejected those amendments, this bill remains flawed. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the three oil drilling bills reported by the Republican Majority on the House Resources Committee, including the one before the House today. I urge the House to defeat them.

One year after the largest oil spill in U.S. history revealed huge safety and enforcement problems with ultra-deep offshore drilling, gas prices are going through the ceiling and the oil companies are raking in profits hand-over-fist. Exxon Mobil just posted a first-quarter profit of $10.7 billion, a 69 percent gain from the previous year. BP reported a first-quarter profit of $7.1 billion, a 17 percent increase. Royal Dutch Shell earned $6.3 billion, up 30 percent. Chevron's profit grew to $6.2 billion, a 36 percent increase. Conoco Phillips reported a first-quarter profit of $3 billion, up 44 percent.

What is the Republican Majority's response? They want to reward the oil companies with additional offshore leases and reduce the ability of the Interior Department to review offshore oil drilling applications for safety.

Proponents of this bill would have us believe that gas prices will go down if we only open up more coastal areas to ultra-deep-water drilling and reduce safety oversight of the oil companies. This is not true. None of these bills will do anything at all to reduce gasoline prices. Even if we threw caution to the wind and opened up these new offshore areas tomorrow, it would take years for them to produce any oil.

Before opening up new offshore areas, it's fair to ask what the industry is doing with the leases they already have. A new report by the Department of Interior reveals that more than two-thirds of existing offshore leases in the Gulf of Mexico and more than half of onshore leases on federal lands are unused. Tens of millions of acres that have already been leased to industry sit idle. The industry should either use the leases they have or give them up.

At a time when our constituents are feeling the pain of rising gas prices, it is unjustifiable that our tax code subsidizes Big Oil to the tune of billions of dollars a year. The Big Five oil companies reported a combined profit of $32 billion in the first quarter of 2011 alone. Repealing the three largest tax breaks for the Big Five oil companies would save taxpayers billions of dollars a year. Instead of rewarding the oil companies, we should at last end these unwarranted subsidies to Big Oil.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1230.

It appears to me that the Republican energy plan is higher gas prices and lower safety standards. This fits nicely with their overall agenda for the 111th Congress: end Medicare to pay for tax breaks for Big Oil.

Yesterday, the Republicans on the Rules Committee blocked my amendment that would require oil and gas companies to publicly disclose their environmental and worker safety record before drilling on the Outer continental shelf.

Earlier this year, Republicans voted to gut the Commodity Futures Trading Commission—the consumer watchdog agency charged with overseeing oil speculators.

And earlier today, even though BP is now reporting $7.1 billion in quarterly profits—17 percent increase—every Republican in the House voted to block consideration of our Democratic bill, the Big Oil Welfare Repeal Act of 2011, to stop the billions of dollars in tax giveaways to the biggest oil companies who don't need taxpayer help to get their job done.

Under the Republican budget that the House approved earlier this year, people in their 40s and 50s now will be forced to pay more for health care when they retire than under current law—at least $6,400 per year more.

But consider this: in the past three months, the top five oil companies made $30 billion in profits and Republicans in Congress want to give them billions more in tax benefits and subsidies. The same Republicans who voted to end Medicare are now refusing to hold a vote on repealing the generous tax breaks for the largest and most profitable corporations in world history.

Make no mistake about it. Their bill on the floor today won't bring down the price at the pump. It won't end the massive taxpayer giveaways to Big Oil. It won't lead to more fuel-efficient cars. It won't crack down on oil speculators. And it won't improve the safety of offshore drilling—and in fact it will require the Interior Department to accept the very same flawed NEPA documents that helped lead to the BP spill in the Gulf.

I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 1230 because it ignores the lessons of the BP spill and it does nothing to help families or consumers. I don't think Americans want Congress to take money away from seniors only to give that very same money to oil giants.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I also want to mention that two members of the House, Congressman GERLACH and Congressman CULBERSON had wanted to cosponsor this bill but because we had to file the reports on the bills on Monday, they were unable to. I appreciate their support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1230

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 "Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act".

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 216 IN THE CENTRAL GULF OF MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct offshore oil and gas Lease Sale 216 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable, but not later than 4 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.—For the purposes of that lease sale, the Environmental Impact Statement for the 2007–2012 5-Year OCS Plan and the Multi-Sale Environmental Impact Statement are deemed to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 218 IN THE WESTERN GULF OF MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct offshore oil and gas Lease Sale 218 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable, but not later than 8 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.—For the purposes of that lease sale, the Environmental Impact Statement for the 2007–2012 5-Year OCS Plan and the Multi-Sale Environmental Impact Statement are deemed to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 220 ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OFFSHORE VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct offshore oil and gas Lease Sale 220 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable, but not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) PROHIBITION ON CONFLICTS WITH MILITARY OPERATIONS.—The Secretary shall not make any tract available for leasing under this section if the President, through the Secretary of Defense, determines that drilling activity on that tract would create an unreasonable conflict with military operations.

SEC. 5. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 222 IN THE CENTRAL GULF OF MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct offshore oil and gas Lease Sale 222 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2012.

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.—For the purposes of that lease sale, the Environmental Impact Statement for the 2007–2012 5-Year OCS Plan and the Multi-Sale Environmental Impact Statement are deemed to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The term ''Environmental Impact Statement for the 2007–2012 5 Year OCS Plan'' means the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program: 2007–2012 (April 2007) prepared by the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) The term ''Multi-Sale Environmental Impact Statement'' means the Environmental Impact Statement for Proposed Western Gulf of Mexico OCS Oil and Gas Lease Sales 204, 207, 210, 215, and 218, and Proposed Central Gulf of Mexico OCS Oil and Gas Lease Sales 205, 206, 208, 213, 216, and 222 (September 2008) prepared by the Secretary of the Interior.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in part B of House Report 112–73. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 112–73.

Mr. HOLT. 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 3, beginning at line 6, amend sections 2 and 3 to read as follows:

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 216 IN THE CENTRAL GULF OF MEXICO.

The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct offshore oil and gas lease sale 216 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable after compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 218 IN THE WESTERN GULF OF MEXICO.

The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct offshore oil and gas lease sale 218 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable after compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

Page 5, beginning at line 1, amend section 5 to read as follows:

SEC. 5. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 222 IN THE CENTRAL GULF OF MEXICO.

The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct offshore oil and gas lease sale 222 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable after compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

Page 5, beginning at line 15, strike section 6.

The Acting CHAIR pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 1220

Mr. HOLT. The authors of this bill are so eager to accelerate the giveaways to Big Oil, rather than protect the consumers, the environment and workers, that they, in their legislation, deem that the shoddy environmental analysis conducted 4 years ago, in other words, years prior to the gulf oil blowout, to be sufficient for all future lease sales in the gulf, despite their glaring deficiencies. They deem—in other words, assume, declare—that this is sufficient. Look, this environmental impact statement was not adequate then, and we know it's not adequate now.

''Deem'' is a dangerous word in legislation, especially legislation that could jeopardize worker safety and imperil the economic structure of coastal communities.

My amendment would strike the language deeming the pre-spill environmental work to be sufficient and it, therefore, would require a new, updated analysis. And the administration says they intend to and are prepared to apply a strengthened environmental analysis incorporating the lessons learned.

This amnesia bill before us learns no lessons from the worst environmental oil spill in our history. Just look at some of the conclusions contained in the outdated environmental analysis.

The EIS determined ''the most likely size of an offshore spill greater than or equal to 1,000 barrels would be 4,600 barrels.'' So, in other words, the pre-BP spill analysis concluded that the most likely size of the largest spill that we would see in the Gulf of Mexico would be 4,600 barrels of oil. The Deepwater Horizon produced 4 million barrels spilling into the gulf.

In addition, the analysis concluded that the total volume of oil that would be spilled from all spills over 40 years would be roughly 47,000 barrels of oil. That's less than what spilled from the Deepwater Horizon in 1 day.

The EIS concluded that, in the worst-case scenario, something like several dozen miles of gulf coastline would be affected by the spill. In reality, it affected 950 miles of coastline, across all the Gulf States.

The earlier EIS review that they would say should apply for all future drilling determined that a deepwater blowout would not present a clean-up problem because the oil would rise in a water column, surfacing almost directly above, that's their words in the EIS, that they would deem to apply, surfacing almost directly over the source location. In fact, we know the oil spewing spread in subsurface plumes for miles and miles and miles across the gulf.

For commercial fisheries, the environmental statement said ''a subsurface blowout would have a negligible effect on the Gulf of Mexico fish resources or commercial fishing.'' In reality, the BP spill closed 88,000 square miles of the gulf to fishing.

These are just a few examples of how this is an inadequate environmental statement. Have we learned nothing from the largest oil spill in gulf waters?

It is so thoughtless and so boilerplate that it talks about protecting walruses in the Gulf of Mexico. This was a thoughtless environmental impact statement, surely not worthy of the people who live along the coast. This environmental impact statement is surely not worthy of those who make their living either in the oil business or the fishing business or any other business.

The fact is, we have far more information now than we did in 2007. And after immense cost, really hard-earned knowledge, we certainly should not proceed as if nothing has happened without reassessing our assumptions and our analyses. The Department of the Interior is working to hold these

sales mandated by this bill, but in a reasonable timeframe.

Any leases should reflect the lessons learned from the BP spill. In other words, it should reflect reality, not some dream world. They live in a dream world economically; they live in a dream world environmentally. It is clearly a world where walruses live in the Gulf of Mexico.

My amendment, I think, is a reasonable way to proceed. It would require that we do new environmental work that builds on the hard-earned lessons that we learned from the largest oil spill in the gulf waters. It ensures that future leasing in the gulf fully considers the environmental impact of drilling.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment. The EIS work conducted thus far for the lease sales, and keep in mind, these lease sales were already okayed, is complete, thorough and sufficient to safely and responsibly conduct these lease sales.

It is important to note that this is only one of many environmental analyses that these leases will undergo before any drilling can start. At each of multiple stages, additional detailed environmental and safety reviews will be conducted.

The language in this bill, underlying bill, allows the administration to move forward with these lease sales in a timely manner, but does not allow drilling until at least several more layers of thorough environmental assessments and reviews are conducted on each lease sale sold at these sales. I think that's what the gentleman was getting to. The underlying bill allows that to happen.

These additional environmental studies will allow for the latest and best available information following the oil spill to be included in the studies and applied to any drilling that will take place.

In totality, the library of environmental reviews will end up totaling tens of thousands of pages, Mr. Chairman, and hundreds of hours by environmental scientists, engineers, biologists, and other professionals.

But this amendment isn't about environmental protection. This amendment is about removing the timelines in this bill to conduct these four lease sales. Keep in mind, these lease sales were already agreed to by a prior administration. The real effect of this amendment is to allow President Obama to block increased energy production by continuing to push these lease sales off past 2012 or 2017, in some cases. The real impact of this amendment is that we are right back where we started when the President canceled these lease sales, sending jobs and energy production overseas.

This administration's actions to delay these lease sales and their long record of anti-energy roadblocks is why 2011, this year, may be the first year since 1958 that no lease sales will occur in the OCS. It is for this reason that OCS revenues in 2011 will fall by more than $9 billion compared to 2008.

By validating the existing EIS work, the bill ensures that these lease sales will move forward this year, generating revenue for taxpayers and ensuring that our leasing program continues in a timely manner, while also allowing for additional safety measures to be taken.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. Here we go again. Delay, delay, delay. The poor people of my district will have to sit there, unemployed and wait again. We've gotten environmental study after environmental study after environmental study that will happen after these lease sales. This does not prevent the additional environmental studies that will take place anyhow. All it will do is force those companies to take up to three more years before we can get to our business of drilling so we can get to our business of providing for the American people affordable energy. Again, it's a delay tactic.

How do I know that? Because I can tell you that this administration pulls delay tactic after delay tactic after delay tactic in permitting wells in the Gulf of Mexico. They lift the moratorium, and then they don't issue permits.

So what do they do now, the other side of the aisle, my colleagues on the other side? They say, well, it looks like we have a piece of legislation in front of us that's going to finally start to open the gulf back up. So let's see how many roadblocks we can put in front of it.

□ 1230

I urge my colleagues, defeat this amendment. Let's get on with the business of providing this country with affordable energy and let's get this economy rolling and let's get back to creating jobs.

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

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

Mr. HOLT. 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 Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 112–73.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. 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 4, beginning at line 19, strike ''if the President, through the Secretary of Defense, determines that drilling activity on that tract would create an unreasonable conflict'' and insert ''until the President, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, certifies that drilling activity on that tract would not create a conflict''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this simple amendment requires the President, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to certify that moving forward with Lease Sale 220 will not impede naval or other Department of Defense operations off Virginia's coast.

The Department of Defense issued a report which stated that 78 percent of the area of Lease Sale 220 is currently used by the Navy for equipment testing, practicing with live ordnance, underwater training, and other critical operations.

There may not be a readily available alternative for live ordnance testing. And, of course, we wouldn't want live ordnance being used near oil wells, now, would we?

As you know, Norfolk is the largest naval base in America. It is critical for our national security and has beneficial side effects, obviously, for the regional economy. But billions of dollars have been invested in Norfolk and in that test bed area.

Perhaps it is possible for offshore oil exploration or wind energy development to be compatible with continued naval operations. That is why we asked for certification. But if energy development forced the Navy to relocate, our national security would suffer, preparedness would suffer, and billions of dollars of extra cost in Federal expenditures would be incurred. Virginia's economy of course would also suffer, as we could lose more than $10 billion in annual contracting income derived from that base.

This amendment ensures that energy development would not cripple naval operations by simply requiring the President with the Secretary of Defense to certify that moving forward with Lease Sale 220 won't impede naval operations and harm national security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

While I appreciate what the gentleman is trying to accomplish, the underlying bill already protects the Defense Department's responsibilities in the Outer Continental Shelf of Virginia. So this amendment is totally unnecessary.

Because preserving the working relationship between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior is of great importance to the Virginia congressional delegation and to the Natural Resources Committee, H.R. 1230 already ensures the mutual goals of national security and energy independence by requiring that the lease sale be conducted with stipulations on surface use, as well as additional requirements to make certain that the leases issued in this area would not impact defense operations.

I also want to point out that bipartisan support for energy production offshore of Virginia does exist. According to a study by the Southeast Energy Alliance, offshore energy development in Virginia could create nearly 2,000 jobs in Virginia and produce more than one-half billion barrels of oil and 2.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

This natural gas is important, because in the last few years the Dominion liquefied natural gas terminal in Baltimore, Maryland, received huge amounts of foreign natural gas. Developing energy production in offshore Virginia could displace foreign natural gas as well as mean more energy for Virginia.

Now, in context, one-half billion barrels of oil is enough to fuel all 4 million cars in Virginia for more than 4 years, and 2.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas could heat all 3.2 million Virginia households for more than 11 years. And, developing resources off Virginia's coast could generate nearly $19.5 billion in revenues to Federal, State, and local governments.

Virginians, along with their Governor, both Democratic Senators, and a majority of the congressional delegation here in Congress, and the city council of Virginia Beach, off of which much of the development would take place, do support offshore leasing and development because they understand it can bring much-needed jobs and revenues to the State.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my friend from Colorado for his remarks. But, frankly, if he is so certain of the protections contained in this legislation, then surely this extra special amendment to make sure that Virginia is protected would not find objection on the other side of the aisle.

I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Northern Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank my good friend and colleague.

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Atlantic fleet is based at the Norfolk Naval Base and operates in the same waters that this legislation proposes to sell for oil and gas development. Does the Republican majority really want to jeopardize those thousands and thousands of jobs that are identified with that naval base?

According to a report issued by the Secretary of Defense, there should be no lease sales in 72 percent of the proposed lease area that this bill directs be sold to oil and gas companies because it is in conflict with live ordnance, air-surface missile, and gunnery exercises, shipboard qualification trials, carrier qualifications, and development and operational follow-on testing and evaluation, and an additional 5 percent would interfere with aerial operations and should not host permanent surface structures such as drilling rigs.

In other words, more than three quarters of the area that this legislation directs be sold to oil and gas companies is in conflict with our national security interests, and a good deal of the remaining 22 percent is within shipping lanes of the country's two busiest commercial ports, Hampton Roads and Baltimore.

Mr. Chairman, our coastal waters are a shared resource that host a number of competing and sometimes incompatible uses. Clearly, direct national security interests should be weighed at least alongside the indirect benefit of unproven oil and gas developments that won't occur for many, many, many years to come.

This amendment would ensure national security interests would prevail. But it also underscores the point that the majority seems too anxious to dismiss: The interests of our coastal fisheries and the tourism industry. Those industries generate billions in income and sustain the livelihood of millions of Americans. Their future is placed at risk when Congress passes laws that disregard the lessons past disasters have taught by mandating shortcuts to more drilling.

I urge my colleagues to accept this amendment and reject the underlying bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I yield 1 minute to my friend from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

This amendment will ensure that necessary safeguards are in place to protect military training operations, NASA missions, and port access in certain offshore areas.

In the Commonwealth of Virginia, the United States Navy trains extensively in the Virginia Capes Operations Area off the coast of Virginia. Additionally, NASA's Wallops Flight Facility on Virginia's Eastern Shore requires a clear and unrestricted rocket and target launch range off Virginia's coast.

I have long had reservations about drilling off the coast of Virginia. I believe the environmental, economic, and national security risks for that drilling far outweigh any potential benefits. But if drilling will occur, this amendment will ensure that commonsense and responsible processes will be in place to safeguard against obvious negative consequences to our military, to NASA, and to port operations.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 1240

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 30 seconds remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Before I yield back, I just want to say I appreciate again the reassurances from our colleague from Colorado, but many of us in Virginia want to be sure.

Again, this amendment is simple. It does not stop oil production or oil drilling offshore. It simply requires, first, a certification that the all-important naval base at Norfolk is protected and that the testing bed offshore is not in jeopardy, given the billions of dollars we have invested in national security in that area and its importance to our regional economy. We think it is a reasonable protection, a reasonable measure.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that the Governor of Virginia supports this, the majority of the House Members from Virginia support this without the amendment, and the Democratic Senators from Virginia have in the past agreed to legislation identical in wording to what this legislation says about offshore activity. So because the offshore activities are adequately and responsibly dealt with in the bill as it is, I would urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 112–73 on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 240, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—174

Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
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
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—240

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
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
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
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)
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
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
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 (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Ackerman
Bilbray
Crowley
Emerson
Engel
Giffords
Hunter
Johnson, Sam
King (NY)
Meeks
Nadler
Olver
Pascrell
Pompeo
Rangel
Rothman (NJ)
Rush
Weiner

□ 1306

Ms. JENKINS and Mr. ROSKAM changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. BONO MACK, and Mr. ELLISON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 240, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

AYES—176

Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
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
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—240

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg

Biggert
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
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
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)
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
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
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
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
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 (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—16

Ackerman
Bilbray
Crowley
DeLauro
Emerson
Engel
Giffords
Johnson, Sam
King (NY)
Meeks
Nadler
Olver
Pascrell
Rangel
Rothman (NJ)
Weiner

□ 1313

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YODER). Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1230) to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain offshore oil and gas lease sales, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 245, reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. LUJÁN. I am opposed to it in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Luján moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1230 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 5, after line 14, insert the following (and redesignate accordingly):

SEC. 5. NO FOREIGN SALES.

The leases offered for sale under this Act shall specify that all oil and natural gas produced under such leases shall be offered for sale only in the United States.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, American families are hurting right now. When the cost of gas at the pump rises, that means that the cost of groceries goes up, the cost of goods goes up, and the cost of just getting to work goes up. The American people need relief; and the way this legislation is written, it will do nothing to decrease the price at the pump, and it will do nothing to lower the international price of oil.

All day today, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have suggested that drilling more is the solution to high gas prices. If my Republican colleagues really believe that increasing drilling in the U.S. will lower gas prices, then we should all be able to agree that oil produced in America should stay in America to help American families and American businesses.

That's why I am offering this final amendment today—to ensure that oil resources that are produced through leasing under this act are kept here and sold here in the United States. Simply put, this means, if we produce it here, we should keep it here for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I come from a State that has oil and gas production, and we know how important domestic production is. We don't disagree that production in the United States is important. Personally, I favor a more comprehensive plan to reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil, one that includes natural gas, wind, solar, one that grows new industries and creates jobs that cannot be outsourced out of the United States.

While I disagree with my Republican colleagues' approach, I think that we can all agree that something must be done to reduce the price of gasoline for consumers. The American people want us to work together to lower gas prices, plain and simple. They know our country is far too reliant on foreign oil, and they want us to do something real about it, plain and simple. Mr. Speaker, some things deserve to be repeated, and I'll tell you that the American people want us to come together to lower gas prices, plain and simple.

At a time when gas prices are at historic highs, if we're going to produce more from American drilling, we should keep it in America to help Americans. We've heard from the other side that the solution is as simple as producing more oil in the U.S., but that's not going to lower costs in international energy markets. That's not how it works.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. domestic oil production is already at its highest level in almost a decade, and that's a fact. In the last 2 years, oil production from the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf has increased by more than a third, and that's a fact. So, while we see our domestic production going up, the price at the pump is going up even higher, and that's hurting families.

Without this amendment, there is nothing in the Republican bill that would guarantee that oil produced under this act would stay in the United States to offer relief for the American people. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we can change all of that, and we can do it together and do what's right for the American people. We can support this amendment that simply says that oil produced in the United States under these leases would stay in the United States.

My Republican colleagues will tell us that this bill is about sending a message to OPEC and to the world that we are willing to produce our own oil. If we're going to send a message, Mr. Speaker, let's send the message that when we drill on the taxpayers' land that America's oil should stay right here in America to lower prices at the pump, plain and simple.

To my colleagues, when you go home to your districts this weekend, ask your constituents if they think oil produced in the U.S. should be kept in the U.S. and refined in the U.S. for American consumers, American families, and American businesses or if they think it should be shipped out of the country.

What do you think they'll say?

Quite simply, that is the choice, and that is all this final amendment says.

It will not kill this bill. If it is adopted, it will be immediately incorporated into the underlying bill, and the bill will be voted upon immediately. Let's do something for the American people, and plain and simple, let's support this amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1320

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members that remarks in debate must be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation, and I rise in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this motion to recommit.

Quite frankly, this amendment is redundant, unnecessary, and another attempt to divert attention from the real issue of increasing energy production in order to create jobs, lower energy costs, and improve national security by lessening our dependence on foreign oil.

First, Mr. Speaker, exports are already subject to the Export Administration Act. Before any oil or gas can be exported, the President must find that the exports will not diminish the total quantity or quality of petroleum available to the U.S. and the national interests and are in accord with the provisions of the Export Administration Act of 1969. If the President finds that exports are in violation of the Export Administration Act, an executive order can halt all these exports if Congress finds that the exports are in conflict with the national interests, and they can act accordingly.

Now, having said it is covered under law, let's really get to the bottom line. This is another distraction from the same people that brought us cap-and-trade. Now, that should probably say everything right there because I find it absolutely ironic my good friend from New Mexico making this argument that if we went out and talked to our constituents if they would like to buy American-made energy, he suggested they would say overwhelmingly yes. Well, of course, they would. They would also say why aren't we drilling for sources here in the United States, offshore in the Gulf of Mexico and onshore; and that's what these three bills do.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion to recommit and pass the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 238, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

AYES—171

Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
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)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
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
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—238

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
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
Cooper
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
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
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
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
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
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)
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)

NOT VOTING—23

Ackerman
Berkley
Bilbray
Crowley
Cummings
Emerson
Engel
Gallegly
Giffords
Hirono
Johnson, Sam
King (NY)
Meeks
Nadler
Olver
Pascrell
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Sanchez, Loretta
Van Hollen
Weiner

□ 1339

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 297 had I been present I would have voted "aye." I was unfortunately detained and unable to vote.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 297, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 266, noes 149, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

AYES—266

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
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
Conyers
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
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
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, E. B.
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
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
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
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
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—149

Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
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)
Costello
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman
Bilbray
Crowley
Emerson
Engel
Gallegly
Giffords
Green, Gene
Johnson, Sam
King (NY)
Meeks
Nadler
Olver
Pascrell
Rangel
Rothman (NJ)
Weiner

□ 1359

Messrs. MILLER of North Carolina, SCHRADER, BUTTERFIELD, and PRICE of North Carolina changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 298, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state for the RECORD that on May 5, 2011, I missed the six rollcall votes of the day, as I was attending a wreath laying ceremony at Ground Zero with President Obama.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote No. 293, on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 245.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote No. 294, On Agreeing to H. Res. 245—Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 1229—Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act and H.R. 1230—Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote No. 295, on Agreeing to the Holt Amendment.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote No. 296, on Agreeing to the Connolly (VA)/Moran (VA)/Sarbanes (MD) Amendment.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote No. 297, on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 1230 with Instructions.

Finally, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote No. 298, on Passage of H.R. 1230.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 2011, I was absent for 6 rollcall votes because I joined the President at a wreath laying ceremony in honor of victims of 9/11 in New York.

If I had been here, I would have voted: "no" on rollcall vote 293; "no" on rollcall vote 294; "yes" on rollcall vote 295; "yes" on rollcall vote 296; "yes" on rollcall vote 297; and "no" on rollcall vote 298.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I was at Ground Zero in New York with the President and 9/11 families and therefore was unavailable for votes in Washington.

However, if I had been here this is how I would have voted: rollcall No. 293: "yea"; rollcall No. 294: "yea"; rollcall No. 295: "no"; rollcall No. 296: "no"; rollcall No. 297: "no"; and rollcall No. 298: "yes."

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 4, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, I hereby give notice of my resignation from the United States House of Representatives, effective Monday, May 9, 2011 at 1:30 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time. Included is a copy of the letter I submitted to Governor Brian Sandoval.

Serving Nevada's Second Congressional District has been one of the greatest honors of my life. No state has been harder hit by the recession than Nevada. My state has the unfortunate distinction of leading the nation in unemployment, foreclosures, and bankruptcy. There is no question that our nation needs to change the way we do business if we are going to get our economy back on track. It has been a privilege to join my House colleagues in the fight to restore fiscal responsibility to Washington and work towards a more prosperous future for our great nation.

I look forward to continuing our important work in the United States Senate.

Sincerely,

DEAN HELLER,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 4, 2011.

Hon. BRIAN SANDOVAL,
Governor, State of Nevada, State Capitol, Carson City, NV.

DEAR GOVERNOR SANDOVAL, I hereby submit my resignation as United States Representative of Nevada's Second Congressional District, effective Monday, May 9, 2011 at 1:30 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time.

Serving Nevada's Second Congressional District has been one of the greatest honors of my life. As you know all too well, no state has been harder hit by the recession than Nevada. There is a a lot of hard work ahead to get our state and nation moving in the right direction. Nevadans across our state have been struggling with job loss, high gas prices, and foreclosures. There is no question that our nation needs to change the way we do business if we are going to get our economy back on track and get Nevadans working again. These issues will remain my top priorities in the United States Senate.

I look forward to our continued work together to promote policies that strengthen our economy and improve Nevadans' quality of life.

Sincerely,

DEAN HELLER,
Member of Congress.

□ 1400

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1081

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1081.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, May 10, 2011, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, 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 Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. PASTOR, Arizona

RECOGNIZING CONTRIBUTIONS OF ENHANCED INTERROGATION TECHNIQUES IN WAR AGAINST TERROR

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, as we have appropriately celebrated the successful mission to take out Osama bin Laden, there has been one discordant note sounded in the Halls of Congress, and that is with the testimony of the Attorney General of the United States. There still is a reluctance on the part of this administration to recognize the major contribution made to this country by those who were involved in enhanced interrogation techniques which resulted in part of the information, the intelligence information, that allowed us to find Osama bin Laden.

The reason I bring this up is this administration has said in the past that certain types of enhanced interrogation techniques equaled torture. I do not believe that to be true, and for that to remain on the record subjects those men and women who have done a tremendous job for this country, which has resulted in one of the successful missions, in addition to other missions that have taken place in our war against terror, subjects them to the cloud of prosecution in the future and the accusation that they involved themselves in forms of conduct that would be defined as torture by some of the highest officials in the United States. That is something that we cannot allow to happen.

When we have the CIA Director indicate that we did receive information as a result of some of these activities, it seems to me that we are duty bound to clear up the record and to thank those men and women, not condemn them.

FEDERAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE NEEDED FOR TEXAS

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

Mr. CANSECO. Mr. Speaker, Texas is burning. Since November, Texas has experienced over 9,000 wildfires that have burned over 2 million acres and destroyed more than 400 homes and several thousand structures. These fires continue to rage, threatening the lives and property of Texans.

The State of Texas and local governments, along with our firefighters and our other first responders, have done a magnificent job of responding to the threats of these wildfires. However, the resources of the State and the local government have been stretched responding to fires we have already had; and the threat of wildfires continues. Without additional assistance, the capacity to respond to future wildfires will be greatly diminished. That is why Governor Perry requested a major disaster declaration and Federal disaster assistance. Unfortunately, President Obama denied this request.

Mr. Speaker, many in Texas and in my district can't seem to understand the President's decision. Governor Perry intends to appeal the President's decision, and I hope the President will reconsider.

REMEMBERING THOSE LOST IN THE APRIL STORMS

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring everyone's attention to the extraordinarily destructive storms that have raged throughout the South and particularly in my home State of Arkansas. In my home State, we have seen flooding and tornado damage wreak havoc on local communities. We have seen the lives of our loved ones tragically taken before their time.

Last week, I personally surveyed the damage in central Arkansas in my district. In the little town of Vilonia, a town north of Little Rock, 70 homes were destroyed and an additional 50 were damaged. I toured Little Rock Air Force Base and saw the damage to structures there and the damage to our C–130s that are so important to our national security. In Hot Springs Village, I saw the damage left in the wake of the latest round of the storms that claimed the life of an 8-month-old boy there. He is one of the 22 Arkansans killed by the storms in April.

I ask my colleagues and all Americans listening today to keep the families affected by this tragedy in their thoughts and prayers.

RECOGNIZING THOSE WHO TRAINED AT THE NAVAL STATION GREAT LAKES

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, when the President sought to take out America's most wanted and dangerous enemy, he called on an elite team of the United States Navy to execute the mission.

The 10th District of Illinois is home to an important Navy base. The Naval Station Great Lakes is the first stop of every single Navy recruit. It is likely that those who executed the mission in Pakistan on Sunday started their training at this base. Today, I want to recognize those who got the job done and the outstanding training provided at Naval Station Great Lakes.

I applaud the continued heroic efforts of our Armed Forces and intelligence personnel, and particularly those who under the cover of a dark Pakistan night dropped into a fortified compound to give justice to millions of people around the world.

Mr. Speaker, our fight against those who want to destroy democracies around the world continues, but today we can press ahead as confident as ever in our Nation's ability to confront and triumph over evil.

MARKING THE HOLOCAUST DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE

(Ms. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the Holocaust Days of Remembrance. In 1938, there was a family that lived in Vienna, Austria. The father was a successful tea merchant. The boys were both talented and bright. And when the Anschluss came and the Nazis arrived, the younger son watched as his mother signed away all of their possessions.

The mother made her way to the United States, because she had relatives here. The older of the two boys was smuggled out of Austria in the trunk of a car. The younger boy was taken to an orphanage, a boy's orphanage in Belgium.

The father, Sigmund, was not able to obtain passage, as the boys eventually did to the United States, and he ended up in the free city of Shanghai, where he reestablished his tea business. He kept writing to his wife, Rose, over the ensuing 2 years, and then she stopped hearing from him. It turned out that Sigmund Haimovitz had died in Shanghai of malaria.

His younger son, Henry, was my father-in-law, and I want to remember Sigmund Haimovitz and his brave family and all those who perished as a result of the terrible events of the Holocaust.

IMPORTANT POINTS FOR AMERICA TO CONSIDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCSHON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and to have an hour to invest in laying out some points here that I think are important for you to consider. And as America listens on, hopefully it will stimulate some of the thought process and help bring people to some conclusions.

The first thing that I think that any one of us wants to speak of and to is the President's announcement which took place very late on Sunday night that the Special Forces team had been successful in taking out Osama bin Laden.

Our first response to that news, that happy news for all of America, I think, is to congratulate the team that fast-roped down into that compound, those who put their lives on the line to put an end to the life of perhaps the most evil man on the planet, Osama bin Laden. And I congratulate the President of the United States for issuing the order and making the decision to go into that compound in the fashion that they did.

□ 1410

He had a number of options. As the news has reported, and I accept this to be fact, that the President sat in and led five different discussions to evaluate the quality of the intelligence that was available and the tactics that might be used in that compound and that he gave the order.

Some have said it was the most courageous order a President had given in their memory or lifetime. They were all from the administration. It was a good order, there's no question. I don't think it was the most courageous. It didn't lack courage. But there are a number of other big decisions that stand up there, I think, in a higher profile than this one. But it was the right decision, it was a good decision, and the President had to take a chance.

He could have ordered a massive bombing raid on that compound and, as some have said, turned it into a glass parking lot, which would have raised the level of the degree of success but firmly eliminated the chance to show that Osama bin Laden was in that compound. He could have dropped a single bomb, a one-ton-plus bomb from a Predator, that would have had a reasonable chance of succeeding in taking out the most evil man on the planet. Or he could have just done nothing. Or he could have ordered the Special Forces in to fast-rope inside that compound and do what they did. Of those options, I believe the President chose the right one, and I congratulate him for that decision.

Yet in sitting here and listening to the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN) talk about the situation with the intelligence that we had, it is clear to me, and it has been clear to me for a long time, that one of the essential links in the intelligence that led us to Osama bin Laden in the compound in Pakistan was information that was given up in part by Khalid Sheikh Mohammed in enhanced interrogation encounters that he had, probably before he went to Gitmo. That information then was worked, it was matched up with other information, and the thread was followed. In fact, the courier was followed to the compound in Pakistan.

It's ironic that the President of the United States campaigned against such enhanced interrogation tactics. It's ironic that many whom I serve with on the Judiciary Committee lined up against George W. Bush and accused him of ordering torture against people who had been attacking and killing Americans, terrorists of the like of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and a very small number of others.

I agree with the gentleman from California. Waterboarding is not torture. If it were torture, we would be torturing our own Special Forces troops. I would be willing to wager—and this I can't verify not knowing the identities of the individuals who did fast-rope down into that compound—that a number of those very same forces that went into the compound that took out Osama bin Laden in their training were likely waterboarded as a part of their training. I've sat in my office and I've gone out in the field and I've talked to those Special Forces personnel who were waterboarded as part of their training. It is not a painful procedure, but it is one that gives one the sensation that they are drowning. It's easy enough to go on the Internet and read the material there, Mr. Speaker. It's an enhanced and effective interrogation technique, and in all of the research that I did—and I read back in story after story of this and had others dig down in it—I found one case where there was a fatality that was nearly a century ago that was because of the brutal tactics that they used in conjunction with the waterboarding. In any case, there are many Americans that are alive today because of the information that our people were able to acquire because of enhanced interrogation techniques, and it's ironic that President Bush approved the methods that acquired the thread, the significant thread of information, without which no one can explain to me how we would have found Osama bin Laden in that compound.

And so the very President who campaigned against the tactics that George Bush was employing is the one that was able to take the information from those tactics and make the right decision to take out OBL. I'm glad that George Bush made the decisions that he made. I'm glad that he was strong and courageous and defended America's ability to gain information in the fashion that they did, because anyone will tell you that was involved with the interrogations, especially of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, that once he understood what waterboarding was, he sang like a canary. If he had not warbled in the fashion that he did, I don't think we would be celebrating in the fashion that we are the end of the life of the most evil man on the planet.

So, I agree with the gentleman from California that the cloud of investigation around the American interrogators who are being investigated for the tactics that they were assured by the Justice Department were constitutional and were legal and now we have a Justice Department with a different opinion, it's putting some of our interrogators through an investigation with the cloud of an eventual indictment hanging over their head for doing the same type of tactics that were used with Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and a very few others to gather the information that allowed us to take out Osama bin Laden. This paradox needs to be resolved, Mr. Speaker, and I am hopeful that the President will give the order for the Justice Department to accept the conclusions that were drawn by the Bush administration and adopt that policy so that Americans can continue to be protected and safe in the face of this threat that we have from without, this threat that comes from radical Islam.

We are fighting radical Islam. Radical Islamists are seeking to kill Americans on a regular basis because they

disagree with western civilization and our philosophy. It's why they attacked us on September 11. That's why they attacked the Khobar Towers. That's why they attacked the Twin Towers the first time in the early nineties. That's why they attacked the USS Cole, the Marine barracks, the list goes on and on, the times that we have been attacked by people who reject our free society. They feel threatened by the liberty and the freedom that is America. They're threatened by the free enterprise that we are. They're threatened by the robust nature of our culture and our economy and our innovativeness where we lead the world in patents and trademarks. Because of that, we need to stand strong and hold ourselves confident.

I point out, also, that the probability that the intelligence was correct and that Osama bin Laden was inside the compound where the attack came from our Special Forces on Sunday, the probability that he was there was a probability that was probably less than 50 percent chance. The President took the chance. If they had gone in and attacked the compound and Osama bin Laden had not been there, I would like to think we would have never heard about it, Mr. Speaker. I don't have any information that says that they tried any other compounds or tried any other locations, although I suspect that we have checked a few more places. I'd like to think we checked a lot of caves up there in the mountains in Pakistan. It's where a lot of us thought he was. That's where our intelligence was telling us that he was. So I would like to think that we were going into some of those locations. But if they had gone into that compound in Pakistan and Osama bin Laden had not been there, we would have never heard about it, which is appropriate and proper, because the odds of this kind of intelligence being spot-on are always less than 100 percent, and in this case I believe it was less than 50 percent. In fact, if you compare the value of the intelligence that said there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq before we went in there, when you had a universal intelligence conclusion that was drawn by the Israelis, the French, the Americans, as the universal global intelligence said, Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. The probability of those weapons being there in Iraq if you analyzed it from the intelligence we had at the time made that probability for WMD in Iraq greater than the probability that Osama bin Laden was even in the compound last Sunday when the attack came.

I make these points, Mr. Speaker, so that we can look back across this continuum of history and understand that intelligence isn't an exact science. It's a series of judgment calls. It's a series of connecting different threads of information together and following hunches and then coming to that and following the hunch and making the decision. President Obama made the right decision. The value of the intelligence we had, it wasn't a 100 percent piece of information that he had to work with, so whatever was the hunch, whatever was the conviction that caused him to make that decision, there's times you're going to be right and there's times you're going to be wrong. He was right this time. I'm glad he made the decision. I'm glad the world has seen the end of Osama bin Laden.

With regard to whether a photograph should be published of Osama bin Laden to give the world a higher measure of proof, I will give some deference to the opinion that came from the chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, MIKE ROGERS of Michigan, who said his measure is, does it make it harder for American military to work with, say, the Afghan people for intelligence and information on the ground in Afghanistan?

□ 1420

Does it make it harder or does it make it easier? Are the chances better or worse that our troops on the ground in Afghanistan will have a more successful time if the picture comes out or if it doesn't?

In addition to that position, I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that if the rumors that it's a hoax grow so great that they're able to use those rumors to recruit more al Qaeda, and if the rumors that it's a hoax strengthen the recruitment of the Taliban, then we should release the picture or the pictures or enough information that people can be completely convinced. I don't have any doubt Osama bin Laden was in that compound; Osama bin Laden is in the bottom of the Arabian Sea. And I don't have any doubt.

But we may have to get to the point where we have to erase the doubts, and I suspect it will be very hard to keep the pictures of this operation completely with a lid on them, although if anybody can do it, our Special Forces can. If that's their order, I expect that they will. I just don't know that the Pakistanis aren't sitting on something now that would get released.

Just another little irony I would point out as I transition, Mr. Speaker, into a little bit different subject matter. The compound is reported to have had 12- to 18-foot walls around it with barbed wire on top. It's pretty interesting that the Secretary of Homeland Security made a trip over to that part of the world to advise Afghanistan on border security and compared the Afghanistan-Pakistan border with the U.S.-Mexican border. It's interesting that the Secretary of Homeland Security has long said: You show me a 50-foot wall; I'll show you a 51-foot ladder.

It's interesting that the 12- and 18-foot walls weren't scaled by Special Forces personnel with 13- and 19-foot ladders. They put helicopters over the top of the compound and fast-roped down inside. The wall was effective and the wire on top of it was effective. That's why they put them there. They don't build all of these walls with wire on top all around the world if they're not effective. It isn't like ladders aren't available in Afghanistan or Pakistan.

My point is, and I often facetiously respond to this idea, that if you show me a 20-foot wall, I'll show you a 20-foot ladder, as if that just makes fun of anybody that thinks we can protect our borders with a wall. If anybody has been to a military compound, you will know there are fences and walls around the military compound. Why is that? It's to keep out enemy infiltrators. No, they don't keep out everybody. You have got to still guard it. People come along with wire cutters and they come along and dig underneath and they will detonate and blow a hole in a concrete wall. They did that in the wall around the Embassy in Saigon, if you remember. So it isn't that they're the only solution.

And when I say we need to build a fence, a wall and a fence on our southern border, Mr. Speaker, I'm not advocating that we build that and walk away and let somebody come up to the other side with a 21-foot ladder. I'm suggesting that, first of all, we don't have to build 2,000 miles of fence, wall, and fence, that we just build a fence, a wall, and a fence with a patrol road in between in those locations and build it until they stop going around the end.

If anybody has been down to the border, you will see the beaten path that goes through, sometimes right through what they're declaring to be fence, the 600-some miles of fence that they declare that we have. 646 I think is the last number that I saw. And when you go down and look at the real fence that's there, some of it is triple fencing that they call tertiary fencing. That's a little too sophisticated for me. If you go to the San Luis area in southwest Arizona, you can see 24-foot-high fences, triple fences. When I was down there last, I asked them directly, Has anyone defeated this triple fencing? Their answer, after several evasive responses and me point-blanking the question several times, was, No, they go around the end. Of course they do. It's a short fence. It doesn't go far enough. And so people go around the end.

So we just keep building a fence, a wall, and a fence until people stop going around the end. If we end up with 2,000 miles of fence, wall, and fence, we must have needed it because they were continuing to go around the end.

We can do this, and we can do this for a lot less money than we're spending today to chase people across the desert 70 and 100 miles north of our border.

Here's how the math works out, Mr. Speaker. We're spending about $12 billion protecting our southern border. That's 2,000 miles. Already, smart people have done this calculus and taken $12 billion and divided by 2,000 miles and come up with a unit price conclusion that we're spending $6 million a

mile to defend our southern border—$6 million.

Now, imagine this. For me, I'm an Iowa guy and I live out in the country on a gravel road, and it's a mile to concrete from where I live in any direction. So my west road, no one lives on it. It's a full mile of gravel.

If Janet Napolitano came to me and said, Congressman, I've got a proposal for you. I need you to guard this mile. Will you guard this mile and see to it that the people that go across it—you can let 75 percent of them through. No problem. Let 75 percent go through. And the 25 percent that you're required to stop, or you should be stopping, you just have to turn them around and send them back south again. And, by the way, I'm going to pay you, Congressman, $6 million a mile to defend this mile of your gravel road. I'd look at that and say, Could you give me a 10-year contract? That's what we do here in this Congress. We budget out for 10 years. That's $6 million a mile for 10 years. It's $60 million for the budget window of 10 years to guard a single mile.

The population that's going across that, 75 percent of those that try are getting through; 25 percent are being interdicted. This is a little bit dated information, but it's testimony before the Immigration Committee.

And so if they were going to pay me $60 million to guard this mile and I didn't have any kind of efficiency standard except turn 25 percent of them back, or so, first, I'm going to want an efficiency standard. I want a 100 percent efficiency standard. We ought to be developing infrastructure that gets us to that point. And so it wouldn't take me $60 million to build a fence, a wall, and a fence on that mile, that mile that runs from my house west. That's $6 million a year for 10 years, $60 million.

I would tap into the first year's annual budget and take one-third of it, $2 million, and I would build a fence, a wall, and a fence for the full mile. So it's 3 miles of structure. I would put a concrete wall in the middle of it. It would have a concrete foundation that made it difficult to dig underneath.

And one thing you know about concrete is you don't get through it with wire cutters. You don't get through it in a simple fashion like you might with a wire fence.

I would put a concrete wall in the middle. I'd have a fence down near the border. I'd move in about 60 or 100 feet and put a concrete wall in that's about 14 feet tall with wire on top, and I'd put another fence inside that. So if they got over my concrete wall, there's another corral. I would then hire fewer Border Patrol, and with needing less equipment, less pension plans, less benefit packages, I would put the first front money up in the infrastructure. You know that by the time they get through the fence, the wall, and the fence, you'll have a chance to catch them. We would put the sensory devices in, put the cameras up, put the vibration sensors in. Maybe we could get Boeing to perfect their system and add that to the fence, the wall, and the fence.

But it is foolish for us to think that we can just keep hiring more and more Border Patrol—we've more than doubled our Border Patrol—and then back off into the desert 70 or 100 miles and begin chasing people around in the sagebrush. That's not the way to do this. We need to shut off the bleeding at the border. This is not a recreational sport to be defending our border and chasing people down in the desert. If we can stop them before they get into the United States, that is the preferred way to go.

I have gone across the English Channel from England over to Calais, France, where the Brits have leased a chunk of ground because they want to stop the illegals before they get across the channel. They have leased this piece of ground from the French and they've set up a high security system there, and the trucks that come through go on ferries, and the ferries haul them across the English Channel, cars and trucks, just a constant rotation of ferries going back and forth across the English Channel.

The British have leased this piece of ground. They raised their technology and their manpower there to preempt access into the United Kingdom because they would rather deal with them on French soil than they would on British soil, because the British laws get a little sloppy like ours do. Once you pick somebody up inside the interior of the United States, they've got an opportunity to appeal, be adjudicated. It can cost us a lot of money.

□ 1430

The important thing is to keep them out of the United States. Let's build a fence, a wall, and a fence. We can do the whole thing for about $2 million a mile, and that leaves $4 million the first year left over to hire Border Patrol and to pay them wages and salary benefits and retirement packages and to give them some equipment with. Then the next year, there's another $6 million available every year—a little maintenance on that wall but not a lot. So that's a $60 million contract, Mr. Speaker, for a decade on a single mile. You put $2 million up front, and now you've got $58 million to play with.

I'll submit that we can do a better job by building infrastructure and using it to protect our border than we can by hiring a lot more personnel and chasing people around in the desert. It is a simple business equation. This political arena doesn't lend itself very well to simple business equations, but that is one, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to continue to push to build a fence, a wall, and a fence; and yes, we need to put something on top of that. I don't care if it looks a little bit bad. If they don't want to see wire on top of the wall at the border, why do the Mexicans build walls at the U.S. border with concertina wire on top? They're not offended when they put up it up. Why would they be offended if we put it up, Mr. Speaker?

It's part of our immigration situation that we need to address, and I'll continue with that in that ''stop the bleeding at the border.'' That is the way to do it. We can force all traffic through our ports of entry, and we should beef up our ports of entry, widen them out, and invest in infrastructure there. We should put personnel there so that we can use surveillance techniques that are state of the art so that we can efficiently move through the traffic that is relatively safe and that is unlikely to have contraband in it. Then we can even better scrutinize those pieces of traffic that are likely to have illegal persons or illegal contraband in them. That would stop the bleeding at the border in a significant way.

We forget that 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in America comes from or through Mexico—90 percent. The drug enforcement people tell me that, of every illegal drug distribution chain in this country, at least one link in that distribution chain is someone who is here in the United States unlawfully. Many times, the whole chain is a chain of custody of illegal drugs going from Mexico through and up into the United States—pick Chicago—and all the way to the end user, and the drugs never go into any hand except of somebody who's here illegally in the United States. Imagine, 90 percent of the illegal drugs in America come from or through Mexico.

Headless corpses are showing up by the dozens in Mexico, and they're starting to show up here in the United States. I went to a meeting in Columbus, New Mexico, a town hall meeting. There were people there who, on their way to church, drive parallel to the border. On their way to church on a Sunday morning, four heads were on display for them to see, which was a warning to, apparently, the other drug cartel. This is spilling over into the United States. Those heads were on the Mexican side, I'll point out, Mr. Speaker, for the point of accuracy, but they're showing up on the U.S. side of the border.

The drug trade here in the United States is extremely lucrative. I've been trying to get these numbers from the drug enforcement personnel, and they've been very hard to get. Yet Fox News reported that the illegal drug trade in America is a $40 billion industry—$40 billion. It has been reported that at least $60 billion is wired from the United States into points south. A lot of that may come from the wages of people who are working here in the United States—and a lot of them working here illegally. There are around 8 million illegals working in America, taking jobs that legal immigrants or American citizens should be doing. But there is $60 billion a year wired south.

Half of it, $30 billion, goes into Mexico, and the other $30 billion goes into the Caribbean, Central America and some into South America—$30 billion into Mexico, the other $30 billion scattered around in the rest of the southern part, south of us, in the Western Hemisphere.

We don't know and they don't speculate on how much of the $60 billion is just laundering illegal drug money. I don't know the basis of the $40 billion number that Fox News reported on the value of illegal drugs that are consumed in America. That's just the only number that's out there that I can find. I don't think we have the basis of enough intelligence to be able to bring a real solution to this.

I don't think our people at the top have done enough work to quantify the problem. They're not talking about the problem. Instead, I see an emphasis on our southern border, a shift that took place under the Obama administration, that causes some of our Border Patrol to pivot. Instead of looking south to say, Hold it. Don't come into the United States illegally, they started to turn around and look north and try to interdict cash and guns that are coming from the United States and going into Mexico. A lot of these guns, by the way, are perfectly legal in the United States but not legal in Mexico.

So do we have the personnel to filter that at the Mexican border?

It's fine to interdict the cash, because that raises the transaction costs of those who are smuggling drugs into the United States, and it's fine to work and cooperate with the Mexicans if they need a little help on guns that become illegal when they get across the border; but we need to focus on people who are smuggling illegal drugs into the United States. We need to focus on illegal people who are being smuggled into the United States. The value of this has not quantified the loss in American lives. Quantifying the loss in treasure is one thing: $60 billion wired south, $40 billion worth of illegal drugs consumed in the United States, violence in Mexico, and headless corpses by the dozen.

I began to ask these questions some years ago, have finally had some response, Mr. Speaker. It's as a result of two studies that I've commissioned over the years by the Government Accountability Office, GAO studies. One came out in April of 2005, and the other one came out just this past month—released within the past few weeks, actually, but it's dated March of 2011.

We've had witnesses come before the Immigration Subcommittee. First, they'll say America is a Nation of immigrants, as if that's the be all-end all of the conclusion we should draw and that we shouldn't try to limit illegal immigration into America, let alone eliminate it, because America is a Nation of immigrants.

My response to that, Mr. Speaker, is: Yes, sure enough. Could you point out for me a nation on the planet that is not a nation of immigrants? I asked that question of witness Ms. Hernandez some few years ago. I asked if she would care to tell me of a nation that is not a nation of immigrants.

She sat there at the witness table—under oath, mind you—and presented as an expert witness. Her eyes kind of rolled a little bit back in the back of her head; and she said, Well, that would be the Incas and the Aztecs.

So I said, Who, according to an anthropologist, came across the Bering Straits about 12,000 years ago. Would you like to try again, Ms. Hernandez?

Of course, she didn't want to try again, and no one has succeeded in pointing out a nation that is not a nation of immigrants. The closest you could come is with the Japanese, and there are two ethnic groups in Japan that are identified by their locales and by the accents and the languages that they have. They believe that both of them came from Polynesian origins centuries and centuries ago.

Every nation, Mr. Speaker, is a nation of immigrants. People have migrated around this planet since Adam and Eve left the Garden of Eden, and they always will. So we don't carry a certain responsibility towards setting aside the rule of law in America because we are a Nation of immigrants. We have a responsibility to preserve, protect and defend the pillars of American exceptionalism—and of course, the rule of law is an essential pillar of American exceptionalism.

So that question of, first, are we a Nation of immigrants, yes, we are; but we are a Nation of laws, and we must adhere to and protect the rule of law.

When we look at the policies that we have, it's important for us to shut off the jobs magnet here in the United States, not only control/stop the bleeding at the border, but we have to shut off the jobs magnet here in America. One of the ways that we do that is to enforce our laws, of course. E-Verify is an important tool. It's a Web site-based software program that allows an employer to run, I call it, the name, rank and serial number—the Social Security number—of an employee through that database. It will go back, and it will search the Department of Homeland Security's database, the Social Security database, NCIC, and come back and tell you if that information represents that that individual can lawfully work in the United States. We use it. I've tried to fool it and I've tried to scramble it, and the longest delay I can get out of it is 6 seconds.

□ 1440

It's very fast. It's very accurate. The software package is only as accurate as the data behind it, and when we find a mistake in E-Verify, it's almost always because someone got married and forgot to change their name or some piece of information like that that needs to be upgraded. Easily fixed. The only way you make E-Verify even better is to use it and use it and use it so that database gets cleaned up, and it's set up to do that with a 72-hour notice of cure.

So using E-Verify is a good tool. I have a better tool out there that I will soon be introducing, Mr. Speaker, and I have introduced it in previous Congresses. I've been waiting for the right time, and we will set up a press conference and roll out a bill called the New IDEA Act. Now, they say there are no new ideas in this Congress, that it's a just repackaging of old ideas. This one I think actually is a relatively new idea, and it comes from this concept that, well, who enjoys enforcing the law? Who's effective in it? Who do the American people believe will come forward and enforce the law?

And as I was thinking that through, it occurred to me that the IRS probably has the maximum respect of all of the law enforcers in America. They have better tools to work with than many of the other agencies out there, and we expect they will come in and they will conduct an audit, and they're going to look to see if they can find something wrong with your tax return. Anybody that's been through an audit doesn't want to go through another audit. Frank Luntz put out some numbers that showed that a majority of Americans would rather be mugged than go through an IRS audit; 58 percent would rather have a root canal than go through an IRS audit. I'd like to have the IRS helping us with immigration law.

So I drafted legislation called the New IDEA Act. It's the New, and the acronym IDEA stands for Illegal Deduction Elimination Act. What it does is it clarifies that wages and benefits paid to illegals are not tax deductible, and then it gives the employer safe harbor if they use E-Verify. So, if the employer in good faith runs their employees through E-Verify, it will give the employer that credit that he used E-Verify, and he can deduct the wages if E-Verify should happen to be wrong, for example, and it won't be.

But otherwise, if the IRS then comes in during a normal audit—we don't accelerate audits, we don't initiate any more audits than we'd normally have—but if the IRS comes in during a normal audit, they would run the Social Security numbers and information of all the employees through E-Verify, and if any of those employees were kicked back at them as not lawful to work in the United States, the IRS then would take a look. They'd give the employer an opportunity to cure, but they would look at that data and say, all right, I'm sorry, the wages that you paid this illegal are not going to be a business expense for you, so they come off the Schedule C and they go over into the profit column in your tax form.

Imagine if you're an employer and you paid $1 million to illegals and the IRS came in to do the audit and they said, I'm sorry, that $1 million that you had as a business expense is not an

expense. You can't expense wages and benefits paid to illegals. So now that $1 million goes over into the profit side, and the IRS looks at that and says, you know, you're going to have to pay interest on that. You had a tax liability that you unlawfully claimed. You're going to have to pay interest on that tax liability, and you're going to have to pay a penalty, and you have to pay the principal, which is a tax liability.

So if it rolls it over to a 36 percent tax rate, plus the interest, plus the penalty, the net result is that turns your $10 an hour illegal into about a $16 an hour illegal, which means that there will be Americans out there that will be taking those jobs at $12, $13, $14, and $15 an hour that didn't have an opportunity to do that before because illegals were in there working for $10. This will open up jobs for Americans.

We saw a big number of new jobless reports pop up today. This unemployment number is not getting better. It is just zigzagging and stagnating at a number that hangs in there close to 9 percent. This is a very, very slow recovery. One of the things we can do to help recover is to pass the New IDEA Act, let the IRS come in and do their normal audits, and employers will decide that they don't want to wait for the IRS to get there. They will want to clean up their workforce as soon as they practically can.

That's part of the beauty of this. This isn't a hard and fast piece of legislation that requires employers to fire all their illegals at once. They can make their decision on when they will take the risk, but what it does do is accumulates a 6-year statute of limitations. So that if an employer gets by this year without an audit and he keeps illegals on the payroll the next year without an audit, he has to go a full 6 years before that first illegal year drops off, and he's still liable for the IRS to go back through the books a full 6 years, which means that employers are going to look at this, and they're going to think, I'm paying $1 million out to illegals; if I get to the end of a 6-year cycle and the IRS comes in and audits me, they're going to deny $6 million that I have written off as business expenses, put that over into the profit side, and you could be looking at $6 million worth of income, and all of that with interest and penalty attached to it. And so your $6 million probably becomes something greater than $3 million in penalties out of the $6 million that were formerly a write-off.

That's how this liability accumulates with a 6-year statute of limitations. That's why employers, even though they may not be able to transition their workforce into a 100 percent legal workforce the first year, the pressure to do so every year will be so great because getting through 6 years without an IRS audit and knowing that you're going to carry with you a full 6 years of risk will cause employers to clean up their workforce on their own.

One of the problems we have is trying to get the administration to enforce immigration law. We can pass a law. We can make it mandatory that everybody use E-Verify. I will probably have an opportunity to vote for that, and I will. But we cannot require the executive branch to enforce the law. The President of the United States takes an oath to take care that the laws are faithfully enforced. That's part of the Constitution, and it's true for the executive branch employees, including Eric Holder, the Attorney General; including Janet Napolitano, the Secretary of Homeland Security. But we can't make them enforce the law.

I've been in the business of seeking to embarrass the administration into enforcing the law now into my ninth year here because we don't have the tools. We can call them forward now that Republicans have the majority. We can have hearings, bring the press into the hearings because the press helps us a lot. They convey that message back to the American people, and the American people understand that there are things they should be outraged about. But we have no tool other than to cut their budget or embarrass them, or I guess there's more Draconian methods that would not be used, and I won't mention those for fear that they will start an unnecessary rumor.

But all of that said, Mr. Speaker, the IRS will come in and do this work, and it won't be about us trying to embarrass them into enforcing the law. It will be about the IRS coming in to turn it into a revenue generator. It will be. The New IDEA Act, Mr. Speaker, is a tool that can do the most to bring our immigration laws in this country under enforcement and to reduce the numbers of illegals that are in the United States the most dramatically with the least amount of cost. In fact, it's a plus-up because it will generate more revenue for the Internal Revenue Service.

Another point on the border, to roll back down to the southern border, Mr. Speaker, and to make this point is that we have a tourism industry that has to do with anchor babies. Anchor babies are babies that are born in the United States to an illegal mother, and the practice over the years has been to grant automatic citizenship to babies born on U.S. soil. It is not a law. It is not a constitutional requirement. It's just a sloppy practice that began that's getting worse and worse and worse.

We have now in this country somewhere between 340,000 and 750,000 babies born to illegal mothers in America that get automatic citizenship. They're anchor babies. They sneak into the United States, many of them, for the purposes of having the baby. They get the little birth certificate with their little footprints on there. Then they either stay here or they go back to their home country and wait until that child comes of age, and they use that child to apply to bring in the family, the nuclear family, then the extended family, and it's out of control—340,000 to 750,000 a year automatic citizens to America that have essentially unlimited ability to bring their families into the United States.

□ 1450

We have testimony before the Immigration Committee that shows us that if you look at immigrants, legal immigrants, and base it on merit, you would think a country would want to establish an immigration policy that was designed to enhance the economic, social, and cultural well-being of the United States of America. Wouldn't any country have an immigration policy that was designed to help them? I mean, it is not selfish of America to want to have an immigration policy that's good for this country. We cannot be the relief valve for all the poverty in the world.

For every some 6.3 billion or so people on the planet—maybe it's more than that—they can't all live in America. There are more than 5 billion that have a lower standard of living than the average Mexican. So if we think we're going to be the relief valve of poverty in the world, and we bring into America 1 million to 1.5 million legally, and across the border comes—there are numbers that I have seen testified to that show as many as 4 million illegals in a year. Many go back and forth. They are carrying drugs on their back. Maybe they're visiting family. The net number I guess we don't know. It seems to shake out pretty odd that you can have that much border crossing, and the numbers don't accumulate.

When I came to this Congress 8-plus years ago, the number was 12 million illegals in America. Now they're giving us estimates that there are maybe 11 million illegals in America. How does that work? Did that many people die? Did we give that many people citizenship that came in here illegally? So I think that number is significantly higher than 11 million or 12 million. I think it's been growing every year for a generation. I think it continues to grow.

Anchor babies, babies that are born to illegal mothers in the United States that get automatic citizenship, cause people to sneak into the United States to have the baby because they see citizenship in America as cashing in to the giant ATM, the giant ATM which is America's welfare cash machine.

Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation has done a lot of research on welfare benefits—he has broken it up in a number of different ways—that go to households where there is at least one illegal that's in it.

I need to come back at a later date, Mr. Speaker, and take up the cost to the American taxpayer of benefits that go to households that are oftentimes headed up by an illegal. When we look at what has happened on the floor of this Congress in the last 4 to 5 years, when the SCHIP legislation passed this

Congress, they weakened their requirements of proof of citizenship for Medicaid.

So free medical care for people who are lower income is being provided to people that should actually be deported back to their home country because the standard that you had to show proof of citizenship that was written into the old Medicaid legislation was struck and replaced with a requirement that you attest to a nine-digit Social Security number. That's the standard. They lowered it that low because the people on that side of the aisle wanted to pay Medicaid benefits to illegals. They want to give them a path to citizenship. They want to give them an opportunity to vote.

I look back at what Ronald Reagan said: What you tax, you get less of; but what you subsidize, you get more of. If you reward people for coming into the United States illegally, and you reward them with welfare packages and plans, you are going to get more people in the United States illegally, and you are going to get more people that are signing up for more welfare.

We have in this country 77 different means-tested welfare programs in the United States of America. There isn't one person in this United States Congress that could stand down here on the floor without a cheat sheet and name every one of them. And there isn't one person in this United States Congress that can actually understand how each one of these 77 means-tested welfare programs interrelates with each other, let alone how it affects the decisions of individuals on whether they are going to get a job or sit at home. If you are on rent subsidy and heat subsidy and food stamps, and list all the other Federal programs that are there, why would you work when you are rewarded for not working?

I look at the labor situation in America. There are 8 million working illegals in America. There are a number of others out there that we probably didn't find in the data that we have. So here we are with the unemployment numbers of about 15 million Americans who are registered as unemployed. There is another 6 to 8 million that are past the data. They've quit trying, so they're no longer technically called unemployed. They just quit looking for a job. There is another 6 to 8 million of those. You are up to over 20 million Americans that are on unemployment, drawing it, or have given up applying for it.

But when I start to add to that number of roughly 20 million, 22 to 23 million Americans that are unemployed or have given up trying and aren't working, and I go to the Department of Labor's statistics, their own statistics that come from the Department of Labor, and I begin to add up the American workforce—that workforce number is a little foggy in my memory—it's 140-some million people in America's workforce. If you start adding those who are not currently working—and I start at age 16 because that's a legitimate age.

You can collect unemployment at age 16 if you have earned enough that they paid in on your behalf—the teenagers between age 16 and 19, there are 9.7 million that aren't in the workforce at all, not even a part-time job of any kind. Yes, they may be students; but there's nothing wrong with working and going to school. That's what a lot of people did, and it builds character. You add to that those that are from 20 to 25 years old, and you go on up the line in different age categories. I went up to age 74 because we pay unemployment at age 74, and Wal-Mart hires at age 74 and so do a lot of other employers. So the age of the workforce I am using is 16 to 74. It's a legitimate bracket. We could narrow that in a little bit, and we would have fewer numbers.

But here's the point: Of the 8 million working illegals in America, there are 80 million Americans of working age that are not in the workforce; 80 million people of working age that are simply not in the workforce. They might have checked out. They are sitting back on some of the 77 means-tested welfare programs. They might be independently wealthy and decided to retire. If so, good on them. But they are not in the workforce for one reason or another, or they are working in the black market. It might be that some of those people are selling drugs who are not in the workforce. But if people say there are jobs out there Americans won't do, name one. Name one job that Americans won't do. I can take you and show you an American that's doing every single job definition that there is in this country.

The reason that you see people here illegally and they're out-competing Americans is because they'll work for less. They'll pile up in a house with many more people living in the same dwelling. They are not a threat to the employer to file workmen's comp or an unemployment claim.

So they are a lower liability for the employer. The employer can bring in a crew of illegals, get a job done, dispatch them down the line; and once they leave that job, they are no longer a liability to them. So it's like being able to lease a machine to come do a job. You say, take the machine back, and park it in the lot, and you are done. You don't have to worry about the depreciation or the maintenance. That's what has happened. In a way, it's a bit inhuman to see this going on.

If we enforced our immigration law, it opens up at least 8 million jobs for Americans or legal immigrants; and if people say there aren't enough Americans to do those jobs, nuts. We have to hire one out of every 10 that's sitting now on the couch and put them to work. Why wouldn't you want to increase and enhance the average annual productivity of our people? Why would you not?

What if we were on a big cruise ship, but it was powered by sails and oars? So many people have to be trimming the sails. So many people have to be pulling on the oars. Somebody has got to be in the kitchen cooking. Somebody has got to be swabbing the deck. Somebody has got to be up there in the wheelhouse navigating, and somebody has got to be steering. With all of that going on, if you didn't have enough people at the oars to pull the load, would you pull that cruise ship off on an island somewhere and load on a bunch more people to pull on the oars? Or would you go after the 80 million people that are sitting on the couch now and have some of those people get up off the couch and grab an oar and pull?

I want to increase the production of America. I want to increase the average annual productivity of Americans. If we do that, we increase our standard of living. If not, if more of us sit back and don't go to work and don't produce anything, and we bring others in to do the work that we say we are now too good to do, then our broader standard of living goes down, and you need more and more welfare programs to pay the people that are not working, and you still have to carry the social costs for the people that are working underneath the market value.

You can't sustain a household for some of the wages that are being paid to illegals. That's why they are tapping into welfare benefits. That's why they use their child that has been born in America as an anchor baby as a means to get access to the welfare program.

□ 1500

And so here we have an America that's underemployed, 80 million people of working age that are not in the workforce. A lot of them are living off of the sweat of the brow of somebody else in the form of the 77 means-tested welfare programs that are out there. They don't have an incentive to go to work, but we pay them with tax dollars if they'll just stay peaceful, stay in their houses, don't cause any trouble. Let's not have any violence in the streets. If you do all that, then we'll hire these other people that are in the United States illegally at substandard wages and subsidize them both.

What sense does that make, Mr. Speaker, for a Nation to not be upgrading its standard of living by increasing the average productivity of our people?

And why would we not be defending the rule of law? And why would we reward people that sneak into the United States to have a baby so they can tap into all this giant ATM?

We've got to put an end to anchor babies. I have the legislation to do it, Mr. Speaker, and I have scores of cosponsors on the anchor baby legislation that I introduced very early in this session with some good gentlemen from Georgia, in particular. ROB WOODALL came in and was ready to step up on that, and there are others. TOM GRAVES is part of that. I appreciate the work that they are doing, and I'm happy to

join with them and work together on those issues.

But we have to have a Nation of laws and a Nation that respects the rule of law. We have to shut off the bleeding at the border.

We need to get more of our Americans to work. You notice I didn't say back to work, Mr. Speaker. We're sometimes into the third and fourth generation where they didn't work at all. They have learned how to game the system, and we've accepted it. We no longer require the welfare-to-work part of this; that you get 5 years total and then you have to go to work. What we see happen is 77 means-tested welfare programs. Nobody can monitor all of that. And the will of the American people isn't such because now half the households don't pay income tax. But they go vote. And they vote themselves largesse from the public treasury. They vote themselves welfare benefits. There are people here that pander to that, and they understand that their political base is expanded when they expand the dependency class in America.

So what did they do?

They passed legislation in here under Speaker PELOSI over and over again that expanded the dependency class in America because it strengthened their political base. ObamaCare is a huge key of expanding the dependency class. It says we're going to promise you that every American has access to health care, every single one. It wasn't an issue. But they conflated the two terms, the term health care and health insurance.

Anyone in America can show up in the emergency room and be treated. That's access to health care, and it's probably superior to most nations. I'm sure it's superior to most nations in the world. I don't know a nation that it's not superior to.

But then it was the promise that, well, it's really not very good. It's expensive that you show up in the emergency room without insurance, so what we really want to do is give everybody their own insurance policy and insure another 30 million people.

So I look at that, and I do the math and I ask the question, who's really not insured and doesn't have affordable options?

These numbers came from the United States Senate, the Republican Senate Conference, the Senate staff, and it came down to this. You start with about 306 million Americans, and then you begin to subtract those that are insured, those that are on Medicare, those that qualify, those that are on Medicaid, those that are qualified for Medicaid but don't sign up, those that are covered under their employer, and those that are eligible under their employer and don't sign up, and you begin to reduce this number of 306 million Americans down. First you take the insured, subtract that from 306, and then you begin to identify the Americans that are uninsured. That was those that are here illegally. I'm not interested in funding their health insurance package. I think it's wrong and immoral for us to do that. They're not on my list.

When you boil it down, Americans without affordable options numbered 12.1 million. Now, that is a lot of people, but it's less than 4 percent of our population. Yet ObamaCare sought to disrupt and transform and change and socialize the health insurance industry in America, 100 percent of it, the health care delivery system, 100 percent of that, in order to reduce the number of uninsured Americans without affordable options from some number that's less than 4 percent down to some other lower number.

At what cost?

The cost of American liberty, cost of the United States Constitution. The cost of our freedom.

ObamaCare is a malignant tumor, and it is metastasizing in the heart and soul of the spirit of the American people.

We are a vigorous people. We are a people that have skimmed the cream of the crop off of every donor civilization on the planet, Mr. Speaker. The vigor that came from people that had a vision and a dream, that came here across the pond in one way or another because they wanted to access the liberty and the freedom that we have here is a different kind of a vigor than saying, well, we got good vigor from Great Britain, and we got it from France and Germany and Italy, wherever else, Eastern Europe and around the planet, Greece, name it. No, we got the best of every donor civilization. We got the vigor from every donor civilization. We got the dreamers from every country that sent legal immigrants here, that gives America a unique vigor. It's different than any other country in the world. That's the reason why we succeed. It's the reason why we can take free enterprise and do something with it. It's why America has risen to become the unchallenged greatest Nation on the planet.

We have all of the rights that come from God that are defined so clearly and well, not just in the Declaration, but in the Constitution and especially in the Bill of Rights, and you add to that free enterprise, and you add to that this vigor that comes from legal immigrants from all over, from every civilization, and you have an America that has a spirit and an attitude that's unique on the planet.

It is unsuitable to take a free people and tie the yoke of ObamaCare around their neck. I will draw the line. I want to see shutting off all funding to ObamaCare tied to the debt ceiling bill, Mr. Speaker. Before we even discuss the debt ceiling, I want a guarantee that all of our troops get paid on time. In the event of a debt ceiling limit or a shutdown of any kind, uniformed troops in the United States or anywhere in the world serving Uncle Sam need to know their paycheck is going to be wired into their account on time every time, no matter what is going on here in the United States Congress.

Second point, TOM MCCLINTOCK's full faith and credit bill that sets up the priority on how we would pay our debts in the event of a debt ceiling limit being reached. We can set those priorities, and it needs to be, pay the interest on those who have loaned money to America first and move our way on down the priority list.

Do those two things, send them out of this House, send them over to HARRY REID in the Senate, and he can decide. Pick them up and send them to the President of the United States and let him sign, let the President sign both of those bills, the Gohmert bill, the McClintock bill into law.

That, Mr. Speaker, would be the qualifier before we'd even begin to discuss what we would do about the prospects of raising a debt ceiling.

But for me, I'd put the cutting off of all funds to ObamaCare on that debt ceiling bill and say there can be no raising of the debt ceiling here by the House of Representatives unless we shut off all the funding that's going to implement or enforce ObamaCare, at least until such time as the Supreme Court should rule.

The President is delaying the action of the Supreme Court. He could have asked for an expedited review of ObamaCare. We all know it's going to the Supreme Court. The President is delaying the decision in the Supreme Court the same way that he delayed bringing his birth certificate out.

Mr. Speaker, it is so important that we not chase good money after bad, that the Supreme Court rule on ObamaCare. At least then, then let Congress decide when they might appropriate rather than these automatic appropriations.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1510

PROVIDE FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do appreciate the recommendations of my friend from Iowa. And I certainly agree, we should be passing a bill that would require no leeway for the Treasury's Secretary, that he should pay our debts as they come due and also make sure the military is paid on time. We know that Social Security is already going to be mandatory spending in the event of a shutdown. And that way we are allowed to pursue the issues that are most critical and that is, really, in the interest of children. That term is used so often. It is really true now. We have got to cut the ridiculous, irresponsible spending to preserve this Union.

But there are two problems out there that are seeking to destroy this country. One is passively to destroy this

country, and that is our gross, irresponsible overspending: $2.1 trillion coming in and $3.75 trillion going out. We won't last much longer as a country if that continues.

The other is not passive. It is very active. And our great military and intelligence communities did a fantastic job apparently in taking out the most wanted man last weekend in the world, the man responsible for possibly more murders than anyone currently in existence on the planet, but certainly he had killed more Americans than anyone else alive on the planet today. And that was, of course, Osama bin Laden.

But there has been a great rewriting of history. And since we know—it has been made very clear that there are radical Islamist jihadists that want to destroy our country—it is ridiculous not to defend ourselves. We took an oath to defend the Constitution.

We are supposed to provide for the common defense. It is the most important responsibility that we as a Federal Government have, because if we do not provide for a common defense, then it matters not what we try to do in the way of Medicare and Medicaid. All kinds of problems occur in the U.S.

If we don't defend ourselves, there are plenty of evil groups who would love to destroy our way of life. In the case of the radical Islamic jihadists, they believe that as much freedom as we have in America leads to decadence and debauchery and that we need one leader, one religious leader, an ahmadi, to preside over one giant, worldwide caliphate.

So for those of us who realize on both sides of the aisle we make a lot of mistakes, people across the country make a lot of mistakes. No one at the current time on Earth is perfect. We realize still that freedom to make our own choices is what the Founders intended, and that is because they believed that the Creator—as they referenced in the Declaration, God referenced in other places, Providence in other places, they believed that that was God's choice for our life, that we have choice.

And even though God knew that we would make bad choices, when people can freely love of their own volition, their own choice, as a father I know that means so much more than if you demand that a child or someone in your care act like they love you.

So thank God. He desires our love and our praise. As a result, we were given freedom of choice. You don't have to look too deeply into founding documents and diaries and journals to realize just how much the Founders, the Continental Congress members, believed that.

So it gets interesting when people try to rewrite history and especially in the process of failing to properly provide for the common defense.

We had the Attorney General of the United States before the Judiciary Committee this week, and of concern to me and many others has been the refusal of this Justice Department to prosecute the unindicted coconspirators in the Holy Land Foundation trial.

The evidence used in that case had been adduced from back in 1991, 1993. There was a treasure trove of material found, I believe, in 2004 here, just across in Virginia. There was a subbasement that had tremendous amounts of documents reflecting the plans and intentions and strategy for the effort to bring down the government as we know it, our way of life as we know it, and that was by radical Muslims.

I am also thankful that there are a majority of Muslims who are moderates. They don't believe jihad means to go about destroying those who oppose what you are doing. They believe that jihad means an internal change of life. And when someone has a moderate Muslim for a friend, he has a friend for life. It kind of reminds me of southern hospitality.

But, nonetheless, we do our moderate Muslim friends no favors in failing to oppose the radical Islamic jihadists, because make no mistake, if we do not defend this Nation against the radical Islamic jihadists, then some of the people that would lose their lives, at a minimum lose their freedoms, would be moderate Muslims, because being a moderate is not abided in the world of a radical Muslim. If you don't believe just as they do, then it is okay to take your life.

So that's why I say we are no friend to our moderate Muslim friends if we do not defend this Nation against the radicals, because our moderate Muslim friends will be targeted if we do not do our job in defending the Nation, which brings me back again to the Holy Land Foundation trial.

The Bush administration, acting on information that was obtained through the 1990s through the Clinton administration Justice Department, FBI, and especially since 1993, the efforts made by the FBI, the incredibly professional work that was done, it was amazing how well they put a case together. Unfortunately, when the case was tried the first time, it led to a hung jury. In the pleadings—and I have many of the documents here. Not all of them. There are boxes and boxes of documents, and I understand even now, under Attorney General Holder, the Justice Department has boxes and boxes of evidence, documents, wiretaps that have not even been translated. You would think that would be fairly important before a decision was made on whether or not to pursue the unindicted coconspirators.

Now, it is not always the case, but in this case the unindicted coconspirators were actually listed. If one goes through the list of unindicted coconspirators, you find groups like the Islamic Society of North America, aka ISNA; you find the North American Islamic Trust, aka NAIT. It is amazing. You find Founders of CAIR, C-A-I-R.

So it was intriguing, after having five convictions on all 108 allegations in the Holy Land Foundation trial that went on in Dallas, that this Justice Department would ultimately decide we are not going to pursue any of those other coconspirators or joint venturers, who the evidence shows clearly provided financing for a known terrorist group, Hamas. The documentation is substantial.

□ 1520

And this is only a tiny thimbleful of the evidence that was in the case.

But when I look here at the Islamic Society of North America, at some of the evidence that came out, we have journal voucher after journal voucher showing the money that was taken out and used to ultimately assist in terrorism or to fund a terrorist group. You see all these journal entries. There are deposit slips in here making clear all kinds of things in the way of money. All kinds of amounts were transferred to assist in the funding of terrorism.

In fact, at the conclusion of the first part of the case with the five defendants, some of the unindicted coconspirators filed a motion to require the Federal District Judge in Dallas to strike or eliminate all of the names of the unindicted coconspirators, or at least their own, and an assistant U.S. Attorney in Dallas named James Jacks did a very good job in rebutting that and laying out in his brief before the Federal District Court how there were significant amounts, tremendous amounts of evidence that showed that the unindicted coconspirators' names should not be stricken from the record. And the judge in his memo order on the case came back and said basically there is a prima facie case.

In fact, the judge said here—this is in his memo decision, and this is Judge Solis, a Federal judge in Dallas—''The government has produced ample evidence to establish the associations of CAIR, C-A-I-R, ISNA, Islamic Society of North America, and NAIT, the North American Islamic''—I have it here, what the T stands for—''with HLF, the Islamic Association for Palestine and with Hamas. While the court recognizes that evidence produced by the government largely predates the HLF designation date, its evidence is nonetheless sufficient to show the association of these entities with HLF, IAP and Hamas,'' and being conjunctive together and not disjunctive. The judge goes on to say, ''Thus maintaining the names of the entity on the list is appropriate in light of the evidence proffered by the government.''

He goes further in his opinion and says, ''The explanatory memorandum includes a section entitled 'Understanding the Role of the Muslim Brotherhood in North America,' which states that the work of the Ikhwan in the United States is a kind of grand jihad in eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within and sabotaging its miserable house by their hands and the hands of the believers so that it is eliminated and God's religion

is made victorious over all other religions.''

Also contained in that document is a list of the Muslim Brotherhood's ''organizations and the organizations of our friends,'' which includes ISNA, NAIT, the Occupied Land Fund, which was HLF's former name, and the United Association for Studies and Research. During the early years of the OLF and HLF operation, OLF raised money and supported Hamas through a bank account that it held with ISNA and NAIT.

Indeed, OLF operated from within ISNA in Plainfield, Indiana, where defendant Baker was employed. The Muslim Brotherhood supervised the creation of a ''Palestine Committee,'' which was put in charge of other organizations such as HLF, IAP, UASR, and ISNA. The July 30, 1994, meeting agenda for the Palestine Committee lists IAP, HLF, UASR, and CAIR as working organizations for the Palestine Committee.

The order is pretty extraordinary in following the pleadings as filed by a quite capable assistant U.S. Attorney at that time, now interim U.S. Attorney in Dallas, and stating basically there is a prima facie case here. In fact, this has come to the attention of a number of us, not insignificantly, what to do with Patrick Poole and his research, Andrew McCarthy and his research, and other individuals who have been prosecutors, people who are familiar with the system, how the system works.

PETE KING, himself, has a very pointed letter that was sent to the Attorney General, asking for answers, and yet he really didn't get much of an answer. In fact, his letter reads this way. It was dated April 15.

''Dear Attorney General Holder, I write to inquire about your decision not to prosecute the 246 individuals and organizations named as unindicted coconspirators in a Hamas terror finance case.''

Actually, it is the largest terror finance case in American history. If you don't cut off the money, the terrorism will continue, and if the terrorists have tremendous amounts of money, it is a lot tougher to defeat them as our enemy, our sworn enemy, sworn to destroy our way of life. If you cut off their funding, it is a lot easier to be at war with someone in a tent, riding a camel, than it is someone who has jets, RPGs and the most sophisticated weaponry and the ability to build million dollar compounds to hide in.

Of course, money also opens the possibility for bribes, which makes it a whole lot easier to hide in plain sight, because people are willing to look the other way. We don't know if that was occurring in Pakistan. There is a lot still to be learned in that situation.

But Chairman KING, PETE KING, goes on and says, ''I have been reliably informed that the decision not to seek indictments of the Council on American Islamic Relations and its cofounder, Omar Ahmad, the Islamic Society of North America and the North American Islamic Trust was usurped by high-ranking decisions at the Department of Justice headquarters over the vehement and stated objections of special agents and supervisors of the FBI, as well as the prosecutors at the U.S. Attorney's Office in Dallas, who had investigated and successfully prosecuted the Holy Land Foundation case. Their opposition to this decision raises serious doubt that the decision not to prosecute was a valid exercise of prosecutorial discretion.''

Chairman KING goes on and says, ''I request you provide answers to the following questions:

''What are the reasons for the Department's decision not to prosecute CAIR, ISNA, NAIT, and Mr. Ahmad, who is a CAIR cofounder and former head of the Palestine Committee of the Muslim Brotherhood in the United States?

''Who made the final decision not to prosecute?

''Who, if anyone, from the Executive Office of the President consulted with, advised or otherwise communicated with the Department of Justice in electronic, oral or written form regarding the Department's decision to not seek indictments of CAIR, ISNA, NAIT, and Mr. Ahmad?

''How does and will the Department and the Federal Bureau of Investigation address the potential for CAIR, ISNA, NAIT to engage in terrorism financing?

''What policies with regard to those organizations have you implemented to address that threat?

''The answers to these questions should provide some explanation for declining a prosecution that is strongly supported by the record from the Holy Land Foundation trial.''

Then the chairman goes through and cites some of the information from that case, and he goes on and says, ''Hamas has been designated as a terrorist organization by the Department of State since October 9, 1997, and its status was reconfirmed by the most recent annual report of the National Counterterrorism Center, issued April 30, 2010.

□ 1530

''Hamas shamefully conducts cowardly suicide bombings against civilian targets inside Israel.'' He goes on and sets out some further information there.

It also should be noted that Chairman LAMAR SMITH, when it was brought to the attention by some of us on the committee, also sent a letter to the Attorney General, requesting information about these very same things. In fact, there was a memo that was involved, and Chairman SMITH on behalf of the Judiciary Committee requested a copy of the March 31, 2010, memo entitled: ''Declination of Prosecution of Omar Ahmad'' from Assistant Attorney General David Kris to Acting Deputy Attorney General Gary Grindler.

As I understand it, Chairman KING got a response; very unsatisfactory. Basically, they're not telling him anything. If they follow that tradition, Chairman SMITH is not likely to get much of an answer. But it causes great concern because we have the Attorney General, who has testified before the committee this week that no one in his Department was involved in advising or consulting over that. Yet we have information about a memo which may contradict the Attorney General directly. If that's the case, he would have given false information before a committee not once but a number of times during his testimony before the House Judiciary Committee. I hope and pray that's not true, but there's one way to find out.

Instead of providing the memo that was requested, he referred Mr. TRENT FRANKS, when he asked, to a Dallas Morning News article that quotes Mr. Jacks as saying there were no political factors involved in that decision. Well, I have a copy of that article as well. I also have a copy of Mr. Jacks' pleadings where he did a very nice job of setting out that there was a strong case—in essence, a prima facie case—against these people wanting to have their names eliminated as coconspirators in the pleading. He also filed a pleading with the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Now, I know as a former judge and chief justice that lawyers are not supposed to file pleadings and try to persuade based on facts that they believe or know not to be true. It's called fraud upon the court, and there's punitive action that lies in that case. But the information that U.S. Attorney Jacks provided to the district court and to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals appears to be very authentic and very well done. Obviously, a very capable lawyer. There are no punitive actions that can be taken for misleading a newspaper. On the other hand, perhaps he doesn't know what was in the memo that was requested from March of last year.

But we're now getting into some very serious grounds when the Attorney General of the United States will not be forthcoming, changes his answers a number of times about who consulted or didn't consult; who's in his department, who's not in his department; who participated. So we've got a lot of explaining to get to. I hope there are legitimate explanations. But one thing is very clear, Mr. Speaker, and that is when the Attorney General is holding evidence that will answer the questions that were asked and prove if anyone is lying and who is lying and when they lied, it is not at all comforting to say, We're not giving you evidence that might contradict something that's been said by the Justice Department, but we will refer you to a newspaper article that an interim U.S. Attorney gave, who serves at the will of the United States President. So then, again, as a former judge, you're not

looking for evidence which may support or not.

Could there be politics at play in this kind of decision? Well, about this Islamic Society of North America, ISNA, it's interesting. I got a transcript of the speech, because I got it off of the White House Web site today, made by the Deputy National Security Adviser to the President of the United States, Barack Obama, his being Denis McDonough. This was actually, it says, for immediate release March 6, 2011. This is printed, like I say, from the Web site. These are the remarks of the Deputy National Security Adviser to the President, Barack Hussein Obama, in which he starts his remarks like this:

Thank you, Imam Majid, for your very kind introduction and welcome.

By the way, these are remarks to the All Dulles Area Muslim Society, ADAMS, ironically.

Thank you, Imam Majid, for your very kind introduction, and welcome. I know that President Obama was very grateful that you led the prayer at last summer's iftar dinner at the White House, which, as the President noted, is a tradition stretching back more than two centuries to when Thomas Jefferson hosted the first iftar dinner at the White House.

Well, ''iftar'' refers to the evening meal when Muslims break their fast during the Islamic month of Ramadan. Iftar is one of the religious observances of Ramadan, and is often done as a community with people gathering to break their fast together. Iftar is done right after sunset time. Traditionally, a date is the first thing to be consumed when the fast is broken.

But if you look at the true history of the country, Thomas Jefferson did invite a leader from Tunis to break bread with him at the White House, and it was at the conclusion of Ramadan, but there's no evidence to indicate whatsoever that this was a traditional iftar dinner.

You get back to the facts. In the second paragraph, he says—and this is Denis McDonough, Deputy National Security Adviser—Our Founders understood the best way to honor the place of faith in the lives of people was to protect their freedom to practice religion. In the Virginia Act, establishing religious freedom, Thomas Jefferson wrote that all men shall be free to profess and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion.

He goes on in his remarks, and he says, Thank you also for being one of our Nation's leading voices for the values that make America so strong, especially religious freedom and tolerance.

Parenthetically, I'm not sure if tolerance includes funding terrorist activities against Israel and the United States, but that's a parenthetical question on my part.

Back to Mr. McDonough, Whether it's here at the ADAMS Center or as president of the Islamic Society of North America, you've spoken with passion and eloquence not only about your own Islamic faith but for the need to build bridges of understanding and trust between faiths.

This is incredible. The Deputy National Security Adviser is thanking the president of a coconspirator—named, at least, as a coconspirator, joint venturer in the Holy Land Foundation trial. He was not merely introducing him at this proceeding, but was also thanking him for being a confidant who led the White House in prayer in their iftar proceeding in the White House. The president of a coconspirator to fund terrorist activities is leading Muslim prayers in the White House.

I realize my time has expired. I just know we need to work hard so that this country's time will not expire.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RANGEL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in district.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 6, 2011, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1424. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Minimum Quality and Handling Standards for Domestic and Imported Peanuts Marketed in the United States; Section 610 Review [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0030; FV10-996-610 Review] received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1425. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0115; FV11-932-1 IR] received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1426. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Amendment To Allow Additional Exemptions [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0072; FV10-927-1 IR] received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1427. A letter from the Director, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, Rural Development Utilities Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rural Broadband Access Loans and Loan Guarrantees (RIN: 0572-AC06) received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1428. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Decision and Order Granting 180-Day Extension of Compliance Date for Residential Furnaces and Boilers Test Procedure Amendments [Docket Number: EERE-2008-BT-TP-0020] (RIN: 1904-AB89) received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1429. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Animal Drugs for Use in Animal Feeds; Florfenicol; Correction [Docket No.: FDA-2010-N-0002] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1430. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Jackson, Mississippi) [MB Docket No.: 11-8] received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1431. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Western Electric Coordinating Council Qualified Transfer Path Unscheduled Flow Relief Regional Reliability Standard [Docket No.: RM09-19-000; Order No. 746] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1432. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Control of the Processing and Use of Stainless Steel (Regulatory Guide 1.44, Revision 1) received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1433. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Models for Plant-Specific Adoption of Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-422, Revision 2 ''Change in Technical Specifications End States (CE NPSD-1186)'', for Combustion Engineering (CE) Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) Plants Using the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process (CLIIP) [NRC-2010-XXXX] received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1434. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-128, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1435. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-001, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1436. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-031, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1437. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-130, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1438. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-58, ''Allen Chapel A.M.E. Senior Residential Rental Project Property Tax Exemption Clarification Temporary Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1439. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-53, ''District of Columbia Board of Elections and Ethics Primary Date Alteration Amendment Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1440. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-54, ''Third & H Streets, N.E. Economic Development Technical Clarification Temporary Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1441. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-55, ''Real Property Tax Appeals Commission Establishment Temporary Amendment Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1442. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-56, ''Clean and Affordable Energy Fiscal Year 2011 Fund Balance Temporary Amendment Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1443. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-57, ''Not-for-Profit Hospital Corporation Board Chairperson Designation Temporary Amendment Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1444. A letter from the Associate Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's 2010 Freedom of Information Act Litigation and Compliance Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e)(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1445. A letter from the Executive Director, Election Assistance Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1446. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1447. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1448. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting the Foundation's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with Title II of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1449. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1450. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1451. A letter from the Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's report on the exterior boundary of Yellow Dog Wild and Scenic River Ottawa National Forest, Eastern Region, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1274; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1452. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — International Terrorism Victim Expense Reimbursement Program [Docket No.: OJP (OVC) 1539] (RIN: 1121-AA78) received April 5, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1453. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's 49th annual report of activities for fiscal year 2010, pursuant to Section 103(e) of the Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961 and Section 208 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1454. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting (Rev. Proc. 2011-22) received April 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1455. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Sunset Date for Attorney Advisor Program [Docket No.: SSA-2009-0048] (RIN: 0960-AH05) received March 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1456. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Revised Medical Criteria for Evaluating Endocrine Disorders [Docket No.: SSA-2006-0114] (RIN: 0960-AD78) received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1457. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report entitled ''Fourth Report to Congress on the Evaluation of the Medicare Coordinated Care Demonstration — Extended'' in response to the requirements Section 4016(c) of Public Law 105-33, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

1458. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting Determining Medical Necessity and Appropriateness of Care for Medicare Long Term Care Hospitals, pursuant to Public Law 110-173, section 114(b)(2) (121 Stat. 2502); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1459. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Programs: Changes to the End-Stage Renal Disease Prospective Payment System Transition Budget-Neutrality Adjustement [CMS-1435-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AQ94) received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. JONES, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. AMASH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 1735. A bill to require the President to transmit to Congress a plan with timeframe and completion date and reports with status updates on the transition of United States military and security operations in Afghanistan to the Government of Afghanistan; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 1736. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the establishment of Mother's Day; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 1737. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the Federal tax on fuels by the amount of any increase in the rate of tax on such fuel by the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 1738. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase, extend, and make permanent the above-the-line deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLD (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 1739. A bill to repeal the Federal sugar program; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 1740. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 1741. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State to refuse or revoke visas to aliens if in the security or foreign policy interests of the United States, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to review visa applications before adjudication, to provide for the immediate dissemination of visa revocation

information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. MILLER of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1742. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a presumption of service connection for illnesses associated with contaminants in the water supply at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, and to provide health care to family members of veterans who lived at Camp Lejeune while the water was contaminated; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1743. A bill to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Vet Center in Prescott, Arizona, as the Dr. Cameron McKinley Department of Veterans Affairs Vet Center; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. BARROW):

H.R. 1744. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the employer health insurance mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. BERG):

H.R. 1745. A bill to improve jobs, opportunity, benefits, and services for unemployed Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 1746. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish signal quality and content requirements for the carriage of public, educational, and governmental channels, to preserve support of such channels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. LATHAM):

H.R. 1747. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the rule treating certain farming business machinery and equipment as 5-year property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CHU, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 1748. A bill to provide consumers relief from high gas prices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JONES, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 1749. A bill to enhance reciprocal market access for United States domestic producers in the negotiating process of bilateral, regional, and multilateral trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 1750. A bill to strengthen the strategic force posture of the United States by implementing and supplementing certain provisions of the New START Treaty and the Resolution of Ratification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 1751. A bill to amend the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 to require that weather radios be installed in all manufactured homes manufactured or sold in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 1752. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate regulations requiring a label to be displayed on the packaging of certain baby monitors to warn that the signals of such monitors may be intercepted by potential intruders; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 1753. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to educational organizations to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

H.R. 1754. A bill to permanently increase the conforming loan limits for the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation and the Federal National Mortgage Association and the FHA maximum mortgage amount limitations; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. HANNA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. JONES, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BACA, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 1755. A bill to enable Federal and State chartered banks and thrifts to meet the credit needs of the Nation's home builders, and to provide liquidity and ensure stable credit for meeting the Nation's need for new homes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 1756. A bill to reauthorize the National Oilheat Research Alliance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 1757. A bill to make permanent the estate tax provisions enacted as part of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 1758. A bill to reduce and prevent the sale and use of fraudulent degrees in order to protect the integrity of valid higher education degrees that are used for Federal employment purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary, 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. BONNER:

H.R. 1759. A bill to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to increase the amount of Gulf of Mexico oil and gas lease revenue shared with Gulf States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1760. A bill to reauthorize the Great Ape Conservation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1761. A bill to reauthorize the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BONNER (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. SEWELL, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. HARPER, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND):

H.R. 1762. A bill to establish a Gulf Coast Restoration Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1763. A bill to close the loophole that allowed the 9/11 hijackers to obtain credit cards from United States banks that financed their terrorist activities, to ensure that illegal immigrants cannot obtain credit cards to evade United States immigration laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1764. A bill to prohibit appropriated funds from being used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1765. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to authorize hunting under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1766. A bill to ensure efficiency and fairness in the awarding of Federal contracts in connection with natural disaster reconstruction efforts; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1767. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow expenses relating to all home schools to be qualified education expenses for purposes of a Coverdell education savings account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1768. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the Coverdell education savings accounts to allow home school education expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1769. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to implement a drug testing program for applicants for and recipients of assistance under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1770. A bill to amend title 44 of the United States Code, to provide for the suspension of fines under certain circumstances for first-time paperwork violations by small business concerns; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. STARK, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 1771. A bill to increase public confidence in the justice system and address any unwarranted racial and ethnic disparities in the criminal process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1772. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to reduce injuries and deaths caused by cell phone use and texting while driving, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself and Mr. KISSELL):

H.R. 1773. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the research credit permanent, increase expensing for small businesses, reduce corporate tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H.R. 1774. A bill to provide for an evidence-based strategy for voluntary screening for HIV/AIDS and other common sexually transmitted infections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, 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. HECK (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HELLER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WEST, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 1775. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish a criminal offense relating to fraudulent claims about military service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 1776. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a program to improve roadway safety infrastructure in all States to enhance the safety of older drivers and pedestrians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. WEST, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LONG, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. AKIN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 1777. A bill to provide consumer relief for artificially high gas prices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, 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 Mrs. MALONEY (for herself and Ms. HIRONO):

H.R. 1778. A bill to assure quality and best value with respect to Federal construction projects by prohibiting the practice known as bid shopping; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 1779. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to reduce the number of civil service positions within the executive branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 1780. A bill to ensure the safety of all users of the transportation system, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, children, older individuals, and individuals with disabilities, as they travel on and across federally funded streets and highways; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CHU, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. MORAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FARR, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 1781. A bill to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. MCCOTTER:

H.R. 1782. A bill to implement the recommendations of the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled ''Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. MILLER of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1783. A bill to provide for enhanced mortgage-backed and asset-backed security investor protections, to prevent foreclosure fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1784. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for annual screening mammography for women 40 years of age or older and for such screening and annual magnetic resonance imaging for women at high risk for breast cancer if the coverage or plans include coverage for diagnostic mammography for women 40 years of age or older; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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 Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1785. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution from charging a fee for admission to any exhibit which is part of the permanent collection of any museum or facility which is part of any bureau established in or under the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1786. A bill to provide for the application of sections 552, 552a, and 552b of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as

the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act), and the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) to the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1787. A bill to revise the composition of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution so that all members are individuals appointed by the President from a list of nominees submitted by the leadership of the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 1788. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow reimbursement from flexible spending accounts for certain dental products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 1789. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide standards and procedures to guide both State and local law enforcement agencies and law enforcement officers during internal investigations, interrogation of law enforcement officers, and administrative disciplinary hearings, to ensure accountability of law enforcement officers, to guarantee the due process rights of law enforcement officers, and to require States to enact law enforcement discipline, accountability, and due process laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 1790. A bill to prohibit assistance to Pakistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. POSEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WEST, and Mr. RIVERA):

H.R. 1791. A bill to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 101 South United States Route 1 in Fort Pierce, Florida, as the ''Alto Lee Adams, Sr., United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 1792. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include automated fire sprinkler systems as section 179 property and classify certain automated fire sprinkler systems as 15-year property for purposes of depreciation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 1793. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to deter public corruption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida (for herself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H. Res. 252. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Train Day; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H. Res. 253. A resolution affirming the rich spiritual and religious history of our Nation's founding and subsequent history and expressing support for designation of the first week in May as ''America's Spiritual Heritage Week'' for the appreciation of and education on America's history of religious faith; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. BACHUS):

H. Res. 254. A resolution encouraging people in the United States to join together in prayer for the victims of the destructive tornadoes and flooding in the South and Midwest and the devastating drought and dangerous wildfires in the South and Southwest; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

14. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 3028 urging the Congress to adopt legislation prohibiting the Environmental Protection Agency from regulating greenhouse emissions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

15. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Wyoming, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 urging the Congress to adopt legislation prohibiting the EPA from regulating greenhouse gas emissions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

16. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of New Mexico, relative to Senate Memorial 41 urging the Congress to reauthorize Section 5056 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

17. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 3019 urging the Army Corps of Engineers to immediately cease wrongful denial of access and wrongful requirement of payment for the natural flows of the Missouri River; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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 Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 1735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause one (provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; and Article I, Section 8, clause 18 (to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof).

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 1736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment to the Constitution:

''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.''

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 1738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''Amendment XVI to the Constitution of the United States: The Congress shall have 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 Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 1739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Interstate Commerce Clause—Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 1740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 2 of the Constitution, ''the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States.'' As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.'' I was elected in 2010 to serve in the 112th Congress as certified by the Secretary of State of Washington state.

Article III, Section 2 states that the Supreme Court has ''the judicial power'' that ''shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States.'' Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution provides that the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land when stating ''The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court.''

The power of judicial review of the Supreme Court was upheld in Marbury v Madison in 1803, giving the Supreme Court the authority to strike down any law it deems unconstitutional. Members of Congress, having been elected and taken the oath of office, are given the authority to introduce legislation and only the Supreme Court, as established by the Constitution and precedent, can determine the Constitutionality of this authority.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 1741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MILLER of North Carolina:

H.R. 1742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (related to providing for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States)

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill addresses federal oversight and management of federal land. Accordingly, pursuant to:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 17, which provides that Congress has the power and authority to: ''exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, *and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings*.

(Emphasis added). Thus, the Constitution's Places Clause confers the express and exclusive constitutional authority to Congress to

manage Federal Property, including federally owned property used for any ''needful'' government purpose. The federal government's duty to raise and maintain a military force subsumes a duty to maintain and take care of its veterans from such military forces. Thus, a veterans' center is a ''needful building'' to fulfill a core constitutional duty, and thus Congress has the exclusive authority to manage it and give it a name. James v. Dravo Contracting Co., 302 U.S. 134, 143 (1937) (taking the ''view'' that the phrase ''other needful buildings'' embraces ''whatever structures are found to be necessary in the performance of the functions of the federal government). For these reasons, the bill seeking to name a veteran's center is constitutionally permissible.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 1745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. BALDWIN:

H.R. 1746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 1747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 1748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 3

Article 4, Sec. 3, Clause 2

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1749.

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. TURNER:

H.R. 1750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. BACHUS:

H.R. 1751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 1752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mrs. Maloney:

H.R. 1753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Spending Authorization

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 1754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 1755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 1756.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Congress has the power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states''

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 1757.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I §8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 1758.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 1759.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 1760.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 1761.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 1762.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1763.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1764.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1765.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article VI, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution as upheld by the Supreme Court of Missouri v. Holland, 252 U.S. H16 (1920)

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1766.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1768.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1771.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 3 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1772.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

''The Congress shall have Power 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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;''

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 1773.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 1774.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 in Article 1 relating to the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 1775.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 1776.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

And

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1777.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This resolution is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 1778.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which reads: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 1779.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1) Article I, 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 Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

2) Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 1780.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. McCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 1781.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McCOTTER:

H.R. 1782.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

Article I, 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 Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. MILLER of North Carolina:

H.R. 1783.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (Relating to the General Welfare of the United States)

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (Relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce)

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1784.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3 (to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes), and clause 18 (to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for the carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof).

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1785.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 1 of article I, and clause 18, section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1786.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 1 of article I, and clause 18, section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1787.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 1 of article I, and clause 18, section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 1788.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 1789.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 1790.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1—The Legislative Branch, Section: 7—Legislative Process: Clauses 1–3—Revenue Bills.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 1791.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 1792.

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 as stated in Article I, Section 7, and Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1793.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 11: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 23: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 104: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 114: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 198: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 210: Mr. BECERRA and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 329: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 389: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 412: Mr. ISSA and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 420: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 431: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 436: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 440: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 451: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. COLE, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 458: Ms. BERKLEY and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 459: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 466: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 468: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 497: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 509: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 513: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 527: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 567: Mr. QUAYLE.

H.R. 601: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 645: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 654: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 664: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 672: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 674: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. QUAYLE.

H.R. 709: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 716: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 719: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 721: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 735: Mr. WOMACK and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 765: Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 787: Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 807: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 808: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 812: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 814: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 822: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 880: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 904: Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 913: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 964: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 965: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 966: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 968: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 971: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 973: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 984: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 985: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1005: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1032: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1036: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1041: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 1044: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1057: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1058: Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1066: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. CHU, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1070: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.

H.R. 1075: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 1093: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 1111: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1113: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1116: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 1119: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1121: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1123: Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARDOZA, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1126: Mr. POMPEO, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1145: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1168: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. BARTLETT.
H.R. 1171: Mr. COHEN, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1172: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1180: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MACK, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1187: Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1189: Mr. CARDOZA.
H.R. 1193: Mr. MORAN and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1195: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1206: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1208: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1219: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1236: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 1254: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1259: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 1262: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 1265: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1269: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. HAYWORTH, and Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 1270: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 1274: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 1297: Mr. WU.
H.R. 1315: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1317: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1319: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 1337: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 1348: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1351: Ms. CHU, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. HANNA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. WATERS, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1356: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1383: Mr. HANNA and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1391: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 1402: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 1404: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1416: Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. QUAYLE, and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 1417: Mr. STARK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. SUTTON, and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1425: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 1448: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1449: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1466: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1483: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1515: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1527: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
H.R. 1530: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 1537: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1546: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1551: Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 1558: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BOREN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 1573: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.R. 1574: Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1578: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1588: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1623: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1656: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1659: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1681: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 1686: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1687: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 1691: Mr. WEST.
H.R. 1692: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. CHU, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. FARR, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1693: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1695: Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CHU, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. STARK, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1705: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 1712: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BONNER, Mr. NUNNELEE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.R. 1721: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. HARRIS.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. LONG.
H. Con. Res. 7: Mr. OWENS.
H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H. Res. 83: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mrs. MALONEY.
H. Res. 87: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Res. 94: Ms. CHU and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H. Res. 106: Mr. HULTGREN.
H. Res. 166: Mrs. MALONEY.
H. Res. 211: Mr. FLORES, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H. Res. 214: Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. STARK, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BACA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. REYES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SULLIVAN.
H. Res. 217: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H. Res. 234: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DOLD, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. JONES, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. CARDOZA.
H. Res. 241: Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. JONES, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. ISSA.
H. Res. 244: Ms. BERKLEY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 1081: Mr. STEARNS.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 5, 2011 No. 60

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, a Senator from the State of Maryland.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal and merciful God, thank You for both spiritual and temporal blessings, particularly the riches of Your mercies poured down upon us.

Thank You for blessing our lawmakers, for guiding their thoughts and words so that their labors glorify You. Lord, give them the strength and courage to fulfill Your commands, trusting Your wisdom more than their own. Save them from either desiring or seeking the honor that comes only from humanity, but may they desire Your approval more than life itself. Keep them from evil as they find safety in Your love. Lord, give them the humility to know that no one has a corner on Your truth and that we need each other to discover Your guidance together.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN 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, May 5, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, a Senator from the State of Maryland, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CARDIN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, normally in opening the majority leader goes first, but he and I have never viewed this as a contentious process. So since he is not here, I will go ahead with my statement.

JOBS CREATION AND TRADE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, when it comes to the state of our economy, the American people have seen enough choreographed rallies on factory floors and speeches that sound good but lead to nothing.

After 2 years of chronic joblessness, they want results.

And that is why we have seen a growing consensus in Washington over the past few weeks that something serious must be done about our Nation's debt.

Even Democrats now admit that failing to bring down the debt would be far more damaging to our Nation's economy in the long run than failing to raise the debt ceiling. The situation has been described as the most predictable crisis in American history. People on both sides of the aisle now realize that the warning bells are too loud to ignore. And last month, President Obama himself made a crucial admission.

In a sign that he too is starting to worry about the prospects of inaction, the President said that failing to produce a serious plan for tackling the deficit and the debt could be a bigger drag on the economy than anything else.

So more and more people see the problem. Now the challenge is achieving a result.

And that is why I proposed a few basic principles yesterday that I believe could guide us to success.

This morning, I want to reiterate those principles ahead of the meeting at Blair House.

By setting out clear principles up front, we are far more likely to get somewhere. And to prevent this crisis before it strikes.

First: It is time our friends on the other side stop pitting one group of Americans against another. Solving this crisis will require all of us working together. Let's act like it.

Second: The level of spending that Democrats want to maintain just is not possible without raising taxes on the middle class, which we know is not going to happen. We are only going to solve this crisis by admitting up front that we have a spending problem.

Third: Entitlements need to be a part of this discussion. So let's drop the scare tactics and work together on reform. Nobody is talking about taking anybody's Medicare.

Fourth: Raising taxes is the last thing we should be doing in the middle of a recession. What's more, a bipartisan majority here in the Senate opposes it. So let's set that idea aside and find some common ground instead. If we recognize these things, we can avert this crisis. If we do not, we will not. And I assure you we will all answer for it.

Very few people saw the last crisis coming. This one, on the other hand, is clear as day. Failing to work together in good faith on a solution is completely indefensible. Everybody agrees

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

this is a crisis. More people, including the President, agree that failing to address it would be disastrous for jobs and the economy. And everybody knows the upcoming debt limit vote is the best opportunity we have to do something about it.

So what are we waiting for?

Doing something meaningful about the debt is the centerpiece of any serious jobs agenda in Washington.

Other things will help on that front. And the President made a small but important step in the right direction yesterday by announcing he was ready to begin talks on a free trade agreement with Colombia, something we have been calling on him to do for years.

Ratifying this agreement, along with other agreements with South Korea and Panama, will open markets to U.S. goods and create thousands of jobs. It was just one of the ideas Republicans included in a comprehensive jobs agenda we released this week, an agenda that focuses on expanding opportunity, lowering costs, and clearing away bureaucratic barriers to growth.

But at the top of our list of the things we need to do to create jobs is bringing down the debt. If we can not get spending under control, we will never get the economy moving.

If the economy does not grow, we will not be able to reduce our deficits and our debt.

And if we do not reduce our massive Federal debt, we face a crisis that makes the financial panic of 2008 look like a slow day on Wall Street.

So this debate couldn't be more important to our near-term and long-term fiscal health.

Everyone has a stake in this debate. If we face up to it like adults, we will not only prevent this most predictable crisis, we will help preserve our way of life. And the best part is no one side will be able to claim the credit. This is the moment. We cannot let it pass.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1213

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand H.R. 1213 is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1213) to repeal mandatory funding provided to States in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to establish American Health Benefit Exchanges.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings in relation to this matter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m. today, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the second 30 minutes. The next rollcall vote is going to be Monday, May 9, at 5:30 p.m. We will notify Senators of the subject matter. It will be with regard to a nomination.

THE DEFICIT

Mr. REID. In regard to the comments made by my friend the Republican leader, as I listened to him, I picked up about three or four points that I think are fairly obvious. One is, do not touch the tax cuts for the rich; No. 2, do not touch the tax cuts for the rich; and No. 3 is that they want to go after entitlements. The largest, of course, are Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid.

We know the Ryan budget calls for privatizing Medicare. Even the Republican majority leader today is quoted in the papers as saying that we are going to have to back off that. I am paraphrasing that, but everyone can read it. It is on the front page of the Washington Post newspaper. But the Ryan budget has a number of ways of saving money. The most significant way of saving money is to destroy Medicare.

The fourth point, after recognizing that, as my friend the Republican leader said, we need to go after entitlements, is, don't tax the rich.

We on this side of the aisle realize we have some problems with spending and we have to do something about it. The problem is not as much about spending as it is about deficits. What are we going to do about these deficits that accumulate every year?

Well, we have some experience from recent years on how to handle that. During the last 4 years of the Clinton administration, we were spending less money than we were bringing in. We were retiring the national debt. In fact, the criticism came from a number of important economists that we were retiring the debt too quickly, that we had to back off that. Well, when President Bush took office, he took that to heart. At the time he took office, there was about an $11 trillion surplus over 10 years. He took care of that. In fact, when President Obama took office, that had been evaporated. It had evaporated. We lost 8 million jobs. It evaporated because we had two wars, all paid for with borrowed money. We had all of those tax cuts paid for with borrowed money.

So on this side of the aisle, we want to do something to rein in these deficits, and we have had experience. We know how to do that. One of the things we did during the Clinton years was unique, but we did it, and it was hard. We had something called the pay-go rules. Without any Washington inside jargon, what this means is that if you have a new program, you have to pay for it. You either have to pay for it by taking other programs and getting rid of those or raising revenue in some way. We did that in the Clinton years. When President Bush took office, his Republican colleagues here in the Congress worked with him and got rid of those rules. That is why we had everything that was unpaid for, and, in fact, ''unpaid for'' is an understatement. It was all borrowed money.

So we know there is a problem with deficits, and we want to work on those.

Today at the Blair House, there is a meeting. I have appointed a couple of people to represent the Democrats in the Senate: Senator INOUYE, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and Senator BAUCUS, chairman of the Finance Committee. The other three leaders in the Congress have appointed people. They are going to meet and talk seriously about ways of reducing the yearly deficits we have.

I would hope one of the things Vice President BIDEN talks about with them—I am confident it will be—is that we don't need to talk about spending caps; we need to talk about deficit caps. We have to be able to work toward reducing these staggering debts by looking at everything.

I am like most everybody here in this body; we do everything we can to protect these brave men and women who are in the military. But the Government Accountability Office told us in a report recently filed that there is $100 billion a year in the Pentagon that is wasted—$100 billion. When asked in a hearing how many private contractors the military has, they said: We don't know. Upon further questioning, they said: Well, it is between 1 million and 9 million people who are contractors. There is a lot of fat in this. These are the same people who, during the Iraq war, from the hearings conducted by Senator Dorgan, were using wads of hundred-dollar bills to play football. We can save a lot of money by looking at domestic discretionary spending, military spending, and doing a better job of making our tax system more fair.

To show how unfair our tax system is today, we tax the American people about $1 trillion a year—a lot of money—but we give tax breaks to corporations and individuals of $1.1 trillion. The point is we give more in tax breaks than we have as revenue in this country. We ought to change all this. My friend, who is the Presiding Officer, and I see my friend from Utah who will be the ranking member of that important committee, the Finance Committee, are going to have to work together to make this tax system more fair.

I appreciate my Republican friend talking about all the things we need to do, but one thing that is very clear that he doesn't want to touch is the

tax cuts to the rich. It is very clear he doesn't want to do anything to deal with the tax cuts to the rich, and he wants to go after entitlements—and he said so this morning—which are Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid.

We have a lot of work to do. The only way we are going to work our way through this is on a bipartisan basis. It is the only way we can do it. The heavily Republican House has to recognize that, the Democrats in the Senate have to realize that, and the President has to realize that. And he does. That is why he has convened this bipartisan meeting at the Blair House today, conducted by the Vice President of the United States.

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 5 p.m. for debate only, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the first hour equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the next 30 minutes.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 20 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NLRB COMPLAINT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to speak about an unfortunate and, quite frankly, disturbing matter.

While we were all back home during the most recent Senate recess, the National Labor Relations Board's acting general counsel, Lafe Solomon, after 17 months of indecision, issued one of the most far-reaching and outrageous complaints ever issued by the Board against a private business. This complaint against Boeing is one of the most outlandish and regrettable complaints I have seen in all my years in the Senate.

The NLRB's acting general counsel—emphasis on the ''acting''—sitting in his ivory tower in Washington, DC, essentially substituted his business judgment for that of a private corporation. In essence, Mr. Solomon claimed the authority to determine where and how a private company is permitted to do business.

This is a specious claim. Boeing did nothing wrong, and I am confident it will ultimately prevail. Yet this complaint carries a potential cost of billions of dollars and thousands of new jobs for the company in the community where it chose to operate.

So why make this decision at all? Why attack a private company with a legal challenge that will cost an enormous amount of money to defend, disrupts business, undermines the efforts of States to increase jobs and promote economic recovery but that will fail for its lack of merit? The answer is simple. The unions want it. This is another chapter in the sorry relationship between unions, big government, and the party of big government.

I have to say, I admire Mr. Solomon's moxie. By making this decision during a congressional recess, it is almost as if he thought it might avoid our scrutiny. Maybe he thought news such as this might not make its way back to the States. To that I say: Nice try, but you will not escape the scrutiny of the American people when it comes to an action this over the top. Sunshine will fall on a decision this politically motivated. In the light of day, the decision and the decisionmakers are going to look awfully bad.

The NLRB's Boeing complaint has been widely criticized in the media, in the Senate by a number of my colleagues, and throughout the business community as a prime example of a Federal bureaucracy run amok. But this is more than another example of an unaccountable bureaucracy harming job creators and employees. What makes this case particularly ugly is, this is a case of regulators conveniently supporting the interests of big labor against private enterprise. What makes this case appalling is, it is a gift-wrapped present to the interests that just so happen to be the largest contributors to Democratic Party campaigns.

The NLRB issued its complaint against Boeing—one of our Nation's iconic companies—for allegedly transferring assembly work on its Dreamliner 787 fleet of airplanes from Puget Sound, WA, to North Charleston, SC. Boeing made a legitimate business decision to open a new plant with new workers in a new more business-friendly climate. It chose South Carolina, in part, to avoid labor disputes and crippling strikes which had befallen the company repeatedly over the past few years.

When Boeing first made this decision way back in 2009, it had experienced four major labor strikes in 20 years. The most recent work stoppage—a 58-day strike in 2008—cost the company $1.8 billion.

Was the decision to bring new work to South Carolina a prudent business decision? Boeing faces significant global competition. The French company, Airbus, is anxious to take Boeing's business with the help—and backing, I might add—of the French Government.

Was the decision good for American workers? Clearly, Boeing's decision was. In the current marketplace, many of Boeing's competitors might have considered moving jobs overseas. Instead of following that course, Boeing saved American jobs.

The President likes to talk about jobs he has created and saved. Well, not a single job—union or nonunion—was lost in the State of Washington as a result of Boeing's decision. In fact, over 2,000 new jobs have been created in Puget Sound since the company's announcement to begin work on the new facility. This is not to mention South Carolina, where hundreds of new jobs were created. Added jobs in Washington plus added jobs in South Carolina sounds like a win-win for American workers to me.

So, yes, Boeing's decision to build its new plant in South Carolina was good for just about everybody. Yet, without asserting any evidence of anti-union animus on the part of Boeing or of an adverse impact on union workers exercising their legal rights, the NLRB filed its complaint and has sought to step in and make Boeing's business decisions for them.

As South Carolina Gov. Nikki Haley described it in an April 26 Wall Street Journal editorial:

> The excitement of South Carolina turned to gloom for millions of South Carolinians who are rightly aghast at the thought of the greatest economic development success our state has seen in decades being ripped away by federal bureaucrats who appear to be little more than union puppets.

Governor Haley should be applauded for calling the NLRB's decision for what it is: a hand-wrapped present to big labor, courtesy of their friends in the Federal bureaucracy and the administration.

Let's take a look at the NLRB's complaint for a moment. First, let's consider the timing of the complaint. It is highly suspect, if you ask me. The Boeing complaint comes just a few short months before the new South Carolina facility was scheduled to open in July and well after most of the construction was completed and the new workers were hired. In other words, after most of Boeing's substantial investments had been made, the heavy hand of the Federal bureaucracy intervened to dictate that its business decision must be reversed.

In its April 21 editorial, the Wall Street Journal describes the Boeing complaint saying:

> After 17 months and $2 billion, the NLRB sandbags Boeing.

The editorial continued:

> There are plentiful legal precedents to give business the right to locate operations in Right to Work states. That right has created healthy competition among the states and kept tens of millions of jobs in America rather than overseas.

An opinion editorial by Steven Pearlstein in the April 26 Washington Post is even more telling. Although Mr. Pearlstein was, not unexpectedly, somewhat supportive of big labor and the NLRB's actions in this case, he nevertheless acknowledged that:

> [i]f the agency prevails and is able to force Boeing to open an additional production line

for its new 787 Dreamliner in Seattle, it could finally put a brake on the steady flow of manufacturing jobs to right to work states in the South.

Pearlstein hits it on the head here. The decision to file this complaint is an attack on business-friendly States that are attracting companies and creating jobs. It is an effort by Washington Democrats and career bureaucrats to force unionism on the entire country. Yet, in my view, Pearlstein does not adequately state the radicalism of the NLRB's position.

The fact is, if the NLRB—doing the bidding of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers—prevails, it will give them the right to dictate business location decisions everywhere, even in non-right-to-work States.

There is a great deal of misinformation coming from those who support the NLRB's actions. In this article, Pearlstein inaccurately describes Boeing's new manufacturing facility in South Carolina as a runaway shop. Boeing had no legal obligation to locate any and all new work in Puget Sound. It was not obligated, under any collective bargaining agreement, to keep the work there. It simply chose to locate new work and new expansion in a business-friendly, right-to-work State. Is that a runaway shop? I think not, and I think most everybody would think not.

Apparently, the NLRB agrees with me because the complaint does not allege that this was a classic runaway shop. In those situations, bargaining unit work that is contractually obligated to be performed by members of the union is shut down unilaterally by management. Employees are laid off, and the company stealthily slips out of town with little or no notice, only to reopen in a new location to perform the exact same work on a union-free basis. Under the law, that is wrong.

The NLRB makes no such allegations because that is not what happened in this case. Instead, the complaint falls back on the broad, catchall argument that Boeing's actions were inherently destructive of union workers' section 7 rights, referring to the rights protected by section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act which, in this case, means the right to strike. If that theory were to apply to all cases such as this one, if companies cannot factor labor conditions into decisions regarding new operations without it being inherently destructive of section 7 rights, there is no logical end to what private decisions can be overruled by the NLRB.

This is an agency run amok and trying to take the place of this Congress.

Fortunately, the legal precedents dealing with this type of decision do not support the acting general counsel's interpretation in the Boeing complaint. The cases cited in the complaint are all distinguishable. Not one of them deals with fact patterns involving new work because there is nothing unlawful about opening a new facility to perform new work that is not obligated under an existing collective bargaining agreement.

Put simply, this is just another effort on the part of the union-packed Obama NLRB to undo years of legal precedent to satisfy big labor. If Boeing's actions are inherently destructive of the union's rights, where is the antiunion discrimination? Once again, not a single union worker lost a job or even lost an hour of work as a result of Boeing's business decision.

Let's be perfectly clear. Boeing workers in the State of Washington actually gained new work and gained 2,000 new jobs following the decision in 2009. These jobs are among the best paid in America. Does that sound like anti-union discrimination? Of course not.

This was not a stealth move in the dark of the night. No one was surprised or caught off guard. The machinists' union knew Boeing was building a new facility in South Carolina. Boeing had even discussed a new location with them. Workers knew about Boeing's plans as well and so did the NLRB. But before issuing his complaint, the acting general counsel stewed for 17 months, while new facilities were being constructed at great expense in South Carolina, at a cost of billions of dollars, and workers were hired to run the assembly lines.

It goes without saying that if Carolina workers wanted a union, they, similar to any other private sector employees in South Carolina or any other State, could file a petition with the NLRB for a union representation election. There was no evidence—zero evidence—of anti-union discrimination by Boeing to any union petition or union representation election. But—and I can't stress this enough—the most important factor is, the work in South Carolina was new work which Boeing was not obligated to perform in the State of Washington under its collective bargaining agreement. Boeing simply decided, for sound business reasons, to open a new facility to perform new work in a business-friendly State. This is something businesses can do all the time and do do all the time; that is, they used to do it all the time before President Obama's acting general counsel and the might of the Federal bureaucracy, under the heavy-handed control of big labor, decided to step in and interfere with Boeing's decision. If this complaint is upheld and this interpretation becomes the new status quo, who knows how it will impact businesses in the future?

Every citizen in South Carolina and every Member of Congress—Republican or Democratic—ought to be outraged by the National Labor Relations Board's decision and action. To borrow from Frank Sinatra, if they can do it there, they can do it anywhere. If the NLRB can do this in South Carolina, disrupting business and killing jobs, it can happen anywhere, including Utah or any other right-to-work State. It can happen even in non-right-to-work States as well.

But the most appalling part about this complaint is not the NLRB's borderline frivolous interpretation of the law. No, it is the remedies the agency is seeking. After asserting that Boeing unlawfully transferred bargaining unit work to South Carolina, the acting general counsel—a career NLRB bureaucrat who, throughout his government legal career, has never been responsible for making a single entrepreneurial decision or creating a single job—sought an order stipulating that Boeing's work on the 787 Dreamliner could not be performed in South Carolina and would have to be moved back to the State of Washington. Well, not back; it would have to be moved to the State of Washington. This is a new business.

As is typical in these cases, the Boeing complaint will surely be subject to lengthy litigation, while Boeing's foreign competitors eagerly seek to supplant Boeing's business orders. Even if Boeing ultimately prevails in the litigation battle, it could lose the business war to fierce global competition. That is stupid to put them in this position.

The Machinists know that and so does the NLRB.

Might I remind supporters of the NLRB that justice delayed is justice denied. Here, the longer the wheels of justice turn, the worse it is for Boeing's business and the worse it is for American jobs and prosperity.

Delay does not favor Boeing, but it plays right into the hands of its global competitors, as well as the Machinists Union and President Obama's acting general counsel at the NLRB, who, it seems, would force the company into accepting a settlement that cements an untenable business decision in law.

This is no less than economic warfare being waged by the NLRB on behalf of President Obama's friends—the labor unions—against Boeing, against the workers in South Carolina and all South Carolinians, and against all the 22 right-to-work States across the country. It may even be against the rights and the privileges and the benefits of the people in Washington because if Boeing, to be competitive, has to move offshore, they are going to lose their jobs. In the end, it is economic warfare by the Obama administration against all business friendly States and against capitalism and free enterprise everywhere.

I am not the only one saying this. I note, for example, that the attorneys general in nine States across the country—Nevada, Virginia, Texas, Georgia, Arizona, Oklahoma, Alabama, Florida, and South Carolina—have written to Mr. Solomon asking that the Boeing complaint be withdrawn.

Their April 28 letter states:

This complaint represents an assault upon the constitutional right of free speech, and the ability of our states to create jobs and recruit industry. . . . The only justification for the NLRB's unprecedented retaliatory action is to aid union survival. Your action seriously undermines our citizens' right to work as well as their ability to compete

globally. Therefore, as Attorneys General, we will protect our citizens from union bullying and federal coercion. We thus call upon you to cease this attack on our right to work, our states' economies, and our jobs.

Editorials from newspapers across the country have criticized the Boeing complaint. Even the Seattle Times wrote in an April 22 editorial:

This page regretted Boeing's decision, but has never thought of it as something that could be, or should be, reversed by the federal government.

The article continues, saying:

[T]he National Labor Relations Board has labeled Boeing's decision an unfair labor practice, and is asking a federal court to order the line to be moved to Washington . . . we would celebrate the day Boeing decided to do that—but it is Boeing's decision.

Later the same editorial concluded:

The company has the right to build assembly plants. It can build them in South Carolina or in Afghanistan if it likes. Its decision may be unwise, but it is Boeing's.

These same sentiments were expressed in the President's hometown newspaper. A Chicago Tribune editorial on April 22 described the NLRB acting general counsel's actions a ''gross intrusion.'' The editorial continued:

Boeing, the Chicago-based aviation company, already has one government-induced headache. Its main rival, Airbus SAS, has received from European nations about $20 billion in subsidies that are prohibited by international trade agreements. That is challenging enough for Boeing as it tries to compete in an international market. But when the U.S. government tries to dictate where Boeing can do business . . . that's even harder to stomach.

The Tribune editorial concluded:

The disastrous, unintended message to a major U.S. employer: Keep your mouth shut and find another country to do business.

The Detroit News has the President and his pro-union administration pegged. About this decision, the editors wrote:

President Barack Obama has made conciliatory sounds seeking to reassure business, but the actions of the NLRB illustrate the real face of his administration. Congress ought to hold hearings on reining in the NLRB.

So if the NLRB's complaint is so transparently awful, what is this all about? Let's see. An unfair decision comes late in the game. It threatens to destroy rather than create jobs, and it is based on specious legal reasoning. Rest assured, the issue is not jobs. The issue is union jobs, and the issue is not better pay for workers. The issue is about money in the union coffers. Ultimately, the issue is about the 2012 elections, because money in union coffers means money for Democratic candidates.

The International Association of Machinists Union is important to President Obama. It endorsed him and contributed substantial resources to his campaign. While President Obama could not deliver on such legislative initiatives as the Employee Free Choice Act, he appears determined that every level of government—especially at the National Labor Relations Board—will be turned in the union's favor.

The contempt for the American people on display in this decision is astounding. The President and congressional Democrats were unable to enact the Employee Free Choice Act, even with supermajorities in Congress. That is the card check bill. But not to worry. Just have some bureaucrats do it for them. Since the Congress could not act, why not have these bureaucrats usurp Congress's position and do it for them?

Keep this episode in mind next time we hear progressives talk about the need for enlightened administration. Keep it in mind when we hear progressives—liberals—claim the President is just interested in doing what works and that he is not ideological.

Progressives ultimately have little respect for the rule of law or for the people themselves.

For all their talk about nonpartisanship and doing what works, what they promote is a supposedly enlightened bureaucracy that, in fact, will push liberal policies, regardless of what the people want.

Progressives are to nonpartisanship as Donald Trump is to subtlety.

Ultimately, progressives are as partisan as they come, and they push their liberalism through a vast and permanent bureaucracy that plods along day after day, largely out of sight of the American people, who would never elect representatives who would actually promote this leftist, antibusiness agenda. When former Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI said elections should not matter as much as they do, this is what she meant. Liberalism should advance no matter what the people of this country actually desire. The foot soldiers who will advance the causes of progressive leftism day in and day out are the unelected and largely unaccountable bureaucrats that churn out page after page of regulation and infiltrate the decisionmaking process of every business, no matter how small the decision or how small the business.

Which brings me to the NLRB's acting general counsel.

How did he even wind up in a position to cause this level of economic mayhem? Not under the established procedure for appointing an interim general counsel under section 3(d) of the National Labor Relations Act, which provides very clearly as follows:

In case of vacancy in the office of the General Counsel the President is authorized to designate the officer or employee who shall act as General Counsel during such vacancy, but no person or persons so designated shall so act (1) for more than forty days when the Congress is in session unless a nomination to fill such vacancy shall have been submitted to the Senate, or (2) after the adjournment sine die of the session of the Senate in which such nomination was submitted.

President Obama ignored the clearly established statutory procedure for appointing an acting general counsel under the National Labor Relations Act and instead made Mr. Solomon his personal acting general counsel under the more generous terms of the Federal Vacancies Act, which is intended to apply to government vacancies in general.

Even if he is technically authorized to do so, the President should not use the Vacancies Act to supplant or displace specific statutory procedures for appointing Federal employees to vacancies where, as here under the National Labor Relations Act, the organic law is perfectly clear as to the intended process.

Why did President Obama make the appointment under the Vacancies Act rather than follow the more preferred and traditional procedure provided under the National Labor Relations Act? The answer is pretty simple.

Under the Vacancies Act, Mr. Solomon is allowed to stay in the job in an acting capacity, without Senate approval, for an initial 210 days—rather than the 40 days provided under the National Labor Relations Act—and then be reappointed again for another 210 days, and a third time for yet another 210 days, until the end of President Obama's term.

This is yet another example of the President end running the law in order to ensconce in office individuals who would have a difficult time surviving the constitutionally required confirmation process—a process that ensures the people and their representatives have some meaningful oversight of the appointee.

So why did no one complain about this appointment before now? I suppose some should have. I suppose after the battle over the nomination of AFL–CIO and SEIU Associate Counsel Craig Becker to the NLRB, many were convinced they could do a lot worse than having a career NLRB civil servant serve as acting general counsel. I am not so sure anyone feels that way now. In fact, in light of his recent actions, including the Boeing complaint, it is hard to conceive of a worse choice for acting general counsel.

That decision should be revisited. That is why I am writing to President Obama to request that he withdraw the appointment of Mr. Solomon.

As far as President Obama's nomination of Mr. Solomon for a full term as general counsel is concerned, it is difficult to imagine how Mr. Solomon could ever be confirmed by the Senate, in view of his actions while serving as acting general counsel.

Government actions such as the ones we have seen with the Boeing complaint are debilitating to our economy at a time when we are struggling to recover from one of the Nation's worst recessions since the Great Depression. Such bureaucratic decisions cost jobs at a time when we are struggling to reduce unemployment. They delay business decisionmaking and interfere with competition. They undermine business confidence in government.

Why should companies invest in expanding business in the United States

if, with the drop of a hat, a Federal bureaucrat can simply reverse that decision and destroy that investment?

At this point, we are left scratching our heads. Why would the acting general counsel do this outrageous act? Unfortunately, the answer appears to be that the decision to issue the complaint was a political one designed to placate an important ally of the President's—organized labor. That answer, while unacceptable, is the only logical answer.

As the April 21 Wall Street Journal concluded:

> Beyond labor politics, the NLRB's ruling would set a terrible precedent for the flow of jobs and investments within the United States. It would essentially give labor a veto over management decisions about where to build future plants.

That must never be allowed to happen. The NLRB should withdraw the Boeing complaint.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN of Ohio). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I understand that maybe there is an agreement that another Member will speak at 11, so I will yield at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

GREATEST FINANCIAL RISK

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I am concerned about the financial status of our country. We are clearly on an unsustainable spending path. The people are rightly furious with their Congress. We should, as they well know, never have gotten ourselves in the financial situation we are in today, where we are projected to have a deficit this fiscal year, of $1.5 trillion—the largest deficit the country has ever had—on top of deficits of the last 2 years of $1.2 trillion and $1.3 trillion.

We are on a path to doubling the entire U.S. debt in less than 4 years. In the next 3 to 4 years we will double the entire debt of the United States. We are on an unsustainable path, as every witness who has testified in recent years before our Budget Committee has stated. It is an unacceptable situation.

There was a shellacking in the last election of people, the big government folks. We have not even had a budget in 2 years—in 735 days we have not had a budget. The Budget Act requires the Congress to pass a budget by April 15. The House has done theirs. The Republican House has passed a budget, a historic budget. The Democratic Senate is now talking about commencing hearings on Tuesday. I hope we have a good hearing. Maybe we will.

I just say that our members, the Republican members of the Budget Committee, asked our chairman to do as the House did and make public their budget in advance of the hearing so it can be examined—it is a complicated document, hard to examine, and it takes some time and effort—and not just plop it down the day the hearing starts. I have been informed that business as usual will continue—unlike what the House did in having a document out early. They will bring out a budget that day, and I guess we will commence to try to vote on it.

I don't think that is a healthy way to succeed. We are facing the greatest financial risk, maybe, this country has ever faced. The President appointed a fiscal commission—we call it the debt commission—cochaired by Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson, who were appointed by the President. They wrote a document and presented it to us with their remarks, which said this Nation is facing the most predictable economic crisis in its history. In other words, they are saying the path we are on is so unsustainable that it is easy to predict that we are facing and heading toward a financial crisis.

There is no higher duty or responsibility for Members of the Congress of the United States than to protect the people of this country from a foreseeable danger. When asked by Chairman CONRAD when we might have such a crisis, Mr. Bowles said it could be 2 years, a little less or a little more. We could have a financial crisis like the one Greece had, or another recession, a surge of inflation, or a surge in interest rates. Senator Simpson, cochairman of the commission, said he thinks it could be 1 year.

The S&P bond evaluators warned that they could downgrade our debt. In fact, Moody's, in December, warned that they could reduce the rating of the American debt in less than 2 years. We are in a serious unsustainable position. We haven't even had a budget. Well, the President is required by law to submit a budget. Every President does.

I asked, when he made his State of the Union Address, that he would address and discuss the danger we are in, why the Nation needs to reduce spending, why it is not some partisan brouhaha but a real threat to the future of the country, and why it is that we must take steps to pull back. He really did not do that in his State of the Union Address. He talked about investments and more investments.

Then I asked that he produce a budget that helps get us over the unsustainable path. I was never more disappointed in the President's budget. He claimed it would save $1 trillion over 10 years. How much is that? Well, according to the Congressional Budget Office, which objectively analyzes these things, the deficit will increase, at the rate we are spending, over the next 10 years, $14 trillion.

What is saving $1 billion? Not nearly enough to get us off the unsustainable path. The debt commission recommended a $4 trillion reduction in spending, which was not enough, either. This was his own commission that he appointed. That was not enough. But at least the numbers were fairly honest. The President's numbers, unfortunately, were not even honest.

The Congressional Budget Office analyzed his budget, and they concluded that it would not reduce the projected increase in debt by $1 trillion, from $14 trillion to $13 trillion. What CBO said was that it was worse. It would add to the debt $2.7 trillion over the CBO baseline. I said at the time that it was the most irresponsible budget ever presented. Maybe someone can find somewhere in the distant past a more irresponsible budget. But when we know we are facing debts and interest rates the likes of which we have never seen before, we need to recognize that we need to make changes. His budget did not change. For example, his budget called for a 10.5-percent increase in educational funding. It called for a 9.5-percent increase in the Energy Department. It called for a 10.5-percent increase in the State Department. It called for a 60-percent increase in spending for the Transportation Department, without any real source of revenue to pay for it, in order to have a monumental new program to build high-speed rail and other items. We do not have the money. The inflation rate is not above 3 percent, and we are getting double-digit increases when the country cannot afford the path we are on. It is unbelievable, really.

After taking great heat from objective observers, the President made a speech. He had a paragraph or two in this speech about the reason we need to have some restraint and reduce spending and why we could not just invest, invest, invest, why we needed to restrain spending. That was in his speech. At least he acknowledged it a little bit, although it was not the detailed, serious engagement of the American people in a discussion as to why we cannot continue at the pace we are on. It was not sufficient to my way of thinking. Maybe I am biased. I do not think so. I do not think he has done that.

In fact, when the Republicans in the House proposed reducing spending this year, he steadfastly opposed it. We have a pattern with the President. He says he is for doing something about the debt path we are on. He opposes any specific action that actually makes a difference in that regard. Then, finally, when they were dragged kicking and screaming into saving $300 billion over 10 years, the President took credit for it as if it was his idea when they have been opposing it all along.

The Democratic leader here proposed a $4 billion reduction in spending, which was nothing. I am worried about where we are heading, how serious we are.

The Senate Republican budget staff has looked at the President's speech

and tried to see what is in it and see where we could go from there. What they found is that it does not reduce spending by $4 trillion. His framework, as he called it, to reduce the deficit by $4 trillion would actually grow the deficit by $2.2 trillion above the Congressional Budget Office baseline.

The American people deserve an honest, fact-based budget. Instead, the President's deficit speech was the biggest gimmick yet. An analysis of the President's April 13 speech exposes the falsity of the claim that this new framework would result in a $4 trillion reduction in the deficit. The announcement reveals that the President's framework is simply a rhetorically repackaged version of the budget he submitted on February 14, a budget that the CBO estimated could actually worsen our deficits by $2.7 trillion.

The committee staff has concluded that the President's framework, compared to the current CBO baseline, would now worsen the debt by $2.2 trillion over 10 years. The President's speech is a sleight-of-hand process that creates the impression of bringing new deficit reduction measures to the table without actually doing so, leaving us at bottom with the original flawed proposal, only presented in language that seems to be new.

Here is how the process worked in the speech and how we analyzed it. I believe this is a fair analysis of it.

One, he offers the same proposals in his framework as his formal budget submission but uses new language.

Two, he assumes savings from his February budget that the Congressional Budget Office has already found to be bogus. He continues to assume savings that the objective Congressional Budget Office says are not legitimate savings. If you score savings in your budget, you can claim you made savings when you have not. We have seen that time and time again. In fact, it is one reason this government is in so much debt.

CBO, by the way, is a bipartisan group, but its leaders are selected by the Democratic majority. They have the majority. This is a group who is not hostile to the President, but they have rejected many of his claims of savings.

Three, it calculates the savings over 12 years. Everybody has been talking about 10 years. He submitted a 10-year budget. To make his numbers look better, he extends it to 12 years and claims more savings than otherwise would be the case if you are comparing apples to apples and oranges to oranges—a 10-year budget.

He adds long-term savings from the just-passed continuing resolution. He claims credit for the spending reductions the House of Representatives forced on us. Some said it was not nearly enough. That is really true. They had proposed saving about $800 billion over 10 years. By the time Democratic resistance had gone forward and the President had resisted, we ended up with only about a $300 billion savings over 10 years. He claims credit for that in his numbers.

As the analysis demonstrates, the framework in his speech offered no new proposals beyond the dangerously flawed February budget. Even if he used their own estimates that have been discredited by CBO, the framework still falls an astonishing $3.2 trillion short of what the deficit commission he appointed recommended.

Perhaps this is why the White House has been unwilling to heed the call of the Senate Budget Committee Republicans. We wrote the President. He has a huge staff over there who works every year on producing a budget. We said: If you made a speech now and if you changed what you had in your budget, translate that into a new budget and send it to us. We had that done in the past a number of times. They refuse. Why? Because a speech is more generalized, it is harder to score, it is harder to analyze, and when you put it into actual print, it can be analyzed, the numbers can be totaled, the deficits can be calculated, and you find out whether it actually does anything worthwhile. They refuse to do it.

As it stands now, we have no plan to have any real reduction of the deficit we are facing from this administration or the Democratic Senate, let alone a framework to reduce it by $4 trillion. But they pretend it is so, and that is offensive. The American people are not happy about it. They know this Senate and this Congress have a responsibility under the law and under any morality and decency to produce a budget that says what we are going to do with their money the next year and how much deficit we are going to incur, how much debt we are going to increase. They have a right to see that. All we have seen is a pushback and lulling and talk of that kind.

So we are heading to it. We are heading to a budget situation in the committee next week. I hope we will. And I think Senator CONRAD, our Democratic chairman, will submit a budget better than the President's budget. Surely it will be. I cannot imagine it will not be substantially better than the budget the President has submitted. But the question is, Will it be enough? They have already blamed PAUL RYAN and the House Budget Committee as being Draconian, ideological, and unreasonable with their budget which would reduce spending $6.2 trillion in honest numbers that they have laid out and defended publicly, which actually confronts some of our long-term spending entitlement programs and tries to get them on a rate of growth not quite as high as it currently is. They are trying to bring this country into a financially sound position.

I do not think the House budget probably goes far enough in the first 10 years to bring our debt under control, but it is an honest, respected document that every objective commentator has praised. Mr. Bowles himself said: If you disagree with Mr. RYAN's budget, at least it is honest, and you need to put your own out there with the same degree of honesty as he did. Mr. Bowles was President Clinton's Chief of Staff, the man chosen by President Obama to head his fiscal commission.

This will be perhaps the most important budget in decades—maybe ever—because our debt situation is deep. It is not easy to get out of the fix we are in. A lot of it is driven by long-term commitments we have made that are unsustainable. We have to confront that honestly and find out how to deal with it in a way that is fair and just.

They say: We cannot cut spending. We need more money for education, 10.5 percent. The State Department needs more money, 10.5 percent. The Energy Department needs more money, a 9.5-percent increase—this year they are proposing, commencing with the October 1, 2012, budget. That is the number the President has submitted. We do not have it.

I ask some of the Members of this body to call Governor Cuomo in New York or Governor Christi in New Jersey or Governor Bentley in Alabama. He just announced he was having to reduce spending by 15 percent, prorate the spending for the rest of this fiscal year by 15 percent. I feel as though that is a message that has been lost in this body.

I see my colleague Senator KLOBUCHAR here. I wanted to share these remarks this morning.

I believe the Vice President is meeting with some people—House and Senate Republicans and Democrats today. Maybe it will be budget No. 3, and maybe the Vice President can fix something. I hope they gave him the responsibility and the freedom to make a decision, or have they told him he cannot cut spending in any significant way? I don't know what they will tell the Vice President, but hopefully something will come out of that and maybe we can get on a better procedure.

At this rate, at this point in our process, we are not in a good position. I am worried about it. Hopefully, we can reach some agreement. If not, we are going to fight it out on the floor of the Senate, of the House, and in conference committee. We are going to change the debt course of this Nation because the American people are going to demand it.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

GAS PRICES

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, it has been nearly 3 years since gas prices were as high as they are now. Back in July 2008, they peaked at about $4 per gallon. We are approaching $4 per gallon for gas today. The average price in Minnesota is $3.94 per gallon, and the

peak driving season is right around the corner.

Back in 2008, I heard from many Minnesotans—from seniors who couldn't afford to drive to their pharmacies to pick up their prescription drugs, from workers who couldn't afford to drive to work, from middle-class moms and dads who had to cancel their summer vacations—who couldn't go up north because gasoline was just too high for their budgets.

Although it wasn't the only factor, these high fuel prices of 3 years ago helped to push our economy into a deep recession. We don't want that to happen again. One of the things we learned 3 years ago is that rising oil prices were not simply the result of supply-and-demand market factors. In fact, the dramatic runup in gas prices was due in part to rampant price speculation by people who had no business being in the oil market.

These were not airlines or trucking companies or other businesses that actually need and use oil and gas and who trade in futures in order to protect their businesses against volatility in the oil market. No, the most frenzied price speculation was by Wall Street traders and hedge fund managers who would never actually touch a drop of oil. They would never use it in their businesses. To them it was just numbers on a computer screen. They were trying to game the system to make some quick profits and then take the money and run, all at the expense of those people in Minnesota or Ohio who are standing there at the gas pump watching those numbers add up.

It is interesting; if we take a look at the gas prices in Minnesota back in 2008—we can, in fact, find it on MinnesotaGasPrices.com—between July and the end of the year, prices dropped from $4 to $1.60 per gallon. Numerous experts have concluded that underlying supply-and-demand fundamentals can't account for the sharp rise or decline in prices.

For example, in the first 6 months of 2008, U.S. economic output was declining while global supply was increasing. But when we look at the cost of oil during that time, it just doesn't match up.

In June of 2007, oil cost $65 per barrel. A year later, in June of 2008, it reached $147 per barrel. It was down to $30 in December of 2008 and back up to $72 in June of 2009. Even if supply and demand were, over the long run, pushing up the price of oil, that alone couldn't explain the massive volatility in the market.

Looking back, we now know much of the dramatic decline in oil prices was the result of Wall Street speculators fleeing the oil market because the spotlight had finally been put on them. In other words, the heat was on, and it got too hot for them to stay.

But here we are today, 3 years later, and the price of a gallon of gas is nearly $1 higher than it was 10 months ago. Once again, I am hearing from Minnesotans who are being squeezed by high prices—families, farmers, and businesses large and small.

There is no doubt some of these prices can be attributed to reduced production from countries such as Libya and Egypt. There is no doubt we can increase domestic production of oil, whether in North Dakota, our neighboring State, where they literally have doubled their production of oil over the last few years, or in Louisiana. Increased domestic production takes time and, in any case, the impact on prices would not necessarily change things—nowhere near what we are seeing right now due to speculation.

That is why a few months ago I wrote to Commodity Futures Trading Commission Chairman Gary Gensler urging him to make swift and strong implementation of speculation limits that were included in the Wall Street reform legislation we passed last year. This legislation authorizes the commission to impose limits on the size of speculative positions in oil futures markets by investors who are not bona fide oil traders. These ''position limits'' are designed to limit market manipulation and make sure the oil market is operating fairly according to supply and demand. We don't want to see Wall Street speculators further drive up oil prices in the coming months.

We also know short-term solutions will only go so far. That is why I have been focused on a long-term energy strategy, a strategy that will provide incentives for our innovators, investors, and entrepreneurs to invest in solutions for our energy future.

In 2008, I helped push through the Commerce Committee, along with a number of my colleagues, the first update to our fuel economy standards in decades. These rules, which are now in place, are expected to save 1.8 billion barrels of oil, about three times as much as Libya produces every year. I am also continuing to work on policies that will increase our homegrown energy production.

It is important to note that studies suggest that biofuels can provide relief at the pump. A recent study from the University of Iowa indicates that from 2000 to 2010 competition from ethanol reduced wholesale gasoline prices by an average of 25 cents per gallon, saving American consumers an average of $34.5 billion each year.

During the gasoline price runup in 2010, the impact of ethanol on gasoline prices was substantially larger, reducing gasoline prices by a national average of 89 cents per gallon and by $1.37 per gallon in the Midwest. Biofuels are the largest and best alternative to imported oil. In fact, we produce more biofuels in this country than we import gasoline from Canada, our largest source of foreign imports.

That is why in March I introduced new legislation with Senator TIM JOHNSON that would significantly boost our Nation's biofuels production and biofuels infrastructure while also providing long-term standards for increasing renewable energy production and major energy efficiency improvements.

First, our bill would provide consumers with more choices at the gas pump by expanding biofuels infrastructure and increasing alternative fuel vehicles. Specifically, it would expand the availability of blender pumps that are capable of dispensing different blends of ethanol and gasoline. It would provide loan guarantees to build new biofuels pipelines and would also require half of the cars produced in 2015 to be flex-fuel vehicles—natural gas-powered, electric-powered, or hybrid vehicles.

Second, to help offset costs, the bill would phase down and eventually phase out the ethanol tax credit. This credit is serving its purpose of helping to reduce the price of gasoline and reducing our dependence on foreign oil by providing consumers choices at the gas pump. But it won't be necessary forever.

Lastly, the bill would create the first national standards for renewable energy and energy efficiency along the lines of Minnesota's 25-percent-by-2025 standard and a 1-percent annual improvement in efficiency.

If I could note, our State has an unemployment rate that is significantly below the national average—two points below the national average. A lot of that has to do with our farm economy, a lot has to do with our innovative companies, but we have done it all with a renewable standard in place—25 percent by 2025. We have done it all with a significant push on ethanol and biofuels and wind and solar. So I say this can be a model for the rest of the country.

Our Nation as a whole has an unemployment rate of 8.8 percent. Gas prices are approaching record levels. We continue to send $730 million a day to foreign countries—many of which have been known to funnel money to terrorists—to meet our basic fuel needs. That is $730 million a day for fuel that we send to other countries. I think we should be investing in the farmers and the workers of the Midwest instead of the oil cartels of the Mideast. But whether it is biofuels plants in the Midwest, electric car factories across this country, electric car battery factories in the Chair's home State of Ohio, that is the future. It is not continuing to send millions of dollars a day to the Mideast.

Each of the provisions in this bill have some support from both Republicans and Democrats, and I am hopeful the bipartisan spirit of this bill can help advance a serious bipartisan discussion about thoughtful solutions to rising gas prices. The key is that everyone needs to realize that inaction is not an option; that bumper sticker slogans will only result in our kicking the can down the road. This is about putting sensible limits on speculation that doesn't affect legitimate companies

that are legitimately hedging their risks. This is about a comprehensive energy plan for the future that includes drilling in Minnesota and other parts of the country but also includes natural gas, includes hydro, includes geothermal and wind and solar and biofuels. That is what this is about.

If we learned anything from Japan—and I support nuclear energy in this country, and I think that should be in the mix as well—it is that we don't want to rely too much on any one source of energy. This idea of looking regionally and looking across the country at different sources of energy is key as we go forward.

During these challenging economic times, we can no longer put our heads in the sand and pretend this isn't happening. Talk to anyone who is filling up their car at the pump now. Talk to anyone who wants to go to their cabin in northern Minnesota for the summer every weekend. They will tell you it does matter. Now is the time to act.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, at some time in the not too distant future—there is some speculation about exactly when—our country will be dealing with the issue of exceeding our borrowing authority. In other words, we have maxed out our credit card. That would be the equivalent for the average family when they can't borrow any more money.

So what happens in that event is that Congress has to take action. Congress essentially has to raise the country's borrowing authority. It is called raising the debt limit. We are coming up on that point in time. It could happen sometime in the July-August timeframe. There is some uncertainty as to exactly when that happens, but the point is it will happen.

The reason it will happen is because we have now accumulated $14.3 trillion in debt, and we have hit the limit, the cap, that exists today on our borrowing authority.

Now, $14.3 trillion in the abstract is hard for most people to wrap their heads around because it is such a massive number. If we translate it into individual terms, it amounts to about $46,000 for every single person in the United States, which in and of itself is an astonishing amount.

Our projected deficit this year is $1.425 trillion, which is the largest ever, in nominal terms. According to CBO, it is the second largest as a share of the economy, literally, since World War II. That is as much debt as we ran up from our Nation's founding, going back to the origin of this country up until 1984 or the equivalent, just in this one single year that we are going to rack up in terms of the deficit. The interest on that amounts to about $213 billion every single year or nearly $700 for every person in the United States. That is assuming interest rates stay at these historically low levels.

While the deficit spending is, in fact, something that will merely delay taxes in the future that somebody is going to have to pay, at some point this is going to have to be paid off, and that burden, in all likelihood, is going to fall on our children and grandchildren. But it is not just something we will have to deal with down the road because the implications today, the real-time implications of this level of spending and debt, are very real for the economy.

There is a great body of research that has been done. A study done by economists Reinhart and Rogoff found that countries with a debt-to-GDP ratio of more than 90 percent grew at 1 percentage point less than they would have otherwise. That is a body of research that looks at nations over the last half century. It even goes back further than that but particularly in the last half century and particularly developed nations that have gotten up to that level of debt that exceeds 90 percent of GDP. That is where we are today, 93 percent government debt-to-GDP ratio here in the United States.

If you take that assumption that anytime you reach that debt level and you sustain it over a long period of time, it costs you a single percentage point of economic growth every single year, according to the President's own economic team, that results in the loss of about 1 million jobs. If you think about the real-time implications of this level of spending and debt, it means we are losing about 1 million jobs every single year in the economy.

You cannot say this is something down the road, that we can continue to kick the can down the road. The fact is we are running out of road. We keep kicking the can, but we are at the end of the road. If we do not take steps now, not only is it going to put a crushing burden of debt on future generations and jeopardize the very foundation of our economy, it is going to have real-time implications today, not just in the future.

I suggest that as we look at this issue of the debt limit coming up, it presents a unique opportunity. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, can come together. If we do not bring this debt-to-GDP ratio back down, we are going to continue to suffer from these job losses, and the impact of that is really very clear.

When the government is out there borrowing more money, it crowds out private investment, so there is less money for private companies and individuals to invest in companies, equipment, plants, housing, training, all those sorts of things, and it spends money on government, on things that are probably less efficient, less necessary, more duplicative, oftentimes downright wasteful when it comes to the programs and the projects that end up being funded. It means instead of investing, having funding for new factories for people to work in, we have more bureaucrats in places such as the EPA or the National Labor Relations Board who are coming up with all kinds of new regulations that are making it more difficult for our small businesses to create jobs. We have more unnecessary Federal property being underutilized that the private sector could use more efficiently.

Unfortunately, the risk to our economy that comes from this out-of-control spending is more than just that, it is more than just the crowding out of private sector investment and the stifling effects of government regulation. We are beginning to face the very real possibility that our country could face a fiscal crisis. Former Chairman Greenspan has suggested that the risk of this occurring in the next few years is nearly 50–50—an alarming thought. Likewise, Standard & Poor's recently warned of a possible downgrade to the U.S. credit rating in the next 2 to 3 years, when they came out with their assessment of U.S. credit, and said they have attached a negative assessment to it. In most cases—at least in a majority of the cases—within a year's time, that leads to a downgrade of credit rating. That would be disastrous for a country such as ours which has always taken great pride and has been the rock out there when it comes to an AAA credit rating.

It is notoriously difficult to predict ultimately when a debt crisis might occur, but it would be inexcusable for us to continue to spend at these elevated levels without assuming there is even the slightest hint of a risk that this could be very devastating to our country, let alone that risk could be very high. But if it were to occur, we would need drastic spending cuts to drag ourselves out of this fiscal crisis, spending cuts that by today's standards would probably be unimaginable.

But the worst effect of this would be the deep recession it would throw our economy into. Think about that. If we did have a debt crisis in this country, what would that mean? For most people, it is going to mean higher interest rates, it is going to lead to countless job losses, pay cuts for a lot of people if you have job losses, and probably significant loss of savings, which would take a terrible toll on the American people. Those are many of the implications of a debt crisis and the implications it would have on the economy—starting, as I said earlier, with higher interest rates. It would make it more difficult for people to borrow money for a home, for a car, for their business. All those sorts of things would be impacted.

But that does not have to be the case. The reason it does not is because most experts have suggested—and it is really true—that this is the most predictable economic crisis we have ever had. It is not as though we don't see it coming. You see all the warning signs out there. You see all the red flags out

there. It is looking us right in the face. We have an opportunity to do something about it, but it will require that we have the political courage to take on this issue of Federal spending.

Next week, we are going to have an opportunity in the Budget Committee to mark up the 2012 budget, which, incidentally—the budget year starts in a mere 5 months from now. I hope this budget will focus primarily on cutting spending because I think that is the primary driver of our deficits. I am concerned that, instead, it will merely continue to spend too much, borrow too much, and tax too much.

Of course, last year, even though there was a markup in the Budget Committee, there was never a budget brought to the floor of the Senate. The Congress never passed a budget. Nor was there one brought to the floor of the House of Representatives. There was not even a vote on a budget in the House or the Senate last year. We have a $3.8 trillion enterprise called the Federal Government that did not even pass a budget.

I believe the most fundamental responsibility we have to the taxpayers of this country is to come up with a plan about how we are going to responsibly use their tax dollars, to indicate to them that they can expect a good return from those tax dollars by the way we do our budget. Frankly, that did not happen last year. I certainly hope it does this year, but it is going to take some leadership here in the Congress. In the House of Representatives, the Republicans have the majority. They did pass a budget out of the House. I hope the Senate Democrats here will also put a budget on the floor that we will be able to vote on and amend and have a meaningful discussion about spending and debt and what we are going to do to get this country back on a path of fiscal sustainability.

The President, I think you could argue, punted when it comes to the issue of spending and debt, first by saying: I am going to appoint a commission to look at this issue. The economists studied it for several months and came out with some findings and ultimately a report in which they put forward a series of recommendations for dealing with the fiscal crisis. The President sort of distanced himself from those recommendations, chose not to take those or to really engage with that commission and its recommendations, and then subsequent to that submitted a budget this year which, ironically, did not do anything to address the long-term issues of spending and debt but, rather, increased spending over the next decade, massively increased the debt, and increased a lot of taxes on small businesses in this country that are job creators. So you did have this issue: borrowing, spending, and debt continually being advanced and put forward by this President and by many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle here in the Congress.

The House Republicans put out a proposal that has been criticized by some, but at least they have put forward a plan. They have engaged the issue of what we are going to do to rein in out-of-control spending both in the near term but also in the longer term with the entitlement programs—Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid—which represent 60 percent of all Federal spending. If we do not rein those programs in or come up with a way of reforming those programs so they are viable, when the 80 million baby boomers retire, we are headed for a train wreck. It is inevitable. You cannot, with the numbers facing us and the kinds of deficits we are already running, the amount of debt we have already accumulated, in any way assume we can get out of this crisis absent taking on these issues and coming up with meaningful reforms for Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Whether or not you subscribe to or like the proposals that were put forward by the House Republicans, at least there is a plan out there.

There are a number of suggestions being bandied around here in the Senate. There is a gang of 6 that is looking at some recommendations. As I said, there is going to be a markup we think next week in the Senate Budget Committee. There is now this new commission the President has appointed to look at the issue of, as we approach the vote on the debt limit, what we can do to address spending and debt. But, frankly, we do not have at this point anything in front of us that does deal directly or meaningfully with this issue of out-of-control spending or debt. I hope some of these discussions are fruitful, that they lead to results, and that they at least put alternatives out there we can debate and discuss. But as of right now, the only proposal we have in front of us is the one put forward by the House Republicans. Again, whether or not you like it, it has created a discussion in this country about what we are going to do to fix our fiscal problems.

I believe we ought to at a minimum go back to 2008 spending levels because if we did that, it would take us back to a time before we had these massive runups or increases in discretionary spending. In the last 2 years, we have seen discretionary spending increase by well over 20 percent at a time when inflation in the overall economy was a mere 2 percent. So Federal spending was increasing literally 10 times the rate of inflation over the last 2 years. It makes sense to me that in this fiscal environment where our deficits are literally about $1.5 trillion every single year as far as the eye can see, the least we can do is restrain spending and cut it back to that level we were at in 2008, before we had this massive runup in spending. I think that is a starting point.

I believe we also ought to be looking at the entitlement programs, which, as I said, have trillions of dollars literally of unfunded liabilities. Medicare alone is a $38 trillion unfunded liability. We are currently on a path where that will bankrupt the Nation if we do not make changes.

It strikes me, at least, that you have not only some issues that deal with the near-term spending issues but also those longer term spending issues. In the near term, as I said, if we went back to 2008 levels, we would at least tighten our belts a little bit in a way that I think most Americans would find to be responsible. But the longer term issue, these entitlement programs, have to be taken up.

There are a series of proposals that would deal with that, one of which is a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. That, frankly, is something I support. I have supported it since I was in the House of Representatives; I have been a cosponsor of that. In fact, when I first got to Congress back in 1997, there was a vote here in the Senate on a balanced budget amendment which failed by one vote. It would take 67 votes in the Senate—two-thirds of the Senate—to approve a balanced budget amendment. It failed by one vote.

I assume, had it passed at that time in the Senate, we would have been able to pass it in the House of Representatives because we did have large majorities and we could have sent it on to the States. It takes 38 States to ratify it, but since most States already have balanced budget amendments in their constitutions, I suspect they would like to see their Federal Government operate with the same sort of fiscal discipline. But it did not pass at that time. I cannot imagine how different our world would be today had it passed 15 years ago and how different this fiscal picture would have looked because it would have put a straitjacket on Washington, DC—something we desperately need. Congress needs discipline imposed upon it. It has not demonstrated historically the capability to deal with these fiscal issues absent some sort of mechanism that puts a straitjacket on the Congress so it cannot spend money.

The balanced budget amendment is something I think we ought to have a debate about, and I hope we do. In the lead-up to the vote on this debt limit, this is one of the proposals we hope to have considered.

As I said before, there are so many States around the country that have balanced budget amendments to their constitutions. Our State of South Dakota is a good example. In the State of South Dakota, the legislature cannot go home until the budget is balanced. That is a requirement. Many States across the country have that same sort of requirement. It is an imperative that requires these States every single year to put their books in order. That is something which is desperately lacking here in Washington, DC, and I hope, again, we could enact a balanced budget amendment.

There are several that have been proposed. I am a cosponsor of a couple of

different versions of that, but we have 47 Republicans who are on a balanced budget amendment, and I hope our colleagues on the other side will join us in at least bringing that to a vote, putting it before the American people, and engaging them in a debate about how best to solve our Nation's fiscal problems. I think they would agree that a balanced budget amendment is a very simple, straightforward way in which to do that.

I also believe we ought to reform our budget process because it is clearly broken. We have a dysfunctional budget process when we cannot pass a budget, when we have a $3.8 trillion enterprise such as the Federal Government and we do not even pass a budget. In most years, typically, we have—if there is a budget that passes, the appropriations bills that follow it are supposed to be completed by the end of the fiscal year, on September 30. Those deadlines routinely are missed.

Typically, what happens is we end up with a big so-called omnibus spending bill at the end of the year that wraps all the various appropriations bills into one massive spending bill, which I do not believe serves the taxpayers very well. It certainly does not allow us, as Members of Congress, to do the appropriate oversight that we should do on various individual agencies of government.

When we throw it all into one big spending bill, as so often happens around here, we lose the transparency and the accountability that is necessary to an effective functioning government. So I believe we ought to reform the budget process.

One of the ways I would do that is to go to a biennial budget. Instead of passing a budget every single year, we would do it every other year. We do it in the odd-numbered years, the years when people are not running for reelection. Because what happens in a year when people are running for reelection is they decide the best way to gain the favor of the voters is to provide more money for this particular program or this program or this constituency or that constituency. As a consequence, there is a momentum to spend more and more money. It strike me that one of the ways we could address that is to do a budget in the odd-numbered years when Members of Congress are not running for reelection. Then, in the even-numbered years, when they are, we look at ways of not how can we spend money but how can we save money. We do more oversight, which is something that is desperately lacking, because many of these Federal programs and agencies so often times sort of do their own thing, absent the appropriate level of oversight. I believe we have a responsibility, as Members of Congress, with whom the legislative responsibility, the power of the purse is entrusted by the Constitution, to do the right types of oversight.

I came across recently a good example when the Government Accountability Office came out with a report. In that report they referenced several different programs. In fact, they dealt with about one-third of all Federal spending. But in examining that one-third of Federal spending, they concluded that there are all kinds of duplications and redundancies in Federal spending.

I will just give a couple by way of example. They discovered that there are 82 programs, spread across 20 different Federal agencies, that deal with the issue of teacher training, that are designed to focus on the issue of teacher training.

Well, I suspect it is arguable about whether that is something the Federal Government ought to be doing in the first place, but it is certainly—I think any American would agree—absolutely insane to have 82 different programs in 20 different agencies doing the same thing.

Something else they discovered was that there are 56 Federal programs that are focused on the issue of teaching financial literacy. I have said this before, and I mean it sincerely, of all places, Washington, DC, should not be leading or doing instructions on financial literacy. But that being said, it is 56 programs spread across 10 different agencies. Do we need that?

That is the kind of thing that gets lost. That is the duplication and inefficiency and waste we all talk about. Yet, because we do not do the oversight we need to, many of these things just continue year after year.

Going to a biennial budget, where every other year we do a budget and then in the even-numbered years, the election years, we are doing oversight, we might actually think of ways to save money for the taxpayers as opposed to spending it.

So a biennial budget, to me, makes sense. I would make the budget resolution we pass binding because right now it is not. As a consequence, it often gets waived. I believe we need to have buy-in from the President. Right now, the budget resolution is passed by the House and the Senate, but the White House does not engage on that. So we do not have teeth in this thing that holds everybody accountable when it comes to spending. Too often that gets waived.

We need to change the way we do things around here with regard to declaring emergencies. Right now, if we want to spend money outside the parameters of the budget, everybody says: Well, it is an emergency. So declaring an emergency has become the norm rather than the exception. It has become the routine in the Congress. We have all these emergency designations which allow Congress to spend and spend. Again, there are not any constraints. It is high time we change that.

So I would make a number of changes in our budget process, which I think would lead to more transparency, more accountability, a more efficient, better-run Federal Government.

That being said, it is not the Federal Government that is going to lead us back to an economic recovery and getting people back to work. It is the hard-working entrepreneurs, it is the small businesses, it is the people in this country who roll up their sleeves every day and go to work trying to make this country stronger and more prosperous.

We are blessed because we have a nation that was founded on some core principles, one of which is economic freedom. We believe in free enterprise and free markets. It is a system that has worked extraordinarily well for this country. Look anywhere else around the world to try and find a rival to what the hard-working entrepreneurs in this country and those basic core economic principles have been able to accomplish. We cannot find one.

It is because of those four principles and the incredible ingenuity, innovation, creativity, and hard work of the American people that we have the greatest economy in the world. But that economy, as I said, is very much in jeopardy if Washington does not get its spending habits under control. Because we continue to crowd out private investment, we continue to make it harder for entrepreneurs to create jobs.

As we talk about the whole issue of spending and debt, one final point I would like to make—because there is this discussion right now about whether there ought to be tax increases. Everybody says: Well, revenues are down relative to historical averages. That is true. But one of the reasons I believe revenues are down is because there are literally trillions of dollars sitting on the sidelines in this country that are not invested because of the economic uncertainty based upon policies coming out of Washington—uncertainty about tax policy, uncertainty about regulations.

We have this tax and regulatory environment that is paralyzing the American economy. So businesses out there that have funds they could deploy, capital they could put to work in this country, are not doing it because they are worried about what Washington might do next.

We have tax policy that is going to expire at the end of 2012. It is very hard to make decisions when tax policies are temporary. It is very hard to make decisions when you do not know what that regulatory agency is going to do to you next. They have consistently—these regulatory agencies—come up with more and more ideas about how to make it more costly, more expensive, more difficult to do business in this country.

I have alluded to a couple. The EPA is a good case in point. It is one that comes into play a lot in my State of South Dakota because we are primarily an ag economy and small businesses. Many of those policies are directed at production agriculture and energy development and all those sorts of things

that allow our economy in my State to grow and to prosper.

So I think one of the reasons tax revenues are down, people are not investing. When they are not investing, they are not turning those resources over. They are not taking realizations, and they are not paying taxes. We need to get investment capital put to work. We need to get people put back to work. The best way to do that is to provide economic certainty: tax policies, regulatory policies that are reasonable and that provide incentives, not disincentives, for investment.

Today, we have tax and regulatory policies that are doing absolutely the opposite. They are discouraging investment, and, as a consequence, I think we have a lower level of revenues. But the real problem, the real problem, is not revenues, it is spending. That is abundantly clear.

If we look at where we have been for the last 40 years in terms of what we spend as a percentage of our overall economy, that average is about 20.6 percent. That is a 40-year average, historical average, we spend on our Federal Government as a percentage of our entire economy. This year we will spend 25.3 percent of our entire economy on just the Federal Government.

That does not include spending on State and local governments. When we add that up, it is over 40 percent of every $1 we spend in this country is spent on government. So what we see is the government is growing relative to our total economy, and the private economy, those folks out there who are creating the jobs in our private economy, is shrinking relative to the size of the government. That is a trend we have to reverse. It starts with getting spending under control. This is not a revenue problem. This is not a tax problem. As much as many of my colleagues would like to make it that, we flatly cannot look the facts in the face and come to any other conclusion but that spending in Washington is out of control, it has to be reined in.

We have to attack the issue, not only of discretionary spending—the part we annually appropriate for—but these entitlement programs which if not addressed are not only going to bankrupt the country but ensure that there is not a Medicare Program and a Social Security Program available to future generations of Americans.

These are very tumultuous times. There is a lot of uncertainty. I think the jobs numbers that came out this morning again point to how fragile this economic recovery is. It is so dependent upon good, sound policies coming out of Washington. For better or worse, small businesses, entrepreneurs now, unfortunately, tend to be partners with Washington, DC, because there is so much policy coming out of here, whether it is tax policy, regulatory policy, that impacts their bottom lines every single day.

We need to get out of the way to keep those taxes low, to get Federal spending under control, to make sure the regulatory framework in which our businesses operate represents the minimum level and not the maximum level that we can do to make it more difficult for small businesses to grow and to create jobs. If we can do those types of things, address the issue of spending and debt, take it on in a meaningful way, deal with this issue of reforming our Tax Code and making sure our tax rates stay low on businesses in this country and make sure regulations and regulatory policies coming out of Washington, DC, are not the impediment they are today to investment and job creation, I think we can get this country back on track.

But that is where it starts. If we want to create jobs, if we want to grow this economy, if we want to make it more prosperous and stronger for future generations, those are the steps, in my view, we have to take. I hope we get started soon. I do not think we can afford to wait.

A lot of people around here think these are all political exercises that we will go through the hoops and the motions, and we will wait to solve this until after the next election. We cannot afford to wait. The time is now. If we do not do it, we are going to put in great peril future generations and their ability to enjoy the same standard of living, the same quality of life we have enjoyed.

That is not fair to them. That is why I believe the time to start is now and the time to get this budget process—not only the reforms of the process but the spending restraints in place—is today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MCCASKILL). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, I was presiding, before the senior Senator from Missouri took my place, and was listening to two of the last three speakers talk about their budget religion, if you will. I think about this. I think we have to look at a little bit of his history.

I do not think I need a lecture on balancing a budget. I was in the House of Representatives in the 1990s when, without one Republican vote, we passed President Clinton's budget. We had a huge budget deficit in those days. That budget began us on the path to a balanced budget.

I supported a balanced budget amendment in the mid-1990s. By 2000, the year President Clinton left office, we had the biggest budget surplus in American history. Then, in 2001, at the push of President Bush and his Republican colleagues in both Houses, this Congress passed a major tax cut, mostly for the wealthy in 2001; another major tax cut, mostly for the wealthy in 2003, both of which I voted against.

President Bush, with intelligence that was not especially sound—being gentle about it—took us into a war with Iraq, did not pay for it; took us into a war with Afghanistan, did not pay for it. I voted against the war in Iraq.

In 2003 or 2004, he pushed through Congress by one vote—I remember I was in the House of Representatives opposing that bill, when they kept the rollcall open for 2 hours or longer that night. President Bush was on the phone with recalcitrant members of his party in the House of Representatives—pushed through a Medicare bill that was a bailout to the drug and insurance companies in the name of Medicare privatization, without paying for it.

President Bush leaves office then, leaving the largest budget deficit in our history—going from the largest budget surplus, written, by and large, by the Democrats, because Republicans did not play ball with us during most of the 1990s. Then, after President Bush and the Republican leadership in many of those years, House-Senate, President Bush left us with the biggest budget deficit in history.

When I hear this revisionist history on the Senate floor—I was not even going to talk about this today. But I heard two colleagues, for whom I have respect, one from Alabama, one from South Dakota, talk about this budget deficit in a way that simply is historically inaccurate—in the name of this deficit, and we have to deal with this deficit.

I know the Presiding Officer is focused on that. A lot of us are focused on that. We have to deal with this deficit. But you don't do the same thing over again where you give big tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans and then privatize Medicare. That is what they are doing. They are cutting health care, saying it is not sustainable, whatever that means, and giving major tax cuts to the rich, and we are saying that is not sustainable.

HONORING NATIONAL TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wish to talk about teachers. In my State, the legislature just passed something called SB 5, and the Governor in Ohio signed it. It was a direct assault in many ways on the teaching profession.

The discussions I hear from conservative politicians and their allies in the media—and they have many on editorial boards, especially in central Ohio—and the lack of respect they show for people who choose to teach as a profession is mind-boggling. We trust our children to teachers, yet we attack them—or too many politicians attack them.

I am going to make it personal. I am going to start with my mom. My mom was a high school English teacher born in Mansfield, GA, in 1920. She taught in the era of segregation in Florida and Georgia. Raising my two older brothers and me in Mansfield, OH—she met my dad coming back from World War II, ending up in another Mansfield at the end of the war—she taught in an era of a growing American middle class. Like

teachers throughout our history, she taught her students and her sons that education is a gateway to opportunity, that it can integrate a segregated nation and create a prosperous nation.

At a time when our Nation needs our teachers the most, when our economy needs our students to succeed, it is appropriate to remind ourselves—in spite of this background noise I hear from so many conservative politicians about teachers' unions and about teachers who don't care, about teachers taking off in the summer and being done at 3 o'clock and all the kinds of attacks they like to make on teachers, I think it is important to remind ourselves of the importance of our teachers.

This week, our country recognizes National Teacher Appreciation Week to give thanks and gratitude to teachers across our country to whom we entrust our children and who have made a difference in our lives.

Let me share a few stories about great teachers in Ohio.

Linda Michael of Pomeroy, OH, in Meigs County, down on the Ohio River, works with homeless students from K–12 to make sure they have equal access to the same education as other students, from Head Start to preschool to doctor referrals. She locates students in shelters, motels, and homes of relatives to make sure they have what they need: housing assistance, clothing, food, utilities, and mental health. Is this a teacher who quits at 3 o'clock and doesn't work during the summer? This is above and beyond the call of duty that most of us do in our society. Imagine growing up homeless, going to school, not having your own room, not having a room to share with your sibling, not having a place to go at night. We need teachers to take care of them. We need to do better as a society, but teachers are really a safety net for these children.

Michelle Rzucidio-Rupright is an elementary school teacher in Cleveland. For her, teaching is not a 9-to-5 job. It means going to homeless shelters after school where her students live. It means buying supplies out of her pocket for her students in the classroom. She is a role model in the community.

I know Senator MCCASKILL talks to teachers a lot and hears these things. How many teachers tell us they reach into their pockets? These are not Wall Street bankers. They are making sometimes as little as $35, $40, $45, $50,000 a year. Do we Senators reach into our pockets and buy folders for our office or buy pens? Do Senators do that? Do most businesspeople reach into their pockets to take care of these children? So many teachers do, to buy construction paper—the ones who teach grade school—to buy pens, to give kids money for lunch sometimes. Clearly, teachers play a role most people in this country don't play.

David Fawcett is a Columbus drama teacher. He has helped generations of new immigrants and low-income students see something greater in themselves—more than just a poor immigrant child trying to make it. He encourages students to learn language and speech and culture through lines of a play or a musical, through elocution lessons under his guiding presence. He is another teacher who focuses on the individual unique needs of a child who may have been born in another country and may have parents who don't speak English. That child has different challenges from what I had with educated, English-speaking parents in Mansfield, OH, with lots of ideas and privileges. I was taught by my parents to read before I started kindergarten because I was smarter than other kids because I had parents who knew that mattered for me to get ahead and for the advantages I had. Mr. Fawcett clearly focuses on each child's individual, unique personality needs, situation, all that.

John Keller is a government teacher in Orange, a suburb 15 miles east of Cleveland. Mr. Keller addresses the complexity of a subject with the simplest of tools: a sense of humor. He engages students as soon as they walk in the classroom, ensuring a passionate debate and empowering students to always stand up and speak out about the world around them. He makes them laugh. What better way to teach than engaging the students, having a big personality and making people laugh, and sometimes the teacher himself, I am sure, being the butt of the jokes, the humor about himself.

Deb Lammers and Paul Lenz, teachers in Miller City in Putnam County, OH—one of Ohio's smallest counties, southwest of Toledo—are the kinds of math teachers every student deserves. They are patient and kind. They adapt teaching skills to student needs, arriving early and staying late. Again, all this stuff: Oh, teachers quit at 3'oclock; teachers don't work in the summer. All of this kind of thing from conservatives. Why they don't like teachers is beyond me, but why so many conservative politicians attack teachers for all kinds of things, I don't even pretend to understand. But Ms. Lammers and Mr. Lenz, teaching in Putnam County OH, arrive early and stay late, being accessible to students whenever they need help.

Delette Walker is a retired grade school teacher in Shaker Heights. For decades, she helped children overcome the insecurity of shyness, instilling in them the confidence to read out loud, to sing in a musical to confront their fears. We know how young children—I have four, my wife and I do. And when they were young—they are not so shy now, but when they were young, they were fairly shy, and they had teachers who helped bring them out of their shell sometimes. As parents, we try to do that, with some success, but I have watched teachers with my own children. I have watched them help them believe in themselves, particularly young girls. I wanted to teach my daughters that they could accomplish anything—anything—and the fact of their gender, especially in that generation a few years ago, especially when I was a kid—girls were treated differently, and girls were not expected to achieve the way boys did or in too many cases the way boys were expected to. I saw teachers, with my own daughters, help them believe in themselves and in a big, important way. That is what Ms. Walker did, now retired, but with grade school children she taught in Shaker Heights.

Diane Skelley, Vicky Hilliard, and Pat Carson are high school teachers in West Carrollton, OH, outside of Dayton. Through the written word, chemistry equations, or musicals, they are teachers who encourage students to try harder and reach higher, never to doubt one's talents. I know a young woman in my office was taught by these three teachers, and I know she believes she can—I know her parents too—take on the world and grow and learn something that women maybe a generation or two ago might not have been so successful at, and Diane Skelley, Vicky Hilliard, and Pat Carson—all three of them at West Carrollton helped her achieve that and helped countless others in Montgomery County in southwest Ohio to move forward, whether it was in English, music, or chemistry.

Vicki Speakman was a Grandview high school teacher. Grandview is outside of Columbus. She was a Spanish teacher, a dedicated mother, a bedrock of the community. She was diagnosed with cancer. Ms. Speakman remained a constant presence at games and concerts, never missing a chance to share a smile, tell a joke, reach out to a lonely student. Ten years ago next month, she lost her fight with cancer, but, like all great teachers, her memory lives in the countless students whose lives are better because of her—not just her memory but the impact she had on these students. Whether they think of Ms. Speakman every day or every week, they live a life differently because of Ms. Speakman. That is true with so many of these teachers.

When I think of this teacher—and I did not know Ms. Speakman, but when I think of her presence at ball games and school plays and I think of so many teachers I had at Mansfield Senior High School—my junior high was one that will probably make the pages here today laugh. The name of my junior high school was Johnny Appleseed Junior High School in north central Ohio, where Johnny Appleseed, 200 years ago or so, used to go around—it was a peculiar life he lived. He went around a country that was totally forested planting apple trees. But to each his own. He became a legend as a result. But I remember, in grade school and junior high and high school, so many teachers who would come to our plays. I played basketball in eighth grade and played baseball and basketball in high school. I would see teachers—not just the coaches but teachers—come to the games, the Friday

night basketball games or the Tuesday afternoon baseball games or the school plays on Saturday. They were part of the community, cheering on their students, not showing favorites but caring particularly for students who were a little more shy or a little less talented who might need a bump up or encouragement from their teacher.

The same goes for Jackie Geary, who taught reading for nearly 45 years in Dayton. She was the matriarch of a family of educators. Her husband Mike is a professor at the University of Dayton, one of our great universities in Ohio. Her daughter Beth is a special needs teacher for families of U.S. military personnel in the country of Japan. Aside from her constant smile and laughter, she reminded all who knew her that one of her great responsibilities was to read to a child each and every night. Jackie passed away last month after a long battle with cancer. Up until her very last days, she insisted on teaching the most valuable lesson of all: compassion and love and commitment.

Again, these are teachers who go above and beyond the call of duty not just to collect a paycheck, not to go home at 3 o'clock, not to be off in the summer and not be a part of the community. Ms. Geary and Ms. Speakman gave so much of their lives to their students. Both passed away, Ms. Speakman some time ago, Ms. Geary more recently. Both will be remembered, and their impact will be seen throughout.

Sandy Ryan is a special-ed preschool teacher in Cleveland. She first taught special needs adults. She then went to college later in life to earn a master's degree to teach special needs children. She buys her students coats in the winter, supplies, including book bags, and coats for children who can't afford them. Again, we don't pay teachers a lot. They are barely in the middle class in terms of their income if they are a single parent and on a teacher's salary. Yet they reach into their pockets. This isn't just buying pencils and pens and occasional lunch money; this is a teacher who buys coats in the winter sometimes for her students because she teaches in a low-income area.

Ms. Donna Marie Shurr is a high school teacher in Oberlin. She partners with local and international projects—water projects in the community, to building homes in Jamaica, to schools in Pakistan and Afghanistan. She inspires students to believe that education is continuous and service is a lifelong pursuit that extends beyond the classroom. She is a teacher who, by showing by example, teaching by example, helps these students navigate the rest of their lives. They have a commitment to service beyond the classroom, beyond their workday, beyond their family, a commitment to service in the community, and it doesn't stop at our borders. With Ms. Shurr from Oberlin, not far from where I live, it is international also.

Ms. Dean Blase is an English teacher at Clark Montessori School in Cincinnati. I visited Clark last year. It was a finalist for the competition for President Obama to deliver its commencement speech, losing out at the last minute to a school in Michigan. Teachers such as Ms. Blase instill values of curiosity and wonder in their students from diverse backgrounds, encouraging academic achievement and community service.

Teachers are counselors, coaches, mentors. They serve as surrogate parents. They are friends of students at the right time. They are advisers, they are cheerleaders, they are partners, they are—fill in the blank—that any of us can do because we have had good teachers in our lives. They so often go the extra step. They drive talented pupils to competitions and scholarship interviews. They are an essential part of our communities.

Yet, in Ohio, SB 5 is an amazing thing. It basically takes away rights from teachers, collective bargaining rights. I know teachers—when they collectively bargain, they sit down at the school board and, sure they negotiate for decent wages, health care, and a pension, but they also negotiate for class size.

I was talking to a teacher at a roundtable at a church right off Capital Square a couple of months ago, and she teaches in a Columbus suburb. But she talked about in negotiations how they negotiate class size because she knows, no matter what she is paid or no matter what benefits she has, she wants to be a very good teacher. She cannot be as good a teacher if there are too many students in the classroom because she cannot give them the kind of individual attention she would want to give them.

Yet the Governor, the legislature, because of this ideological mission they are on, want to bust teachers unions, they want to, apparently, downgrade the respect teachers have in the community. Maybe they think they should become bankers or doctors or lawyers so they can make more money. I do not know why they think that.

But what that means is—I am tired of hearing parents tell me and young people tell me: My daughter or I or whoever was going to be a teacher, and they were studying at Miami University or Ohio University or Toledo or Hiram College, whatever, and they decided—when they hear all these politicians, conservative, mostly Republican politicians, in Ohio, Columbus, downgrading teachers and criticizing the profession of teacher—they think: Why do I want to do that? I am not going to make a lot of money. If I am not going to have any respect from the people who run my State, why do I want to be a teacher—in spite of the fact they did want to be a teacher.

I am also hearing from young teachers who are now in the classroom waging these fights that it is not easy teaching kids who do not have much advantage, it is not easy teaching kids who have discipline problems, it is not easy teaching kids whose parents are not particularly engaged for reasons of dysfunctional families or income or all the reasons parents are not as involved as we would like them to be. It is hard enough to do that without a bunch of Republican conservative politicians criticizing the profession in saying: They quit at 3 o'clock, they do not work in the summers, they are lazy, whatever they say about them.

So I wished to talk about teachers who have affected my life. Most of these teachers I have mentioned have taught people in my office. We walked around the office and said: Tell me about some teachers. Almost every one of these teachers is somebody who has helped to produce stars, absolute stars, in my office. That is one reason I wanted to share their stories, and I wanted to share their stories because I think most of us who are fairminded—unless we are elected to legislatures and rightwing politicians—most of us care about education, most of us care about teachers, most of us appreciate what teachers gave to us, most of us honor them and respect them.

But you are not honoring and respecting teachers, you are not honoring and respecting perhaps the most important profession in this country, when you take away their rights, when you downgrade them, when you go after their unions in the name of some ideological mission you are on. It is tragic, and I am sorry. I apologize for them and their behavior to the teachers of Ohio and teachers around the country. It is too important a profession to do that.

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. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO HAROLD SCHNITZER

Mr. WYDEN. I come to the floor to honor a man who touched every corner of my home State of Oregon. Harold Schnitzer left his mark on our business community, the arts, health care, education, and practically every nook and cranny of my home State.

Harold Schnitzer died last week of complications relating to cancer and diabetes. He learned of his impending death earlier this year and faced it with extraordinary style, grace, and the wit that marked his 87 years of life.

Those who knew Harold Schnitzer describe him in one of two ways. Many knew him as a powerful and philanthropic force in our State. Others knew him as approachable, easygoing, and especially as a person who never took himself all that seriously. I knew him

in both ways, and I knew him as a friend.

Like many in Oregon, I am saddened by Harold's passing. Harold was a successful real estate developer. He and his wife of 62 years, Arlene, gave generously to my alma mater, the University of Oregon, and to Portland State University. They established the Harold Schnitzer Diabetes Health Center at the Oregon Health Sciences University. Their gifts of art and financial support helped transform our Portland Art Museum into a center for regional art works.

The generosity of Harold and Arlene can be found throughout Oregon in places such as the Oregon Zoo, a special favorite of my children, Lewis and Clark College, the Mittleman Jewish Community Center, the Oregon Symphony, the Oregon Ballet, and the Portland Opera. A centerpiece of Oregon's art community is the beautiful Arlene Schnitzer Concert Hall in our downtown Portland community. It is affectionately known as ''the Schnitz.''

Harold Schnitzer was a humble man, and he came from humble roots. As a boy, he earned 25 cents a week polishing metal in his father's Portland scrap yard. From there it was on to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for a degree in metallurgy, and then he went on to a career in real estate.

Certainly, our colleagues from the bay area of California know who Harold Schnitzer was because with great pride he restored the historic Claremont Hotel Club and Spa in Berkeley to its former glory. In true Harold Schnitzer fashion, when he sold the hotel in 1998 the proceeds provided the funding for two family charitable foundations.

We have lost a man, but, fortunately, we have not lost his vision and his generosity. His wife Arlene will continue to stand for those kinds of good works in our home State, and their son Jordan, a successful businessman in his own right who shares his parents' passion for philanthropy, continues every single day to look for opportunities to serve our home State. You can look no further than the Jordan Schnitzer Museum of Art in Eugene and downtown Portland's Simon and Helen Director Park, named for his maternal grandparents.

What I liked most about Harold Schnitzer was his very wry sense of humor and particular knack for summarizing the events of our time. I remember often when I would see him after a particularly spirited discussion in the Senate. Harold had a great interest in politics and was a devout consumer of all the Sunday morning talk shows. After a particularly volcanic debate in Washington, DC, about some issue where it seemed nothing could get resolved, I would go home and be out and about, perhaps at the grocery store in Portland, and I would see Harold. He would tug on my elbow and say: I have been watching what is going on in Washington, DC, RON. Got things pretty much worked out back there, do you?

He would kind of chuckle and sort of express perfectly his sense of the irony of the challenges we have in Washington, DC. He knew somehow we would always get through them. Whenever I was around Harold, I got a sense that he really captured some of the irony of what goes on in Washington, DC, very well. He brought that same kind of approach and that light touch and combination of humor and irony to so much of what he did.

In my view, Harold Schnitzer represented what was good in humanity. His legacy of good works is going to go forward. But for all those who didn't know him personally, didn't know him like I had the chance to, I wanted to take just a few minutes to tell the Senate and our country that Harold Schnitzer was a very special man. In my view, he was what I call a vintage Oregonian—somebody who got up every day and tried to make our State and country a better place. He will be greatly missed.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERCHANGE FEES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there are many issues which come before the Senate, and some are simple and some are complex. The issue I am going to speak to today is one which you are personally aware of, Mr. President, as the Senator from West Virginia, and one that more and more Members are becoming aware of. It is the question of interchange fees or swipe fees.

For those who do not follow this closely, every time we use a credit card or a debit card in the United States of America, the retailer or merchant we do business with pays a fee to the bank that issues the card. The fee is established by the major credit card networks, Visa and MasterCard. They tell the banks how much they will receive each time a customer uses these cards.

What it comes down to is the fee that is being charged, the debit card fee, has become a subject of controversy. Let's go back in history a little bit. I can still remember when people used checks, and some still do but not as frequently. Now we use the plastic form of a checking account. Instead of writing out a check and pushing it through the banking system, and for a few cents watching it be processed, we use a debit card. A debit card draws money directly out of our checking accounts to the merchant we are doing business with.

So the debit card has, in fact, by a large measure, replaced checks—and in many instances replaced cash—as more and more people are using plastic for transactions. So I started hearing from merchants and retailers all around the United States about the fee that was being charged for debit card transactions.

Now, debit card transactions are different from credit card transactions in this respect. When I use my credit card, I am going to be billed each month for what I put on my credit card. There is a collection issue: Will Durbin actually make his monthly payment? Will he make it on time? Is he able to make the payment? And there is a question about whether this is going to be processed.

So there is, I guess, an uncertainty involved in credit card transactions and much less so when it comes to debit card transactions because that money is coming directly out of our checking accounts to the merchant. So in terms of risk, there is greater risk with a credit card than for a debit card. Nevertheless, over the years what we have seen is the swipe fee, or fee charged to a merchant for the use of a debit card, keeps going up, up, and up.

People would say: Well, why don't the merchants and retailers bargain with Visa, MasterCard, and the banks to make sure they do not have to pay an increasingly large fee every time a person uses a debit card?

The answer is they have no power to bargain at all. Not at all. So the retailer, the merchant, ends up accepting the debit card, swiping the debit card, paying for the transaction, and then paying a fee, to the point where one would ask: Well, how much of a fee is it?

The average debit card fee, found by the recent study of the Federal Reserve, is about 40 cents a transaction. Now, 40 cents may not sound like much if someone is buying a television—of course, though, it is going to be a percentage fee—but think about 40 cents if a person standing in front of you in line at the airport is buying a package of bubble gum. That 40 cents is all the profit that retailer could ever expect, and it is going right out the window. In fact, they are losing money on the transaction because of the debit card.

So for years retailers and merchants, restaurants, convenience stores, hotels, charities, universities, went to Visa and MasterCard and said: You cannot keep just raising this fee. It is not fair to us. You are not justifying it in terms of the costs of doing business, and we are paying more and more out of each transaction, even though the cost has not gone up.

Basically, Visa and MasterCard told them: Go take a hike. We are going to charge what we want to charge. Take

it or leave it, buddy. If you do not want to take plastic, that is your business. Try to do business without it. You cannot.

So retailers and merchants were on the losing end of this conversation. So they came to me and said: Is there a way to do a study on this issue and determine what is fair? So a few years ago I joined with Senator Bond of Missouri, and the two of us, on the credit card reform bill, asked for a public Fed study on fee and cost information. Well, it turned out the banking industry did not want any study at all. They killed our amendment for a Fed study and told people—all the people in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans—vote against even a study of the swipe fee, the debit card interchange fee.

So we ended up empty handed. The day came last year when we revisited the issue. This time I came to the floor with an amendment and said: Here is what I would like to do. I would like to give to the Federal Reserve the power to promulgate a rule which says the fee charged for the use of a debit card is going to be reasonable and proportional to the costs incurred by the bank in processing this transaction. We are going to put in a factor for fraud. If there is something they need to add to take care of fraud, add it in. We went a step further. We said this is not going to apply to every bank and credit union that issues a debit card. We are going to exempt the overwhelming majority of community banks and credit unions across America.

There are about 15,000 community banks and credit unions across the United States—-15,000. So we said: If your bank or credit union has a valuation of less than $10 billion, you are not covered by this reasonable and proportional law. You are exempt. At the end of the day, it meant that about 100 banks across America were subject to this new law and three credit unions. All the rest are exempt.

So you say: Well, Durbin, if you exempted all of these banks and credit unions, almost 15,000 of them, and you only affected about 100 of them, how can this have any impact? Well, it turns out, of the largest banks in America, three of the big ones—that would be Chase, Wells Fargo, and Bank of America—really comprise nearly half of all the debit card transactions in the country. Some say even more, 60 percent or even more. So by just making this a law that applies to the largest banks, we are affecting the majority of debit card transactions, and we are establishing a reasonable and proportional fee for what the transaction is.

So the retailer and merchant, the person running the mom-and-pop store or the person running a big box store is going to get fair treatment in terms of how much is charged.

So you say to yourself: Well, how much are they charging now? The Federal Reserve estimates they are charging about 40 cents a transaction, and the actual cost to the bank and the credit card company is about 10 cents. They are charging four times as much as they should on each transaction.

How much money is it worth to the banks? The estimates range from $1.3 to $1.7 billion a month—a month. Now, these banks, the big banks that I am addressing with this law, they are not having little collections outside the bank to keep themselves in business. They are bringing in quite a bit of money. They are very profitable, and to say that they should have a reasonable charge for retailers and merchants across America, small businesses and large businesses alike, I do not think is unreasonable. Remember, we exempted the community banks. We exempted the credit unions. It is only the big ones that are going to be affected by this.

Well, one would think I had done the worst thing in the world to these banks and credit card companies. They have unleashed, with the greatest fury they can possibly put together on Wall Street, this attack against the Durbin amendment. They are sending out letters—Chase is—to all of the people who have debit card accounts and credit card accounts saying if this Durbin amendment goes through, we are going to charge extra fees here and extra fees there.

Well, at the end of the day, that is the threat that we always hear from them. The fact is, since they are virtual monopolies in their business, they are increasing their fee charges regularly. People across America know it. Every time we put in a reform, they race to raise their interest rates and race to raise their penalties. They give these ''free'' checking accounts loaded with penalties if you stumble and do not pay on the exact day or whatever it happens to be.

So it has become quite a battle. It is a battle between Visa, MasterCard, and the biggest banks in America versus the retailers and merchants of America. They are both engaged. Now, the retailers and merchants cannot hold a candle to the big banks and credit card companies when it comes to their investment in this fight. But they are trying valiantly, and we are organizing small businesses across the United States—in Illinois, West Virginia, all over the place—to step up and say: Come on. This is an important part of business.

Now, I ran into one of my colleagues on the Senate floor, and she said: What I am worried about is even if you reduce the fee charged to the retailer for using the debit card, how is that going to help the customer? How is that going to translate into anything more than profits for the business?

Well, Mr. President, in your family background, you have been involved in business. If you have a competitor across the street, whether it is a gas station, a drug store, a grocery store, a restaurant, you know your price competition is an important part of whether a person chooses your store over the other store. So when you give the owner of the store a break on the fee that is being charged by the credit card companies and banks, then you give them an opportunity to engage in more price competition.

But what about Walmart? This is the monster of retailers in terms of size, about 10 percent of all of the sales in America. I can tell you, even with Walmart, Target is looking over its shoulder. It is watching the prices of goods and deciding whether it can be competitive. So there is competition at this level.

If we give retailers a break when it comes to the amount they have to pay to the banks and credit card companies, I think it is going to end up in consumer benefits. The consumer organizations, the major ones in this town, support what I have done. They aren't supporting the position of the big banks and credit card companies.

One of the arguments that comes down is interesting. The lion's share of the argument against my amendment is not coming from the people directly affected by it. We are not hearing as much in Washington from those big banks on Wall Street or the credit card companies, and they are the ones most affected by it. Why? They don't have much credibility around here. These are the folks who came filing in for a bailout when they made some pretty bad decisions and got billions of dollars from the Federal Government to bail them out, and then, of course, they turned around and gave bonuses and all sorts of high-level compensation to their officers. So they are not the most popular crowd on Capitol Hill. So they have brought in surrogates to argue their position, and the surrogates, as my colleagues know, are the small banks and small credit unions saying the Durbin amendment is terrible.

The first thing we have to say to them is: You are exempt. You are not covered by the Durbin amendment. If you have $10 billion in assets or less, you are not covered. Still, they argue, at the end of the day, we think this might hurt us.

I have taken an extra step, beyond the law, to try to deal with some of their concerns because I value these community banks and credit unions. I worry they have now become part of the banking industry—in capital letters—instead of what they were traditionally: our neighborhood banks, our small town banks, our local credit unions. They have now become part of this big banking industry thing. I don't think it is healthy for them, and I don't think it is healthy for the economy or for consumers. So what I did was go to the merchants coalition on my side of this issue, the retailers, and ask them to put out a statement of policy when it comes to whether they are going to discriminate on the card that is presented.

Let me be more specific. If you are running a restaurant in Wheeling, WV,

and somebody walks through the door and puts a debit card—these are all debit cards—puts a debit card down to pay for the meal, will your restaurant take a close look and say: Oh, that is a community bank with a higher interchange fee than it might be with a card from Chase Bank, for example? That is one of the concerns expressed by the community banks and credit unions. Even though you exempted us, all these retailers could discriminate against us because our swipe fee is higher than it might be coming out of Chase.

We ended up with a letter—an important letter—which I have shared with every one of my colleagues, and it is a letter from the Merchants Payment Coalition, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERCHANTS PAYMENTS COALITION,
Washington, DC, May 2, 2011.

Hon. DICK DURBIN,
Majority Whip, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DURBIN: We understand that some in the financial services industry are claiming that the Durbin Amendment exemption from interchange ''swipe fee'' regulation for financial institutions with assets under $10 billion will not be effective in practice because merchants will discriminate against debit cards with higher swipe fees. On behalf of the undersigned trade associations, and the tens of thousands of merchants and retail locations we represent, we are writing to make clear that we have no contractual or practical ability to treat debit cards issued by small financial institutions or credit unions differently than those issued by large institutions. Furthermore, our member companies are committed to customer service and it is not in their interest to discriminate against debit cards that so many customers carry.

Currently, merchants are subject to Visa and MasterCard network rules that require us to accept all Visa and/or MasterCard debit, regardless of which bank or credit union issues the card. This is called the Honor All Cards rule and we risk the threat of $5,000 per day fines—or higher—if we break this rule, so we assure you that merchants have no intention of violating this term of brand acceptance. These rules also prevent merchants from pricing goods differently based upon the financial institution that issued the card.

Additionally, even if these rules were not in place, merchants have no practical ability at the point-of-sale to distinguish between big bank and small bank cards, nor the swipe fee rates associated with those cards. Indeed, in many if not most retail environments, employees never see the face of the card the customer is using: the customers swipe their cards themselves.

Lastly, even if merchants could differentiate between card issuers, there are no market or economic incentives to discriminate against mid-sized and smaller financial institutions' cards. If a customer wants to pay with a card, merchants will let them use that card because the retail industry is fundamentally all about competing to deliver value and customer service. If merchants didn't accept the card, they would risk losing the sale and losing the customer; a risk very few in the competitive retail industry are willing to take. Additionally, most consumers only have one debit card in their wallet. We would absolutely prefer they pay with that debit card, rather than with a credit card, because while debit card per transaction rates have grown exponentially over the past several years, credit card swipe fees are far higher and continue to be a significantly more costly burden on businesses of all sizes.

We appreciate the opportunity to set the record straight regarding the many misrepresentations being made about the Durbin Amendment, and you have our commitment that the retail community across the nation will do its part to help ensure that the exemption of financial institutions with less than $10 billion in assets from the swipe fee reforms on debit cards will work in the marketplace.

Sincerely,

American Beverage Licensees; Coalition of Franchisee Associations; Food Marketing Institute; Interactive Travel Services Association; International Franchise Association; National Association of College Stores; National Association of Community Pharmacists; National Association of Convenience Stores; National Association of Shell Marketers; National Association of Theatre Owners; National Association of Truck Stop Operators; National Council of Chain Restaurants; National Franchisee Association; National Grocers Association; National Restaurant Association; National Retail Federation; National Small Business Association; Petroleum Marketers Association of America; Retail Industry Leaders Association; Society of Independent Gasoline Marketers of America.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you, Mr. President. Let me quote a few words from it. This is a letter to me, dated May 2:

Dear Senator DURBIN:

We understand that some in the financial services industry are claiming that the Durbin Amendment exemption from interchange ''swipe fee'' regulation for financial institutions with assets under $10 billion will not be effective in practice because merchants will discriminate against debit cards with higher swipe fees. On behalf of the undersigned trade associations, and the tens of thousands of merchants and retail locations we represent, we are writing to make clear that we have no contractual or practical ability to treat debit cards issued by small financial institutions or credit unions differently than those issued by large institutions. Furthermore, our member companies are committed to customer service and it is not in their interest to discriminate against debit cards that so many customers carry.

Currently, merchants are subject to Visa and MasterCard network rules that require us to accept all Visa and/or MasterCard debit, regardless of which bank or credit union issues the card. This is called the Honor All Cards rule and we risk the threat of $5,000 per day fines—or higher—if we break this rule, so we assure you that merchants have no intention of violating this term of brand acceptance. These rules also prevent merchants from pricing goods differently based on the financial institution that issued the card.

The No. 1 complaint of community banks and credit unions about discrimination against their cards is addressed directly by this letter. I have made this a part of the RECORD. It is being sent to every Member of the Senate.

There is a second part of this argument. The question is whether Visa and MasterCard, the networks, will continue to allow the community banks and credit unions to charge a higher interchange fee than the big banks. Under our law, there is no reason to change it. So I am challenging Visa and MasterCard and these card networks to state clearly and unequivocally, as this letter has stated, that they will not discriminate against these smaller banks, community banks, and credit unions. The merchants have come forward as a matter of record, and it has been put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this day, to say there will be no discrimination. At the end of the day, if Visa and MasterCard will make the same promise of no discrimination, then ultimately there is no disadvantage to the community banks and credit unions. None. Now the burden is on the big credit card networks to step up to the plate.

I am sending a letter today to the president and CEO of the Illinois Bankers Association, the Illinois Credit Union League and the Community Bankers Association of Illinois and we are going to send it to their national affiliates as well, sending them a copy of this merchants letter so they can no longer make the claim that they are going to be victims of discrimination by merchants and retailers and asking them to now step up and join us in challenging Visa and MasterCard and the major card networks. That, to me, resolves the most fundamental issue that has been brought to the Members of the Senate. They can no longer claim that these retailers are going to discriminate against them. As a matter of record, they will not.

I think it is important for us to change this system, and I think it is important for these virtual monopolies of Visa and MasterCard to be held accountable. I think what we have done in passing this law and giving the Federal Reserve the authority to establish this rule is the right thing to do.

Now there is a big effort afoot to stop us. The Presiding Officer knows that. They are lobbying such as I have never seen before on Capitol Hill. You would think there was $1 billion a month at stake, and there is. They are determined to stop the Federal Reserve from issuing a rule which says that retailers and merchants across America will be treated fairly. They are going to stop them, if they can, and I am going to fight them all the way. I am hoping my colleagues who joined me in this vote and those who share my feelings about small business across America will stand with me.

I know the alternative. The largest banks in America and the credit card companies have a lot of friends, and they are very powerful, but I think we ought to give the Federal Reserve the chance to issue reasonable final rules.

In fact, talk to any bank across the country, and they are going to tell you that the current system is working just fine. They don't want reform. They don't want any change. They

want to keep it as is. It is worth billions of dollars to the major banks to keep this charge as is, at the expense of businesses across America.

I favor transparency and I favor competition and I wish we didn't have to bring the Federal Reserve into this conversation. But we looked for a neutral regulatory agency that would establish a reasonable and impartial fee, promulgate a rule, issue it after a public comment period and implement it, and that is what we are striving to do.

The CEO of JPMorgan Chase, who is a friend of mine—or at least he used to be—Jamie Dimon, has called interchange reform downright idiotic. He spent a good portion of his recent annual shareholder letter criticizing this reform. Chase has also sent a letter to its customers warning about my amendment, and Chase is constantly threatening to raise fees on its customers unless they stop the Durbin amendment. A few weeks ago, I sent Jamie Dimon a letter and responded to some of his criticisms. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, April 12, 2011.

JAMIE DIMON,
Chief Executive Officer and President, JPMorgan Chase & Co., New York, NY.

DEAR MR. DIMON: In your recent annual letter to your company's shareholders, you wrote a lengthy and dismissive critique of the debit interchange fee reform legislation that I drafted and that Congress enacted last year. You have also been quoted describing my amendment as ''counterproductive,'' ''price fixing at its worst,'' and ''downright idiotic.'' I am compelled to respond, and I ask that you share this response with your shareholders as well as your customers.

Clearly, debit interchange reform has displeased many in the financial services industry. Your industry is used to getting its way with many members of Congress and with your regulators, and my amendment and the Federal Reserve's draft regulations were not written the way you wanted. But that does not mean they were written poorly or that the process that created them was flawed. To the contrary, interchange reform will carefully but firmly rein in the fee collusion that your bank and thousands of other banks currently engage in through Visa and MasterCard. The wisdom of this reform is confirmed by the irrationality of the arguments that your industry raises against it—arguments that are based upon misrepresentations and threats rather than evidence or logic.

The American people deserve to know the real story about the interchange fee system and the ways that banks in general—and Chase in particular—have abused that system. I have said and written much on this topic already, but I will respond to five of your specific criticisms below.

1. Your letter claims that my reform amendment ''is an example of a policy that has little basis in fact or analysis.'' In fact, the amendment was drafted based upon years of Congressional hearings, Government Accountability Office reports, academic articles, and published studies by the Federal Reserve's economists and payment system experts. These analyses showed that the debit interchange system is uncompetitive, inefficient, and harmful to consumers. Your industry often acts like these analyses do not exist, so I will explain what they reveal.

The debit interchange system is not a properly functioning market. For years, card-issuing banks like Chase have agreed to let the Visa and MasterCard duopoly fix the interchange fee rates that banks receive from merchants each time a debit card is swiped. The banks get the fees but they do not set the fees. This system of price-fixing by Visa and MasterCard on behalf of thousands of banks has gone entirely unregulated.

There are two core problems with Visa and MasterCard's fixing of interchange rates. First, centralized rate-fixing does not give card-issuing banks incentive to manage their operational and fraud costs efficiently. This is because all banks in the network are guaranteed the same network-fixed interchange rate whether they are efficient or inefficient. Competition is absent and inefficiency is subsidized when fees are set in this manner.

Second, Visa and MasterCard have incentive to constantly increase interchange rates and there is no countervailing market force to temper these fee increases. Visa and MasterCard want as many of their debit cards to be swiped as possible because they are paid a network fee by merchants each time a card is swiped. By raising interchange rates, Visa and MasterCard can entice banks to issue more of their cards. Because Visa and MasterCard have enormous market power and control around 80 percent of the debit cards in consumers' wallets, merchants cannot realistically say no to accepting Visa and MasterCard and have no leverage to negotiate fee rates with them. There is no naturally-occurring market force in today's interchange system that would ever lead rates to go down.

So merchants are stuck with ever-rising debit interchange fees that add up to more than $16 billion each year. These fees not only affect merchants, but also universities, charities, government agencies and all others who accepts debit cards as payment. The fees end up getting passed on to consumers in the form of higher retail prices for groceries and gas. Consumers, and particularly unbanked consumers, ultimately bear the cost of subsidizing the interchange system.

We owe it to our nation's consumers and businesses to ensure that the interchange system is efficient, transparent, and subject to competitive market forces. Studies have shown that Americans pay the highest debit interchange rates in the world, and that these rates have continued to increase in recent years. The Federal Reserve has also found that the high interchange rates charged today far exceed what it actually costs to conduct a debit transaction. Nearly every other industrialized country has established reasonable regulation over their debit systems, and these countries have achieved improved efficiency, lower fraud, and consumer benefits. The time has come for reasonable reform of the dysfunctional U.S. debit interchange system, and my amendment will make that reform a reality.

2. You say that ''it's a terrible mistake and also bad policy for the government to get involved in price fixing.'' Of course, my amendment does not create price fixing—it constrains the price fixing that Visa and MasterCard currently perform on banks' behalf. Visa and MasterCard cannot simply be trusted to fix interchange prices in a way that is fair for all participants in the debit card system. They have not proven worthy of that trust.

Last year Congress decided that there should be reasonable regulatory constraints placed on Visa and MasterCard to ensure that they cannot use their market dominance to funnel excessive interchange fees to the nation's biggest banks. A strong bipartisan majority supported my amendment, which said that if Visa and MasterCard are going to fix fee rates on behalf of banks with over $10 billion in assets, those rates must be reasonable and proportional to the cost of processing the transaction. It is important to make clear that if Chase wants to set and charge its own fees in a competitive market environment, the amendment does not regulate those fees. The only regulated fees are those fees that banks let card networks fix on their behalf.

3. You criticize the law Congress passed because it does not consider ''the cost of fraud.'' Your comment highlights how the current interchange system, which supposedly does consider the cost of fraud, creates exactly the wrong incentives when it comes to fraud prevention. Fraud rates are far lower for PIN debit transactions than for signature debit transactions, but Visa and MasterCard set higher interchange fees for signature debit than for PIN ostensibly to cover the higher cost of fraud. Banks now urge cardholders to pay with signature in order to get the higher fees. For example, on April 21, 2010, the American Banker reported that your own bank sent a mailing to your debit customers that strongly suggested they should ''always select'' signature.

Chase's practice of steering American cardholders toward fraud-prone signature debit stands in stark contrast to Chase's practices in Canada. The Chase Canada website indicates that ''chip and PIN technology will become available for all Chase Canada MasterCard and Visa cards in 2011.'' Your Canadian-based subsidiary Chase Paymentech Solutions says on its website that chip and PIN technology provides ''Enhanced Security and Fraud Reduction—Chip technology is virtually impossible to copy and combining its use with a PIN helps reduce lost, stolen or counterfeit transactions.'' It is frankly inexcusable that your bank would urge your American customers to ''always select'' a fraud-prone technology while you provide your Canadian customers with technology that enhances security and reduces fraud.

In contrast to the current U.S. interchange system which rewards banks for promoting fraud-prone signature debit, my amendment will allow interchange fee increases only to those banks that successfully prevent fraud. The Federal Reserve can implement this in its final rulemaking by setting target fraud prevention metrics and allowing increased interchange for banks that meet those targets.

4. You say that Chase needs debit interchange fees to pay for the ''fixed costs of servicing checking accounts and debit cards'' such as ''printing and mailing of the cards,'' ''operational and call center support to service the cards,'' and ''the costs of ATMs and branches.'' Here you are using the old financial industry trick of first conflating the cost of conducting debit card transactions with the cost of offering other checking account-related services, and then arguing that network-fixed debit interchange rates should be used to cover this whole basket of costs. It is a clever argument that aims to justify Visa's and MasterCard's exorbitant price-fixed rates, but the shortcomings of this argument are evident.

The costs you cite in your letter are costs which banks should be incentivized to manage efficiently, and allowing Visa to fix interchange fee rates across all its member banks to supposedly cover these costs is a recipe for inefficiency and excess. Card network companies like Visa are not positioned to know what the appropriate level of cost is

for operating ''ATMs and branches,'' nor are they equipped to determine how much of a particular bank's ''printing,'' ''mailing,'' ''operational'' and ''call center'' costs are attributable to debit cards instead of ATM cards or credit cards. Further, Visa has no way of knowing if a particular bank is using debit interchange revenue not to cover legitimate costs but instead for rewards, ads, profit, or executive bonuses. Indeed, because Visa itself profits by incentivizing banks to issue more and more of its cards, Visa has every incentive to inflate the interchange fees it fixes to levels that compensate banks far in excess of their costs. In order to correct these incentives for inefficiency and excess, my amendment limits network interchange price-fixing on behalf of the 3 biggest banks to an amount that is reasonable and proportional to the costs that are necessary to authorize, clear and settle a particular debit transaction over the network's wires.

Also, your claim that interchange fees must be high enough to cover all checking account-related costs is undermined by the fact that banks also charge many other high consumer fees under the premise of covering those exact same costs. Banks like Chase charge consumers many fees for maintaining and accessing funds in their checking accounts—monthly fees, overdraft fees, failed payment fees, ATM withdrawal fees, failure to maintain a minimum balance fees, account closing fees, and more. Bank revenues from these consumer fees have not gone down in recent years as interchange fee revenues have gone up; to the contrary, bank revenues from consumer fees have also reached record highs. I would draw your attention to the November 12, 2008, Wall Street Journal article entitled ''Banks Boost Customer Fees to Record Highs'' and the July 1, 2009, New York Times article entitled ''Bank Fees Rise as Lenders Try to Offset Losses,'' both of which discuss your bank and other banks' efforts to raise consumer fees long before my amendment was ever written.

5. You say that the amendment ''potentially will harm consumers'' because ''banks will be forced to lose money on debit interchange transactions and likely will compensate by increasing fees in some way for deposit customers.'' This threat defies both facts and logic.

First, there is no evidence that banks cannot continue to offer debit cards profitably with reduced interchange. As Andrew Martin explained in the excellent January 4, 2010, New York Times article entitled ''How Visa, Using Card Fees, Dominates a Market,'' up through the early 1990s banks used to offer debit cards even though they received no interchange fees. In fact, many banks used to pay merchants for accepting debit cards, because debit cards saved money for banks when compared to the banks' costs of processing paper checks. The current high-fee debit interchange system in this country only developed because Visa entered into and took over the debit market the mid-1990s through an antitrust violation, and Visa then imported credit card-type interchange fees into the debit space. Studies have shown that many other countries enjoy vibrant debit systems with interchange fees strictly regulated or prohibited entirely. In short, past experience in this country and present examples in other countries demonstrate that banks like Chase can easily continue to offer debit card services without the excessive subsidy of high interchange fees.

Second, if Chase follows through on threats to increase consumer fees (beyond those increases you have already made in recent years), market competition would suggest that many of your deposit customers would take their business elsewhere. In fact, many of those customers would likely take their business to the small banks and credit unions who are exempted from my amendment's interchange fee regulation and for whom Visa and other debit networks have already agreed to set a higher tier of interchange rates. And for those who continue to speculate that my amendment will hurt small banks and credit unions, I recommend they read Simon Johnson's excellent analysis in the April 7 New York Times entitled ''Big Banks Have a Powerful New Opponent.''

In conclusion, I recognize that Chase will likely see decreased revenue from interchange reform, but I urge you to keep some perspective. Last year Chase had $17.4 billion in profits—up 48 percent from the previous year—and a 15 percent profit margin. Your own personal compensation ''jumped nearly 1,500 percent to $20.8 million in 2010'' according to Reuters. In contrast, middle-class American families are struggling to get by in a tough economy—an economy that went south because of the banking industry's unregulated excesses.

There is no need for you to threaten your customers with higher fees when you and your bank are already making money hand-over-fist. And there is no need to make such threats in response to reform that simply tries to spare consumers from bearing the cost of interchange fees that are anti-competitive and unreasonably high.

Interchange reform is necessary and it is long overdue. Right now the Fed is working diligently to craft a set of final regulations that will reflect the comprehensive information it has gathered and that will respond to the valuable comments it has received. In the coming weeks I am confident the Fed will produce a reasonable set of reforms that will enhance the efficiency, competitiveness and fairness of the debit system. This will neither be ''counterproductive'' nor ''idiotic.'' It will be good news for all Americans.

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. DURBIN,
United States Senator.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you, Mr. President. I haven't had a reply yet from Mr. Dimon. He called me. I called him back. That seems to be the end of our exchange. But I would like to hear his response. I encourage him to share my letter with the same shareholders and customers to whom he has written. After all, in his shareholder letter, Mr. Dimon said he wanted ''analysis in the full light of day'' of the Durbin amendment, so I figured he would want his audience to be informed on my position. I don't think Chase has done that yet. I hope they will.

I know the banking industry prefers for the giant Wall Street banks to stay in the background when it comes to this fight because they are not that popular. Estimates indicate that about half of all debit swipe fees go to just 10 big banks and the Big Three, Bank of America, Chase, and Wells Fargo, make the most of all, well over $1 billion a year each. But the banking industry knows the public isn't happy with big banks, so the industry is using small banks and credit unions as their public face in this battle. Industry argues that even though my amendment exempts all but the largest 1 percent of banks from fee regulation, the exemption will not work and small banks are going to get hurt. Well, this letter makes it clear that when it comes to retailers and merchants, there will not be any pain inflicted. They are, in fact, exempt under the law and they will be exempt in practice.

As I said, I received a letter from 20 of the Nation's largest retail associations that reaffirms what I just said. I think the letter is compelling. In this letter, these merchant groups make it clear they don't have the contractual authority, the practical ability or the economic incentive to discriminate against small bank or credit union debit cards. They point out that Visa and MasterCard contracts impose strong penalties on them even if they try. Second, they point out that in many, if not most, retail environments, the merchant doesn't have the practical ability to distinguish between a small bank or a large bank card at the point of sale.

I had Wendy Chronister, whose family owns a chain of gas stations in downstate Illinois, come to my office and talk about this. I have known her mom and dad a long time, and Wendy is running the business and running it well. She said: Senator, for goodness' sake, when they put the plastic on the counter we take it. We need the sales. We are not going to argue with them about who issued the credit card or debit card. That just stands to reason. They are not going to ask them to put their debit cards away when they come to a cash register. They will lose sales and customers if they do it.

Finally, the merchants make the observation that most customers only have one debit card, so if you want to make a sale, they are going to take that debit card.

What I have tried to do with this letter is to show that those on my side of this debate—the small businesses, the retail merchants, convenience stores, hotels, and restaurants across America—are trying to be reasonable. Had the credit card companies and major banks been reasonable on this issue, I never would have introduced this amendment. They refuse—refuse—to bargain with the retailers and merchants. They said it was a ''take it or leave it,'' and they did it in the obscurity of retail contracts and regulations which are almost impossible to work through.

I think those who are asking for a delay and study of this issue should be called out for what they are asking. Every month they delay means customers and consumers across America will pay over $1 billion more in these fees on debit cards—money taken away from retailers, taken away from small business, and taken away from our economy. When these small businesses have the advantage they can get under the Durbin amendment, they are going to be able to be more profitable, expand their businesses, and hire more people. How many times have we heard a speech on the floor that the key to economic recovery in America is small business. If you truly believe, then you cannot vote for this 2½-year delay and study of this issue, if you truly believe

in small business. I think the issue is very clear.

I urge my colleagues not to fall for this game the banks and card companies are playing. Don't let them delay and derail the swipe fee reform consumers need so badly. The Senate has already voted to establish a process for interchange reform. We should let that process continue and we should let the Federal Reserve issue their rules, which they are planning to do in just a matter of weeks, and I think at that time we will see that there is a reasonable way to deal with this that doesn't create a disadvantage for community banks and credit unions.

(Mr. CARDIN assumed the chair.)

GAS PRICES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, the average price of gasoline is $3.96 a gallon nationwide. I have my own specially appointed monitor of gasoline prices in the State of Illinois: my wife. I called her yesterday morning and she said to me: Senator, it is up to $4.20 a gallon in Springfield. What are you going to do? So she put me on the spot. Since she is my No. 1 constituent, I said: I will at least make a speech, and that is what I am going to do on the floor of the Senate.

In my home State of Illinois, the price is well over $4 a gallon—not just in Springfield but statewide. Every time they go to the pump, families and small businesses feel the pinch. At the same time, the five largest oil companies in the country made $33.9 billion in profit between January and March of this year. ExxonMobil earned almost $11 billion in the first 3 months of this year—69 percent greater profits this year compared to last year. The high oil and gas prices are forcing many American families to make tough choices about what to forgo so they can fill the tank.

It gets worse. While operating at substantial profits, oil companies will get an estimated $4 billion this year in Federal subsidies. Think about that. These companies making $11 billion in the first 3 months of the year are asking for Federal subsidies. We don't have the money to subsidize them. In fact, we have to borrow.

How do you pay for higher gas prices in America? You are going to pay it three ways. First, you pay at the pump, sometimes 80 or 90 bucks to fill your tank, even in Maryland. Secondly, you are going to pay when you pay your taxes because your tax dollars are going back to the oil companies to subsidize their operations.

But you are going to pay a third time. Do you know why? Because we have to borrow 40 cents for every $1 we spend in America and we borrow it primarily from China and we have to pay China back with interest. So your children and your grandchildren are going to pay interest on the money we borrowed to provide a subsidy—an annual subsidy—of $4 billion to oil companies that are making recordbreaking profits.

What is wrong with this picture? Is there anybody left in this town who is willing to fight for families and small businesses that are getting nailed with these high gasoline prices?

The interesting thing—and I know the Presiding Officer, who was a former Congressman from Maryland, knows what I am saying is accurate—there are rights of spring in America: the opening of the baseball season, the Easter egg hunts, seder dinners for our Jewish friends, and skyrocketing gasoline prices. Every single year, right before the summer vacation season, the oil companies raise gasoline prices at the pump, and politicians line up at microphones, such as this one, and beat the heck out of oil companies and talk about how fundamentally unfair it is and then we replay this movie next year—every year, year after year.

For the oil companies, why do the prices go up? Any excuse will do. This year, it was Libya. Qadhafi is in trouble. We are going to raise prices at the pump by 40 cents, 50 cents or $1. It turns out Libya is responsible for about 3 percent of the world's oil supply, and even if there is an interruption of the supply from that place, most of their oil goes to Europe. But, as I said, any excuse will do when it comes to raising gasoline prices.

Next week, we are going to take up a bill I support that would end these tax subsidies to big oil companies. Have you seen their advertising? These oil companies, such as ExxonMobil, that made $11 billion in the first 3 months of the year, say, if we cut their subsidies, they are going to raise gasoline prices even higher. Talk about being at the end of a gun here: Your money or your life.

The Close Big Oil Tax Loopholes Act would end the special treatment given to several companies with leases in the Gulf of Mexico. These companies have been allowed to drill and pump oil without paying the Federal Government for the oil they extracted. Ending the special treatment and tax breaks we give to oil companies will generate billions of dollars. We suggest—I suggest—let's take the money that is going to these highly profitable—recordbreaking profitable—oil companies and put it in to reduce the deficit. How about that for a start? Reduce the amount of money we are borrowing from China so we do not have to pay interest on it.

This bill is not intended to punish the oil companies for turning a profit. But it certainly is not going to reward them with more taxpayers' dollars. It simply asks large wealthy international companies—in an industry that has existed for over 100 years—to pay their fair share and no longer depend on the government for a handout.

Some of these tax breaks started almost 100 years ago. They were created to encourage companies to explore for oil. However, at $113 a barrel, how much more encouragement do these oil companies need?

Domestic oil production, incidentally—I hear about this all the time from some of the critics—domestic oil production in this country has been increasing consistently since the year 2008. Domestic production was 1.8 billion barrels in 2008. It was 2 billion barrels in 2010.

In 2004, about 60 percent of oil consumption in America was from imports, and imported oil as a percentage of consumption has dropped a little more each year. Last year, it dipped to 50 percent—still too much, but the amount of imported oil has come down as domestic production has gone up.

The United States is currently the third largest oil producer in the world behind Saudi Arabia and Russia. This is despite the fact that we have less than 2 percent of the world's total proved oil reserves.

Oil production, incidentally, has also been increasing on Federal lands and waters since 2008.

Some of the critics are saying: You know why gas prices are up? They will not let the oil companies go out and drill in the Gulf of Mexico and other places. Shouldn't we be careful about drilling in the Gulf of Mexico? I think so. BP taught us that lesson last year. But having said that, oil production has increased on Federal lands and waters since 2008.

In the last 2 years, oil production from the Federal Outer Continental Shelf has increased by more than one-third—446 million barrels in 2008 to over 500 million barrels in 2009 and more than 600 million barrels in 2010.

Oil production on Federal lands increased 5 percent in 2010 over 2009. But greater domestic production of oil has not led to lower gasoline prices. We have higher gasoline prices. Drill baby drill is not the solution to rising gas prices in the short or long term.

The United States consumes each year 25 percent of the oil that is produced in the world. We have the capacity to produce 2 to 3 percent. We cannot drill our way out of this challenge.

Crude oil prices went up in February with the spread of political unrest in the Middle East and North Africa, even though domestic production in the United States was going up too.

The oil industry has access to millions of acres of Federal land and water—land they have bought leases on and land they will not drill on. For them to argue the government is stopping them from drilling, the obvious question is, So what about the land you currently have to drill on? Why aren't you taking that lease land and putting it into production?

Out of the 41 million acres under lease across the United States, the oil industry is only using 12 million acres for production. That leaves 29 million acres under lease to oil companies that are not being used today.

Thirty-eight million offshore acres are currently under lease, but only 6.5

million acres of them are in active production. The Bureau of Land Management issued over 4,000 drilling permits last year—4,000 of them—but approximately 2,500 of them still remained unused at the end of the year.

So this argument that the requests for permits to drill are stacking up in some bureaucratic office in Washington and if they would just approve them, these oil companies would start drilling more oil and gas prices would come down, is not the truth. The Bureau of Land Management issued 4,000 drilling permits last year; 2,500 of them went unused.

I support measures proposed by my colleagues to force the oil companies to use their leases or lose them. The bill would require nonproducing leases to pay an annual fee of $4 an acre. These leases of public lands should be actively used for domestic energy production, not kept idle as we face higher oil prices.

Let me close by saying I recently returned from a trip to China—10 days in China. China is an enigma. On the one hand, they are the most significant economic partner of the United States. They are our largest creditor. They loan us more money than any other country. On the other hand, they are our most significant economic competitor. Partner and competitor, that is the relationship.

When you go to China, you are struck by the fact that their air pollution is horrible. In every city we visited, I cannot imagine how people live there full time and do not develop serious health problems because of the terrible pollution they have in their country. But despite the pollution, they are creating an expanding economy. They are building right and left. What are they focusing on as the No. 1 area where China wants to dominate the world? Clean energy. In every direction: solar panels and wind turbines and new research on clean energy.

I wish I could say the same for the United States. But I am afraid I cannot. We do not have an energy policy. We are still dependent on traditional fuels. We still have to recognize those fuels create environmental issues we have to face, and, unfortunately, we are not. We are not acknowledging the fact that if we are not careful, China is going to dominate in the world when it comes to clean energy throughout the course of this century.

We need an energy policy in this country, not just to deal with the terrible gas prices we are facing today but to deal with a future which makes us less dependent on foreign oil.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING CARL PIKE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to once again touch on a subject that is important to me. I know it is very important to the Presiding Officer because the Commonwealth of Virginia and the great State of Maryland have a large number of Federal employees. As the Presiding Officer knows, this week we celebrate Public Service Recognition Week to honor public servants at all levels of government for their admirable patriotism and contributions to our country.

I wish to begin by commending our military intelligence professionals for the coordinated and painstaking work that was responsible for tracking down Osama bin Laden. There are a number of nameless, faceless Federal workers who have been investigating his whereabouts for more than a decade. I was proud to be in this Chamber with the Presiding Officer and colleagues from both sides of the aisle when, on Tuesday afternoon, this body recognized their work.

Our military and intelligence professionals are not the only ones on the front lines of keeping our country safe. Today, I rise to honor a resident of Reston, VA, Carl Pike, the Assistant Special Agent in Charge of the Special Operations Division at the Drug Enforcement Administration, DEA. This is a photo of Carl and his whole team.

We have all seen reports in recent years detailing the violent and inhumane acts of the Mexican drug cartels that terrorize cities and control a significant percentage of the narcotics flowing into the United States. Mr. Pike is the head of a complex multiagency task force set up to catch many of these violent criminals and disrupt the flow of drugs. Last year, he and his team led the largest strike ever against La Familia, one of the most ruthless Mexican drug cartels and a major trafficker of methamphetamine in the United States. The strike, dubbed ''Project Coronado,'' was an operation that spanned 20 States, 50 cities, 2 countries, and multiple Federal agencies. Attorney General Eric Holder said the ''unprecedented, coordinated U.S. law enforcement action'' was a ''significant blow to La Familia's supply chain of illegal drugs, weapons and cash flowing between Mexico and the United States.''

The strike would not have been possible without Mr. Pike, as so many of his colleagues attest. One DEA Special Assistant Agent in Charge said:

> He oversaw the broad interests of the law enforcement community, displayed phenomenal negotiating and planning skills, and facilitated collaboration between agencies and international partners that often had competing interests.

In the end, Project Coronado led to the arrest of 1,200 associates of La Familia and the seizure of 1½ tons of methamphetamine, $32 million in cash, and 400 weapons. It truly was a significant achievement.

Carl Pike and his team should be recognized for removing dangerous drugs and criminals off our streets—something for which we can all be grateful.

I hope my colleagues will join me in honoring Mr. Pike and his team as well as all those at the DEA for their excellence and service to our Nation.

I was also proud to be part of a group earlier today recognizing a number of Federal employees—nine from the Commonwealth of Virginia and many from the State of Maryland—who were part of a national competition that recognizes quality work of government workers.

As we see this week in broad display those military intelligence professionals in this most dramatic action against Osama bin Laden, as we see Mr. Pike and his team taking on drug cartels, and as we see the hundreds of thousands of other Federal workers who day-in and day-out, often without recognition, do the job of keeping our government operating and in many ways keeping our country safe, I hope my colleagues will join in saluting those efforts and recognize that this week, Public Service Recognition Week, is to honor all of our public servants.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that we are continuing in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

RUSSIAN RULE OF LAW

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, on several occasions I have risen to address my colleagues on the topic of Russia and the continuing sad state of the rule of law in the Russian Federation. Today, I rise once again to address the latest information regarding the absence of a rule-of-law framework in Russia's approach to businesses and investors. Specifically, this situation negatively impacts the United States and the entire international community.

There have been a number of poor decisions around the world related to the Yukos Oil issue that highlight Russia's hostility toward investment and business. As my colleagues may be aware, GML, the majority shareholder of the former Yukos Oil, previously headed by businessman and now political prisoner Mikhail Hoarders, has a $100 billion arbitration claim against the Russian Federation to obtain compensation for the Yukos assets which were summarily taken between 2003 and 2005.

Several recent developments demonstrate yet again that international courts do not recognize Russia's 2003 expropriation of Yukos Oil Company as legitimate and that former stakeholders of the company may pursue compensation for their assets that were seized improperly and, in essence, nationalized by the Russian State.

Court victories handed to shareholders involved in the dispute indicate that the international legal system

will not recognize the validity of Russia's bankruptcy of Yukos. In December 2009, the New York Times detailed one of these victories in which an independent arbitration panel made a jurisdictional ruling that shareholders of the former Yukos Oil Company, GML, had the right to file and pursue an estimated $100 billion in damages from the Russian Government. The tribunal determined that Russia, as a signatory, was bound by the Energy Charter Treaty and must adhere to its provisions. This claim now moves to the next stage, with a decision expected in October 2013—regrettably slow but moving surely.

The most recent victory occurred in December of last year and involved a second international arbitration tribunal in Stockholm, which awarded RosInvestCo UK, a minority shareholder of Yukos, $3.5 million for the damages resulting from the Russian Government's actions. This was the first case in which anyone seriously examined the claims of an individual Yukos shareholder. The panel independently and unanimously concluded that the Russian Federation was liable for expropriating RosInvestCo's assets. I stress to you that this was a unanimous decision even though the tribunal included a Russian arbitrator.

I bring these developments to the attention of my Senate colleagues because I believe they demonstrate a growing movement in the international community that holds Russia accountable for its actions toward investors, and it is a movement the United States should support.

Minority shareholders, such as RosInvestCo, are just the tip of the iceberg when it comes to shareholders who lost billions that were rightfully theirs as a result of the seizure of Yukos assets. In the United States alone, shareholders were stripped of $6 billion to $12 billion.

Russia's actions toward Yukos remind us that investment in Russia is extremely risky. The international community is taking note. Americans are taking note. American legislators should take note.

Recent court decisions indicate that the legitimacy of the Russian Government's claims over Yukos assets are suspect at best.

With these thoughts in mind, I urge my colleagues to continue working to ensure protection and adequate mechanisms for U.S. shareholders and businesses doing business in Russia.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

GULF SHUTDOWN ANNIVERSARY

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, tomorrow, May 6, will mark the 1-year anniversary of the formal moratorium placed on Gulf of Mexico energy production by President Obama and Secretary Salazar. I wish to speak on the eve of that occasion, particularly as our constituents continue to see the price at the pump go up and up, with really no end in sight. I think those two facts are deeply related because I think this moratorium, which continues as a de facto moratorium—a ''permatorium'' or a permit logjam to this day—is really one of the most poorly thought out, mismanaged, and ill-conceived energy decisions in terms of domestic energy production in our history.

The first of these moratoriums in the gulf—there are actually three different formal moratoriums—was announced on behalf of President Obama by Secretary Salazar 1 year ago tomorrow, May 6, 2010. It was done, in retrospect, we find out, very hastily and without scientific backing and justification. I say that because after that first moratorium was put down on May 6, 2010, on June 22 a Federal judge, Martin Feldman, of the Eastern District of Louisiana ruled against this job-crushing moratorium. It banned drilling below 500 feet of water for 6 months. But Judge Feldman put it on hold because he found that under Federal law it had failed to properly weigh a number of factors, including the economic impact it would have on the industry and surrounding communities.

I might add, in a hearing we had in the Senate about the administration's decision to place the moratorium in effect, it was shocking to hear administration officials say very directly—no holds barred—that they never considered any economic impact in the decision whatsoever. Again, failing to properly weigh the economic impact of the decision has been a chronic problem in some agencies, such as the EPA.

Unfortunately, this administration seems to have brought that same knee-jerk reaction to the Interior Department with the same economic illiteracy. In the Interior Department's infinite wisdom, on July 12, Secretary Salazar issued a backup second moratorium. The court struck down the first moratorium on the basis of existing Federal law, so he just came and issued a second moratorium on deepwater drilling. The second moratorium would soon be met with resistance and disappointment as coastal Louisiana communities would realize there was nothing they could do to stop Interior, which seemed hell-bent on adversely impacting their jobs.

On October 12, Secretary Salazar celebrated an illusory victory by lifting that moratorium, and at the time, he claimed that ''the policy position we are articulating today is that we are open for business.'' That is what Secretary Ken Salazar said on October 12. Unfortunately, those of us who live in Louisiana and along the gulf coast know that is not true. What he should have said is, the policy position we are articulating today is that we are open for business as long as you don't need a permit from the Interior Department, because that second formal moratorium was lifted, but that brought us to the initiation of the third moratorium—not a formal moratorium but a de facto one, a permatorium, a complete permit logjam in this administration and at the Department of the Interior. Again, this has been commonly and accurately referred to as a de facto moratorium, sometimes a permatorium, an absolute permit logjam. Secretary Salazar has perpetuated that, and Director Bromwich has perpetuated that. They repeatedly stated it doesn't exist, but the facts, the statistics, the numbers make bare that lie.

It would not be for 4 more months—until February 28 of this year—that the Interior Department would issue the very first permit to drill in deep water an exploratory well. So, again, big celebration, big announcements that the formal moratorium was lifted, but for 4 months zero permits and only 4 months later the first deepwater exploratory permit.

To date, even since February 28 of this year, there have only been 12 deepwater permits issued in the gulf. That pace is well below the pace before the BP disaster—about 60 percent slower than the prespill pace. This is for shallow and deep water combined. The pace of only deepwater new well permits—permits that would increase domestic supplies and our reserves—is forthcoming at the average pace of one per month—just a trickle, just a tiny percentage of the predisaster pace.

Tomorrow will be 1 year since the Obama administration implemented this moratorium policy, the first of three crushing moratoriums, two formal moratoriums, the ongoing de facto moratorium. The Energy Information Administration—and that is a nonpartisan division of the Department of Energy—is now estimating that the falloff in domestic production this year alone will be about 200,000 barrels per day—that is a lot of oil, 200,000 barrels per day—and an additional 200,000 barrels per day in 2012. To put this falloff in production that is expected from the Obama administration's policy in perspective, as a result of the permitting logjam, by 2012 we would lose as much production in the Gulf of Mexico as we currently import from Brazil and Colombia combined. These are the two countries, by the way, that are supported with taxpayer-funded guaranteed projects related to their energy production. This falloff in production in the gulf by 2012 is roughly equivalent also to what we imported in January from Iraq.

There are several points I would like to highlight for tomorrow's anniversary of the initiation of this moratorium policy.

First, the price of gasoline at the pump is now $3.98 a gallon. It has more than doubled since President Obama took office. There is perhaps not a greater antistimulus for our economy than the doubling of the price at the pump.

Second, seven deepwater rigs have left the Gulf of Mexico. They are gone,

and they are not coming back anytime soon. In addition, five are cold-stacked or without a contract. That is a total of 12 rigs. Ironically, that is exactly the same number of deepwater permits the Interior Department has issued—a trickle compared to pre-BP levels.

Third, what minor credit I should give the Interior Department for this abysmal pace of permitting will be noted when I release my hold on the nomination of Dan Ashe. I am currently holding that nomination of a top-level Interior Department official. I said I would hold it until we got at least 15 deepwater exploratory permits. At the time I initiated that, there were zero. As I said, that is now finally up to 12. I said I would lift the hold when we got to 15. We are just three away. We will get there. I will lift the hold. But that is merely a trickle of what our pace needs to be.

Fourth, today I will be introducing an important piece of legislation. It is called the Agency Overreach Moratorium Act. We need a moratorium. We need a moratorium on regulatory overreach, agency overreach, as we see in the Interior Department, in EPA, in many other agencies. This legislation is intended to prevent Federal action that would unilaterally destroy jobs on Federal lands on the OCS. That is happening every day at the Interior Department. Instead of issuing permits to find American energy, they are issuing regulations, the most recent on a whole new category of contractors—completely unnecessary because they were already regulating the drillers. That is regulatory overreach, and that is job-killing action. My Agency Overreach Moratorium Act will lay out the real moratorium we need on job-killing action out of Washington, out of this administration, not on domestic energy production.

I thank all of my colleagues, and I hope we will all come together soon around a commonsense, proactive domestic energy policy. It needs to include a lot. I am a fervent believer in all of the above, but it certainly needs to start lifting the continuing de facto moratorium on U.S. energy production, on U.S. jobs, on good additional Federal revenue to the U.S. Treasury to lower our deficit if we are going to get on the right energy path.

Mr. President, 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. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. McCASKILL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SYRIA

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, I rise to speak specifically about the alarming situation in Syria, where the regime of Bashar al Asad is pursuing a barbaric campaign of indiscriminate repression against the Syrian people.

Over the past 2 weeks, the crackdown pursued by Asad has markedly escalated. There can no longer be any doubt about his intentions. As a report by a respected nongovernmental organization, the International Crisis Group, warned this week:

> The regime's hope appears to be that a massive crackdown can bring the protestors to heel. . . . Such a course of action would entail loss of life on a massive scale and it could usher in a period of sectarian fighting with devastating consequences for Syria. It could destabilize its neighbors. And, ultimately, it is highly unlikely to work.

Madam President, in the city of Deraa, the Asad regime has deployed tanks against the civilian population. It has cut off phone lines, water, food, and electricity, and deployed snipers—according to human rights groups—who have been firing at anyone who ventures outdoors. That includes young people who are sent outdoors by their families to try to buy food.

In short, what we see in Deraa is a broad-based, indiscriminate assault by Asad's military forces against the people of his own country. The evidence is growing that international crimes are being perpetrated by Bashar Asad himself in the city of Deraa in Syria.

The attack on Deraa is just one part of a course of a broader crackdown by Syrian security forces across the country—a crackdown that has left several hundred people dead. Tanks and military forces have been reported being deployed in other cities in Syria. According to Human Rights Watch, the number of arbitrary detentions of civilians and enforced disappearances around the country has skyrocketed in recent days as the Asad regime has swept up not only demonstrators but women, minors, and family members of activists. Another Syrian human rights group has documented more than 500 arrests in Deraa alone since last week, and thousands more nationwide have also been detained or disappeared arbitrarily.

As the report by the International Crisis Group argued—the report I referenced before that came out earlier this week:

> The regime is also fanning the flames of sectarianism, spreading rumors of impending acts targeting specific groups. Sectarian tendencies no doubt exist in parts of the country, but the authorities' tactics betray a determined and cynical attempt to exploit and exacerbate them.

What is most remarkable of all is that in the face of and despite these outrageous inhumane actions by the Asad regime, the people of Syria refuse to be silenced. They refuse to be intimidated. In the face of tanks and snipers, the people of Syria have continued to cry out and demonstrate for their fundamental human rights, and they have continued to do so peacefully. Moreover, despite the sectarian provocations by President Asad, the message of the protesters has remained steadfastly one of Syrian national unity.

Tomorrow, Friday, it is expected that thousands of brave Syrians will once again take to the streets of their cities and towns in protest of the totalitarian dictatorship that currently controls their country. As they do so, I want them to know that the United States and the rest of the civilized world stands unequivocally on the side of the people of Syria in solidarity with them in their courageous struggle for their human rights. They should know also that we are increasingly confident that the people of Syria can and will prevail over the Asad regime.

There is much we in the United States can and must do to help the Syrian people in their fight for freedom. Last week, the Obama administration issued an Executive order authorizing targeted sanctions against individuals and organizations responsible for the human rights abuses in Syria. The administration used this newest authority to sanction three Syrian officials, including Maher al Asad, the brother of Bashar al Asad. This was a very important action, and I thank and commend the Obama administration for taking it.

There is, however, more that now can and must be done. To begin with, it is clear there are many more individuals in the Syrian Government than the three named so far who are responsible for the human rights abuses and worse that are taking place throughout Syria. It is urgent and essential that the Obama administration expand the sanctions to cover these additional Syrian officials.

Members of the Syrian security forces and government must understand they face a choice in the days ahead. If they stick with the Asad regime and participate in the barbaric crackdown against their fellow Syrians, their names are going to be made famous around the world, and they will be held accountable.

It is also critical that the United States impose sanctions on Bashar al Asad himself, for he is the head of the regime that is systematically carrying out large-scale human rights abuses. It is he who is directing his military forces to fire on his own people. Surely, it requires a willing suspension of disbelief to think the order to use military force against the Syrian people did not originate with the President of Syria himself—Bashar al Asad. He must be held accountable.

I respectfully urge President Obama to speak out as soon as possible, directly and personally, about what is happening in Syria. The moral authority of the President of the United States matters enormously at historic moments such as the one in Syria now. Unfortunately, there are still many in Syria and throughout the Middle East who believe the United States is hedging its bets in Syria. It is time to put those doubts to rest.

I have met over the last few weeks, as recently as yesterday, with Syrian

dissidents, and I have heard the same question from them again and again: Why has President Obama not spoken out personally about what is happening in Syria?

I say: The administration has made statements.

They say: We need to hear and see the President and hear his voice—President Obama—making clear his disdain and refusal to accept what is happening in Syria today.

So I respectfully urge the President to answer these appeals by Syrian freedom fighters for support of their cause. I hope the President can make clear once again, as he did so effectively in the cases of Egypt and Libya, that Bashar al Asad has lost the legitimacy to lead Syria, and it is time for Bashar to go.

The United States can also work with our allies and partners to increase international pressure on the Asad regime. Press reports indicate, I am pleased to note, that the European Union is preparing to put in place an arms embargo against Syria, and it is also considering targeted human rights sanctions against top Syrian officials. I fervently hope our European friends and allies take these and further steps to increase the pressure on the Asad regime.

I am especially encouraged that the French Foreign Minister this week correctly called for Bashar al-Asad to be sanctioned directly himself, to tie up his economic assets, to limit his mobility. In addition to our EU partners, I wish to say I believe Turkey can also play a unique leadership role in the days and weeks ahead to support a successful democratic transition in Syria.

No one has worked harder than Prime Minister Erdogan to encourage Bashar al-Asad to reform, to accept the legitimate demands of the Syrian people, and embrace democracy. Unfortunately, despite these efforts, Asad has ignored the wise counsel of the Turkish leader and refused to respond with action. I, therefore, hope President Obama will find a way to partner directly with Prime Minister Erdogan on developing a new strategy toward Syria, one that recognizes that despite our hopes and efforts, there will be no real progress as long as Bashar al-Asad remains in power in Damascus, a policy that aligns our two democracies—America and Turkey—unequivocally with the democratic aspirations of the Syrian people.

We should also work with our allies on the U.N. Human Rights Council to ensure that the investigative mission to Syria, which was agreed upon by the Council last week, is undertaken immediately. Every day matters. We should work to refer Asad's regime to the International Criminal Court—again, as we did in the case of Libya.

What the Asad regime is doing to the people of Syria looks every day more the mirror image of what the Qadhafi regime has done to the people of Libya. For its actions in the city of Deraa and throughout the country, the Asad regime deserves to be investigated by the International Criminal Court.

I respectfully urge our own administration to use the diplomatic clout that we have at the United Nations to put what is happening in Syria on the agenda of the U.N. Security Council.

I have no illusions about the challenges and obstacles that exist at the Security Council at this time to taking action with regard to what is happening in Syria, but we must try. If the Security Council fails to take up what is happening in Syria, perhaps because of the opposition of the Russians and the Chinese, it does so at the expense of its own international credibility and legitimacy.

Finally, I hope President Obama will work together with our international allies to provide the Syrian people with the humanitarian assistance that they urgently need—food, water, and medical supplies—and to restore communications linkages that the Asad regime has cut among the freedom fighters in various communities in Syria. Asad has cut them in an effort to prevent news and information about what is happening in Syria also from reaching the outside world.

The situation in Syria is fast approaching the point of no return. The fact is, several hundred Syrians have been killed by Asad's security forces. This is a regime that I conclude is beyond self-correction. Bashar al-Asad is not a reformer. He is a corrupt dictator and an inhumane thug and his regime has long been one of the worst in the Middle East. It is time for him to go.

Let me conclude by adding that nearly a decade after the attacks of September 11, Americans and people throughout the world awoke Monday morning to a safer, better world with Osama bin Laden gone. It is fitting that Osama bin Laden has been killed just as Arab democracies across the Middle East and North Africa are being born, are coming to life. The peaceful, youth-driven democratic revolutions now taking place in Syria, Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya are the true repudiation of the extreme ideology that I will call bin Ladenism. To rid our world not only of bin Laden but of bin Ladenism, it is critical that we now do everything in our power to help the democratic forces in Syria and across the Middle East succeed, for it will ultimately be quite correctly and powerfully at the hands of his fellow Arabs and Muslims that the hateful and violent ideology of bin Laden and its manifestations of a different sort in dictatorships across the Middle East are finally discredited and abandoned on the ash heap of history where they belong.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECTING AMERICA'S WATERS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, this month people all over the country will grab their tackle boxes and head off in pursuit of the elusive trout in mountain streams. Mothers and fathers will turn on their kitchen faucets and hand their children glasses of clean, pure drinking water that we have in this country. Farmers will irrigate their spring plantings in vegetables and grains with clear water from nearby streams.

All over the United States, Americans will take advantage of the simple but priceless natural resource of America's water. Thanks to the actions taken by the Obama administration last week, we can rest assured these vital resources are being protected by the full strength of the Clean Water Act.

Last week, the Obama administration released a guidance document on the jurisdictional waters of the United States. The document was a sensible response to the confusion left in the wake of recent Supreme Court rulings. The draft document that was released last week will help the Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in the near term as they make decisions about whether projects will impact the waters of the United States and therefore require protective permits.

Eventually, this draft document will be replaced by formal regulations that will ensure the Clean Water Act continues to protect America's waters. For nearly 40 years, the Clean Water Act has safeguarded almost all of our Nation's waters. These safeguards protect our rivers, streams, and wetlands from pollution in accordance with Congress's intent that the landmark statute, ''restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the nation's waters.''

Nowhere in America is this more important—the enforcement of the Clean Water Act—than the Chesapeake watershed. We understand more than 100,000 rivers and streams come together to form North America's largest estuary, and they are all critical to the health of the Chesapeake Bay.

These streams and rivers, along with their associated wetlands, serve as a habitat for hundreds of species, buffers for slowing the flow of pollutants into the bay, and sponges that soak up and hold large amounts of floodwater and stormwater runoff.

Despite major steps forward that have resulted in a majority of the Nation's waters now being safe for fishing, swimming, and other uses, recent Supreme Court decisions have placed this progress at risk. The guidance developed by professional scientists and

improved by the Obama administration provides strong protection for our Nation's waters and restores the ability of Federal agencies to enforce the Clean Water Act. I also wish to underscore the fact that the guidance reflects the longstanding agricultural and other exemptions codified in the Clean Water Act.

This is a commonsense solution right in the mainstream of American values.

The Supreme Court's recent rulings put millions of acres of wetlands and thousands of miles of streams at risk. The Court's decision in its 2001 ruling in SWANCC v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and its more recent rulings in 2006—Rapanos v. United States and Caravell v. Army Corps of Engineers—threatened to roll back the Clean Water Act, making nearly 60 percent of our Nation's waters vulnerable to polluters.

The waters threatened by the narrowing of the Clean Water Act protections are important for fish and wildlife habitat, flood protection, and supply of drinking water. More than 117 million Americans receive drinking water supplied, at least in part, by headwaters and similar streams. These vital streams and wetlands are also critical to the health of our most treasured water bodies from the Chesapeake Bay, to the Great Lakes and Lake Champlain, to Puget Sound.

Millions of small streams and wetlands provide the fresh water that flows into these regional economic engines. If we do not protect this incredible network of waters, we cannot hope to restore these water bodies to health.

As Americans, we cherish clean water and the magnificent bounty we are blessed with. That is why last week's announcement was met with such strong support from a broad range of Americans, especially from our sportsmen. Among the groups supporting the administration's actions are Ducks Unlimited, the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Wildlife Foundation, the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, and Trout Unlimited.

As chairman of the Water and Wildlife Subcommittee of the Environment and Public Works Committee, I am especially pleased the administration has taken such a strong and sensible approach to protecting our Nation's waters. Too often we raise our voices in criticism of the actions of others. Today, I am proud to add my voice to the chorus of thanks to the Obama administration for a job well done.

Thank you, Madam President. With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

(The remarks of Ms. LANDRIEU pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 158 are located in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with my colleague, Senator HATCH of Utah for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATE FLEXIBILITY ACT

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the Senate floor as a physician who practiced medicine in Caspar, WY, for about a quarter of a century, and I will talk about the concerns I have about the President's health care law, part of which has taken over $500 billion from our seniors on Medicare and taken that money not to help Medicare or to help save Medicare or to strengthen Medicare but to put a whole new government program in place.

They want to put about 16 million or so people on Medicaid. It is a program that is not functioning well now. Many doctors don't want to take care of patients on Medicaid. Yet as part of this health care law, there is something called the Medicaid maintenance of effort, and 33 Governors have written to the President saying they don't want this to apply to them.

I am delighted to be a cosponsor of a piece of legislation called the State Flexibility Act. I do that and come to the floor with that as a physician who practiced medicine, and I have been coming to the floor week after week with a doctor's second opinion.

Today, my second opinion is that this State Flexibility Act is a good idea. It gives States the flexibility they need to give the Governors the flexibility they have requested. It is a bipartisan effort in the sense that Governors, whether they be Republican or Democrat, are looking for more flexibility with this Medicaid Program, and specifically the Medicaid maintenance of effort.

I ask my colleague, the senior Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH, if he could perhaps tell us a little bit about this effort that he has now introduced, which I have cosponsored, the State Flexibility Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I appreciate his perspective on this important issue because he is a physician. The Senator has cared for Medicaid patients, and he understands the Medicaid Program better than anyone in this body. The Senator has also served in the State legislature, so he has that experience. He understands that, unlike Washington, States must balance their budgets every year.

I want to talk about the rollback of the Medicaid maintenance of effort or MOE requirement threatening both Medicare beneficiaries and the financial health of many States throughout the country. I think it is important to go through a little history on this subject.

When Medicaid was first established as a limited State-Federal partnership, less than 5 million Americans used this program. Today, nearly one in four is enrolled in this government program. Medicaid spending now absorbs nearly one-quarter of all State government budgets, often forcing severe cuts to other critical State programs.

Unfortunately, this situation is getting even worse with the Medicaid mandate first imposed in the stimulus bill and again in the partisan health care law. As a result of these Washington mandates, States are being forced to make drastic cuts to important priorities, such as education and law enforcement.

Unlike Washington, which too often just prints money to pay for out-of-control spending, States actually have to make tough budget decisions every year. States are facing the worst budget crisis since the Great Depression, with a collective $175 billion shortfall. Washington's micromanagement of State Medicaid programs makes it incredibly difficult for the States to balance their budgets and provide for those who are most in need. Because of the overly generous benefit programs that Washington forces on the States, they are unable to target health services to those most in need of assistance. Governors are unable to undertake commonsense reforms that root out program waste, fraud, and abuse.

The result of these MOE requirements is nothing short of a Washington-induced State fiscal crisis.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask my colleague this: We are from neighboring States, Wyoming and Utah. I ask if the Senator could perhaps explain exactly how these Medicaid maintenance of effort mandates—and I believe they are onerous Washington mandates—directly impact Utah.

Mr. HATCH. In my home State of Utah, the fiscal year 2012 budget shortfall will be approximately $390 million. That is a lot of money. My State has said:

> MOE requirements imposed by the Federal Government will cost the State $3.2 million annually.

This might not sound like a lot to the people in Washington, DC, who don't bat an eye at trillion-dollar deficits, but in Utah that is a lot of money in the State budget. My close friend in Utah, Governor Gary Herbert, said:

> Not a State in this Nation is immune to tough budget decisions, and sometimes Washington makes it even harder. Utah must seriously weigh the real cost of Medicaid, one of the largest and most expensive programs we have. Unfortunately, Federal mandates tie our hands. Utah has zero flexibility to respond to economic conditions, or the option to scale the program back in a way that reflects local values and priorities.

Governor Herbert and many others across the Nation have repeatedly

asked Washington to repeal these onerous Medicaid mandates. We have introduced legislation—the State Flexibility Act, as the Senator mentioned—to do exactly what the Governors have asked.

The State Flexibility Act fully repeals these burdensome Medicaid MOE regulations. It starts to put States back in control to balance their budgets while simultaneously lowering Federal entitlement spending. Our legislation will save taxpayers $2.8 billion over just the first 5 years. That is a lot of money.

Regardless of political affiliation, I am confident this bill has the potential to garner strong, bipartisan support in Congress, and it represents a strong first step toward achieving comprehensive Medicaid reform. Any Senator who has talked to his or her State's Governor knows we need to pass this legislation to enable States to survive the current fiscal crisis and to better care for the most vulnerable Medicaid beneficiaries in their respective States.

It is time for Congress to roll back these unreasonable MOE mandates and put the States, not Washington, back in charge.

I personally thank the Senator, my colleague from Wyoming, Mr. BARRASSO, for working with us on this legislation. Without him here, I don't think we would be able to do anywhere near as much as we are doing. The Senator, in particular, brings a unique perspective to the debate over MOE requirements, and I don't know of any Senator who is serving his State any better than he.

I would appreciate hearing more of the Senator's thoughts on this matter because he has the experience, and he has operated on countless people, and he has done it whether they have been Medicaid beneficiaries, people who have insurance, or people who have nothing. I know that. I have great admiration for the Senator from Wyoming. These States have been heavily burdened with MOE requirements, which are bureaucratic unnecessaries. I would like to hear from the Senator how important that is.

Mr. BARRASSO. I appreciate the comments of my colleague. I have taken care of Medicaid patients over the years, and I know this is a program that is burdensome. I also served in the State legislature, and I know the mandates coming out of Washington make it harder for the people back home to take care of patients and harder for our State legislatures to deal with helping people on Medicaid, making it more difficult for physicians to take care of those patients, and making it more expensive. There is a lot of waste in the mandate.

When Senator HATCH talked about the comments from his Governor, I have comments from ours as well, Governor Matt Mead, who has been in office only just since January. He wrote and was one of the 33 Governors who signed a letter to President Obama saying that the costs of maintaining their Medicaid Programs are fast becoming a serious threat to the State's general funds.

We live in a State where we have to balance the budget every year. He went on to say that Wyoming needs to have flexibility, which is the key word and the title of the bill introduced by Senator HATCH, S. 868, the State Flexibility Act.

That is what Governors are asking for, flexibility, because with that flexibility they can do better for the patients, and they can do it cheaper. Wyoming needs the flexibility at the State level to ensure that the Medicaid Program is operated efficiently and effectively.

People do not believe they are getting efficiency and effectiveness out of Washington these days. They do not think they are getting value for their money. I agree with the American people. I have heard them loudly and clearly. I said it when I was practicing medicine and I say it as a Member of the Senate.

Our Governor goes on: Wyoming strongly supports the removal of these maintenance of effort requirements. This is why I come to the Senate floor every week to talk about this health care law, the implications of it, the impact on the people of this great country, and why I think this health care law is one that is ultimately bad for patients, bad for providers, the nurses and the doctors who take care of those patients, and also bad for the American taxpayers. At a time when we are borrowing 41 cents for every $1 we spend in this country, we cannot afford to continue to waste money.

Our problem in this country is not that we are taxed too little, it is that we spend too much and do not spend it well. We have to begin focusing differently, and one of the ways we can do it—my understanding from looking at this is actually the Congressional Budget Office, which does the scoring on legislation, scored Senator HATCH's State Flexibility Act as actually saving, I think, $2.8 billion total over 5 years.

Mr. HATCH. Right.

Mr. BARRASSO. Isn't that what we are trying to do: save money, help people, do it more efficiently, more effectively? That is why I am proud to cosponsor with my friend, Senator HATCH, the State Flexibility Act.

Mr. HATCH. And give the States flexibility to do what they can do better than the Federal Government. As a former medical liability defense lawyer back in my early days, I represented doctors, health care providers, nurses, and hospitals in defending them from what were, in most cases, frivolous suits that run up the cost of medicine.

I cannot tell you what it means to me to have Senator BARRASSO in the Senate with all the medical experience he has had. Frankly, the States can do the job, but they cannot do it within budget if we keep piling regulation and onerous burdens on them, such as the partisan health care bill does.

Frankly, I want the Senator from Wyoming to know I feel it is an honor to serve with him and an honor to have a couple of medical doctors on our side. Dr. BARRASSO and Dr. COBURN are both excellent doctors. They have lived through these problems. They know what they are like. They do not have to have anybody tell them what is wrong with the approaches we are taking. They know what is wrong.

Frankly, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for being willing to serve here.

Mr. BARRASSO. I appreciate the kindness and I appreciate the fact that Senator HATCH is allowing me to work with him. He has a long and illustrious career of leadership in the Senate, and he has been a champion over the years of the fact that States are better than Washington to make decisions because what works in one State may not work in another State. If we give States the flexibility, ultimately they will do it better. They are the laboratories of democracy. That is why we believe in limited government and making decisions at the local level as close to home as possible, which is why I know so many Governors across the country support the State Flexibility Act. I am hoping we get a successful vote in the Senate on it because whenever Washington makes a one-size-fits-all decision, it hardly ever works for most folks back home.

Mr. HATCH. That is right. I believe this will have great bipartisan support among the Governors and hopefully in this body. I thank Senator BARRASSO for bringing this to our attention.

Mr. BARRASSO. I thank Senator HATCH.

Madam President, I will tell you, I still believe this is a law that is bad for patients, it is bad for health care providers of this country, the nurses and doctors who take care of them, bad for taxpayers. I will be back at home in Wyoming over the weekend visiting with patients, as well as providers, as well as taxpayers, listening to what they have to say. I know the people of Wyoming have great concerns about this health care law and would like the kind of flexibility that is described in S. 868, the State Flexibility Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. COCHRAN pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 170 are located in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield the floor.

COMMENDING CONGRESSMAN PETER WELCH

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like share the good work being done by my friend and colleague in the House of Representatives, Congressman PETER WELCH.

As Democrats and Republicans continue their discussions, I am proud that PETER is bringing a Vermont perspective and Vermont values to the debate. He understands the dangers the United States faces if we default on our debt, but the burden of addressing our mounting national debt must be shared fairly. Budgets are a reflection of our national priorities, and we simply cannot balance our budget on the backs of the most vulnerable alone.

I applaud PETER for bringing his reasoned and responsible message to the debate. I ask unanimous consent that an article on Congressman WELCH from today's The Hill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REP. WELCH: PARTISAN DIVISION BEGS CLEAN VOTE TO RAISE NATION'S DEBT CEILING

(By Mike Lillis)

Lawmakers seeking a bipartisan deficit-reduction plan to accompany the looming debt-ceiling vote are deluding themselves about the efficiency of Congress, according to the Democrat spearheading the push for a clean debt-limit bill.

Rep. Peter Welch (D–Vt.), who has emerged in recent weeks as the staunchest proponent of a standalone debt-ceiling hike, said the parties are simply too far apart ideologically to reach a budget deal in time to avoid the market turmoil many fear would attend inaction on the debt limit.

In a sit-down interview with The Hill from his fourth-floor Longworth office, Welch noted the recent fight over 2011 spending took the country to the very brink of a government shutdown.

The battle over the long-term budget will be even tougher to resolve, he warned, and thus should be tackled separately from the must-pass debt-limit hike.

''If the leadership thinks it can make progress on some steps that would move us toward a better long-term sustainable budget—fine,'' Welch said Monday. ''But if any of us are candid—and we saw how just the simple question of trying to keep the lights on in the government brought us to the midnight hour—do we realistically think that the gap between the [Democrats'] approach on the budget and the [Republicans'] approach on the budget can be bridged in that period of time?''

Congress's systemic dysfunction was on display last month, Welch charged, when Standard & Poor's revised its U.S. debt-rating outlook from ''neutral'' to ''negative.'' That move was largely influenced not by fiscal considerations, he noted, but by ''a lack of confidence in Congress and its ability to make the compromises that are required to get from here to there.''

With that in mind, Welch last month spearheaded a letter urging Democratic leaders to unite behind a clean debt-limit bill. It was endorsed by 114 Democrats. The potential economic fallout of flirting with default, he warned, is too serious to saddle the debt-ceiling vote with politically charged budget conditions.

''This is not a matter of ripping up the credit card; this is a matter of paying off the credit card,'' Welch said. ''And if you don't allow us to do that . . . we're basically saying we're going to stiff our creditors.''

For almost a century, Congress has set a cap on the nation's debt, allowing the government to issue bonds to fund its deficit spending—up to a certain level.

Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner has projected the government will surpass the current $14.3 trillion ceiling on May 16. Recognizing the improbability that Congress will act before then, Geithner on Monday told lawmakers he can take ''extraordinary measures'' to stave off default for several more months. He set the new deadline at Aug. 2.

All sides of the debate agree that Congress will ultimately raise the debt ceiling. The question remains how it will do that.

Republican leaders have insisted that the debt-limit vote be coupled with a strategy for bringing down deficits over the long haul—a sentiment shared by a growing number of Senate Democrats.

''The vehicle upon which something is likely to be achieved to reduce government spending is the debt ceiling,'' Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R–Ky.) told reporters Tuesday. ''I don't intend to vote to raise the debt ceiling unless we do something significant about the debt.''

In the House, Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R–Va.) suggested Tuesday that Republicans might stage a vote on a clean debt-ceiling bill just to prove it can't pass—a strategy Welch blasted as a ''political stunt.''

Rep. John Larson (Conn.), chairman of the House Democratic Caucus, said this week that Democrats are ''amenable'' to strategies that couple the debt-ceiling vote with a long-term deficit-reduction plan—with a major caveat.

''They just have to be consistent with not touching Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid and dismantling the social compact between the American people and [their] government,'' Larson told The Hill on Tuesday.

Therein lies the trouble, as GOP leaders are eyeing cuts to all of those programs as part of their deficit-reduction plans.

Leaders from both parties, representing both chambers, will meet Thursday with Vice President Biden in the first official attempt to reach a long-term budget agreement.

Welch, a chief deputy whip, doesn't have much faith in a quick resolution.

''The more the clock ticks, the more apprehension you'll start to see in the markets,'' he warned. ''When this happens, it could happen very quickly—and with devastating consequences.''

It's not the first time Welch has emerged on the national stage amid a thorny budget debate. In December, he was among the fiercest opponents of the agreement between Obama and McConnell to extend the George W. Bush-era tax cuts through 2012, even for the wealthiest Americans.

This week, he tempered that criticism with a bit of pragmatism.

''It was not a great deal, but it was the best deal [we could get],'' he said. ''My criticism also acknowledges that the president had his reasons, and we in the House—the Democrats—didn't have the votes.''

Welch was also highly critical of the cuts to low-income energy subsidies contained in Obama's 2012 budget proposal—cuts Welch said would ''literally freeze'' his constituents who rely on them to pay their heating bills.

''A lot of us understood that the president was making a statement,'' Welch said Monday of that critique. ''I respected what motivated the president.''

In some sense, Welch's rise to prominence is as improbable as passage of the clean debt-ceiling hike he's lobbying. The third-term liberal is a relative newcomer to Capitol Hill. And the Vermont he represents hardly shares the national political reputation that characterizes many of its New England neighbors.

Yet lawmakers on both sides of the aisle say Welch's emergence is no accident. Rep. Jim Cooper (D–Tenn.), a Blue Dog leader who shares a Capitol Hill apartment with the liberal Welch, said his roommate studies hard and uses his experience as a state legislator to great advantage in Washington.

''Peter is a nerd, just like me,'' Cooper said in an e-mail. ''He actually takes the time to read legislation and understand the issues, which has become a rarity in Washington. Coming from state government, where you need to balance the budget every year, he understands the importance of paying for legislation. This has made him a key consensus builder in the House and one of the strongest advocates of fiscal responsibility in the Progressive Caucus.''

Rep. Peter Roskam (Ill.), the Republican chief deputy whip, called Welch ''a happy warrior''—the rare legislator who ''firmly believes in a set of principles'' but is also quick to engage the other side.

''When the country looks at Washington, they feel like members are just talking past each other,'' Roskam told The Hill this week. Welch, on the other hand, ''is very engaging.''

The bookshelf in Welch's office tells a similar story. It holds volumes by Nancy Pelosi as well as T. Boone Pickens; it boasts the 9/11 Commission Report but also a collection of poems by Rumi, a 13th-century Persian poet and mystic.

Welch is also one of the few Democrats willing to go face to face with Sean Hannity, the conservative—and characteristically combative—Fox News pundit.

Welch conceded Monday that he ''got the Democratic treatment'' during his recent Hannity appearance. But only by reaching across the aisle, he said, will lawmakers in Washington ever be truly effective.

''A lot of us get in arguments as though it's an ideological battle to be won, rather than a practical problem to be solved. . . . That doesn't work for the country,'' he said. ''I hope that we all can take a step back—all of us—and see that there's real advantage to us trying to work together.''

HONORING THE MILITARY AND INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITIES

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I was pleased to join Senate Majority Leader REID and Republican Leader MCCONNELL in offering the strongest possible support for the Senate resolution honoring our heroic military and intelligence communities responsible for carrying out the mission that resulted in the death of one of the most reviled murderers and nefarious menaces of our time—Osama bin Laden.

As a senior member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I cannot begin to commend our Armed Forces and intelligence professionals enough for their absolutely exceptional and flawless heroism in conducting the most perilous and consequential of operations. With the highest level of perseverance, professionalism, service, and sacrifice conceivable, our bravest and finest joined forces and brought the day of reckoning and justice that long awaited this wretched terrorist.

This landmark event is indeed a significant stride in the war on terrorism. Since 9/11, the efforts of our tireless and dedicated Armed Forces and intelligence operators have sought to keep our homeland safe and make the world more secure. On May 1, 2011, these efforts culminated in the death of one of

terrorism's global leaders, marking a decisive milestone in the war against terror. We are blessed with such brave and valiant men and women serving this country at home and abroad. These heroes have made selfless sacrifices and put their lives on the line for our Nation. While we are sleeping at night, they are fighting on our behalf. During this now-legendary May 1 raid, their mettle and courage were brought to the forefront for all the world to see.

As a result of the horrendous events of September 11, 2001, that are etched upon our consciousness for all time, we will never be the same. Out of the rubble of September 11 rose our resolve, out of despair grew our determination, and out of the hate that was perpetrated upon us stood our humanity. We illustrated in word and deed that the iconic American spirit is stronger and more permanent than any pain or suffering that can be inflicted upon us.

If the likes of Osama bin Laden laid bare the unimaginable cruelties of which humankind is capable, it also imbued forever within our minds the heights to which the human spirit can rise—even and especially in the face of the most daunting of circumstances. The resilience we recaptured as a country remains pressed upon our national psyche and the memory of the inspirational sacrifices of so many heroic Americans who perished that September morning will forever have a home in our hearts and our prayers.

I think about all of the servicemen and women who willingly joined the military specifically to fight because of what happened on 9/11, and the sacrifices of their families and the lives that have been lost. Today, and every day, we express immeasurable gratitude to the over 6,000 Americans in Iraq and Afghanistan who have given their lives to make the world a safer place. Without their vital contributions, we could not have achieved this milestone today. This resolution will stand as a testament that without the stalwart efforts and unwavering dedication of our valorous men and women in uniform and within our intelligence community, this threshold moment in our nation's history would not have been possible.

While justice has been brought to the face of terrorism for the last decade, we must remain vigilant. In the aftermath of bin Laden's death, the threat posed by al-Qaida and other terrorist groups continues real and unabated—and we must remain on high alert. British statesman Edmund Burke once famously said ''all that is necessary for the forces of evil to win in the world is for enough good men to do nothing.'' These heroic patriots whom we laud today tracked their target with precision, preparation, and patience, as well as an unmistakable sense of duty and valor reserved for only the best among us, and they delivered a death knell that will reverberate for generations to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ERICA QUIN-EASTER

• Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, women-owned businesses are growing at one and a half times the national average in the United States. This astonishing statistic alone is impressive, but it should also be noted that despite this growth women owned small businesses face unique challenges. Thankfully there are programs in place that provide guidance to these entrepreneurs by individuals with specialized knowledge in women's business issues.

Today I commend and recognize an exceptional woman who epitomizes the core values of entrepreneurship with conviction and competence—Erica Quin-Easter, a microenterprise coordinator at Maine Centers for Women, Work & Community in Presque Isle. Ms. Quin-Easter was recently named Maine's 2011 Women in Business Champion by the U.S. Small Business Administration, and she is being recognized today for this achievement at a luncheon in Bangor. This is a richly deserved honor as Ms. Quin-Easter continuously focuses on enhancing women's abilities to bring to fruition their dreams of small business ownership.

Maine Centers for Women, Work & Community was founded in 1978. It serves as the only statewide comprehensive women's economic development organization in Maine. In 2008, Ms. Quin-Easter joined the Maine Center for Women, Work & Community at the Presque Isle location. The Presque Isle location serves Aroostook County, our State's largest and northernmost county. Since joining Women, Work & Community, Ms. Quin-Easter has assisted nearly 500 entrepreneurs on topics from loans to taxes to business plans.

Ms. Quin-Easter also strives to educate the greater small business community, extending her reach beyond those who may utilize the center's resources. For example, this past March she wrote an article for the Bangor Daily News to enlighten small business owners on taking control of their business finances. Work such as this demonstrates Ms. Quin-Easter's commitment to ensuring that small businesses throughout Maine prosper. She also assisted in organizing a day-long seminar for women called ''ALL for Women''—Aroostook Leadership and Learning for Women—to connect them with other business and community leaders and mentors to assist in gathering insight and confidence to reach for their dreams of self employment.

In addition to Ms. Quin-Easter's excellent work for small businesses, she continually seeks to enhance and promote her community. As a long-time musician and composer, Ms. Quin-Easter recently collaborated with poets and musicians to arrange ''(F)light.'' This piece will showcase Women in Harmony, a 60-member chorus of women's voices in Portland, with whom Ms. Quin-Easter previously sang.

Furthermore, Ms. Quin-Easter works on the board of directors for Momentum Aroostook Board and Wintergreen Arts Center. While engaging in these philanthropic endeavors, Ms. Quin-Easter is also a University of Maine Canadian-American Center fellow. For one person this is an extraordinary workload, but Ms. Quin-Easter's daily energy and enthusiasm shine throughout all her work. Her many contributions to Maine, and Aroostook County in particular, demonstrate her commitment to enhancing cultural diversity across our State and helping others improve their own conditions.

Erica Quin-Easter is truly an inspiring individual. Her dedication to encouraging and counseling women entrepreneurs and small business owners is exemplary and inspiring. I thank Erica for her tireless work on behalf of women and congratulate her on the distinction of being named ''Maine's 2011 Women in Business Champion'' by the U.S. Small Business Administration, a very well deserved honor.•

HONORING WORLD WAR II VETERANS

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge and honor a very special group of veterans. In appreciation of their selfless service to our country, Brookshire's Grocery and Super 1 Foods have sponsored a World War II Heroes Flight that will take 33 World War II veterans to Washington, DC, free of charge. A group of 27 veterans will be in Washington May 10–12, 2011, for this very special trip.

I want to take a moment to thank all these brave veterans visiting our Capital city this trip:

Peter Ballas, Shreveport, LA; Sam Canter, Blanchard, LA; Nick DeFatta, Shreveport, LA; Les Eckhard, Shreveport, LA; Chuck Fellers, Shreveport, LA; Mason Ferguson, Shreveport, LA; Dale Foster, Homer, LA; James Fraiser, Minden, LA; Bootsie Frazier, Shreveport, LA; Aubrey Gaston, Choudrant, LA; Frank Guraedy, West Monroe, LA; Bobby Harrell, Shreveport, LA; Snookie Harrison, Shreveport, LA; Ken Hawkins, Bossier City, LA; Robert Hawkins, Shreveport, LA; Gene Hodgkins, Monroe, LA; Pete Johnson, Shreveport, LA; Dorothy Kneipp, Keithville, LA; Glenn Murphy, Alexandria, LA; Don Odom, Homer, LA; Earl Owens, Shreveport, LA; Frank Porter, Shreveport, LA; Ray Rushing, Shreveport, LA; Grady Shows, Shreveport, LA; Don Tompkins , Bossier City, LA; Wilmer Warrington, Shreveport, LA; Fred Wells, Shreveport, LA.

While visiting Washington, DC, these veterans will tour Arlington National Cemetery, the Iwo Jima Memorial, the World War II Memorial, the U.S. Capitol, and other sites. This program provides many veterans with their only opportunity to see the great memorials dedicated to their service.

Thus, today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring these great Americans and thanking them for their devotion and service to our Nation.•

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:04 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3. An act to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions and to provide for conscience protection, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1214. An act to repeal mandatory funding for school-based health center construction.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1214. An act to repeal mandatory funding for school-based health center construction; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1213. An act to repeal mandatory funding provided to States in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to establish American Health Benefit Exchanges.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 3. An act to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions and to provide for conscience protections, and for other purposes.

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–1473. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of defense articles, to include technical data, and defense services to support the design, manufacture and delivery of the Es' Hail Satellite Program in the amount of $50,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1474. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed amendment to a technical assistance agreement for the export of defense articles, to include technical data, and defense services to Japan for the support, maintenance, overhaul and assembly, inspection and test of F110–GE–129 gas turbine engines for use in F–2 fighter aircraft in the amount of $100,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1475. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, U.S. Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to certifications granted in relation to the incidental capture of sea turtles in commercial shrimping operations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1476. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, status reports relative to Iraq for the period of December 21, 2010 through February 20, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1477. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a proposed amendment to parts 120 and 124 of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1478. A communication from the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to U.S.-funded international broadcasting efforts in Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1479. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Definition of Multiple-Award Contract'' ((RIN0750–AH12)(DFARS Case 2011–D016)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1480. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Accelerate Small Business Payments'' ((RIN0750–AH19)(DFARS Case 2011–D008)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1481. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Nuclear and Chemical and Biological Defense Programs) transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Defense Chemical and Biological Defense Program Annual Report to Congress for 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1482. A communication from the Director of the Policy Issuances Division, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''New Formulas for Calculating the Basetime, Overtime, Holiday, and Laboratory Services Rates; Rate Changes Based on the Formulas; and Increased Fees for the Accredited Laboratory Program'' (RIN0583–AD40) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 20, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1483. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((44 CFR Part 64)(Docket No. FEMA–2011–0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1484. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulation M—Consumer Leasing'' (Docket No. R–1400) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1485. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulation Z—Truth in Lending'' (Docket No. R–1399) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1486. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of the Understandings Reached at the 2010 Australia Group (AG) Plenary Meeting and Other AG-Related Clarifications and Corrections to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR)'' (RIN0694–AF04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1487. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Editorial Corrections to the Export Administration Regulations'' (RIN0694–AE96) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 27, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1488. 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 ''Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Clothes Dryers and Room Air Conditioners'' (RIN1904–AA89) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1489. A communication from the Chief, Endangered Species Program, Fish and Wildlife Services, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; 44 Marine and Anadromous Taxa: Adding 10 Taxa, Delisting 1 Taxon, Reclassifying 1 Taxon, and Updating 32 Taxa on the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife'' (RIN1018–AW09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1490. A communication from the Deputy Director for Operations, Legislative and Regulatory Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits'' (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1491. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers from the Wah Chang facility in Albany, Oregon, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1492. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers from the Grand Junction Operations Office, Grand Junction, Colorado, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1493. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers from the Vitro Manufacturing site in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1494. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers from the Norton Co. (or a subsequent owner) in Worcester, Massachusetts, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1495. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers from the Linde Ceramics Plant in Tonawanda, New York, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1496. A communication from the Deputy Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medical Devices; Obstetrical and Gynecological Devices; Classification of the Hemorrhoid Prevention Pressure Wedge'' ((21 CFR Part 884)(Docket No. FDA–2011–N–0118)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 27, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1497. A communication from the Deputy Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of the Requirements for Constituent Materials'' ((21 CFR Part 610)(Docket No. FDA–2010–N–0099)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 27, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1498. A communication from the Deputy Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Irradiation in the Production, Processing, and Handling of Food'' ((21 CFR Part 179)(Docket No. FDA–1998–F–0072)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 27, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1499. A communication from the Deputy Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medical Devices; General and Plastic Surgery Devices; Classification of the Low Level Laser System for Aesthetic Use'' ((21 CFR Part 878)(Docket No. FDA–2011–N–0188)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 27, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1500. A communication from the Chief of the Border Securities Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Technical Amendments to List of CBP Preclearance Offices in Foreign Countries: Addition of Dublin, Ireland'' (CBP Dec. 11–08) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1501. A communication from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the Department of Homeland Security in the position of Under Secretary for Management, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1502. A communication from the Director, Public Affairs and Government Relations, U.S. Postal Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the commission's fiscal year 2010 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1503. A communication from the Equal Employment Opportunity Director, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation's fiscal year 2010 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1504. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the commission's calendar year 2010 Sunshine Act compliance report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1505. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, the Corporation for National and Community Service's fiscal year 2010 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1506. A communication from the Deputy Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the commission's fiscal year 2010 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1507. A communication from the Director, Equal Employment Opportunities and Diversity Programs, National Archives, transmitting, pursuant to law, the National Archive's fiscal year 2010 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1508. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Sufficiency Review of the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority's (DC Water) Fiscal Year 2011 Revenue Estimate in Support of the Issuance of $300,000,000 in Public Utility Subordinate Lien Revenue Bonds (Series 2010A and 2010B)''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1509. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Review of the Office of Risk Management's Fiscal Year 2009 Performance Accountability Report''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1510. A communication from the Chief, Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations: Amendments Related to the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008'' (RIN0584–AD95) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 20, 2011; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–1511. A communication from the Chairman, Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the memorial construction; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Scott C. Doney, of Massachusetts, to be Chief Scientist of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

*Coast Guard nomination of William G. Dwyer, to be Lieutenant Commander.

*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Jessica L. Bohn and ending with Jeremy A. Weiss, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 8, 2011.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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 Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 888. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 889. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the establishment of Mother's Day; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 890. A bill to establish the supplemental fraud fighting account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 891. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the recognition of attending physician assistants as attending physicians to serve hospice patients; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. ENZI, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COATS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. VITTER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. LEE):

S. 892. A bill to establish the Department of Energy and the Environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 893. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance to the State of Louisiana for a pilot program to develop measures to eradicate or control feral swine and to assess and restore wetlands damaged by feral swine; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WEBB, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 894. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2011, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 895. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to invest in innovation for education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 896. A bill to amend the Public Land Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans; help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational and scenic resources; train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts; and promote the value of public service; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. LEE):

S. 897. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to clarify that uncertified States and Indian tribes have the authority to use certain payments for certain noncoal reclamation projects and acid mine remediation programs; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 898. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary to establish a comprehensive design standard program to prevent, control, and treat pollulted stormwater runoff from federally funded highways and roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. 899. A bill to provide fo the eradication and control of nutria; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 900. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to educational organizations to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 901. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to ensure that amounts are made available for projects to provide recreational public access, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 902. A bill to amend part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants for the repair, renovation, and construction of elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 903. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to create a Citrus Disease Research and Development Trust Fund to support research on diseases impacting the citrus industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 904. A bill to improve jobs, opportunity, benefits, and services for unemployed Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KOHL, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 905. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of hearing aids; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. COATS, Mr. BURR, Mr. ENZI, Mr. COBURN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HATCH, Mr. KYL, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 906. A bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions and to provide for conscience protections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 907. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the reduction in the deductible portion of expenses for business meals and entertainment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 908. A bill to provide for the addition of certain real property to the reservation of the Siletz Tribe in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 909. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to permit certain revenues of private providers of public transportation by vanpool received from providing public transportation to be used for the purpose of acquiring rolling stock, and to permit certain expenditures of private vanpool contractors to be credited toward the local matching share of the costs of public transportation projects, and for other purposes; 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. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. Res. 165. A resolution designating July 23, 2011, as ''National Day of the American Cowboy''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHANNS (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. Res. 166. A resolution commemorating May 8, 2011, as the 66th anniversary of V–E Day, the end of World War II in Europe; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. REID, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. BENNET):

S. Res. 167. A resolution recognizing the historical significance of the Mexican holiday of Cinco de Mayo; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KOHL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. TESTER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 168. A resolution commemorating and acknowledging the dedication and sacrifice made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REID:

S. Res. 169. A resolution to authorize testimony, documents and legal representation; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

S. Res. 170. A resolution honoring Admiral Thad Allen of the United States Coast Guard (Ret.) for his lifetime of selfless commitment and exemplary service to the United States; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. Res. 171. A resolution recognizing and supporting National Train Day on May 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KIRK, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. MORAN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. CASEY):

S. Res. 172. A resolution recognizing the importance of cancer research and the contributions made by scientists and clinicians across the United States who are dedicated to finding a cure for cancer, and designating May 2011, as ''National Cancer Research Month''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. Con. Res. 15. A concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day, and reaffirming United States leadership and support for efforts to combat malaria as a critical component of the President's Global Health Initiative; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 167

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 167, a bill to amend title 18, United

States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 275

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 275, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for enhanced safety and environmental protection in pipeline transportation, to provide for enhanced reliability in the transportation of the Nation's energy products by pipeline, and for other purposes.

S. 357

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 357, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to identify and declare wildlife disease emergencies and to coordinate rapid response to those emergencies, and for other purposes.

S. 366

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 366, a bill to require disclosure to the Securities and Exchange Commission of certain sanctionable activities, and for other purposes.

S. 384

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 384, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research.

S. 412

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 412, a bill to ensure that amounts credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are used for harbor maintenance.

S. 425

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 425, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of permanent national surveillance systems for multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, and other neurological diseases and disorders.

S. 468

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 468, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify the authority of the Administrator to disapprove specifications of disposal sites for the discharge of, dredged or fill material, and to clarify the procedure under which a higher review of specifications may be requested.

S. 598

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 598, a bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage.

S. 616

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 616, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to support the community schools model.

S. 634

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 634, a bill to ensure that the courts of the United States may provide an impartial forum for claims brought by United States citizens and others against any railroad organized as a separate legal entity, arising from the deportation of United States citizens and others to Nazi concentration camps on trains owned or operated by such railroad, and by the heirs and survivors of such persons.

S. 700

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 700, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the treatment of certain farming business machinery and equipment as 5-year property for purposes of depreciation.

S. 701

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 701, a bill to amend section 1120A(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to assure comparability of opportunity for educationally disadvantaged students.

S. 705

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 705, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to repeal the CLASS program.

S. 740

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 740, a bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act.

S. 758

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 758, a bill to establish a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) Master Teacher Corps program.

S. 763

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 763, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the establishment of teacher evaluation programs.

S. 781

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 781, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to conform the definition of renewable biomass to the definition given the term in the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002.

S. 815

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 815, a bill to guarantee that military funerals are conducted with dignity and respect.

S. 844

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 844, a bill to provide incentives for States and local educational agencies to implement comprehensive reforms and innovative strategies that are designed to lead to significant improvement in outcomes for all students and significant reductions in achievement gaps among subgroups of students, and for other purposes.

S. 868

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 868, a bill to restore the longstanding partnership between the States and the Federal Government in managing the Medicaid program.

S. RES. 133

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 133, a resolution to require that new war funding be offset.

S. RES. 144

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 144, a resolution supporting early detection for breast cancer.

S. RES. 153

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 153, a resolution recognizing the 25th anniversary of the Chernobyl nuclear disaster.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 889. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the establishment of Mother's Day; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Mother's Day Centennial Coin Commemorative Coin Act. I am proud to be joined by a bipartisan group of cosponsors including Senators MANCHIN, COCHRAN, STABENOW, and WHITEHOUSE.

With Mother's Day set for Sunday, May 8th, this is a special event for all of West Virginia because this annual tribute to our mothers began in West Virginia. In 1908, a West Virginian woman by the name of Anna Jarvis petitioned her local church to declare May 9th as Mother's Day. She hoped that this holiday would serve as a remembrance for mothers and a reminder for peace. Within a year, all 46 current States held some sort of Mother's Day and a mere 5 years later, Congress and the President declared the second Sunday of May national Mother's Day. The centennial for the national recognition of Mother's Day will occur in 2014, and this bill provides an opportunity to commemorate the centennial of this great holiday and further recognize the millions of American mothers whose essential role in life cannot be overstated.

The legislation I am introducing today would recognize the centennial of Mother's Day by authorizing the Treasury to mint commemorative Mother's Day coins. Profits generated from the sale of these coins would be donated to Susan G. Komen for the Cure and The National Osteoporosis Foundation. Susan G. Komen for the Cure has raised nearly $2 billion for breast cancer research since 1982, and the National Osteoporosis Foundation is considered our Nation's leading voluntary health organization.

Each year, more than 200,000 women are diagnosed with breast cancer and nearly 40,000 die of this devastating disease. This legislation not only honors our Nation's mothers, but also helps to raise funds to fight the second most prevalent cancer in women. Thousands of mothers have benefited from the efforts of these organizations and they are well deserving of our support. Therefore, I encourage my colleagues' support for this legislation to honor every mother in our country and to prepare for the upcoming centennial. Celebrating Mother's Day by helping to promote the health of American mothers seems to be a fitting tribute.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 890. A bill to establish the supplemental fraud fighting account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, I am proud to join with Senator GRASSLEY to introduce the Fighting Fraud to Protect Taxpayers Act of 2011. Combating fraud is a vital issue on which Senator GRASSLEY and I have a long track record of working together, and with great success. In these trying economic times, cracking down on the fraud which has harmed so many hard-working Americans is more important than ever. I look forward to working with Senator GRASSLEY, and with Senators from both parties, to quickly pass this crucial legislation.

In the last Congress, one of the first major bills the Senate Judiciary Committee considered, and one of the first bills President Obama signed into law, was the Leahy-Grassley Fraud Enforcement and Recovery Act. That bill gave fraud investigators and prosecutors additional tools and resources to better hold those who commit fraud accountable. We heard about the significant success that has already resulted from the Fraud Enforcement and Recovery Act and other key fraud fighting provisions we championed in a Judiciary Committee hearing earlier this year, but it is clear that our work is not done.

In the past two years, we have learned much more about the scourges of financial fraud, mortgage fraud, government contracting fraud, health care fraud, and oil and gas fraud. I have also been very disturbed by the ongoing reports about inaccurate, forged, or fraudulent documents in the housing foreclosure process. Today's bill reflects the ongoing need to invest in enforcement to better protect hard-working taxpayers from all of these insidious types of fraud.

In the last fiscal year alone, the Department of Justice recovered well over $6 billion through fines, penalties, and recoveries from fraud cases—far more than it costs to investigate and prosecute these matters. The recovery of these vast sums of money demonstrates that investment in fraud enforcement pays for itself many times over.

The Fighting Fraud to Protect Taxpayers Act capitalizes on this rate of return by ensuring that a percentage of money recovered by the Government through fines and penalties in fraud cases and other criminal cases is reinvested in the investigation and prosecution of fraud cases. That means that we can ensure more fraud enforcement, more returns to the government, and more savings to taxpayers, all without spending new taxpayer money.

The bill also makes other modest changes to ensure that prosecutors and investigators have the tools they need to combat fraud. It extends the international money laundering bill statute to tax evasion crimes. This will deter individuals from evading our tax laws by hiding their money overseas. It also protects American consumers from identity theft by strengthening the prohibition against trafficking in passwords and the federal identity theft statute. As more and more business is conducted online, we must ensure that consumers' personal information remains protected.

The Secret Service has responsibility for investigating a variety of complex financial fraud crimes, including identity theft. This bill gives the Secret Service additional tools to conduct critical undercover investigations. Fraud cases are often complex and difficult to prove, so undercover investigations can be a key way to ferret out criminal activity.

In the last Congress, Senator GRASSLEY and I worked together to strengthen the False Claims Act, which empowers whistleblowers to shine a light on fraud and recover stolen tax dollars that would otherwise go undiscovered. These new laws are already paying off. Since January 2009, the Department of Justice has recovered more than $6.8 billion in False Claims Act cases, far more than any other 2-year period. Today's legislation asks the Attorney General to report to Congress on False Claims Act settlements, which will help ensure that the False Claims Act remains a valuable tool for fighting fraud.

Finally, the bill promotes accountability within Government. Along with requiring reporting, it takes modest steps to ensure that the resources already entrusted to the Justice Department are used responsibly by strengthening oversight of the Department's Working Capital Fund.

Major fraud cases take time to investigate and prosecute. The renewed focus on fraud enforcement we have seen from this administration and from Congress will continue to yield significant results. But we must continue to give law enforcement agencies the tools and resources necessary to root out fraud so that they can continue to recoup losses and protect taxpayer funds. Everyday, taxpaying Americans deserve to know that their Government is doing all it can to hold responsible those who commit fraud and to prevent future fraud.

Americans are worried about their budgets at home. We need to protect their investment in their government. Fighting fraud and protecting taxpayer dollars are issues Democrats and Republicans have worked together to address in the past, and in these difficult economic times, we need to continue in that spirit of bipartisanship. I look forward to working with Senator GRASSLEY, the administration, and Senators of both parties to crack down on fraud by passing the Fighting Fraud to Protect Taxpayers Act.

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. 890

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 ''Fighting Fraud to Protect Taxpayers Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE WORKING CAPITAL FUND REFORMS.

Section 11013(a) of the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act (28 U.S.C. 527 note) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Notwithstanding'' and inserting the following:

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'covered amounts' means—

''(i) the unobligated balances in the debt collection management account; and

''(ii) the unobligated balances in the supplemental fraud fighting account;

''(B) the term 'debt collection management account' means the account established in the Department of Justice Working Capital Fund under paragraph (2);

''(C) the term 'fraud offense' includes—

''(i) an offense under section 30A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78dd–1) and an offense under section 104 or 104A of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 (15 U.S.C. 78dd–2 and 78dd–3);

''(ii) a securities fraud offense, as defined in section 3301 of title 18, United States Code;

''(iii) a fraud offense relating to a financial institution or a federally related mortgage loan, as defined in section 3 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2602), including an offense under section 152, 157, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1011, or 1014 of title 18, United States Code;

''(iv) an offense involving procurement fraud, including defective pricing, bid rigging, product substitution, misuse of classified or procurement sensitive information, grant fraud, fraud associated with labor mischarging, and fraud involving foreign military sales;

''(v) an offense under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 involving fraud;

''(vi) an action under subchapter III of chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the 'False Claims Act'), and an offense under chapter 15 of title 18, United States Code;

''(vii) an offense under section 1029, 1030, or 1031 of title 18, United States Code; and

''(viii) an offense under chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code; and

''(D) the term 'supplemental fraud fighting account' means the supplemental fraud fighting account established in the Department of Justice Working Capital Fund under paragraph (3)(A).

''(2) DEBT COLLECTION MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.—Notwithstanding'';

(2) by striking ''Such amounts'' and inserting ''Subject to paragraph (4), such amounts''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) SUPPLEMENTAL FRAUD FIGHTING ACCOUNT.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established as a separate account in the Department of Justice Working Capital Fund established under section 527 of title 28, United States Code, a supplemental fraud fighting account.

''(B) CREDITING OF AMOUNTS.—Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, or any other statute affecting the crediting of collections, the Attorney General may credit, as an offsetting collection, to the supplemental fraud fighting account up to 0.5 percent of all amounts collected pursuant to civil debt collection litigation activities of the Department of Justice.

''(C) USE OF FUNDS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), the Attorney General may use amounts in the supplemental fraud fighting account for the cost (including equipment, salaries and benefits, travel and training, and interagency task force operations) of the investigation of and conduct of criminal, civil, or administrative proceedings relating to fraud offenses.

''(ii) LIMITATION.—The Attorney General may not use amounts in the supplemental fraud fighting account for the cost of the investigation of or the conduct of criminal, civil, or administrative proceedings relating to—

''(I) an offense under section 30A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78dd–1); or

''(II) an offense under section 104 or 104A of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 (15 U.S.C. 78dd–2 and 78dd–3).

''(D) CONDITIONS.—Subject to paragraph (4), amounts in the supplemental fraud fighting account shall remain available until expended and shall be subject to the terms and conditions of the Department of Justice Working Capital Fund.

''(4) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—There are rescinded all covered amounts in excess of $175,000,000 at the end of fiscal year 2012 and the end of each fiscal year thereafter.

''(B) RATIO.—For any rescission under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of the Treasury shall rescind amounts from the debt collection management account and the supplemental fraud fighting account in a ratio of 6 dollars to 1 dollar, respectively.

''(5) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Taxpayer Protection and Fraud Enforcement Act of 2011, and every year thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report that identifies, for the most recent fiscal year before the date of the report—

''(A) the amount credited to the debt collection management account and the amount credited to the supplemental fraud fighting account from civil debt collection litigation, which shall include, for each account—

''(i) a comprehensive description of the source of the amount credited; and

''(ii) a list the civil actions and settlements from which amounts were collected and credited to the account;

''(B) the amount expended from the debt collection management account for civil debt collection, which shall include a comprehensive description of the use of amounts in the account that identifies the amount expended for—

''(i) paying the costs of processing and tracking civil and criminal debt-collection litigation;

''(ii) financial systems;

''(iii) debt-collection-related personnel expenses;

''(iv) debt-collection-related administrative expenses; and

''(v) debt-collection-related litigation expenses;

''(C) the amounts expended from the supplemental fraud fighting account and the justification for the expenditure of such amounts; and

''(D) the unobligated balance in the debt collection management account and the unobligated balance in the supplemental fraud fighting account at the end of the fiscal year.''.

SEC. 3. REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS AWARDED IN FALSE CLAIMS ACT PROSECUTIONS.

Section 3729(a)(3) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Any costs paid under this paragraph shall be credited to the appropriations accounts of the executive agency from which the funds used for the costs of the civil action were paid.''.

SEC. 4. INTERLOCUTORY APPEALS OF SUPPRESSION OR EXCLUSION OF EVIDENCE.

Section 3731 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the second undesignated paragraph by inserting ''Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, an Assistant Attorney General, or the'' after ''an indictment or information, if the''.

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF INTERNATIONAL MONEY LAUNDERING STATUTE TO TAX EVASION CRIMES.

Section 1956(a)(2)(A) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''intent to promote—'' and inserting the following: ''intent to—

''(i) promote''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following

''(ii) engage in conduct constituting a violation of section 7201 or 7206 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or''.

SEC. 6. STRENGTHENING THE PROHIBITION AGAINST TRAFFICKING IN PASSWORDS.

Section 1030(a)(6) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''protected'' before ''computer''; and

(2) by striking '', if—'' and all that follows and inserting ''; or''.

SEC. 7. CLARIFYING VENUE FOR FEDERAL MAIL FRAUD OFFENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3237(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the second undesignated paragraph by adding before the period at the end the following: ''or in any district in which an act in furtherance of the offense is committed''.

(b) SECTION HEADING.—Section 3237 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the section heading by striking ''**begun**'' and all that follows and inserting ''**taking place in more than one district**''.

(c) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 211 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 3237 and inserting the following:

''3237. Offenses taking place in more than one district.''.

SEC. 8. EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY OF SECRET SERVICE.

Section 3056 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting ''641, 656, 657,'' after ''510,''; and

(ii) by striking ''493, 657,'' and inserting ''493,''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''federally insured''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(h)(1) For any undercover investigative operation of the United States Secret Service that is necessary for the detection and prosecution of a crime against the United States, the United States Secret Service may—

''(A) use amounts appropriated for the United States Secret Service, including unobligated balances available from prior fiscal years, to—

''(i) purchase property, buildings, and other facilities and lease space within the United States (including the District of Columbia and the territories and possessions of the United States), without regard to sections 1341 and 3324 of title 31, section 8141 of title 40, and sections 3901, 4501 through 4506, 6301, and 6306(a) of title 41; and

''(ii) establish, acquire, and operate on a commercial basis proprietary corporations and business entities as part of the undercover investigative operation, without regard to sections 9102 and 9103 of title 31;

''(B) deposit in banks and other financial institutions amounts appropriated for the United States Secret Service, including unobligated balances available from prior fiscal years, and the proceeds from the undercover investigative operation, without regard to section 648 of this title and section 3302 of title 31; and

''(C) use the proceeds from the undercover investigative operation to offset necessary and reasonable expenses incurred in the undercover investigative operation, without regard to section 3302 of title 31.

''(2) The authority under paragraph (1) may be exercised only upon a written determination by the Director of the United States Secret Service (in this subsection referred to as the 'Director') that the action being authorized under paragraph (1) is necessary for the conduct of an undercover investigative operation. A determination under this paragraph may continue in effect for the duration of an undercover investigative operation, without fiscal year limitation.

''(3) If the Director authorizes the proceeds from an undercover investigative operation to be used as described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), as soon as practicable after the proceeds are no longer necessary for the conduct of the undercover investigative operation, the proceeds remaining shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

''(4) As early as the Director determines practicable before the date on which a corporation or business entity established or acquired under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) with a net value of more than $50,000 is to be liquidated, sold, or otherwise disposed of, the Director shall notify the Secretary of Homeland Security regarding the circumstances of the corporation or business entity and the liquidation, sale, or other disposition. The proceeds of the liquidation, sale, or other disposition, after obligations are met, shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

''(5)(A) The Director shall—

''(i) on a quarterly basis, conduct detailed financial audits of closed undercover investigative operations for which a written determination is made under paragraph (2); and

''(ii) submit to the Secretary of Homeland Security a written report of the results of each audit conducted under clause (i).

''(B) On the date on which the budget of the President is submitted under section 1105(a) of title 31 for each year, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report summarizing the audits conducted under subparagraph (A)(i) relating to the previous fiscal year.''.

SEC. 9. FALSE CLAIMS SETTLEMENTS.

(a) REPORTS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than November 1 of each year, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that describes each settlement or compromise of any claim, suit, or other action entered into with the Department of Justice that—

(1) relates to an alleged violation of section 1031 of title 18, United States Code, or section 3729 of title 31, United States Code (including all settlements of alternative remedies); and

(2) results from a claim for damages of more than $100,000.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORTS.—The description of each settlement or compromise required to be included in an annual report under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) the total amount of the settlement or compromise and the portions of the settlement attributable to violations of various statutory authorities;

(2) the amount of actual damages, or if the amount of actual damages is not available a good faith estimate of the damages, that have been sustained and the minimum and maximum potential civil penalties that may be incurred as a consequence of the conduct of the defendant that is the subject of the settlement or compromise;

(3) the basis for any estimate of damages sustained and the potential civil penalties incurred;

(4) the amount of the settlement that represents damages and the multiplier or percentage of the actual damages used in determining the amount to be paid under the settlement or compromise;

(5) the amount of the settlement that represents civil penalties and the percentage of the maximum potential civil penalty to be paid under the settlement or compromise;

(6) the amount of the settlement that represents criminal fines and a statement of the basis for the fines;

(7) a description of the period during which the matter to which the settlement or compromise relates was pending, including—

(A) the date on which the complaint was originally filed;

(B) a description of the period the matter remained under seal;

(C) the date on which the Department of Justice determined whether to intervene in the case; and

(D) the date on which the settlement or compromise was finalized;

(8) whether a defendant or any division, subsidiary, affiliate, or related entity of a defendant had previously entered into a settlement or compromise relating to section 1031 of title 18, United States Code, or section 3730(b) of title 31, United States Code, and, if so, the date of and amount to be paid under each such settlement or compromise;

(9) whether a defendant or any division, subsidiary, affiliate, or related entity of a defendant—

(A) entered into a corporate integrity agreement relating to the settlement or compromise;

(B) entered into a deferred prosecution agreement or nonprosecution agreement relating to the settlement or compromise; or

(C)(i) previously entered into—

(I) a corporate integrity agreement relating to a settlement or compromise relating to a different violation of section 3730(b) of title 31, United States Code; or

(II) a deferred prosecution agreement or nonprosecution agreement relating to a settlement or compromise relating to a different violation of section 1031 of title 18, United States Code; and

(ii) if the defendant had entered an agreement described in clause (i), whether the agreement applied to the conduct that is the subject of the settlement or compromise described in the report or similar conduct;

(10) for a settlement involving Medicaid, the amounts paid to the Federal Government and to each State participating in the settlement or compromise;

(11) whether civil investigative demands were issued in process of investigating the matter to which the settlement or compromise relates;

(12) for a qui tam action—

(A) the percentage of the settlement amount awarded to the relator; and

(B) whether the relator requested a fairness hearing relating to the percentage received by the relator or the total amount of the settlement;

(13) the extent to which officers of the agency that was the victim of the loss resolved by the settlement or compromise participated in the settlement negotiations; and

(14) the extent to which a relator or counsel for a relators participated in the settlement negotiations.

SEC. 10. AGGRAVATED IDENTITY THEFT AND FRAUD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1028A of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the section heading by adding ''**and fraud**'' at the end.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 1028A and inserting the following:

''1028A. Aggravated identity theft and fraud.''.

SEC. 11. FRAUD AND RELATED ACTIVITY IN CONNECTION WITH IDENTIFICATION DOCUMENTS, AUTHENTICATION FEATURES, AND INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1028(a)(7) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''(including an organization)'' after ''person''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 1028 and inserting the following:

''1028. Fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents, authentication features, and information.''.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 893. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance to the State of Louisiana for a pilot program to develop measures to eradicate or control feral swine and to assess and restore wetlands damaged by feral swine; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that will be a critical component in our efforts to recover and rebuild Louisiana's vast coastal wetlands. My bill works to address the threatening problem of coastal wetland deterioration in Louisiana caused by non-native, invasive feral swine populations. Few are aware that the marsh and wetlands along Louisiana's coast comprise some 40 percent of the Nation's total salt marshes. Louisiana's coastline is a national treasure. Yet, this national treasure is disappearing at an alarming rate due to a number of natural and man-made factors, including the destruction of wetlands caused by non-native feral pig populations that are literally eating away the coast.

Louisiana's coastline is an increasingly fragile and finite source of protection. It protects against storm surges, the varied effects of climate change, and it protects the many communities that thrive on the coastal plains of Louisiana. The survival of the affected acreage is crucial not only to the continued existence of my State and the states directly above mine—which will be affected if Louisiana's wetlands continue to deteriorate—but also to our Nation's energy independence and security. Forty percent of America's refining capacity flows from the Gulf Coast to service the rest of our Nation, and if Louisiana's coastline continues to disappear, our Nation's refiners and energy infrastructure will be jeopardized. As such, the loss of our

wetlands threatens not only our teeming wildlife, but also land, lives, energy infrastructure, and navigation.

That is why I rise today to introduce the Feral Swine Eradication and Control Pilot Program Act of 2011, to address the challenges these species pose to our efforts to reverse coastal wetland deterioration.

Every 30 minutes, a portion of Louisiana's coast the size of a football field is converted from healthy marsh into open water. Since 1930, 1.2 million acres have been lost. That is an area roughly the size of Delaware. Scientists predict that Louisiana will lose another 700 square miles of coastal wetlands by 2050. That is an area the size of the greater Washington, D.C. and Baltimore metro areas.

Exacerbating this problem is the irresponsible introduction of the feral hog to Louisiana. This invasive species has caused extensive damage to our natural wildlife habitat. In Louisiana, the wild omnivores compete with native wildlife for food resources; prey on young domestic animals and wildlife; and carry diseases that can affect pets, livestock, wildlife and people. Scientists now believe that the feral hogs are not only imposing enormous damage to the marsh, but are also negatively impacting native freshwater mussels and insects by contributing E. coli to water systems.

According to the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, the wild pig is the most prolific large mammal in North America and given adequate nutrition, its populations in an area can double in just four months.

Louisiana's landscape has already been ravaged by the nutria rodent. In 2002, the first program was created to combat the increasing nutria populations. This program, the Coast-wide Nutria Control Program, CNCP, incentivized trappers to catch nutria in return for monetary compensation. This program has proven successful at decreasing nutria populations and significantly reducing their impact to coastal wetlands.

However, more effort was needed to further reduce the nutria damage to wetlands, both in Louisiana and in other marshy environments, including Maryland's Chesapeake Bay. The Nutria Eradication and Control Act was enacted in 2003 to provide a critical supplement of funding to strengthen the Coast-wide Nutria Control Program. In July of 2009, I joined my friend and colleague Senator CARDIN in introducing the re-authorization of the Nutria Eradication and Control Act. These two measures to combat nutria populations have been instrumental in reducing the nutria damage to Louisiana's wetlands.

Unfortunately, now Louisiana has another pest eroding its marshes and wetlands. Feral swine are listed by the World Conservation Union, IUCN, as one of the top 100 invasive species worldwide. If action is not taken to control the feral swine population, our biologists fear these animals will undo much of the progress Louisiana has made in controlling the nutria population. It is my hope that with the help of my colleagues, we can pass this bill to help eradicate these pests from our vanishing coastline once and for all.

For these reasons, it is imperative that we control the feral swine in Louisiana. As such, the bill I am introducing today authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to allocate funding to create a pilot program modeled off of the Nutria Eradication and Control Act. This program will assess the nature and extent of damage to the wetlands in Louisiana and develop methods to eradicate or control the feral swine population, and restore the coastal areas damaged by this invasive species. It is a small program, but the benefits are potentially vast. It is my hope that by creating this program, we can achieve similar success at combating feral hogs as we have had at controlling nutria populations.

It is for all of these reasons that this legislation is crucial. I ask that my colleagues support its prompt passage.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WEBB, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. MORAN and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 894. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2011, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today, as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am proud to introduce the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2011.

Effective December 1, 2011, this measure directs the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to increase the rates of veterans' compensation to keep pace with a rise in the cost-of-living, should an adjustment be prompted by an increase in the Consumer Price Index, CPI. Referred to as the COLA, this important legislation would make an increase available to veterans at the same level as an increase provided to recipients of Social Security benefits.

All of my colleagues on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Senators BURR, ROCKEFELLER, AKAKA, SANDERS, BROWN of Ohio, WEBB, TESTER, BEGICH, ISAKSON, WICKER, JOHANNS, BROWN of Massachusetts, MORAN, and BOOZMAN join me in introducing this important legislation. I look forward to our continued work together to improve the lives of our Nation's veterans.

Last year, Congress passed, and the President signed into law, Public Law 111–247, which would have increased veterans' compensation rates had there been an increase in the CPI. While there was no cost-of-living increase in 2011 due to a decline in the CPI, the 2012 adjustment was projected to be .9 percent in the President's fisal year 2012 budget submission.

The COLA affects so many important benefits, including veterans' disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation for surviving spouses and children. It is projected that over 3.5 million veterans and survivors will receive compensation benefits in fiscal year 2012.

As the daughter of a disabled veteran, I understand the critical nature of these benefits as many recipients depend upon these tax-free payments for their most basic needs, in addition to the needs of their spouses and children. We have an obligation to the men and women who have sacrificed so much to serve our country and who now deserve nothing less than the full support of a grateful Nation. The COLA brings us one step closer to fulfilling our Nation's promise to care for our brave veterans and their families.

I ask our colleagues to show their continued support for our Nation's veterans by working together to ensure this benefit remains available and is not diminished by the effects of inflation.

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. 894

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 ''Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) RATE ADJUSTMENT.—Effective on December 1, 2011, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall increase, in accordance with subsection (c), the dollar amounts in effect on November 30, 2011, for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation under the provisions specified in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNTS TO BE INCREASED.—The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to subsection (a) are the following:

(1) WARTIME DISABILITY COMPENSATION.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1114 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1115(1) of such title.

(3) CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.—The dollar amount under section 1162 of such title.

(4) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO SURVIVING SPOUSE.—Each of the dollar amounts under subsections (a) through (d) of section 1311 of such title.

(5) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO CHILDREN.—Each of the dollar amounts under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of such title.

(c) DETERMINATION OF INCREASE.—

(1) PERCENTAGE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each dollar amount described

in subsection (b) shall be increased by the same percentage as the percentage by which benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 2011, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(2) ROUNDING.—Each dollar amount increased under paragraph (1), if not a whole dollar amount, shall be rounded to the next lower whole dollar amount.

(d) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons under section 10 of Public Law 85–857 (72 Stat. 1263) who have not received compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

(e) PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED RATES.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register the amounts specified in subsection (b), as increased under subsection (a), not later than the date on which the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 2012.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. LEE):

S. 897. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to clarify that uncertified States and Indian tribes have the authority to use certain payments for certain non-coal reclamation projects and acid mine remediation programs; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill important to public health and safety and the environment. This legislation addresses an interpretation by the Department of the Interior, DOI, which restricts the ability of states to use certain funds under the Abandoned Mine Land, AML, Program authorized by the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act, SMCRA, for non-coal abandoned mine reclamation and for the remediation of acid mine drainage. This bill is identical to legislation that was reported by voice vote by the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources last Congress.

Amendments to SMCRA, passed as part of the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006, Pub. L. No. 109–432, reauthorized collection of an AML fee on coal produced in the United States and made certain modifications to the AML program. The amendments also provided that so-called ''make-up'' funds, amounts that had accrued to the states and tribes for several years under the formula in SMCRA but had not been previously appropriated, be paid out to the states and tribes over a period of years as mandatory payments.

Under the AML program, which is administered by DOI, funds are expended to reclaim abandoned mine lands, with top priority for protecting public health, safety, general welfare, and property, and restoration of land and water resources adversely affected by past mining practices. The program is largely directed to abandoned coal mine reclamation, but beginning in 1977 when SMCRA was first enacted, funds have been available pursuant to section 409 to address abandoned non-coal mine sites. A review of the legislative history of this provision and the long-standing administrative interpretation of section 409 reveals that the section is intended to address ''non-coal mine reclamation'' on abandoned mine lands.

Western states such as New Mexico, Colorado, and Utah have prioritized the use of AML funds to undertake the most pressing reclamation work on both abandoned coal and non-coal mine sites. While activities on non-coal mine sites have consumed a relatively insignificant portion of the funding provided for the overall AML program, the results in terms of public health and safety in these states is considerable, and there is significant work yet to be done.

Similarly, the use of AML funds for remediation of acid mine drainage has been important in many areas, especially in the Appalachian states, such as Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia. Until enactment of the 2006 amendments to SMCRA, states and tribes with approved AML programs had been able to set aside up to 30 percent of their AML funds for acid mine drainage remediation without respect to time limitations that would otherwise apply.

In 2007, the Solicitor at the Department of the Interior interpreted the amendments as limiting the ability of uncertified states and tribes to use the ''make-up'' AML funds for priority non-coal abandoned mine reclamation and acid mine drainage set-aside programs. See Memorandum Opinion M–37014. The Solicitor found that these make-up funds cannot be used for priority non-coal mine reclamation in the case of states and tribes that had not certified completion of their coal reclamation work and likewise cannot be used for acid mine drainage set-aside programs.

The bill that I am introducing today would correct what I believe is an unfortunate and unintended interpretation of the 2006 amendments by modifying the language of SMCRA to clarify that the funding would be available for non-coal abandoned mine reclamation and acid mine drainage set-aside programs as it was prior to the passage of the amendments in 2006.

I want to underscore that the bill does not increase funding to the states and tribes. It simply clarifies that states and tribes can have flexibility to use AML funds that they receive under existing law for these two important uses, as was the case prior to the 2006 amendments. I hope that my colleagues will support this legislation, which has important implications nationwide.

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. 897

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

SECTION 1. ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION.

(a) RECLAMATION FEE.—Section 402(g)(6)(A) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1232(g)(6)(A)) is amended by inserting ''and section 411(h)(1)'' after ''paragraphs (1) and (5)''.

(b) FILLING VOIDS AND SEALING TUNNELS.—Section 409(b) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1239(b)) is amended by inserting ''and section 411(h)(1)'' after ''section 402(g)''.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Section 411(h)(1)(D)(ii) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1240a(h)(1)(D)(ii)) is amended by striking ''section 403'' and inserting ''section 402(g)(6), 403, or 409''.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 898. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary to establish a comprehensive design standard program to prevent, control, and treat polluted stormwater runoff from federally funded highways and roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing legislation that will help prevent millions of gallons of pollution from entering our Nation's precious water resources. The season we are in makes my legislation particularly timely. Spring is one of the wettest times of year, and with every Spring shower polluted stormwater runoff washes a myriad of chemicals pollutants, sediment, debris, oil and grease, and other contaminates from our nation's roads and highways into our lakes, rivers, streams, bays, and coastal waters.

Stormwater is the Nation's largest source of water pollution. While rain itself contains air pollution particulates that are deposited in every drop, most stormwater pollution is picked up on the surface and carried off as runoff. Stormwater washes contaminants like oil, grease, heavy metals, nutrients, asbestos, sediments, road salts and other de-icing agents, brake dust, and road debris from the millions of miles of America's roads and into storm drains that discharge into nearby waters. Almost all of this polluted stormwater is discharged without any treatment.

When rain falls on these hard, impervious surfaces it often has no where to go but down the channels created by curbs and retaining walls, into storm drains and into the nearest natural water body. According to research compiled by the National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration's, NOAA, National Geophysical Data Center, the U.S. is covered by more than 112,600 square kilometers of impervious surfaces. That is a space larger than the State of Ohio. With 985,139 miles of Federal aid highways stretching from every corner of the country, polluted highway runoff is no small problem facing our Nation's waters.

The effects of polluted stormwater runoff are real. For example, the Anacostia River—Washington's ''other'' and often forgotten river—can be seen from the Capitol Dome as it flows out of Prince George's County, MD, and into the District and on to its confluence with the Potomac. Runoff from within the 176 square mile watershed of the Anacostia, most of which is in Maryland, but also includes the east side of D.C. and the entire Capitol complex, all makes its way into the Anacostia. The stormwater that enters the Anacostia is extremely polluted from the thousands of acres of road surfaces that cover the watershed, which exacerbates the incidence of combined sewer overflows and has impaired the Anacostia for many years. It is no coincidence that the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service has found the Anacostia's bottom-feeder catfish to have the highest incidence of liver tumors than any other population of catfish in the country. The cause of the tumors are the high levels of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, a by-product of fuel combustion, that come from vehicle tailpipe emissions and are deposited on the road and in the air and then washed into the river with every shower or thunderstorm.

This is not a problem unique to Maryland or the Chesapeake Bay region, nor is it a problem unique to urban environments as opposed to rural environments. Polluted runoff is a problem that affects any watershed where impervious paved road and highway surfaces have altered the natural hydrology of a watershed. Over time, federal highway policy has come to recognize the drastic impacts highways and surface transportation can have on the environment and on water quality. Title 23 of the U.S. Code states: ''transportation should play a significant role in promoting economic growth, improving the environment, and sustaining the quality of life'' through the use of ''context sensitive solutions.'' The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, ISTEA, authorized using transportation enhancement funds for ''environmental mitigation to address water pollution due to highway runoff.'' It is important to note, however, that this is just one of 12 types of eligible enhancement projects and only 1.1 percent of enhancement project funds have gone toward environmental mitigation projects since 1992.

In 2008, at the request of the House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee, the Government Accountability Office issued a report examining key issues and challenges that need to be addressed in the next reauthorization of the transportation bill. That report highlighted the clear link between transportation policy and the environment. Taking a policy approach to require that the planning, design, and construction of highways are done in an environmentally responsible manner, with an eye toward mitigating the water quality impacts highways have on our Nation's water resources, will help address this issue and better meet our Nation's transportation goals. This legislation also helps advance the October 5, 2009, Executive Order affirming that Federal policy and Federal agencies shall ''conserve and protect water resources through efficiency, reuse, and stormwater management; eliminate waste, recycle, and prevent pollution; and leverage agency acquisitions to foster markets for sustainable technologies and environmentally preferable materials, products and services.''

Over the years, The U.S. Department of Transportation has established design standards for federal-aid highways to improve the performance and safety of our highway infrastructure. These design standard improvements were the result of obvious safety and engineering problems that needed to be addressed. These design standard are essential to ensuring that the Federal Government's investment in transportation infrastructure is resulting in a well-designed, safe and reliable ''product'' for the benefit of the American people.

The same can be said for the need for establishing environmental design standards for Federal-aid highways as a means of protecting water quality. While stormwater runoff from highways may be classified as non-point source pollution, it is unquestionably the source of a wide range of contaminants that impair rivers, lakes, streams and coastal waters; create costly remedial situations; and detract from the value and health of our precious water resources. Requiring Federal-aid highways to meet an environmental standard for protecting water quality will improve the value of the Federal Government's investment in our Nation's highway infrastructure.

The approach my legislation takes to mitigate polluted highway runoff is through the implementation of a design standard, developed by the United States Department of Transportation, requiring the maintenance or restoration of the pre-development hydrology of a federal-aid highway project site. This same approach was made law by the Energy Independence & Security Act of 2007 for the development of new Federal buildings and facilities.

My bill would require that all substantial federal highway projects must be planned and designed ''to ensure that covered projects are sited, constructed and maintained in accordance with design standards intended to protect surface and ground water quality and ensure the long-term management of stormwater originating from Federal-aid highways.'' This would be achieved by approaches that avoid and minimize alteration of natural features and hydrology and maximize the use of onsite pollution control measures using existing terrain and natural features.

My bill also recognizes that geography and other physical characteristics of the land may not always allow on-site treatment of polluted highway runoff. When conditions are impracticable my legislation would allow for an ''appropriate off-site runoff pollution mitigation program'' within the watershed of a Federal-aid highway project site that can protect against the water quality impacts of the project.

The Clean Water Act requires that we protect the waters of the United States. As with most pollution abatement strategies, preventing stormwater pollution is cheaper, more effective, and easier to implement than trying to clean up and remediate the problem after contamination has occurred.

Not addressing stormwater pollution at its source just kicks the proverbial can down the road for someone else to deal with. When water resources are contaminated by polluted highway runoff, mitigating the pollution, which is a preventable discharge in the first place, should not be the responsibility of local goverments, wastewater treatment facilities, or drinking water utilities.

Water pollution has many sources and our nation's highways produce a tremendous volume of contaminated stormwater. Time and time again, experience has taught us that addressing pollution at its source is the most effective means of abating pollution. It is time we applied this principle to our Nation's Federal-aid highways. I urge my colleagues to support my legislation and help move our country closer to meeting the goals of the Clean Water Act and the goals of our national transportation policy.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. 899. A bill to provide for the eradication and control of nutria; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I am proud to reintroduce the Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2011 along with my colleagues, Senator LANDRIEU, Senator MIKULSKI, Senator MERKLEY, and Senator HAGAN. This legislation will build on the successful Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2003. This program encourages habitat protection, education, research, monitoring, and capacity building to provide for the long-term protection of coastal wetlands from destruction caused by nutria.

Invasive species are one of the largest threats to biodiversity in the United States today. As invasive species go, the nutria is one of the most destructive creatures we have, especially in my home State of Maryland and in Louisiana.

The nutria is a large, semi-aquatic rodent that was originally brought to the United States to bolster the fur trade in the early 20th century. Unfortunately, we underestimated their strong appetite and high reproductive

potential. Since their introduction, the nutria have damaged millions of acres of wetlands and countless miles of shoreline and have even earned a spot among the International Union for Conservation of Nature's list of the world's 100 worst invasive alien species. By the early 1990s, the Chesapeake Bay/Delmarva Peninsula population was estimated to exceed 150,000 animals.

These ''eating machines'' can consume up to 25 percent of their body weight in plants per day, feasting directly on plant roots. This wrecks havoc on our wetlands, turning our once productive lands into barren mud flats. The destruction exacerbates the damaging impacts of ongoing land subsidence and sea level rise.

We understand how important our wetlands are and provide numerous ecosystem services to our society. They provide fish and wildlife habitat, flood protection, erosion control, and water quality preservation.

In my own State of Maryland, nutria invaded the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge nearly 6 decades ago, destroying vital habitat for native shorebirds, muskrats, and blue crabs. They are responsible for the loss of more than 5,000 acres of wetlands in this refuge alone.

We must remember this has a significant impact on people—people who depend on it for their livelihood and for people who use it for recreation. The loss of Blackwater wetlands, that are vital to the fishery, was estimated to cost Maryland's economy nearly $4 million annually. Millions of Americans spend billions of dollars pursuing their fishing, hunting and wildlife watching activities, which contribute to millions of jobs in industries and businesses that support wildlife-related recreation.

In 2000, Congress established a Federal funding source to develop a successful public-private partnership program to address nutria in Maryland. This financial support has directly led to the successful eradiation of nutria from 150,000 acres of the approximate 400,000 acres of wetland habitats that they infest. The project success is due to strategic planning, permanent and dedicated staff members, and cooperation with private landowners.

In Louisiana, an incentive program is used to encourage trappers to trap nutria. Since the implementation of the program, the damage to coastal wetlands has been reduced from 90,000 to 20,000 acres.

The management techniques developed in Maryland and Louisiana have already been exported to other states like Oregon and Washington to control their own nutria populations and minimize the damage done to their marsh habitats. Healthy wetlands are returning to places where nutria have been removed. But the job is not yet done.

Last Congress, I introduced the Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2009 to continue and improve the successful nutria eradication program in Maryland and Louisiana and expand it to other significantly impacted states like Oregon and Washington. This bill passed out of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee in 2009 and had the support of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, the Louisiana Department of Wildlife & Fisheries, and the Nature Conservancy.

Today, I proudly rise again and rededicate myself to passing the Nutria Eradication Control Act of 2011. This bill will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance to the states of Maryland, Louisiana, Delaware, Oregon, Washington, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and North Carolina to eradicate and control nutria populations and restore nutria-damaged wetlands.

We know how valuable our wetlands are. We know how destructive the nutria is. We know what we can do to stop the nutria and that these programs work. I urge my colleagues to remember that we have a responsibility to be good stewards of the earth and to join me in supporting this bill.

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. 899

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 ''Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

Section 2 of the Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–16; 117 Stat. 621) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and in Louisiana'' and inserting '', the State of Louisiana, and other coastal States'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''in Maryland and Louisiana on Federal, State, and private land'' and inserting ''on Federal, State, and private land in the States of Maryland and Louisiana and in other coastal States''; and

(C) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following:

''(3) This Act authorizes the Maryland Nutria Project, which has successfully eradicated nutria from more than 130,000 acres of Chesapeake Bay wetlands in the State of Maryland and facilitated the creation of voluntary, public-private partnerships and more than 406 cooperative landowner agreements.

''(4) This Act and the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 3951 et seq.) authorize the Coastwide Nutria Control Program, which has reduced nutria-impacted wetland acres in the State of Louisiana from 80,000 acres to 23,141 acres.

''(5) The proven techniques developed under this Act that are eradicating nutria in the State of Maryland and reducing the acres of nutria-impacted wetlands in the State of Louisiana should be applied to nutria eradication or control programs in other nutria-infested coastal States''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance to the States of Delaware, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington to carry out activities—

''(1) to eradicate or control nutria; and

''(2) to restore nutria damaged wetlands.''.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

The Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–16; 117 Stat. 621) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 3 and 4 as sections 4 and 5, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 2 the following:

''SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

''In this Act:

''(1) COASTAL STATE.—The term 'coastal State' means each of the States of Delaware, Oregon, North Carolina, Virginia, and Washington.

''(2) PROGRAM.—The term 'program' means the nutria eradication program established by section 4(a). ''

''(3) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP.—The term 'public-private partnership' means a voluntary, cooperative project undertaken by governmental entities or public officials and affected communities, local citizens, nongovernmental organizations, or other entities or persons in the private sector.'

''(4) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.''.

SEC. 4. NUTRIA ERADICATION PROGRAM.

Section 4 of the Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–16; 117 Stat. 621) (as redesignated by section 3) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, subject to the availability of appropriations, provide financial assistance to the States of Maryland and Louisiana and the coastal States to implement measures—

''(1) to eradicate or control nutria; and

''(2) to restore wetlands damaged by nutria.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''the State of'' before ''Maryland'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''other States'' and inserting ''the coastal States''; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''marshland'' and inserting ''wetlands'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''(c) ACTIVITIES'' and inserting ''(c) ACTIVITIES IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND''; and

(B) by inserting '', and updated in March 2009'' before the period at the end;

(4) in subsection (e), by striking ''financial assistance provided by the Secretary under this section'' and inserting ''the amounts made available under subsection (f) to carry out the program''; and

(5) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Subject to subsection (e), for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2016, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out the program such sums as are necessary.''.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Section 5 of the Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–16; 117 Stat. 621) (as redesignated by section 3) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''2002 document entitled 'Eradication Strategies for Nutria in the Chesapeake and Delaware Bay Watersheds'; and'' and inserting ''March 2009 update of the document entitled 'Eradication Strategies for Nutria in the Chesapeake and

Delaware Bay Watersheds' and originally dated March 2002;'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''develop'' and inserting ''continue''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) develop, in cooperation with the State of Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, the State of Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, the State of Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the State of North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, and the State of Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, long-term nutria control or eradication programs, as appropriate, with the objective of—

''(A) significantly reducing and restoring the damage nutria cause to coastal wetlands in the coastal States; and

''(B) promoting voluntary, public-private partnerships to eradicate or control nutria and restoring nutria-damaged wetlands in the coastal States.''.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 900. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to educational organizations to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Simon Wiesenthal Holocaust Education Assistance Act. This important legislation would provide competitive grants for educational organizations to make Holocaust education more accessible and available throughout this Nation.

I would like to commend my former colleague in the House, Congresswoman MALONEY, for her leadership on this issue. I also want to thank my colleague from New Jersey, Senator LAUTENBERG, for agreeing to be an original cosponsor.

This past Monday, we solemnly commemorated Holocaust Remembrance Day, in memorial of perhaps the greatest crime ever perpetrated against humanity. As we reflect upon the tragedies of the events surrounding the Holocaust, the lives lost, the families destroyed, the potential unfulfilled, we must renew our oath to never forget, so this dark chapter in history will never be repeated.

We must forever remember the approximately six million Jewish men, women and children, as well as millions of others who faced persecution, displacement, and death at the hands of the Nazis. We must remember their stories not just to honor their lives, but more importantly, to educate the next generation about the dangers of intolerance, ignorance, and bigotry. I could not think of a better namesake for this bill, Simon Wiesenthal, who honored the memories of those lost by dedicating his life to bringing those responsible to justice.

Some people might ask why we need to learn more about something that happened over 65 years ago and an entire ocean away. The same critics might argue that anti-Semitism, while terrible, is a relic of the past that will never be repeated. Unfortunately, this is not the case, and we, as a Nation, must not ignore this appalling truth.

Even to this day, we do not have to go half way around the world to find examples of intolerance and hate; rather we can look into our own neighborhoods and communities. According to the FBI, there were 1,376 hate crimes motivated by religious bias in 2009. More than 7 out of 10 of these crimes were perpetrated against Jews because of their religion. In fact, even in my own State of New Jersey, a State of immense diversity, tolerance and understanding, we have seen a number of incidents that tear at the fabric of our society.

In July of 2010, a Rabbi and his 12 year old son were subject to anti-Semitic slurs from an unidentified man in a sedan as they walked towards their synagogue in Edison, NJ.

A few days after, the Edison Police Department investigated a second anti-Semitic incident at a Lexus dealership where eight cars had been vandalized with swastikas.

Last year in Chatham, New Jersey, anti-Semitic leaflets with the words ''Kill Jews'' were littered throughout the town. Local police found the culprit and arrested him. However, Chatham Township Police said they could only charge the offender with littering because he was not apparently targeting an individual.

New Jersey college students at Rutgers University have also experienced this terrible discrimination on numerous occasions. This past fall, when a guest speaker came to present at a Jewish event on campus, he was continually harassed by a large group of students that shouted slurs and disrupted his speech several times. Since then, there has been an escalation of anti-Semitic incidents. One of which included a student event this past January that attempted to exploit the Holocaust and accuse Israel of ethnic cleansing. When students showed up in peaceful protest, they were charged an admission fee, while supporters of the event were admitted for free.

These troubling events do not occur in a vacuum. They are fed by bigotry, hatred, and above all else: ignorance. This ignorance is fueled by provocative, dangerous, and bigoted rhetoric that both threaten the safety and well being of individuals, while also insulting the honor of millions of Jewish people. So called academics seek to rewrite history to minimize and spin the facts surrounding the Holocaust; the government of Iran has waged campaigns not just to rewrite, but to simply erase an inconvenient truth. This is not an academic issue shrouded in intellectualism; Holocaust denial is bald-faced anti-Semitism, rooted in hate, and it has no place in our society.

We cannot sit idly by and hope that time alone will heal these wounds. We must take proactive steps to ensure that our society may properly study and take lessons from the Holocaust. Holocaust education is essential for school children so that we may achieve this goal.

Although some States now require the Holocaust to be taught in public schools, the Simon Wiesenthal Holocaust Education Assistance Act goes further and makes grants available to organizations that instruct students, teachers, and communities about the dangers of hate and the importance of tolerance in our society. This legislation would give educators the appropriate resources and training to teach accurate historical information about the Holocaust and convey the lessons that the Holocaust can teach us today.

However, while much growth and healing have come about in the 66 years since Auschwitz was liberated, there remains a significant barrier that we must break through. After 6 decades, many of our youth may view the Holocaust as an event that occurred in the distant past. Only by proper acknowledgement of the incredible loss of life during the Holocaust, will we ever be able to ensure that such an event never happens again.

It is in our common interest to raise our voices against anti-Semitism and against all hatred and discrimination. Funding accurate educational programs on the Holocaust is a step toward winning this battle.

So as America stands with Israel and all followers of the Jewish faith in condemning anti-Semitism, let us do everything in our power to end discrimination and educate future generations about the danger of hatred and bigotry.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 902. A bill to amend part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants for the repair, renovation, and construction of elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, safe, modern, healthy school buildings are essential to creating an environment where students can reach their full academic potential. Today, too many students in the United States, particularly those most at risk of being left behind, attend school in facilities that are old, overcrowded and run-down. The 2009 Infrastructure Report Card compiled by the American Society of Civil Engineers gives public schools a D grade. Too many of our Nation's schools were built over a half century ago, and are not equipped to meet the needs of 21st Century students and teachers. School-facility needs are impacting the preparedness of our children for work in critical fields, such as mathematics and science.

The National Center for Education Statistics reported in 2000 that the Nation's elementary and secondary

schools required approximately $127 billion to repair or upgrade their facilities. A 2008 State-by-State analysis by the American Federation of Teachers found that the Nation's school infrastructure needs total an estimated $255 billion. While the condition of public school buildings is primarily a state and local responsibility, the Federal Government can and should help, especially when it comes to closing disparities between affluent and disadvantaged school districts. The current economic environment makes it exceedingly difficult for States and school districts to renovate and in some cases build new schools to meet this important need.

That is why I am pleased to introduce the School Building Fairness Act. This legislation provides $1 billion to States for competitive matching grants to local educational agencies; LEAs, for school repair, renovation, and construction. In awarding the grants, States must consider poverty, condition of school facilities, capacity, adherence to green building standards, and likelihood of maintenance. I have seen this work in Iowa with the success of the Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program, which provided over $121 million in federal assistance to over 300 school districts and leveraged more than $600 million of additional local funding through the matching requirement. I am sure that it will work across the rest of the country. 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. 902

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 ''School Building Fairness Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Providing safe, healthy, and up-to-date public elementary and secondary school facilities is a crucial component of improving student academic performance and retaining high-quality, committed educators.

(2) The 2009 Infrastructure Report Card compiled by the American Society of Civil Engineers gives public schools a D grade.

(3) The National Center for Education Statistics, in 2000, reported that the Nation's elementary and secondary schools required approximately $127,000,000,000 to repair or upgrade facilities.

(4) A State-by-State analysis by the American Federation of Teachers in 2008 concluded that the Nation's school infrastructure needs an estimated $254,600,000,000.

(5) The Department of Education documented in 1998 that the average age of a public elementary or secondary school building was estimated at 42 years old, past the age when schools tend to deteriorate rapidly.

(6) School districts spent more than $304,000,000,000 for public school construction contracts from 1995 through 2004, according to data collected by McGraw-Hill Construction.

(7) According to a 2006 report by the Building Educational Success Together coalition, the per-student investment made in the most affluent school districts to repair or construct schools was nearly double the amount of the per-student investment made in the most disadvantaged school districts.

(8) Since 1998, the Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program has provided $121,000,000 in Federal assistance to over 300 school districts for school repair and construction. That Federal investment in school repair and construction has leveraged more than $600,000,000 of additional local funding through a match required by the State government.

(9) Green schools use an average of 33 percent less energy than conventionally built schools, and generate financial savings of about $70 per square foot, according to the 2006 report ''Greening America's Schools: Costs and Benefits''.

SEC. 3. GRANTS FOR SCHOOL REPAIR, RENOVATION, AND CONSTRUCTION.

Part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7241 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Subpart 22—School Facilities

"SEC. 5621. GRANTS FOR SCHOOL REPAIR, RENOVATION, AND CONSTRUCTION.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CHARTER SCHOOL.—The term 'charter school' has the meaning given the term in section 5210.

''(2) CHPS CRITERIA.—The term 'CHPS Criteria' means the green building rating criteria developed by the Collaborative for High Performance Schools.

''(3) EARLY LEARNING FACILITY.—The term 'early learning facility' means a public facility that—

''(A) serves children who are not yet in kindergarten; and

''(B) is under the jurisdiction of a local educational agency.

''(4) ENERGY STAR.—The term 'Energy Star' means the Energy Star program of the Department of Energy and the Environmental Protection Agency.

''(5) GREEN GLOBES.—The term 'Green Globes' means the Green Building Initiative environmental design and rating system.

''(6) HIGH-NEED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term 'high-need local educational agency' has the meaning given the term in section 2102(3)(A).

''(7) LEED GREEN BUILDING RATING SYSTEM.—The term 'LEED Green Building Rating System' means the United States Green Building Council Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design green building rating system.

''(8) PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITY.—The term 'public school facility' means a public elementary or secondary school facility, including a public charter school facility or an existing facility planned for adaptive reuse as a public charter school facility.

''(9) RURAL LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term 'rural local educational agency' means a local educational agency that meets the eligibility requirements under—

''(A) section 6211(b) for participation in the program described in subpart 1 of part B of title VI; or

''(B) section 6221(b) for participation in the program described in subpart 2 of part B of title VI.

''(10) STATE.—The term 'State' means each of the several states of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

''(b) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

''(1) RESERVATIONS.—From the funds appropriated under subsection (i) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve 1 percent to provide assistance to the outlying areas and for payments to the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Education. Funds allocated under this paragraph shall be reserved by the Secretary for distribution among the outlying areas and the Secretary of the Interior on the basis of their relative need for public elementary school and secondary school repair, renovation, and construction, as determined by the Secretary.

''(2) ALLOCATION TO STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—From the funds appropriated under subsection (i) for a fiscal year that are not reserved under paragraph (1) for the fiscal year, the Secretary shall allocate to each State educational agency serving a State an amount that bears the same relation to the funds as the amount the State received under part A of title I for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made bears to the amount all States received under such part for such preceding fiscal year, except that no such State educational agency shall receive less than 0.5 percent of the amount allocated under this subsection.

''(c) WITHIN-STATE DISTRIBUTIONS.—

''(1) ADMINISTRATIVE AND OTHER COSTS.—

''(A) STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY ADMINISTRATION AND OTHER COSTS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (D), each State educational agency may reserve not more than 1 percent of the State educational agency's allocation under subsection (b) for the purposes of administering the distribution of grants under this subsection and awarding grants under subparagraph (C)(v).

''(B) REQUIRED USES.—The State educational agency shall use a portion of the funds reserved under subparagraph (A)—

''(i) to provide technical assistance to local educational agencies; and

''(ii) to establish or support a State-level database of public school facility inventory, condition, design, and utilization.

''(C) PERMISSIBLE USES.—The State educational agency may use a portion of the funds reserved under subparagraph (A) for—

''(i) developing a statewide public school educational facility master plan;

''(ii) developing policies, procedures, and standards for high-quality, energy efficient public school facilities;

''(iii) supporting interagency collaboration that will lead to broad community use of public school facilities, and school-based services for students served by high-need local educational agencies or rural local educational agencies;

''(iv) helping to defray the cost of issuing State bonds to finance public elementary school and secondary school repair, renovation, and construction; and

''(v) awarding grants to State-operated or State-supported schools, such as a State school for the deaf or for the blind, to enable such schools to carry out school repair, renovation, and construction activities in accordance with subsection (d).

''(D) STATE ENTITY ADMINISTRATION AND OTHER COSTS.—If the State educational agency transfers funds to a State entity described in paragraph (2)(A), the State educational agency shall transfer to such State entity not less than 75 percent of the amount reserved under subparagraph (A) for the purpose of carrying out the activities described in subparagraph (C).

''(2) DISTRIBUTION OF COMPETITIVE SCHOOL REPAIR, RENOVATION, AND CONSTRUCTION GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds allocated to a State educational agency under subsection (b) that are not reserved under paragraph (1), the State educational agency shall distribute 100 percent of such funds to local educational agencies or, if the State educational agency is not responsible for the financing of public

school facilities, the State educational agency shall transfer such funds to the State entity responsible for the financing of public school facilities (referred to in this section as the 'State entity') for distribution by such State entity to local educational agencies in accordance with this paragraph, to be used, consistent with subsection (d), for public elementary school or secondary school repair, renovation, and construction.

''(B) COMPETITIVE GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—The State educational agency or State entity shall carry out a program to award grants, on a competitive basis, to local educational agencies for public elementary school or secondary school repair, renovation, and construction. Of the total amount available for distribution to local educational agencies under this paragraph, the State educational agency or State entity, shall, in carrying out the grant competition—

''(i) award to high-need local educational agencies, in the aggregate, not less than an amount which bears the same relationship to such total amount as the aggregate amount such high-need local educational agencies received under part A of title I for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made bears to the aggregate amount received for such preceding fiscal year under such part by all local educational agencies in the State;

''(ii) award to rural local educational agencies in the State, in the aggregate, not less than an amount which bears the same relationship to such total amount as the aggregate amount such rural local educational agencies received under part A of title I for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made bears to the aggregate amount received for such preceding fiscal year under such part by all local educational agencies in the State; and

''(iii) award the remaining funds to local educational agencies in the State that did not receive a grant award under clause (i) or (ii), including to high-need local educational agencies and rural local educational agencies that did not receive a grant award under clause (i) or (ii).

''(C) CRITERIA FOR AWARDING GRANTS.—In awarding competitive grants under this paragraph, a State educational agency or State entity shall take into account the following criteria:

''(i) PERCENTAGE OF POOR CHILDREN.—The percentage of children served by the local educational agency who are between 5 to 17 years of age, inclusive, and who are from families with incomes below the poverty line.

''(ii) NEED FOR SCHOOL REPAIR, RENOVATION, AND CONSTRUCTION.—The need of a local educational agency for school repair, renovation, and construction, as demonstrated by the condition of the public school facilities of the local educational agency or the local educational agency's need for such facilities.

''(iii) GREEN SCHOOLS.—The extent to which a local educational agency will make use, in the repair, renovation, or construction to be undertaken, of green practices that are certified, verified, or consistent with any applicable provisions of—

''(I) the LEED Green Building Rating System;

''(II) Energy Star;

''(III) the CHPS Criteria;

''(IV) Green Globes; or

''(V) an equivalent program adopted by the State or another jurisdiction with authority over the local educational agency.

''(iv) FISCAL CAPACITY.—The fiscal capacity of a local educational agency to meet the needs of the local educational agency for repair, renovation, and construction of public school facilities without assistance under this section, including the ability of the local educational agency to raise funds through the use of local bonding capacity and otherwise.

''(v) LIKELIHOOD OF MAINTAINING THE FACILITY.—The likelihood that a local educational agency will maintain, in good condition, any public school facility whose repair, renovation, or construction is assisted under this section.

''(vi) CHARTER SCHOOL EQUITABLE ACCESS TO FUNDING.—In the case of a local educational agency that proposes to fund a repair, renovation, or construction project for a public charter school, the extent to which the public charter school lacks access to funding for school repair, renovation, and construction through the financing methods available to other public schools or local educational agencies in the State.

''(D) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A State educational agency or State entity shall require local educational agencies to match funds awarded under this paragraph.

''(ii) MATCH AMOUNT.—The amount of a match described in clause (i) may be established by using a sliding scale that takes into account the relative poverty of the population served by the local educational agency.

''(d) RULES APPLICABLE TO SCHOOL REPAIR, RENOVATION, AND CONSTRUCTION.—With respect to funds made available under this section that are used for school repair, renovation, and construction, the following rules shall apply:

''(1) PERMISSIBLE USES OF FUNDS.—School repair, renovation, and construction shall be limited to 1 or more of the following:

''(A) Upgrades, repair, construction, or replacement of public elementary school or secondary school building systems or components to improve the quality of education and ensure the health and safety of students and staff, including—

''(i) repairing, replacing, or constructing early learning facilities at public elementary schools (including renovation of existing facilities to serve children under 5 years of age);

''(ii) repairing, replacing, or installing roofs, windows, doors, electrical wiring, plumbing systems, or sewage systems;

''(iii) repairing, replacing, or installing heating, ventilation, or air conditioning systems (including insulation); and

''(iv) bringing such public schools into compliance with fire and safety codes.

''(B) Public school facilities modifications necessary to render public school facilities accessible in order to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.) and section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794).

''(C) Improvements to the environmental conditions of public elementary school or secondary school sites, including asbestos abatement or removal, and the reduction or elimination of human exposure to lead-based paint, mold, or mildew.

''(D) Measures designed to reduce or eliminate human exposure to classroom noise and environmental noise pollution.

''(E) Modifications necessary to reduce the consumption of electricity, natural gas, oil, water, coal, or land.

''(F) Upgrades or installations of educational technology infrastructure to ensure that students have access to up-to-date educational technology.

''(G) Measures that will broaden or improve the use of public elementary school or secondary school buildings and grounds by the community in order to improve educational outcomes.

''(2) IMPERMISSIBLE USES OF FUNDS.—No funds received under this section may be used for—

''(A) payment of maintenance costs in connection with any projects constructed in whole or part with Federal funds provided under this section;

''(B) purchase or upgrade of vehicles;

''(C) improvement or construction of stand-alone facilities whose purpose is not the education of children, including central office administration or operations or logistical support facilities;

''(D) purchase of information technology hardware, including computers, monitors, or printers;

''(E) stadiums or other facilities primarily used for athletic contests or exhibitions or other events for which admission is charged to the general public; or

''(F) purchase of carbon offsets.

''(3) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—A local educational agency or State-operated or State-supported school shall use Federal funds subject to this subsection only to supplement the amount of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available from non-Federal sources for school repair, renovation, and construction.

''(e) QUALIFIED BIDDERS; COMPETITION.—Each local educational agency that receives funds under subsection (c)(2) shall ensure that, if the local educational agency carries out repair, renovation, or construction through a contract, any such contract process ensures the maximum number of qualified bidders, including small, minority, and women-owned businesses, through full and open competition.

''(f) PUBLIC COMMENT.—Each local educational agency receiving funds under subsection (c)(2)—

''(1) shall provide an opportunity for public comment, and ensure that parents, educators, and all other interested members of the community in which the school to be assisted is located have the opportunity to consult, on the use of the funds received under such subsection;

''(2) shall provide the public with adequate and efficient notice of the opportunity described in paragraph (1) in a widely read and distributed medium; and

''(3) shall provide the opportunity described in paragraph (1) in accordance with any applicable State and local law specifying how the comments may be received and how the comments may be reviewed by any member of the public.

''(g) REPORTING.—

''(1) LOCAL REPORTING.—Each local educational agency receiving funds under subsection (c)(2) shall submit a report to the State educational agency, at such time as the State educational agency may require, describing the use of such funds for school repair, renovation, and construction.

''(2) STATE REPORTING.—Each State educational agency receiving funds under subsection (b) shall submit to the Secretary, at such time as the Secretary may require, a report on the use of funds received under this section and made available to local educational agencies (and, if applicable, to State-operated or State-sponsored schools) for school repair, renovation, and construction.

''(h) REALLOCATION.—If a State educational agency does not apply for an allocation of funds under subsection (b) for a fiscal year, or does not use the State educational agency's entire allocation for such fiscal year, then the Secretary may reallocate the amount of the State educational agency's allocation (or the remainder thereof, as the case may be) for such fiscal year to the remaining State educational agencies in accordance with subsection (b).

''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2012, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2016.

''SEC. 5622. NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS STUDY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Center for Education Statistics shall conduct a study of the condition of public school facilities in the United States.

''(b) ESTIMATES AND MEASURES.—In conducting the study, the National Center for Education Statistics shall—

''(1) estimate the costs needed to repair and renovate all public elementary schools and secondary schools in the United States to good overall condition; and

''(2) measure recent expenditures of Federal, State, local, and private funds for public elementary school and secondary school repair, renovation, and construction costs in the United States.

''(c) ANALYSIS.—In conducting the study, the National Center for Education Statistics shall examine trends in expenditures of Federal, State, local, and private funds since fiscal year 2001 for repair, renovation, and construction activities for public elementary schools and secondary schools in the United States, including examining the differences between the types of schools assisted, and the types of repair, renovation, and construction activities conducted, with those expenditures.

''(d) REPORT.—The National Center for Education Statistics shall prepare and submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study.

''SEC. 5623. NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE FOR EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—From the funds appropriated under subsection (c), the Secretary shall award a grant or contract to maintain a clearinghouse that will collect and disseminate information on effective, best educational practices, and the latest research, regarding the planning, design, financing, construction, improvement, operation, and maintenance of safe, healthy, high-performance school facilities for nursery and prekindergarten, kindergarten through grade 12, and higher education.

''(b) DURATION.—The grant or contract under subsection (a) shall be awarded for a period of 5 years.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2016.''.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 904. A bill to improve jobs, opportunity, benefits, and services for unemployed Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to announce the introduction of a bill that, if enacted, would empower the States to more wisely spend the $31 billion in unemployment funds that have been allocated to them for the remainder of this year. This bill will allow states to avoid job-killing unemployment tax hikes while strengthening the safety net program for unemployed workers. I am honored to introduce this legislation simultaneously with a bill being introduced today in the House by The Honorable DAVE CAMP, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

The Jobs, Opportunity, Benefits and Services Act of 2011, or JOBS Act for short, is just that. A pro jobs bill that goes to the heart of what unemployment benefits are meant to be: not a permanent welfare payment, but a bridge to help unemployed workers until they can find a new job. A hand up, not a hand out. This bill is sorely needed. Since the recession began, 33 States have borrowed $48 billion in Federal funds to pay for unemployment benefits. These loans, if gone unpaid, will result in increased taxes on employers and job creators. Three States already have been forced to do so, and experts predict that 21 additional States will be required to raise taxes on jobs this year if nothing is done.

The JOBS Act allows states the flexibility to manage their unemployment funds to pay benefits, reduce their borrowings, or establish programs to help unemployed workers get jobs. The States can decide for themselves where their greatest needs lie. Under current law, States don't have the flexibility they need to adapt. The Federal Government pays for up to 73 weeks of unemployment, an all-time record. But not every state needs to spend the money the way Washington dictates. For example, North Dakota has only a 3.6 percent rate of unemployment, but the unemployed can collect up to 34 weeks of unemployment paid for with Federal funds, in addition to the normal 26 weeks under pre-recession law. This bill would allow States to more wisely direct those Federal funds.

How does the bill work? The $31 billion in Federal funds already allocated to the States will be advanced to them and will remain available for unemployment benefits or, if the State chooses, some or all can be used to repay their loans in order to avoid raising taxes, or enact programs that will lead to the rapid reemployment of unemployed workers. What this bill will not do is add any new Federal spending or reduce the amount of Federal funds a State is already scheduled to receive for unemployment insurance or mandate that States change the way they use those funds. It is up to the States to decide what is best for them and their citizens based on local conditions. This bill truly is a ''win, win'' for States, workers and the businesses struggling to expand and hire.

I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 907. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the reduction in the deductible portion of expenses for business meals and entertainment; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce legislation to restore the 80 percent tax deduction for business meals and entertainment expenses.

By way of background, business meals previously were fully deductible. In 1986, the Congress reduced the allowable tax deduction for business meals and entertainment from 100 percent to 80 percent. In 1993, the deduction was further reduced to its current level of 50 percent. The business meal deduction should be reformed to better reflect the basic principle that business expenses should be fully deductible. Increasing the limitation to 80 percent would better align the provision with these objectives.

More importantly, at a time when the Nation is getting back on stronger economic footing, the legislation is particularly critical especially for the small businesses and self-employed individuals that depend so heavily on the business meal to conduct business. Small companies often use restaurants as ''conference space'' to conduct meetings or close deals. Meals are their best, and sometimes only, marketing tool. Certainly, an increase in the meal and entertainment deduction would have a significant impact on a small business's bottom line.

In addition, the effects on the overall economy would be significant. Research has shown that increasing the business meal deduction to 80 percent would increase business meal sales by over $7 billion and increase the number of jobs by over 200,000. Moreover, restaurants service more than 130 million guests every day. Every dollar spent dining out generates $2.05 in business to other industries, totaling more than $1.7 trillion in overall economic impact.

The impact of the restaurant industry on the Nation's economy is considerable and felt in every State. Accompanying my statement is the National Restaurant Association's, NRA's, State-by-State chart reflecting the estimated economic impact of increasing the business meal deductibility from 50 percent to 80 percent.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this important legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a State-by-State chart be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 907

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

SECTION 1. REPEAL OF REDUCTION IN BUSINESS MEALS AND ENTERTAINMENT TAX DEDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 274(n)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to only 50 percent of meal and entertainment expenses allowed as deduction) is amended by striking ''50 percent'' and inserting ''80 percent''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 274(n) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The heading for section 274(n) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''ONLY 50 PERCENT'' and inserting ''PORTION''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF INCREASING BUSINESS MEAL DEDUCTIBILITY FROM 50% TO 80%

State	Increase in business meal spending 50% to 80% deductibility (in millions)	Total economic impact in the State (in millions)	Total employment impact in the State (number of jobs created)
Alabama	$92	$186	2,952
Alaska	19	33	452
Arizona	151	300	3,984
Arkansas	50	101	1,689
California	967	2,267	26,315
Colorado	136	313	3,943
Connecticut	88	165	2,019
Delaware	24	43	499
District of Columbia	39	53	313
Florida	472	957	12,522
Georgia	230	532	6,732
Hawaii	54	104	1,402
Idaho	28	55	933
Illinois	313	744	8,786
Indiana	135	278	4,272
Iowa	51	102	1,669
Kansas	56	112	1,606
Kentucky	90	183	2,618
Louisiana	98	193	2,888
Maine	29	55	848
Maryland	148	307	3,594
Massachusetts	193	388	4,649
Michigan	191	380	5,872
Minnesota	119	272	3,714
Mississippi	50	95	1,630
Missouri	134	298	4,084
Montana	21	40	710
Nebraska	35	73	1,190
Nevada	83	147	1,974
New Hampshire	34	63	784
New Jersey	205	442	4,993
New Mexico	45	82	1,331
New York	482	954	11,251
North Carolina	222	467	6,849
North Dakota	12	22	373
Ohio	252	540	8,081
Oklahoma	74	157	2,491
Oregon	94	194	2,611
Pennsylvania	258	582	7,688
Rhode Island	29	53	706
South Carolina	108	221	3,329
South Dakota	15	30	509
Tennessee	143	322	4,191
Texas	576	1,405	17,036
Utah	50	113	1,682
Vermont	13	22	335
Virginia	200	423	5,312
Washington	157	340	4,160
West Virginia	32	54	950
Wisconsin	107	224	3,629
Wyoming	12	19	346

Source: National Restaurant Association estimates, 2011

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 908. A bill to provide for the addition of certain real property to the reservation of the Siletz Tribe in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce a bill that will address the cumbersome and time consuming process under existing law within the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This piece of legislation will streamline the land acquisition process for the Confederated Tribe of Siletz Indians. The current process for taking land into trust is not working, and I believe there are changes that need to be revived in the existing process. I am pleased to be joined by Senator MERKLEY in this effort.

The original Siletz Coastal Treaty Reservation, established by the Executive Order on November 9, 1955 was diminished and then eliminated by the Federal Government's allotment and termination policies. Tribal members and tribal government have worked to rebuild the Siletz community since the Western Oregon Termination Act of August 1954 stripped the Siletz people of Federal tribal recognition, and since then the tribe has been struggling to rebuild its land base. This legislation would work to facilitate the tribe's land into trust process within the original Siletz coast reservation to overcome the chronic Bureau of Indian Affairs, BIA, delay in processing applications. Instead of having two processes to bring each piece of former reservation land back into the reservation after purchase, one to bring the land into trust, and another, to make it reservation land, allows the tribe to combine the process.

In this case, because the original reservation was disassembled, the tribe terminated and provided a very small land base upon restoration, virtually every tract of land the tribe seeks to place into trust today is considered by BIA pursuant to ''off reservation'' procedures. ''Off reservation'' requests would mean that the ''. . . secretary gives greater scrutiny to the tribe's justification of anticipated benefits . . .''

By applying the on-reservation fee-to-trust criteria for lands within the Siletz Tribe's original reservation, this legislation allows the Tribe to take land into trust that will ultimately provide for vital tribal programs such as housing, government administration, and jobs—for both tribal and county residents. In addition, the bill emphasizes the importance and the intent of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934—which allows the Secretary of Interior, in his or her discretion, to take land into trust for the benefit of an Indian tribe or of individual Indians. Essentially, reversing the loss of tribal lands and restoring some of the Tribe's original land base by allowing the Tribe to take land into trust under the same provisions as other Indian tribes within their reservations.

This bill underscores the importance of economic stability and self-determination for the confederated tribe of Siletz Indians and its members. Oregon Tribal communities suffer some of the greatest hurdles, whether it is health care, education, or crime on reservations, this bill would alleviate much of the cost and much needed resources associated with the bureaucratic hoops the tribe has had to jump through for years—which mean a significant savings of time and resources.

As a result of the great working relationships, the Siletz Tribe has approached all six involved counties, and obtained their support. This legislation establishes and confirms a positive and beneficial partnership between the Federal Government, Siletz Tribe and local counties Lincoln, Lane, Tillamook, Yamhill, Benton, and Douglas.

That is why I am introducing—the process has not sped up and we recognize the need for more action. It's always great to see Tribes and local counties work together to come up with proactive, inventive solutions for their communities to tackle challenging economic conditions.

I want to express my thanks to all the citizens and community and tribal leaders who have worked to build their communities. They represent the pioneering spirit and vision that defines my state.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 165—DESIGNATING JULY 23, 2011, AS ''NATIONAL DAY OF THE AMERICAN COWBOY''

Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. Reid of Nevada, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 165

Whereas pioneering men and women, recognized as ''cowboys'', helped establish the American West;

Whereas the cowboy embodies honesty, integrity, courage, compassion, respect, a strong work ethic, and patriotism;

Whereas the cowboy spirit exemplifies strength of character, sound family values, and good common sense;

Whereas the cowboy archetype transcends ethnicity, gender, geographic boundaries, and political affiliations;

Whereas the cowboy is an excellent steward of the land and its creatures, who lives off the land and works to protect and enhance the environment;

Whereas cowboy traditions have been a part of the culture of the United States for generations;

Whereas the cowboy continues to be an important part of the economy through the work of many thousands of ranchers across the Nation who contribute to the economic well-being of every State;

Whereas millions of fans watch professional and working ranch rodeo events annually, and rodeo is one of the most-watched sports in the Nation;

Whereas membership and participation in rodeo and other organizations that promote and encompass the livelihood of cowboys span every generation and transcend race and gender;

Whereas the cowboy is a central figure in literature, film, and music and occupies a central place in the public imagination;

Whereas the cowboy is an icon in the United States; and

Whereas the ongoing contributions made by cowboys and cowgirls to their communities should be recognized and encouraged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 23, 2011, as ''National Day of the American Cowboy''; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 166—COMMEMORATING MAY 8, 2011, AS THE 66TH ANNIVERSARY OF V-E DAY, THE END OF WORLD WAR II IN EUROPE

Mr. JOHANNS (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 166

Whereas on December 11, 1941, 4 days after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Germany and Italy declared war on the United States;

Whereas on November 8, 1942, United States and Allied forces began Operation Torch, the invasion of North Africa;

Whereas German and other Axis forces in North Africa surrendered on May 13, 1943;

Whereas in July of 1943, United States and Allied forces landed in Sicily;

Whereas on September 8, 1943, Italy surrendered to United States and Allied forces, although German troops in Italy continued to fight until May of 1945;

Whereas more than 150,000 Allied soldiers landed in France on June 6, 1944, known thereafter as ''D-Day'';

Whereas on August 25, 1944, United States and Allied forces liberated Paris;

Whereas from mid- to late- December, during the Battle of the Bulge, United States troops heroically resisted a major German offensive in Belgium and France;

Whereas United States troops crossed the Rhine River at Remagen on March 7, 1945;

Whereas Germany surrendered unconditionally to the Western Allies at Reims on May 7, 1945, and to the Soviet Union on May 9, 1945, in Berlin;

Whereas during World War II, an estimated 292,000 members of the United States Armed Forces were killed in action and more than 400,000 members of the United States Armed Forces died; and

Whereas United States President Harry S. Truman declared May 8, 1945, ''V-E day'', the end of World War II in Europe, although war with Japan continued until August 14, 1945: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the historic contribution made by United States veterans of World War II to human liberty and the safety of the United States and its allies;

(2) honors veterans who served in the European Theatre of Operations and elsewhere during World War II;

(3) remembers with gratitude the members of the United States Armed Forces who made the ultimate sacrifice during World War II; and

(4) commemorates May 8, 2011, as the 66th anniversary of V-E Day, the end of World War II in Europe.

SENATE RESOLUTION 167—RECOGNIZING THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MEXICAN HOLIDAY OF CINCO DE MAYO

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 167

Whereas May 5, or ''Cinco de Mayo'' in Spanish, is celebrated each year as a date of great importance by the Mexican and Mexican-American communities;

Whereas the Cinco de Mayo holiday commemorates May 5, 1862, the date on which the Battle of Puebla was fought by Mexicans who were struggling for their independence and freedom;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo has become one of the most famous Mexican national holidays and is celebrated annually by nearly all Mexicans and Mexican-Americans, north and south of the United States-Mexico border;

Whereas the Battle of Puebla was but one of the many battles that the courageous Mexican people won in their long and brave struggle for independence and freedom;

Whereas the French, confident that their battle-seasoned troops were far superior to the almost amateurish Mexican forces, expected little or no opposition from the Mexican army;

Whereas the French army, which had not experienced defeat against any of the finest troops of Europe in more than half a century, sustained a disastrous loss at the hands of an outnumbered, ill-equipped, and ragged, but highly spirited and courageous, Mexican force;

Whereas after three bloody assaults on Puebla in which more than a thousand gallant Frenchmen lost their lives, the French troops were finally defeated and driven back by the outnumbered Mexican troops;

Whereas the courageous and heroic spirit that Mexican General Zaragoza and his men displayed during that historic battle can never be forgotten;

Whereas many brave Mexicans willingly gave their lives for the causes of justice and freedom in the Battle of Puebla on Cinco de Mayo;

Whereas the sacrifice of the Mexican fighters was instrumental in keeping Mexico from falling under European domination;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo serves as a reminder that the foundation of the United States is built by people from many nations and diverse cultures who are willing to fight and die for freedom;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo also serves as a reminder of the close ties between the people of Mexico and the people of the United States;

Whereas in a larger sense, Cinco de Mayo symbolizes the right of a free people to self-determination, just as Benito Juarez once said, ''El respeto al derecho ajeno es la paz'' (''The respect of other people's rights is peace''); and

Whereas many people celebrate during the entire week in which Cinco de Mayo falls: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the historical struggle for independence and freedom of the people of Mexico; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States to observe Cinco de Mayo with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 168—COMMEMORATING AND ACKNOWLEDGING THE DEDICATION AND SACRIFICE MADE BY THE FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS WHO HAVE BEEN KILLED OR INJURED IN THE LINE OF DUTY

Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KOHL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. TESTER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 168

Whereas the well-being of all citizens of the United States is preserved and enhanced as a direct result of the vigilance and dedication of law enforcement personnel;

Whereas more than 900,000 men and women, at great risk to their personal safety, presently serve their fellow citizens as guardians of the peace;

Whereas peace officers are on the front lines in protecting the schools and schoolchildren of the United States;

Whereas in 2010, 158 peace officers across the United States were killed in the line of duty;

Whereas Congress should strongly support initiatives to reduce violent crime and to increase the factors that contribute to the safety of law enforcement officers;

Whereas there are recorded 18,983 Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who lost their lives in the line of duty while protecting their fellow citizens, and whose names are engraved upon the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, District of Columbia;

Whereas in 1962, President John F. Kennedy designated May 15 as National Peace Officers Memorial Day; and

Whereas on May 15, 2011, more than 20,000 peace officers are expected to gather in Washington, District of Columbia, to join with the families of their recently fallen comrades to honor those comrades and all others who went before them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates and acknowledges the dedication and sacrifices made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty;

(2) recognizes May 15, 2011, as ''National Peace Officers Memorial Day''; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate ceremony, solemnity, appreciation, and respect.

SENATE RESOLUTION 169—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY, DOCUMENTS AND LEGAL REPRESENTATION

Mr. LEAHY submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 169

Whereas, in the case of *Social Security Administration v. Charlotte N White*, No. CB–75211–11–0004–T–1, pending before the Merit Systems Protection Board, a subpoena for deposition testimony and document production has been served on Sherae Hunter and a subpoena for deposition testimony has been served on Wes Kungel, both employees in the Office of Senator Mary L. Landrieu;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved that Sherae Hunter and Wes Kungel are authorized to testify and produce documents in *Social Security Administration v. Charlotte N White*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Sherae Hunter, Wes Kungel,

and any other individual in Senator Landrieu's office in this matter.

SENATE RESOLUTION 170—HONORING ADMIRAL THAD ALLEN OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD (RET.) FOR HIS LIFETIME OF SELFLESS COMMITMENT AND EXEMPLARY SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COCHRAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 170

Whereas Admiral Thad Allen, the 23rd Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, retired from the Coast Guard on June 30, 2010, after 39 distinguished years of service;

Whereas Admiral Allen graduated from the United States Coast Guard Academy in 1971 and served in a number of capacities, including serving as the Principal Federal Official for response and recovery operation for Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, Coast Guard Chief of Staff, and most recently as National Incident Commander for the Deepwater Horizon Disaster in the Gulf of Mexico;

Whereas Admiral Allen commanded with distinction the foremost Coast Guard in the world from 2006 to 2010 and has embodied the Coast Guard's enduring values of honor, respect, and devotion to duty;

Whereas Admiral Allen, during his tenure as Commandant, focused the Coast Guard on modernization and improved readiness in responding to natural disasters;

Whereas Admiral Allen, during his tenure as Commandant, worked to ensure the safety of professional mariners and millions of recreational and commercial vessels, facilitate commerce, protect the ports and maritime infrastructure of the United States from terrorism, conduct humanitarian operations, protect our marine environment, secure United States borders, combat drug trafficking, support anti-piracy efforts, and support Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom;

Whereas Admiral Allen demonstrated the vision and transformational leadership that will provide the United States with a Coast Guard that is not only capable of meeting and exceeding the ever-changing maritime challenges of the United States, but also able to better anticipate future challenges and missions;

Whereas Admiral Allen provided steady leadership in times of crisis;

Whereas as Dwight Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States once said, "The qualities of a great man are vision, integrity, courage, understanding, the power of articulation, and profundity of character"; and

Whereas as we bid fair winds and following seas to Admiral Allen, it is appropriate that he be remembered as exemplifying such trademark characteristics exhibited by great leaders: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(a) recognizes and honors Admiral Thad Allen of the United States Coast Guard (retired), on behalf of a grateful Nation, for his lifetime of selfless commitment and exemplary service; and

(b) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to Admiral Thad Allen.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to submit a resolution today to honor the distinguished 39-year career of ADM Thad Allen, retired Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard.

Our Nation's first Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, observed that "a few armed vessels, judiciously stationed at the entrance of our ports, might at a small expense be made useful sentinels of the laws." These words inspired the creation of the modern day U.S. Coast Guard. More than 200 years later, the Coast Guard is today dutifully executing its diverse and challenging missions, demonstrating their dual functionality as both a military service and a law enforcement authority.

Despite limited resources and a broadened scope of responsibility, the Coast Guard has risen to the increased challenges it faces. Time and time again, the men and women of the Coast Guard prove the value of their presence and their important role in protecting the public, as well as the environmental, economic, and security interests of the United States.

For almost four decades, Admiral Allen dedicated himself to these missions and capped his career by providing meritorious leadership to our Nation's oldest continuous seagoing service.

Thad Allen was born and raised in Tucson, AZ. His parents were chief damage controlman Clyde Allen and Wilma Allen. After graduating from the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in 1971, he served in a variety of assignments, eventually becoming Commandant. He often refers to himself as the "unlikely admiral."

It has been said before, and I think it is worth repeating: "When times are at their worst, the Coast Guard is at its best." Admiral Allen deserves credit for providing the leadership skills that allowed that statement to remain true during some of the most difficult times for our Nation in recent years.

I came to know Thad Allen in a time of hardship. My home State of Mississippi and other Gulf Coast States had just experienced two of the deadliest hurricanes in our Nation's history in Katrina and Rita. He was the principal Federal official for response and recovery from those natural disasters. I will never forget the destruction we witnessed—homes, schools, and big oak trees that had stood for decades were completely leveled. But through his efforts and those of the brave men and women throughout the Coast Guard, over 33,500 gulf coast residents were rescued from rooftops and flooded homes.

Admiral Allen proved himself to be a man of not just sterling courage, with compassion to match, but also a man of great integrity and an enormous capacity for hard work. He is a direct reflection of the guardian ethos and an inspiration of those who have had the good fortune to work with him.

Admiral Allen will, of course, be the first to say that the brave men and women throughout the ranks of the Coast Guard are the ones who deserve the credit for success. He has made a habit of openly praising their sacrifice and often thankless service.

Today, I am proud to say that my State, due in part to his leadership and those Coast Guard men and women who have served under him, has made a great deal of progress in recovering from the most severe natural disasters in our Nation's history.

As the Coast Guard's motto is "Semper Paratus"—always ready—Admiral Allen is an embodiment of that motto. We do not need to look back too far to find an example, most recently, when the President selected him to serve as national incident commander in the wake of the Deepwater Horizon oilspill in the Gulf of Mexico. Admiral Allen stood ready and provided resolute leadership, overseeing the Federal Government's response efforts and remaining on Active Duty for an additional 3 months past his slated retirement.

In Mississippi, we are grateful for the service and leadership of ADM Thad Allen, which will be long remembered and appreciated. I know the admiral and his family will enjoy the new opportunities that come with retirement, in addition to a well-earned respite from the demands and challenges of his exemplary career in the U.S. Coast Guard.

SENATE RESOLUTION 171—RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING NATIONAL TRAIN DAY ON MAY 7, 2011

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 171

Whereas Amtrak was founded on May 1, 1971, bringing together the passenger train operations of 20 separate rail companies;

Whereas Amtrak is celebrating its 40th anniversary of providing passenger rail service to the country;

Whereas Amtrak introduced high-speed Acela Express service, the fastest train in North America, to the Northeast Corridor in 2000;

Whereas Amtrak ridership increased in each of the 17 months between November 2009 and March 2011;

Whereas in 2011, Amtrak will send an "exhibit train" to travel the country with educational exhibits and historical styling to showcase the railroad's history to the public;

Whereas Amtrak trains and infrastructure carry commuters to and from work in congested metropolitan areas, providing a reliable rail option and reducing congestion on roads and in the skies;

Whereas for many rural Americans, Amtrak represents the only major intercity transportation link to the rest of the country;

Whereas passenger trains provide a more fuel-efficient transportation system, cleaner transportation alternatives, and energy security;

Whereas on a per-passenger-mile basis, intercity passenger rail was 25 percent more energy efficient than airplanes and 30 percent more energy efficient than automobiles in 2008;

Whereas Amtrak provided intercity passenger rail travel to 28,700,000 Americans in 46 States during fiscal year 2010;

Whereas community railroad stations are a source of civic pride, a gateway to over 500 of our Nation's communities, and a tool for economic growth;

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports the goals and ideals of National Train Day, as designated by Amtrak.

SENATE RESOLUTION 172—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF CANCER RESEARCH AND THE CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY SCIENTISTS AND CLINICIANS ACROSS THE UNITED STATES WHO ARE DEDICATED TO FINDING A CURE FOR CANCER, AND DESIGNATING MAY 2011, AS ''NATIONAL CANCER RESEARCH MONTH''

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KIRK, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. MORAN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 172

Whereas in 2011, cancer remains one of the most pressing public health concerns in the United States, with 1,500,000 Americans expected to be diagnosed with cancer and more than 500,000 expected to die from the disease;

Whereas the term ''cancer'' refers to more than 200 diseases that collectively represent the leading cause of death for Americans under age 85, and the second leading cause of death for Americans overall;

Whereas the national investment in cancer research has yielded substantial returns in research advances and lives saved, with a scholarly estimate that every 1 percent decline in cancer mortality saves the United States economy $500,000,000,000;

Whereas advancements in the understanding of the causes, mechanisms, diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of cancer have led to cures for many types of cancers and have converted other types of cancers into manageable chronic conditions;

Whereas the 5-year survival rate for all cancers has improved during the 30 years prior to the date of approval of this resolution to more than 65 percent, and as of 2011, there are more than 12,000,000 cancer survivors living in the United States;

Whereas partnerships with research scientists and the general public, survivors and patient advocates, philanthropic organizations, industry, and Federal, State, and local governments have led to advanced breakthroughs, early detection tools that have increased survival rates, and a better quality of life for cancer survivors; and

Whereas advances in cancer research have had significant implications for the treatment of other costly diseases such as diabetes, heart disease, Alzheimer's disease, HIV/AIDS, and macular degeneration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the importance of cancer research and the invaluable contributions of the researchers in the United States and worldwide and who are dedicated to reversing the cancer epidemic;

(2) designates May 2011, as ''National Cancer Research Month''; and

(3) supports efforts to make cancer research a national and international priority so that one day the more than 200 diseases known as cancer are eliminated.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 15—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF WORLD MALARIA DAY, AND REAFFIRMING UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP AND SUPPORT FOR EFFORTS TO COMBAT MALARIA AS A CRITICAL COMPONENT OF THE PRESIDENT'S GLOBAL HEALTH INITIATIVE

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 15

Whereas April 25th of each year is recognized internationally as World Malaria Day;

Whereas malaria is a leading cause of death and disease in many developing countries, despite being completely preventable and treatable;

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 35 countries, the majority of them in sub-Saharan Africa, account for 98 percent of global malaria deaths;

Whereas young children and pregnant women are particularly vulnerable and disproportionately affected by malaria;

Whereas malaria greatly affects child health, with estimates that children under the age of 5 account for 85 percent of malaria deaths each year;

Whereas malaria poses great risks to maternal health, causing complications during delivery, anemia, and low birth weights, with estimates that malaria infection causes 400,000 cases of severe maternal anemia and from 75,000 to 200,000 infant deaths annually in sub-Saharan Africa;

Whereas heightened national, regional, and international efforts to prevent and treat malaria over recent years have made measurable progress and have helped save hundreds of thousands of lives;

Whereas the World Health Organization's World Malaria Report 2010 reports that in 2010, more African households (42 percent) owned at least one insecticide-treated mosquito net (ITN), more children under 5 years of age (35 percent) were using an ITN compared to previous years, and household ITN ownership reached more than 50 percent in 19 African countries;

Whereas the World Health Organization's World Malaria Report 2010 further states that a total of 11 countries and one area in the African Region showed a reduction of more than 50 percent in either confirmed malaria cases or malaria admissions and deaths in recent years (Algeria, Botswana, Cape Verde, Eritrea, Madagascar, Namibia, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia, and Zanzibar, United Republic of Tanzania), and that in all countries, the decreases are associated with intense malaria control interventions;

Whereas continued national, regional, and international investment is critical to continue to reduce malaria deaths and to prevent backsliding in those areas where progress has been made;

Whereas the United States Government has played a major leadership role in the recent progress made toward reducing the global burden of malaria, particularly through the President's Malaria Initiative (PMI) and the United States contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria;

Whereas, on World Malaria Day in 2009, President Barack Obama stated, ''The U.S. stands with our global partners and people around the world to reaffirm our commitment to make the U.S. a leader in ending deaths from malaria by 2015. . . It is time to redouble our efforts to rid the world of a disease that does not have to take lives.'';

Whereas, under the Global Health Initiative (GHI), the United States Government is pursuing a comprehensive, whole-of-government approach to global health, focused on helping partner countries to achieve major improvements in overall health outcomes through transformational advances in access to, and the quality of, healthcare services in resource-poor settings; and

Whereas recognizing the burden of malaria on many partner countries, PMI has set the target for 2015 of reducing the burden of malaria by 50 percent for 450,000,000 people, representing 70 percent of the at-risk population in Africa: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day, including the achievable target of ending malaria deaths by 2015;

(2) recognizes the importance of reducing malaria prevalence and deaths to improve overall child and maternal health, especially in sub-Saharan Africa;

(3) commends the recent progress made toward reducing global malaria deaths and prevalence, particularly through the efforts of the President's Malaria Initiative and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria;

(4) welcomes ongoing public-private partnerships to research and develop more effective and affordable tools for malaria diagnosis, treatment, and vaccination;

(5) reaffirms the goals and commitments to combat malaria in the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–293);

(6) supports continued leadership and investment by the United States in bilateral and multilateral efforts to combat malaria as a critical part of the President's Global Health Initiative; and

(7) encourages other members of the international community to sustain and scale up their support and financial contributions for efforts worldwide to combat malaria.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 318. Mr. REID (for Mr. PAUL) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 158, congratulating the students, parents, teachers, and administrators of charter schools across the United States for ongoing contributions to education, and supporting the ideals and goals of the 12th annual National Charter Schools Week.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 318. Mr. REID (for Mr. PAUL) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 158, congratulating the students, parents, teachers, and administrators of charter schools across the United States for ongoing contributions to education, and supporting the ideals and goals of the 12th annual National Charter Schools Week; as follows:

Strike the 14th whereas clause.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests. The hearing will be held on Wednesday, May 18, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the following bills:

S. 220, to provide for the restoration of forest landscapes, protection of old growth forests, and management of national forests in the eastside forests of the State of Oregon;

S. 270, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Deschutes County, Oregon;

S. 271, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a property conveyance with the city of Wallowa, Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 278, to provide for the exchange of certain land located in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes;

S. 292, to resolve the claims of the Bering Straits Native Corporation and the State of Alaska to land adjacent to Salmon Lake in the State of Alaska and to provide for the conveyance to the Bering Straits Native Corporation of certain other public land in partial satisfaction of the land entitlement of the Corporation under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act;

S. 322, to expand the Alpine Lakes Wilderness in the State of Washington, to designate the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River and Pratt River as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes;

S. 382, to amend the National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986 to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture regarding additional recreational uses of National Forest System land that is subject to ski area permits, and for other purposes;

S. 427, to withdraw certain land located in Clark County, Nevada, from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws and disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials, and for other purposes;

S. 526, to provide for the conveyance of certain Bureau of Land Management land in Mohave County, Arizona, to the Arizona Game and Fish Commission, for use as a public shooting range;

S. 566, to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System;

S. 590, to convey certain submerged lands to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in order to give that territory the same benefits in its submerged lands as Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa have in their submerged lands;

S. 607, to designate certain land in the State of Oregon as wilderness, to provide for the exchange of certain Federal land and non-Federal land, and for other purposes;

S. 617, to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Elko County, Nevada, and to take land into trust for the Te-moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada, and for other purposes;

S. 683, to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of land to the town of Mantua, Utah;

S. 684, to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of land to the town of Alta, Utah;

S. 667, to establish the Rio Grande del Norte National Conservation Area in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

S. 729, to validate final patent number 27–2005–0081, and for other purposes;

S. 766, to provide for the designation of the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Area in the State of Oregon, to designate segments of Wasson and Franklin Creeks in the State of Oregon as wild rivers, and for other purposes;

S. 896, to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans; help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational and scenic resources; train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts; and promote the value of public service; and

S. 897, to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to clarify that uncertified States and Indian tribes have the authority to use certain payments for certain noncoal reclamation projects.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510–6150, or by email to allison_seyferth@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Scott Miller or Allison Seyferth.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests. The hearing will be held on Wednesday, May 25, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the following bills:

S. 233, to withdraw certain Federal land and interests in that land from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws and disposition under the mineral and geothermal leasing laws;

S. 375, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with State foresters authorizing State foresters to provide certain forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration and protection services;

S. 714, to reauthorize the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 730, to provide for the settlement of certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510–6150, or by email to allison_seyferth@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Scott Miller or Allison Seyferth.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 5, 2011, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Legislative Proposals in the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development's FY 2012 Budget.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. 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 May 5, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. 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 May 5, 2011, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 5, 2011, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Assessing U.S. Policy and its Limits in Pakistan.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. 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, to conduct a hearing entitled ''First, Do Not Harm: Improving Health Quality and Patient Safety'' on May 5, 2011, at 10 a.m., in 430 Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 5, 2011, at 2:15 p.m. in room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Stolen Identities: The Impact of Racist Stereotypes on Indigenous People.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on May 5, 2011, at 10 a.m., in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISASTER RECOVERY AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Disaster Recovery and Intergovernmental Affairs of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 5, 2011, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Understanding the Power of Social Media as a Communication Tool in the Aftermath of Disasters.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 5, 2011, at 9:45 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, CUSTOMS, AND GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness of the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 5, 2011, at 2 p.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Enforcing America's Trade Laws in the Face of Customs Fraud and Duty Evasion.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE: PUBLIC FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REPORTS

The filing date for the 2010 Public Financial Disclosure reports is Monday, May 16, 2011. Senators, political fund designees and staff members whose salaries exceed 120 percent of the GS–15 pay scale must file reports.

Public Financial Disclosure reports should be submitted to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510.

The Public Records office will be open from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on the filing date to accept these filings. For further information, please contact the Public Records office.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JAMES MICHAEL COLE TO BE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 62.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of James Michael Cole, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk. I ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of James Michael Cole, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Herb Kohl, Dianne Feinstein, Al Franken, Christopher A. Coons, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Sheldon Whitehouse, Sherrod Brown, Mark Udall, Richard J. Durbin, Thomas R. Carper, Bernard Sanders, John D. Rockefeller IV, Jeanne Shaheen, Charles E. Schumer.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 61; that there be 3 hours of debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on Calendar No. 61; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITION OF CONFEREE—H.R. 658

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator ISAKSON be added as a conferee for the FAA reauthorization bill, H.R. 658.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING THE STUDENTS, PARENTS, TEACHERS, AND ADMINISTRATORS OF CHARTER SCHOOLS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 158 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 158) congratulating the students, parents, teachers, and administrators of charter schools across the United States for ongoing contributions to education, and supporting the ideals and goals of the 12th annual National Charter Schools Week.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise to make a few brief remarks about the fact that this week we are celebrating National Charter Schools Week in America and in the Senate. I am pleased to join my colleague, LAMAR ALEXANDER, in cosponsoring this resolution, which I hope will be hotlined tonight, and that means passed unanimously without the need to bring it to the floor for debate because there are so many Members of the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans, who recognize the value of high-quality charter schools and the difference they are making in the advancement of education reform and the extraordinary achievements being reached by students and teachers in communities because of them.

I wish to make a brief statement on the Senate floor and then share some interesting and exciting statistics from my own experience in the city of New Orleans, which is the city that has the highest percentage of children in charter schools in America today.

As a parent of two precious and delightful children, I know firsthand the value of a quality education to secure their futures. Many American families are fortunate to live in places where public schools provide engaging and effective instruction and a culture of achievement that inspires students to aim high and thrive. Other families have the financial means to provide their children with a top-notch private school education. The Presiding Officer knows, whether it is in Missouri or Louisiana or Texas or right here in DC, that education can be quite expensive in our top private elementary and secondary schools in our country. Sometimes tuition can reach up to $25,000 a year and beyond. As hard as that might be for some to believe, that is true. Unfortunately, too many Americans are left without either option for their children, and their children are falling through the cracks. This cannot continue if America is going to maintain a leadership role and produce young adults who have the knowledge and skills to compete and win in this new worldwide marketplace.

Fortunately, in a growing number of communities, including several in Louisiana and particularly in New Orleans, there is another exciting option for parents and students: high quality public charter schools.

This week, as I said, we celebrate the 12th annual National Charter School Week. It is a good time to take stock of how successful many charter schools have been and what we can do to replicate them across the country and, more importantly, what we can do to improve them; what we can do to eliminate poor charter schools and strengthen the great ones and make the good ones even better. Charter schools are public schools that receive public funding and serve the same neighborhood students as traditional public schools.

Currently, it may surprise people to know there are over 5,000 charter schools in our country serving more than 1.6 million children. These schools are required to meet the academic student achievement accountability requirements under all of our laws and in the same manner as traditional public schools. However, they differ from traditional public schools in several important ways. Charter schools operate free from many of the district rules and regulations so they have more freedom to innovate, to experiment, to explore, to think outside of the box, to try new approaches. Charter schools have autonomy in areas such as the length of the school day and year, as well as principal and teacher recruitment, selection, and development. With this freedom, however, comes greater accountability for improved student achievement. Unlike public schools in many places, charter schools that aren't successful can actually lose their charter, be forced to close, or be forced to transition to a new model. There are countless examples of high-performing charter schools that are producing impressive results, and they continue to show that our students, including—and most importantly—our low-income and minority students and disadvantaged students can and are rising to great academic heights.

In my home State of Louisiana, there are 90 public charter schools, including 61 in the city of New Orleans, representing almost 72 percent of our city's student population—a higher proportion than any other school system in the United States. The city's Sci Academy is one remarkable example of a successful charter school, and I had the great pleasure to skype with some of their students earlier this morning.

Sci Academy opened in 2008 with 90 ninth graders entering a rigorous and inspiring environment. More than half of the ninth graders who entered Sci Academy's inaugural class had failed State promotional performance tests, and more than 70 percent read well below the ninth grade level. Many of these students had missed a full year of school because of Hurricane Katrina and were significantly behind other students of their age.

Incredibly, that same freshman class later scored 76 percent on our State's test, making it the third most successful high school in New Orleans. The other high schools that beat it out actually had selective enrollment. What is extraordinary about Sci Academy is that it is open enrollment, focusing on the quality of teachers and the quality of teaching. It is remarkable.

Right here in the District of Columbia—and I am proud to have had a hand in the development of this in the District of Columbia as a former chair of a subcommittee and a partner with ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and others who have worked so hard with the District on its reform efforts—charter schools are an integral part of improving educational outcomes in this city, our Nation's Capital.

Starting with two small campuses in 1996, DC public charter schools now educate almost 40 percent of the school-aged children in the District, and they are serving the highest percentage of low-income and minority students in the city's most economically disadvantaged neighborhoods. DC's public charter schools outperform the city's traditional public schools from the fifth grade up, and they graduate 84 percent of their students—higher than both the city and the national average.

Where quality charter schools exist, parents have real choices, exciting choices, and they are overwhelmingly choosing public charter schools. Many of these schools have long waiting lists. In fact, more than 50 percent of charter schools report having waiting lists, and the total number of students on these waiting lists is enough to fill more than 1,100 average-sized charter schools—quite a number on these waiting lists.

Over the past 17 years, Congress has provided $1.6 billion in funding to the promising charter school movement throughout the country through grants for planning, program design, initial implementation, replication, expansion, dissemination, evaluation, and for improving facilities. Our efforts at the national level are beginning to show real results. Maintaining and increasing where possible funding for charter schools is a winning proposition for parents, for students, for their teachers, for our community, and, may I say, for our Nation, for our workforce of the future, and for our economic security.

Make no mistake. America will only go as far as our collective talent and ability will take her. Our future will continue to be shaped by how well we prepare today's students for tomorrow's challenges. Parents who are doing everything they can to give their children an opportunity for success deserve not only a quality choice but a solution to the challenges of our educational system. Successful charter schools provide that choice, and in many areas they provide the solution. Now it is time to make them a central component of our educational strategy all over the country.

Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER and I are pleased to chair the charter caucus in the Senate, to join with President Obama and Secretary Arne Duncan in a focus on quality education for all children in America. President Obama and Secretary Duncan often say charter schools are one tool, not the only tool, to get us from failing and mediocre public schools to great and exciting public schools in our country that are making a real difference.

I wish to share some extraordinary results that were given to me just this week as I hosted a roundtable with staffers and Senators about the accomplishments of charter schools. This comes from a wonderful group in New Orleans, New Schools for New Orleans,

that is one of the leaders in the charter school movement nationally. They are helping the city of New Orleans and many of our organizations, in partnership with all sorts of funders and philanthropies, and the city of New Orleans, the mayor, and the city council, and others who are so supportive of what is going on. Our universities, I might say, including the University of New Orleans, Tulane University, Dillard, and Xavier have also been on the forefront of this movement as well.

Let me share these results because they are quite extraordinary. This chart shows that in 2005, 62 percent of students in the city of New Orleans—not 15 percent, not 20 percent, but 62 percent—were academically unacceptable. Based on standards set by our State and by the Federal Government, in 2005 basically 62 percent of all the students in New Orleans were failing. They were not up to just basic educational levels in reading and math.

We had a terrible event happen, as many people will remember. In 2005 we had Hurricanes Katrina and Rita and the crashing of our levee system, the failing of our levee system, and 100 of our 146 public schools were virtually destroyed and remain unusable. Through the great efforts of local leaders, State leaders, and Federal leaders, and with FEMA's help and some new, out-of-the-box thinking, we were able to pool the money the Federal Government was going to reimburse each individual school and present one check to the city of New Orleans and the school board and the recovery district, and we have been building a new school system ever since. Charter schools are the foundation of that rebuilding.

It is quite extraordinary that in only 5 years, when you look at the same population, virtually—there have been some families who have not yet come back, but they are on their way; there have been some families who left and are not coming back—it is a population still of a great number of minority students and disadvantaged and lower middle-class students, as well as middle-class and some wealthy students in our public school system, and we have moved from 62 percent unacceptable to only 17 percent unacceptable in 5 years. I do not know of any other group of schools anywhere in the country that has made such remarkable gains. So when people question, do charter schools work, let me say that the evidence is in. Quality charter schools work. In every place they exist, they outperform even their suburban counterparts and in large measure suburban counterpart public schools that are among some of the best.

Many of these charter schools are in rural areas where there is not a lot of opportunity for White, Black, Hispanic, or Asian kids. Some of them are in intercities that do not have the same opportunities.

We, again, have taken 62 percent of our population who were underperforming and now it is only 17 percent.

As it says on this chart, I have in the Chamber, the New Orleans students' test scores demonstrate the first significant improvement in the city's history—a 30-percent increase—and, finally, closing the achievement gap between New Orleans' schools and State schools by more than 50 percent.

A Thomas B. Fordham Institute study ranked 30 major cities on six critical reform categories. New Orleans, I am proud to say, was ranked the No. 1 reform-friendly city in the country, followed by Washington, DC, New York, Denver, and Jacksonville.

But the great news is that there are cities and counties and States waking up to the exciting opportunities of education reform. We know that in America today, it should be unacceptable in some of our communities where 50, 60, 70 percent of our children are failing to get out of high school. We should be ashamed that even when some of our children walk across that stage and get that diploma that signifies they have graduated, they are leaving truly, in many places, without the skills to get the job that will give them a living or saving wage because our schools have been handing out diplomas that are not worth the paper on which they are written. That has to come to an end. That is what we are fighting for. That is what charter schools help us to do.

Now, is it possible for public schools that are not charters to achieve this success? Yes. And that is also happening. But I found in my own experience, trying to work with a system that was unwilling to make too much change, that charter schools provide the kind of competition and spark and challenge to an otherwise system that is run by a monopoly. This provides a diverse set of providers to education. It encourages new kinds of educators to come in as teachers. It gives the schools the freedom they need to make it work for the students who walk through that front door and want so desperately to walk across that stage with a diploma that means something and a future ahead of them.

I am proud to help lead this effort here in the Senate. I thank my colleagues for supporting this effort for the 12th year—a resolution commending high-quality charter schools in America.

Let me say in conclusion that we are not resting on our laurels. I have introduced a bill, along with others. Senator DURBIN and Senator KIRK have introduced a companion bill, if you will. Both bills are in an effort to take the bar even higher, to say to the country: Let's get rid of our low-performing charter schools. Let's focus on strengthening the authorizers of these charter schools. We do not want authorizers out there who are giving out charters to run schools to people who have no idea what they are doing.

We do not want this movement to fail. We want this movement—we know it can be successful. We know it can be a real choice for parents. Think about it. Think about the value of a quality education. If you have to pay for it in the private sector, you are paying $25,000 to $30,000 a year in some of our communities. Maybe you are lucky enough to be in a Catholic school, an Episcopal school, where the tuition is subsidized and you can get the student in and out for $6,000 to $10,000 a year, but for many families with four children or five children, that is out of reach. They cannot possibly afford that. So having quality public schools is essential in every community in our country.

I believe that if we can do this in New Orleans, which is one of the poorest cities—not the poorest, but we struggle, as you know, in the city of New Orleans; we have a very broad demographic population—if we can do it here, trust me, it can be done anywhere with political will and with the support of your State and local governments, and, of course, the Federal Government.

So I am pleased to cosponsor the ALL-STAR bill, which is a grant program for growth and replication of high-quality charter schools, and to have introduced my own bill, the Charter School Quality Act. I am going to be working very closely with Senator HARKIN, who has been open in many ways to these new ideas, and working with him as we authorize the Elementary and Secondary Act, and be reminded of the great success charter schools are having.

Ultimately, we would like to have 100 percent of the public schools in the city of New Orleans be charters, with some of the most exciting charter providers, some of the best in the world operating our schools, challenging our kids, giving parents real choices where they want to send their kids based on the personalities of the children and the desires and dreams of that family. That is really what America is all about—competition, choice, and opportunity. We just are not quite doing enough in this regard in our country today. But perhaps the success of this movement can show us a way forward.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I hope we can get that resolution adopted without further delay tonight. Again, I wish to congratulate everyone who has worked so hard on making this National Charter School Week a success here in DC, in our Nation's Capital, and around our country.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the amendment to the preamble which is at the desk be agreed to, the preamble, as amended, be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 318) was agreed to, as follows:

Strike the 14th whereas clause.

The resolution (S. Res. 158) was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

S. RES. 158

Whereas charter schools deliver high-quality public education and challenge all students to reach their potential;

Whereas charter schools promote innovation and excellence in public education;

Whereas charter schools provide thousands of families with diverse and innovative educational options for their children;

Whereas charter schools are public schools authorized by a designated public entity that—

(1) respond to the needs of communities, families, and students in the United States; and

(2) promote the principles of quality, accountability, choice, and innovation;

Whereas in exchange for flexibility and autonomy, charter schools are held accountable by their sponsors for improving student achievement and for the financial and other operations of the charter schools;

Whereas 40 States, the District of Columbia, and Guam have passed laws authorizing charter schools;

Whereas in 2011, close to 5,000 charter schools are serving more than 1,600,000 children;

Whereas in the past 17 fiscal years, Congress has provided a total of more than $2,600,000,000 in financial assistance to the charter school movement through grants for planning, program design, initial implementation, replication, expansion, dissemination, evaluation, and facilities;

Whereas numerous charter schools improve the achievements of students and stimulate improvement in traditional public schools;

Whereas charter schools are required to meet the student achievement accountability requirements under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) in the same manner as traditional public schools;

Whereas charter schools often set higher and additional individual goals than the requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) to ensure that charter schools are of high quality and truly accountable to the public;

Whereas charter schools—

(1) give parents the freedom to choose public schools;

(2) routinely measure parental satisfaction levels; and

(3) must prove their ongoing success to parents, policymakers, and the communities served by the charter schools;

Whereas more than 50 percent of charter schools report having a waiting list, and the total number of students on all such waiting lists is enough to fill more than 1,100 average-sized charter schools;

Whereas the 12th annual National Charter Schools Week is scheduled to be held May 1, through May 7, 2011: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the students, parents, teachers, and administrators of charter schools across the United States for—

(A) ongoing contributions to education;

(B) the impressive strides made in closing the persistent academic achievement gap in the United States; and

(C) improving and strengthening the public school system in the United States;

(2) supports the ideals and goals of the 12th annual National Charter Schools Week, a week-long celebration to be held May 1 through May 7, 2011, in communities throughout the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to hold appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities during National Charter Schools Week to demonstrate support for charter schools.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed en bloc to the following resolutions which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 166, 167, 168, and 169.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

S. RES. 168

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased the Senate has once again passed a resolution commemorating our Nation's law enforcement officers and National Peace Officers Memorial Day. The Senate's official recognition of National Peace Officers Memorial Day is a tradition I am proud to support each year.

In 2010, 158 law enforcement officers died while serving in the line of duty. We honor their memory. Each year, we commemorate the bravery of the many law enforcement officers and peace officers who deserve our thanks and support. National Peace Officers Memorial Day is an opportunity to recommit ourselves to provide them with the tools they need to stay safe and to do their jobs as effectively as they can.

There are more than 900,000 men and women at work protecting our communities, our schools, and our children. They investigate and apprehend the most violent criminals and strive to keep our communities safe and secure. Since the first recorded police death in 1792, the names of 18,983 law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice have been added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial.

National Peace Officers Memorial Day provides the people of the United States, in their communities, in their State capitals, and in the Nation's Capital, with the opportunity to honor and reflect on the extraordinary service and sacrifice year after year by those members of our police forces. More than 20,000 peace officers are expected to gather in Washington in the days leading up to May 15 to join with the families of their fallen comrades. It is right that the Senate show its respect on this occasion, and I am proud to honor their service and their memory.

S. RES. 169

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a request for testimony and documents in an action before the Merit Systems Protection Board brought by the Social Security Administration against an administrative law judge in SSA. Among the matters for which SSA has brought this action against the administrative law judge is conduct by that administrative judge during a visit with staff in the office of Senator LANDRIEU in April 2009.

Counsel for the administrative law judge against whom the action is brought has subpoenaed for deposition two employees of Senator LANDRIEU's office and also sought by subpoena the production of documents from Senator LANDRIEU's office.

Senator LANDRIEU would like to cooperate and make the employees available for depositions. Accordingly, this resolution would authorize Sherae Hunter and Wes Kungel, the subpoenaed employees in Senator LANDRIEU's office, to testify at depositions in this matter. The resolution would also authorize production of relevant documents sought by subpoena, except where a privilege should be asserted, and would authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel of the two subpoenaed employees.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc, that there be no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to these matters be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

The resolutions, with their preambles, read as follows:

S. RES. 166

(Commemorating May 8, 2011, as the 66th anniversary of V-E Day, the end of World War II in Europe)

Whereas on December 11, 1941, 4 days after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Germany and Italy declared war on the United States;

Whereas on November 8, 1942, United States and Allied forces began Operation Torch, the invasion of North Africa;

Whereas German and other Axis forces in North Africa surrendered on May 13, 1943;

Whereas in July of 1943, United States and Allied forces landed in Sicily;

Whereas on September 8, 1943, Italy surrendered to United States and Allied forces, although German troops in Italy continued to fight until May of 1945;

Whereas more than 150,000 Allied soldiers landed in France on June 6, 1944, known thereafter as ''D-Day'';

Whereas on August 25, 1944, United States and Allied forces liberated Paris;

Whereas from mid- to late- December, during the Battle of the Bulge, United States troops heroically resisted a major German offensive in Belgium and France;

Whereas United States troops crossed the Rhine River at Remagen on March 7, 1945;

Whereas Germany surrendered unconditionally to the Western Allies at Reims on May 7, 1945, and to the Soviet Union on May 9, 1945, in Berlin;

Whereas during World War II, an estimated 292,000 members of the United States Armed Forces were killed in action and more than 400,000 members of the United States Armed Forces died; and

Whereas United States President Harry S. Truman declared May 8, 1945, ''V-E day'', the end of World War II in Europe, although war with Japan continued until August 14, 1945: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the historic contribution made by United States veterans of World War II to human liberty and the safety of the United States and its allies;

(2) honors veterans who served in the European Theatre of Operations and elsewhere during World War II;

(3) remembers with gratitude the members of the United States Armed Forces who made the ultimate sacrifice during World War II; and

(4) commemorates May 8, 2011, as the 66th anniversary of V-E Day, the end of World War II in Europe.

S. RES. 167

(Recognizing the historical significance of the Mexican holiday of Cinco de Mayo)

Whereas May 5, or ''Cinco de Mayo'' in Spanish, is celebrated each year as a date of great importance by the Mexican and Mexican-American communities;

Whereas the Cinco de Mayo holiday commemorates May 5, 1862, the date on which the Battle of Puebla was fought by Mexicans who were struggling for their independence and freedom;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo has become one of the most famous Mexican national holidays and is celebrated annually by nearly all Mexicans and Mexican-Americans, north and south of the United States-Mexico border;

Whereas the Battle of Puebla was but one of the many battles that the courageous Mexican people won in their long and brave struggle for independence and freedom;

Whereas the French, confident that their battle-seasoned troops were far superior to the almost amateurish Mexican forces, expected little or no opposition from the Mexican army;

Whereas the French army, which had not experienced defeat against any of the finest troops of Europe in more than half a century, sustained a disastrous loss at the hands of an outnumbered, ill-equipped, and ragged, but highly spirited and courageous, Mexican force;

Whereas after three bloody assaults on Puebla in which more than a thousand gallant Frenchmen lost their lives, the French troops were finally defeated and driven back by the outnumbered Mexican troops;

Whereas the courageous and heroic spirit that Mexican General Zaragoza and his men displayed during that historic battle can never be forgotten;

Whereas many brave Mexicans willingly gave their lives for the causes of justice and freedom in the Battle of Puebla on Cinco de Mayo;

Whereas the sacrifice of the Mexican fighters was instrumental in keeping Mexico from falling under European domination;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo serves as a reminder that the foundation of the United States is built by people from many nations and diverse cultures who are willing to fight and die for freedom;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo also serves as a reminder of the close ties between the people of Mexico and the people of the United States;

Whereas in a larger sense, Cinco de Mayo symbolizes the right of a free people to self-determination, just as Benito Juarez once said, ''El respeto al derecho ajeno es la paz'' (''The respect of other people's rights is peace''); and

Whereas many people celebrate during the entire week in which Cinco de Mayo falls: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the historical struggle for independence and freedom of the people of Mexico; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States to observe Cinco de Mayo with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

S. RES. 168

(Commemorating and acknowledging the dedication and sacrifice made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty)

Whereas the well-being of all citizens of the United States is preserved and enhanced as a direct result of the vigilance and dedication of law enforcement personnel;

Whereas more than 900,000 men and women, at great risk to their personal safety, presently serve their fellow citizens as guardians of the peace;

Whereas peace officers are on the front lines in protecting the schools and schoolchildren of the United States;

Whereas in 2010, 158 peace officers across the United States were killed in the line of duty;

Whereas Congress should strongly support initiatives to reduce violent crime and to increase the factors that contribute to the safety of law enforcement officers;

Whereas there are recorded 18,983 Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who lost their lives in the line of duty while protecting their fellow citizens, and whose names are engraved upon the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, District of Columbia;

Whereas in 1962, President John F. Kennedy designated May 15 as National Peace Officers Memorial Day; and

Whereas on May 15, 2011, more than 20,000 peace officers are expected to gather in Washington, District of Columbia, to join with the families of their recently fallen comrades to honor those comrades and all others who went before them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates and acknowledges the dedication and sacrifices made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty;

(2) recognizes May 15, 2011, as ''National Peace Officers Memorial Day''; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate ceremony, solemnity, appreciation, and respect.

S. RES. 169

(To authorize testimony, documents and legal representation)

Whereas, in the case of *Social Security Administration* v. *Charlotte N. White*, No. CB–75211–11–0004–T–1, pending before the Merit Systems Protection Board, a subpoena for deposition testimony and document production has been served on Sherae Hunter and a subpoena for deposition testimony has been served on Wes Kungel, both employees in the Office of Senator Mary L. Landrieu;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Sherae Hunter and Wes Kungel are authorized to testify and produce documents in *Social Security Administration* v. *Charlotte N. White*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Sherae Hunter, Wes Kungel, and any other individual in Senator Landrieu's office in this matter.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 100–696, appoints and reappoints the following Senators as members of the United States Capitol Preservation Commission: the Honorable RICHARD J. DURBIN of Illinois (reappointment), and the Honorable BEN NELSON of Nebraska (appointment) vice the Honorable MARY L. LANDRIEU of Louisiana.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 3

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I believe there is a bill at the desk due for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions and to provide conscience protections, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read a second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 9, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, May 9; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for debate only until 4:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 62, and there be 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my colleague, who is a Member of the House of Representatives, DEAN HELLER, will, on Monday, at 2 o'clock p.m., be sworn in as a Senator representing the State

of Nevada. It will take place in this Chamber at 2 o'clock, as I indicated.

The next rollcall vote will be at 5:30 p.m. on Monday. That vote will be a cloture vote on the nomination of James Cole, to be Deputy Attorney General.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 9, 2011, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:15 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 9, 2011, at 2 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING CHANCELLOR HOWARD COHEN AND PATRICIA COHEN

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I stand before you today to honor Purdue University Calumet (PUC) Chancellor, Dr. Howard Cohen and his wife, Patricia Cohen. On Saturday, May 7, 2011, Chancellor and Patti Cohen will be honored at an event for their many years of service in the field of education at Purdue University Calumet. Chancellor Cohen, with the support of Patti, has had a tremendous impact on numerous students and educators throughout Northwest Indiana and across the nation and their efforts are to be highly commended.

From 2001 to 2010, Patricia Cohen's commitment and partnership in support of her husband has been instrumental in the growth and development of Purdue University Calumet. Patti graduated summa cum laude with a bachelor's degree in nursing from the University of Wisconsin and also earned a master's degree in occupational therapy from Boston University. With her background in the medical field, Patti continues to share her knowledge with PUC and is a member of the PUC Honorary Nursing Organization: Sigma Theta Tau, Bet Mu Chapter. She is also a past member of the PUC Health and Wellness Committee. In addition, Patti has represented PUC on trips to universities in China, Poland, Spain, Oman, and Costa Rica. She has also established, planned, and hosted numerous campus and community events.

Howard Cohen is among less than a handful of academicians who I have dealt with over the last generation who I would describe as the ''best.'' Howard has used his inestimable intellect to impart wisdom to others. His leadership has introduced permanent positive changes throughout Northwest Indiana and our state. His vision has provided all of us with a guide to an improved and gentler future.

Additionally, Chancellor Cohen's professional and academic career led him to become a prominent, innovative leader in the field of education. In 1966, he graduated summa cum laude with a bachelor's degree in philosophy from the University of Minnesota and went on to earn a master's degree and a doctoral degree from Harvard University. Since 2001, Dr. Howard Cohen has been Chancellor at PUC and also holds an appointment as Professor of Philosophy. Over the past ten years, Chancellor Cohen has dedicated his time and passion into making PUC the high quality, full-service university that it is today. PUC has expanded tremendously under the leadership of Chancellor Cohen. During his tenure, Chancellor Cohen has established student housing, constructed the Academic Learning Center and established nine centers and institutes of applied research. Labeled his signature project, Chancellor Cohen was influential in the implementation of the innovative experiential learning initiative, a program that blends traditional learning with hands-on, applied learning, which is now a curriculum requirement for all students seeking a bachelor's degree.

In addition to their truly impressive devotion to education and to Purdue University Calumet, Howard and Patti passionately serve the people of Northwest Indiana though their involvement in numerous community organizations. They have been married since 1968 and have two beloved children and two grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in commending Chancellor Howard Cohen and Patricia Cohen. Their inspiration continues to fuel the future of education and their life work has provided exceptional new opportunities in Northwest Indiana and across the nation. For their selfless, lifelong commitment they are worthy of the highest praise.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF EVA BLASZ EGRI AND THE MUSICAL CONCERT ''ZOCHRENU LECHIM''

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Eva Blasz Egri, a Holocaust survivor whose spirit and strength serve as an inspiration to her family, friends, and her community.

Eva, a longtime friend of my constituent Len Romano, shared with him details of her tragic past in Auschwitz and the loss of her family during World War II. After returning to her home in Hungary after the War, Eva uncovered treasured songs that her father, Hazzan Shmuel Blasz, had given to a non-Jewish neighbor who risked his life to hide the precious music from the Nazis. Hazzan Blasz wrote these songs before the War when he served as chief cantor and musical composer for the Egr Jzr Temple in Hungary.

After uncovering these musical compositions in the basement of her home and keeping them to herself for decades, long after she moved to the United States, she recently decided to share these documents with Len.

I am proud to stand here today to honor Len and the distinguished cantors from the New York area who have worked hard to bring these songs to life by performing them in a concert at Temple Beth Sholom in Smithtown tonight.

Eva's resilience is a lesson to us all to find the hidden beauty in apparent tragedy and commemorate the lives and contributions of those whose lives were lost.

I applaud the efforts of so many in my district who have worked to bring Eva's music to the forefront and hold this special concert called ''Zochrenu Lechim,'' Remember Us Unto Life.

HONORING MR. DENNIS KAHN

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Dennis Kahn, the 2011 Honoree for the American Cancer Society's Cuisine for the Cure Event, for his struggle in overcoming cancer and his remarkable contributions to the community I serve in Western New York.

Dennis, a highly regarded attorney, has dedicated his life to representing those facing significant challenges in their own lives and professions. Also a loving and devoted husband to Carrie and father to Max, Dennis exemplifies the strong values that make communities like Buffalo great.

Yet nothing could quite prepare Dennis for the challenge he faced in the fall of 2009, when he found out that he had stage 4 cancer in his parotid gland. Like so many other cancer patients, Dennis's diagnosis hit him like a ton of bricks. And after enduring surgeries and an aggressive radiation and chemotherapy regimen, we are lucky to have him here with us today to share his story and the lessons he has learned from it.

Like many other cancer survivors and their families, Dennis wants to give back and help others like him. The struggles of people with cancer are unique—not knowing whether your body is actively growing cells that will harm you can be sheer terror. To handle this amid all of life's normal challenges is overwhelming. Dennis's commitment to help other patients and survivors is notable, making him worthy of being honored at this year's Cuisine for a Cure event.

We need more advocates like Dennis to raise awareness about cancer in our communities. Let his story be a lesson to us, to inspire us, and to continue to fight to alleviate suffering due to cancer in our lifetime. I often say that cancer research is a continuum, and it needs to be maintained, and that we can't just stop and start. Advocates like Dennis remind us of this promise.

HONORING THE AMERICAN PARKINSON DISEASE ASSOCIATION

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Central Susquehanna Valley Chapter of the American Parkinson Disease Association.

The American Parkinson Disease Association helps over 1.5 million Americans who live with this progressive disorder of the central nervous system. This year, the APDA is celebrating its 50th anniversary, currently sponsoring 45 chapters which focus on local fundraising efforts and awareness, 55 information

and referral centers which serve the needs of those with the disease and their caretakers, and over 1,000 support groups throughout the United States. The APDA has worked tirelessly over the past 50 years in fulfilling their mission to ''Ease the Burden—Find the Cure'' through research, patient and family services and education.

In conjunction with Geisinger HealthSouth, the Central Susquehanna Valley Chapter has hosted this Walk-A-Thon on Sunday May 1, 2011, to increase awareness across the state of Pennsylvania, and I am honored to be included in such a noble and selfless cause.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and honor those who work with the American Parkinson Disease Association. I commend the efforts of the Central Susquehanna Valley Chapter and Geisinger HealthSouth in hosting this Walk-A-Thon and advancing Parkinson's disease research across the country.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF LIONEL WAYNE MAGEE III FOR HIS APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

HON. RODNEY ALEXANDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man who was selected to attend the U.S. Air Force Academy. Lionel Wayne Magee III will follow in his parents' footsteps by serving our country in uniform.

Magee, an 18-year-old senior at Seoul American High School on Yongsan Garrison, the Republic of Korea, is poised to attend the prestigious academy this fall. With him he brings an enormous amount of leadership and passion to the incoming class of cadets. While attending high school, Magee was committed to a range of extracurricular activities including varsity football, Taekwondo, National Honor Society, Boys State, Eagle Scout as well as numerous volunteer hours in support of the community.

Attending one of our Nation's military academies is an invaluable experience that offers a first-rate education while providing those who undertake it some of the most challenging and rewarding opportunities of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Lionel Magee on his acceptance into the U.S. Air Force Academy and in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to our Nation.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 2011

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Our first priorities in the House of Representatives must be helping to foster job creation and supporting middle class families. More than four months into the 112th Congress, we have not considered one bill that would achieve these goals.

This deceptively named bill claims that it would enact a government-wide prohibition on federal subsidies for abortion and health insurance plans that cover it. In truth it is an unprecedented and extreme attempt to limit health insurance coverage for American women, raise taxes on small businesses, infringe on the legally protected rights of American Servicewomen, and make this legal, constitutionally protected medical procedure inaccessible to women.

This bill would eliminate tax credits for families and small businesses to purchase comprehensive health insurance plans. This would result in substandard health care for millions of Americans.

Unprecedented, H.R. 3 would change the tax code to promote an anti-choice agenda. This bill would allow women to use tax preferred saving accounts for abortion care only in cases of rape, incest, or when their life is in danger. Under this extreme bill, women would have to prove to the IRS that they have been victim of sexual assault to use their own money for their medical care.

This bill triumphs on states' rights by preventing the District of Columbia from using its own funds to pay for abortion services for low-income women. Further, it would permanently deny low-income women, federal employees, and military women access to abortion care, even when their health is at risk.

It is important to remember why comprehensive health care is needed. I recently heard a heartbreaking story from one of my constituents who was desperate to have a baby with her husband. Unfortunately after getting pregnant, they discovered that the fetus had a deadly condition and was not going to survive. They were left with only one choice—to terminate the pregnancy. This couple never thought they would be in that position. This bill would deny private health insurance companies from providing this kind of medical care to women.

The question of whether or not to have an abortion is one of the most difficult decisions any woman can face. Reproductive health care is a personal matter that should be left to individuals, their doctors, and their families without interference from the government. Rather than making abortion more dangerous for young women, I believe that Congress should do more to create the conditions that enable women to make true choices by providing comprehensive sexuality education and ensuring that women have access to a range of effective contraceptives.

I oppose H.R. 3 and urge my colleagues to vote no on this dangerous piece of legislation.

TRIBUTE TO DR. RONALD FEINMAN

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Ronald Feinman, a constituent of mine from Boca Raton who will retire from teaching at the end of June after 39 years.

Dr. Feinman, a Senior Professor of History and Political Science at Broward College in Pembroke Pines, and an Adjunct Professor of History at Florida Atlantic University in Boca Raton, moved to South Florida in 1989 after teaching for 17 years in New York at Queens College, New York Institute of Technology, and Pace University. A graduate of Queens College, Dr. Feinman earned his PhD from the City University of New York Graduate Center in1975.

A student of history from an early age, Dr. Feinman has dedicated his life and professional career to ensuring future generations grow up with an appreciation of American history, politics and government. This dedication is evident in the pure enthusiasm he shows for his students and the topics he professes, and the strong reputation he has established amongst his peers and his students is a direct result. He has developed strong friendships with many of his students throughout his teaching career, and some of them have taken him for as many as eight classes along their way to completing their degree.

The author of Twilight of Progressivism: The Western Republican Senators and the New Deal, 1933–1945, Dr. Feinman regularly contributes articles and book reviews in a wide range of academic journals, lectures on modern American topics throughout South Florida, and maintains a blog discussing daily political topics. While he is looking forward to retirement and having the opportunity to spend more time with his family and travel, after taking a year off, he intends to return to teaching part-time to continue doing what he loves.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ronald Feinman embodies the true essence of an educator and a role model for our younger generations. I know I speak not only for myself, but for the thousands of students whose lives he has positively impacted throughout the four decades of his career in congratulating him on his retirement and wishing him the best going forward.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 4th, I missed rollcall votes 286–292 for unavoidable reasons.

Specifically, I was in Tarpon Springs, Florida, in my congressional district, to attend the funeral of a close family member, who passed away earlier in the week.

Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall vote No. 286: ''yea'' (Adoption of H. Res. 237, the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3—No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act); rollcall vote No. 287: ''yea'' (Jackson-Lee Amendment No. 1); rollcall vote No. 288: ''yea'' (Capps Amendment No. 2); rollcall vote No. 289: ''nay'' (McCarthy Motion to recommit H.R. 1214); rollcall vote No. 290: ''yea'' (Passage of H.R. 1214, To Repeal Mandatory Funding for School-based Health Center Construction); rollcall vote No. 291: ''nay'' (Speier Motion to recommit H.R. 3); rollcall vote No. 292: ''yea'' (Passage of H.R. 3, No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act).

INTRODUCTION OF THE SMITHSONIAN MODERNIZATION ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce three bills to modernize the Smithsonian Institution and to enhance its governance and fundraising ability, in keeping with the recommendations of a number of experts, including the Smithsonian Independent Review Committee, chaired by former U.S. Comptroller General Charles Bowsher. This bill, the Smithsonian Modernization Act, makes changes to the Smithsonian's governance structure by expanding and changing the composition of its Board of Regents, from 17 members, which includes six Members of Congress, the Vice President of the United States, and the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, to 21 members, comprised solely of private citizens. This change will strengthen both the Smithsonian's governance and fundraising capacity, and it is the first significant change in this old and revered institution since it was established in 1846. The second bill, the Smithsonian Free Admission Act of 2010, seeks to preserve the long-standing free admission policy for permanent exhibits at an institution that is largely funded by the federal government, as envisioned by James Smithson, its founder. Finally, the Open and Transparent Smithsonian Act of 2011 will apply the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act to the Smithsonian in the same manner they apply to federal agencies.

The Smithsonian Institution is a unique and irreplaceable cultural, historical, educational and artistic complex without any public or private counterpart in the world. Since its founding, the Smithsonian has developed an extraordinary array of world-class museums, galleries, educational showplaces and unique research centers, including 19 museums and galleries, nine research facilities, the National Zoo, and the forthcoming National Museum of African American History and Culture, which has been approved by Congress and is now seeking funding from the private sector for construction. The Smithsonian has grown with donations from American culture and life, and financial contributions, but most of its funding continues to come from federal appropriations. Despite receiving 70 percent of its funding from the federal government, the Smithsonian has long had serious infrastructure and other needs.

Congress must help the Smithsonian strengthen its ability to build resources beyond what taxpayers are able to provide. The most important step Congress could take today is to rescue the Smithsonian from its 19th century governance structure, which keeps it from accessing needed and available private resources and limits close and critical oversight. The Smithsonian Modernization Act bill provides a governance structure befitting the Smithsonian's unique complexity. In no small part, the difficulty the Smithsonian has faced results from limitations inherent in its antiquated governance structure. The existing structure may have fit the Smithsonian over 170 years ago, but today the structure has proven to be a relic that does a disservice to the Smithsonian. The present governance structure places immense responsibility on dedicated but overextended Members of the House and Senate, the Vice President of the United States and the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. These federal officials comprise almost half of the Smithsonian Board of Regents, and must perform their fiduciary duties as board members while giving first priority to their sworn responsibilities as important federal officials.

In 2007, an independent review committee found that the Board had violated principles of good management during the tenure of the former Secretary of the Smithsonian, Lawrence Small, allowing him to create an ''insular culture.'' The Committee's report indicated that the Board had failed to provide desperately needed oversight and had overcompensated Mr. Small. The report also found that Sheila P. Burke, the Smithsonian's then-deputy secretary and chief operating officer, had frequent absences from her duties because of outside activities, including service on corporate boards, for which she earned more than $1.2 million over six years. Further, the Smithsonian's then-Business Ventures chief, Gary Beer, was dismissed for financial indiscretions. This unprecedented crisis, caused by unprecedented controversies and irresponsible risks, put into sharp focus the need for new revenue streams and for a modern governance structure. The first full-blown scandal in the Smithsonian's history, replete with embarrassing media coverage, damaged its reputation and perhaps the confidence of potential contributors. The poor judgment and overreaching of Smithsonian personnel during that period requires new and concentrated oversight by citizens for whom the Smithsonian would command priority attention.

The Board of Regents, of course, has taken some important action on its own. After irregularities were uncovered by the media, the Board responded to the controversies by creating a governance committee, chaired by Patty Stonesifer, a Regent and former chief executive officer of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, with a mandate to comprehensively review the policies and practices of the Smithsonian and how the Board conducts its oversight of the institution. The Board also established an Independent Review Committee (IRC), chaired by former U.S. Comptroller General Charles A. Bowsher, to review the issues arising from an Inspector General's report and the Board's response, and related Smithsonian practices.

The IRC was forthright in its investigation and recommendations. The IRC stated explicitly that the root cause of the problems at the Smithsonian was an antiquated governance structure, which led to failures in governance and management. According to the IRC, the Board must assume a fiduciary duty that carries a ''major commitment of time and effort, a reputational risk, and potentially, financial liability.'' The IRC further argued that the Smithsonian, with a budget of over $1 billion a year, must have a Board who ''act as true fiduciaries and who have both the time and the experience to assume the responsibilities of setting strategy and providing oversight.'' The IRC cited a lack of clarity of the roles of the U.S. Vice President and Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court on the Board, and said that ''it is not feasible to expect the Chief Justice to devote the hours necessary to serve as a fiduciary agent.'' The same observation could be made of the Members of the House and Senate who serve on the Board. The IRC recommended that the Board increase the level of expertise and the number of members to ensure that the Regents have sufficient time and attention to dedicate to the Smithsonian.

The Smithsonian's own governance committee identified several Board weaknesses, concluding that the Board did not receive or demand the reports necessary for competent decision-making, that the staff whom the Board depended upon for oversight inquiries did not have direct access to information, and that the inability of staff to communicate red flags ''crippled'' internal compliance and oversight.

Only Congress, with the concurrence of the president, can amend the Smithsonian Charter. The last change to the Board's structure occurred over 30 years ago, but only to increase the number of private citizens on the Board from six to nine.

The number of Regents, however, is not the root problem. Although the bill expands the Board from 17 to 21 members, it, most importantly, brings the Board into alignment with modern public and private boards by requiring all Regents to be private citizens. The search for private funds by Smithsonian management was a major cause of the recent controversy. Faced with crippling budget problems, the Regents must be free to give new and unprecedented attention and energy to finding and helping to raise substantially more funds from private sources. The new structure envisioned by the bill will improve oversight and the capacity for fundraising from private sources. Unlike federal officials, private citizens are entirely free to assist in private fundraising. Most importantly, private citizens will have sufficient expertise to serve on the Board, and will be able to devote the personal time and attention necessary to fulfill the fiduciary responsibility that comes with serving such a venerable and complex institution.

The bill preserves and strengthens the traditional role of the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate in selecting Board members, while eliminating the self-perpetuating role of the Board in selecting private citizens for the Board. The Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate will each send 12 recommendations to the President of the United States, who will select the 21 members of the Board of Regents.

Considering the seriousness of the findings of the Board's own governance committee and of the IRC, the changes prescribed by the bill are nothing short of necessary. The reform of the fiduciary and governance issues that have brought public criticism to this iconic American institution must begin with the indispensable step of making the Smithsonian's governance consistent with that of similar institutions today. Only congressional attention can reassure the public that the controversies that recently besieged the Smithsonian will not recur. In the face of an unprecedented public controversy, Congress would be remiss if it left the Smithsonian to its own oversight and devices alone for improvement.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE BLOCK HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 1961

HON. RODNEY ALEXANDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Block High School Class of 1961 as they celebrate their 50 year reunion. The alumni will observe this momentous occasion on Sunday, June 18, 2011.

The 1961 class was a cohesive and talented group who became doctors, nurses, elected officials, teachers, business owners, pharmacists, law enforcement personnel and investigators, and some have proudly served our country in uniform. Moreover, of the 43 classmates who graduated on May 18, 1961, only five are no longer with us.

This group of alumni is undoubtedly dedicated to each other, and they have gathered for several reunions throughout the decades since their graduation from the Jonesville, La. school. This reunion will surely be another success as they come together to commemorate each other and the significant and memorable occasions that have taken place throughout their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the Block High School Class of 1961 as they gather for their 50 year reunion. I know it will be a joyous celebration.

IN HONOR OF BISHOP ANTHONY M. PILLA

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Bishop Emeritus Anthony M. Pilla, the 2011 recipient of the Shrine Church of St. Stanislaus' Four Eagles Award. Bishop Pilla is being honored for his many years of service and commitment to the Saint Stanislaus community.

Bishop Anthony Pilla was born in Cleveland on November 12, 1932. He attended John Carroll University and went on to be ordained a Catholic Priest within the Cleveland Diocese in 1959. On June 30, 1979, Pope John Paul II named him Auxiliary Bishop of Cleveland. In 1980, he was named Apostolic Administrator of the Cleveland Diocese, and became the ninth Bishop of Cleveland on January 6, 1981. He was elected president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in 1995 and served in that position for three years. He served as Bishop until his retirement in 2006.

Bishop Anthony Pilla is being honored for his outstanding record of dedication to the Shrine Church of St. Stanislaus in Cleveland, Ohio. As Bishop of Cleveland, he advised Fr. William Gulas regarding the Church's renovations. He was responsible for achieving the Church's status as a shrine, thus opening the doors to thousands of visitors. He was instrumental in expanding Cleveland Central Catholic High School, which is located on St. Stanislaus Church's campus, and worked with community members on countless development and revitalization efforts. Even since his retirement, he has remained an active member of the St. Stanislaus community. For these reasons, the St. Stanislaus community is awarding Bishop Emeritus Anthony Pilla the Four Eagle Award, named for the legendary four eagles that protected the body of the martyred St. Stanislaus.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of Bishop Emeritus Anthony M. Pilla as he receives the Four Eagles Award for his devotion and dedication to the parish and community of the Shrine Church of St. Stanislaus in Cleveland, Ohio.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our nation's teachers during National Teacher Appreciation Week, which is being held this year May 1st–7th.

This is a time to express our thanks and admiration for the more than 3 million teachers in the United States. I encourage everyone to express their appreciation for those teachers who have touched their lives or the lives of their children.

Teachers are heroes in our communities, shaping the next generation of great minds. No great leader, scientist, or artist would be where they are today without the influence of caring and dedicated teachers.

Thurgood Marshall once said, ''None of us got where we are solely by pulling ourselves up by our bootstraps. We got here because somebody—a parent, a teacher, an Ivy League crony or a few nuns—bent down and helped us pick up our boots.''

There is perhaps no other occupation that influences the fabric of our society more than teachers, and we are fortunate to have this week dedicated to recognizing their contributions.

I am particularly proud of our teachers from my home state of Texas—serving as motivators and mentors for our future leaders. I remain dedicated to working in Congress to ensure that Texas teachers and all teachers have the resources necessary to successfully prepare our Nation's youth for a successful future.

CONGRATULATING MATTHEW WICKS

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Matthew Wicks for being a first prize winner of C–SPAN's Student Cam competition. Matthew created a fantastic video entitled ''After the Storm'' which details the tragedy of one of the worst tornadoes in Iowa history. On May 25, 2008, the community of Parkersburg, Iowa was hit by an EF–5 tornado with winds of over 200 mph. This tornado destroyed the Parkersburg community.

Matthew's video highlights the successes and challenges faced by the Aplington Parkersburg community as they worked with the federal government to obtain disaster relief funding. Matthew did an excellent job of detailing the struggles of the Parkersburg community while seeking disaster funding. While the community did receive disaster relief funding, there are many challenges they still face today as they continue to work with FEMA.

Matthew's video illustrates the struggles that so many communities face when dealing with the aftermath of a natural disaster. I'm proud to have Matthew as one of my constituents and I congratulate him on his success. I wish him the best in his future endeavors.

COMMENDING THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE OSAMA BIN LADEN OPERATION

HON. ALBIO SIRES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, late Sunday night, we learned that the United States had successfully captured the mastermind behind the horrific attacks of September 11th, and today I rise to congratulate President Obama, the Navy SEALs, and all the men and women of our military and intelligence community on a successful mission. Osama bin Laden had been on the run for nearly 10 years, but in the end, he was not able to evade the tireless pursuit of the United States.

President Obama made the courageous decision to send U.S. Navy SEAL Team 6 on a mission to Osama bin Laden's compound in Pakistan, and within forty minutes, our ten year ordeal was ended. In this short period of time, the SEALs were even able to collect intelligence to further aid the United States in its ongoing fight against terrorism.

I commend the heroism of all those who participated in this expertly designed and executed operation, and I applaud President Obama's tough decision to move forward with this operation. Osama bin Laden has been brought to justice.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE RETIREMENT OF ANN COMISKEY FROM THE TROY COMMUNITY COALITION AFTER A DECADE AS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Ann Comiskey on the occasion of her retirement from the Troy Community Coalition after nearly 10 years of dedicated and passionate service to the community as its Executive Director.

Ms. Comiskey's 38-year career has been one of advocacy and service for causes and programs which have impacted countless individuals in communities across Southeast Michigan. In her role with the Michigan Department of Social Services, Ms. Comiskey provided key support to many residents of Wayne County. After 10 years of dedicated service in that role, Ms. Comiskey then joined

the Highland Park School District, where she worked with at-risk youth and adults to ensure they were able to complete their primary education via alternative programs. In her time with the School District, Ms. Comiskey demonstrated strong leadership skills, developing the Job Club program, which aided high-risk students in their professional development. As part of this work, Ms. Comiskey developed an in-depth knowledge of substance abuse treatment and prevention programs, which has greatly aided in her work with the Troy Community Coalition, when she joined in 2002 as its Executive Director.

As a Troy resident, Ms. Comiskey's service to her community began long before she joined the Coalition. Her volunteer work includes involvement in the Troy Chamber of Commerce and the Troy Women's Association, of which she is a Lifetime Member. In recognition and appreciation of her volunteer advocacy within the community, she was selected as Troy's Distinguished Citizen in 2000. Additionally, she also serves on the advisory board for the Michigan Nonprofit Association and is Co-Chair of the Prevention Coalition of Southeast Michigan.

In her role as Executive Director of the Troy Community Coalition for nearly the last decade, Ms. Comiskey has continued to build on the Coalition's nationally recognized track record of substance abuse prevention in the community. Under her leadership, the Coalition has continued to bring all sectors of the Troy community together to promote positive social norms and implement programs to advocate for changes which create a stronger and healthier substance free community. With her strong stewardship of the Coalition, Ms. Comiskey has become nationally recognized within the substance abuse prevention community and in 2006 she was designated Advocate of the Year by the Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the invaluable contributions Ms. Comiskey has made to both the residents of Troy and the greater community of southeast Michigan. While I know she will be sorely missed by all who work with her, she will undoubtedly have many years of productive volunteer service to our community to come.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL DAY OF REASON

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Thursday, May 5, 2011 as the 2011 National Day of Reason.

The National Day of Reason, observed by millions of people in this country and around the world since 2003, celebrates the application of reason and the positive impacts it has had on humanity. Reason and rational discourse have the power to improve living conditions around the world and cultivate intelligent, moral, and ethical interactions among people.

Reason and rational thinking have made our country great. The Constitution of the United States of America is based upon the philosophies developed during the historical Age of Reason and the idea that citizens engaging in rational discourse and decision-making can govern themselves. The Constitution also contains a strong separation of church and state, making it clear that government should continue to be built on reason.

Our nation faces many problems—ending two wars, creating jobs, educating our children, tackling our budget, and protecting our safety net. Although the gravity of these issues may drive many to prayer, the way we will solve them is through the application of reason.

The National Day of Reason is also about taking time to improve our communities—whether that means holding a blood drive or collecting items for the local food bank. It is also about ensuring that our government represents citizens of all beliefs and backgrounds.

I encourage everyone to join in observing this day and focusing upon the employment of reason, critical thinking, the scientific method, and free inquiry to the resolution of human problems and for the welfare of human kind. It is the duty and responsibility of every American to promote the development and application of reason.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF MR. ROBERT FOULKROD

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Mr. Robert M. Foulkrod, a writer, life coach, and spiritual awakening researcher who passed away on May 2, 2011.

Mr. Foulkrod was born on May 8, 1924 in State College, Pennsylvania. He eventually moved to Dover, New Hampshire where he attended high school. After high school, Robert served with the U.S. Army, climbing the ranks from private to sergeant. He later earned his bachelor's degree in mechanical engineering at University of New Hampshire in 1961. Upon completing his education, Robert again joined the armed forces and served with the U.S. Air Force as a lieutenant performing research on aircraft armament systems.

Robert had very successful careers in electronic engineering and career counseling. As a mechanical engineering section manager with Sanders Associates, Inc., Mr. Foulkrod researched, designed and produced several new technologies and systems. During his tenure as an electronic engineer Robert was a member of the Institute for Electrical and Electronics Engineers and the American Society of Mechanical Engineers. After years as an electronic engineer, Robert changed careers and began working for Honeywell Computer Company as their hospital systems marketing manager. As marketing manager, he developed and performed inspirational training to hospital computer systems salespeople.

Later, Mr. Foulkrod would work as a career change counselor with Bernard Haldane Associates. He served as a personal coach to people aspiring to change career paths. In addition to his influence as a counselor, Mr. Foulkrod was a revered researcher in spiritual awakening. He dedicated years of his life to research and published several articles with the United States Psychotronics Association. He also authored a number of books on the subject including Visit Boosting Friends and The Game of Awakening.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in remembrance of Mr. Robert M. Foulkrod, who served the country bravely and inspired many throughout his life. I offer my condolences to his life partner, Barbara Hero, three children, family, and friends.

HONORING MR. TOM BRIAN'S DISTINGUISHED CAREER

HON. DAVID WU

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Tom Brian, former Chair of the Washington County Board of Commissioners. Chair Brian retired after 12 years with Washington County, Oregon, and more than 30 years of service to our community.

Tom embarked on an exemplary term as Chair of the Washington County Commission in 1998. Over the next 12 years, Tom spearheaded numerous projects, including the establishment of L.L. "Stub" Stewart State Park and the opening of the Westside Express Service (WES) Commuter line. Tom was a noted listener and consensus builder who focused on the needs of his constituents and worked tirelessly to address their issues. He approached his work with integrity and a true sense of dedication.

Tom's foresight helped make Washington County an attractive place to live and do business. His leadership on projects like the Scoggins Dam raise will be missed. Tom has encouraged and empowered his community to continue the work he started and I know his spirit of service will continue to inspire all citizens of Washington County.

Former Oregon Governor Tom McCall said, "Heroes are not giant statues framed against a red sky. They are people who say, this is my community, and it is my responsibility to make it better." Tom Brian truly is an American hero, for he has devoted much of his life to making his community better.

It is an honor to recognize Chair Brian for his service and for providing a heroic example to us all.

REMEMBERING FIRE CHIEF MATT AKER

HON. MIKE PENCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart to honor the tragic loss of Fire Chief Matt Aker of Portland, Indiana.

Chief Aker began his career in public service as a volunteer with the Portland Fire Department in July of 1997. He joined the force full time in 2002, was appointed Assistant Fire Chief in 2005, and then served as Fire Chief.

Chief Aker's list of accomplishments and certifications are extensive and include: EMS-First Responders, Fire Inspector I and II, Fire Investigator I, Technical Rescue Awareness, Fire Officer I, Ice Rescue, Rope Rescue, Hazardous Material Incident Command, Hazmat

1st Responder Awareness and Operations, ECI Fools, American Heart Association CPR and AED, Chairman of Membership of IFCA, Adhoc with ceremonies at Emergency Conferences, Portland's Representative for DPC, District 6 Co-Chair for Fire Task Force Element and Jay County's Representative to Region 6 Fire Training Council.

He was also the Captain of the Jay County Sheriff Reserves, a member of Emergency Response Team, the Portland Rotary Club, the Portland Morning Optimists and the American Red Cross.

In the midst of such tragedy, let us pray for God's comfort for the Aker family and cling to the words of the Good Book which says that "in all things God works for the good." I offer this comfort and my deepest condolences to Chief Aker's wife Brooke; parents, Mike and Linda Aker; Grandmothers, Maxine Aker and Rosie Hutchens; two brothers, Brad and Chad Aker; sister, Lori Ferguson; and his nine nieces and two nephews.

LINDSEY BUXMAN TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise and pay tribute to a young lady who has exhibited a desire to improve her community and empower the arts for future generations. Lindsey Buxman, of Pueblo, Colorado was one of 100 young people in the United States to be honored by the Prudential Spirit of Community Program for community service.

Lindsey Buxman, a student at Pueblo Centennial High School and an avid dancer, took it upon herself to create a fundraiser to restore the stage at Memorial Hall Theater. Lindsey brought her plan before Pueblo City Hall, and found that the whole theater was in danger of being torn down if enough money could not be raised for a complete renovation. This is when Lindsey decided that she was going to take action to make sure the total restoration of the Memorial Hall Theater would become a ballot initiative. Lindsey, with the help of fellow students and dancers, gave speeches and obtained signatures to ensure that an initiative to restore the theater made it on the ballot.

Lindsey Buxman has fully given herself to her community and her love of the arts, and in doing so she has shown exceptional leadership qualities.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the efforts of young Lindsey Buxman to enhance her community, and I encourage all of America's youth to follow her lead and get involved in their communities.

HONORING BARBARA ANN KAZEN

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the contributions of the late Barbara Ann Kazen, former President of the Bethany House in Laredo, Inc., a settlement house for the homeless and indigent in Laredo, Texas. Mrs. Kazen served the community by dedicating herself to charitable, cultural and civic organizations.

Mrs. Kazen was born on January 3, 1941 in Abilene, Texas to Virginia Lee Lively and James Lee Sanders, a humble family of ranchers. She lived much of her life in Albany and Texarkana, Texas. She passed away surrounded by her close family and friends on March 15, 2011 after a courageous fight with cancer. She graduated from Texas High School in 1959 and continued her education at Texas Christian University and the University of Texas at Austin as a Latin and Ancient History major. She continued to pursue her interests in communication by attending Laredo Junior College to study journalism, languages, and Food and Beverage Management. At UT Austin, Mrs. Kazen met her husband, U.S District Judge George B. Kazen. She is survived by her husband, children and grandchildren.

Mrs. Kazen's career is both a multifaceted and praiseworthy one. Her professional career includes working as a hostess and producer of the shows High Noon, Profile, and Consumer Report. She also served as director of catering and sales at both La Posada Motor Hotel and the Laredo Country Club. Most importantly, Mrs. Kazen's devotion to community, church and charitable work is truly commendable. She led Bethany House of Laredo, Inc. as president from 1996 until 2011; and also served as vice-president of the American Cancer Society. Moreover, she contributed to cultural and civic organizations such as the Laredo Civic Ballet Association, the Laredo Little Theatre, and Ruthe B. Cowl Rehabilitation Center by serving on the Board of Directors at each of these institutions. She was also an active member of the Society of Martha Washington, a debutante presentation in Laredo, serving as publicity chair, historian, and second vice-president. She further illustrated her commitment to charitable work as a founding Charter Member of the Laredo Homeless Coalition and her dedication to the Blessed Sacrament Parish.

Mrs. Kazen was recognized by many organizations for her many contributions to the community. These recognitions include the American Cancer Society's "Award for Outstanding Service" in 1971, the Laredo March of Dimes "Lady of the Year" in 1978, and the Laredo Seven Flags Rotary Club's, "Paul Harris Fellow" in 2000. Her commitment to the city of Laredo was invaluable.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had this time to recognize the late Barbara Ann Kazen. She proved herself to be indispensable for her dedication to charitable work and the betterment of the state of Texas and Laredo. Her example is an inspiration for us all.

CONGRATULATING HIGH SCHOOL ARTISTS FROM THE 11TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, once again, I come to the floor to recognize the great success of strong local schools working with dedicated parents and teachers. I rise today to congratulate and honor a number of outstanding high school artists from the 11th Congressional District of New Jersey. Each of these talented students participated in the 2011 Congressional Arts Competition, "An Artistic Discovery."

Their works of art are exceptional.

Seventy-six young men and women participated. That is a wonderful response, and I would very much like to build on that participation for future competitions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the three winners of our art competition. First place was awarded to Andrea Ibarra from Ridge High School for her work, "Max." Second place was awarded to Grace Cheung from Ridge High School for her work, "Journey Through Equus." Third place was awarded to Rachel Fico from Madison High School for her work, "Within Reach."

Honorable Mentions were awarded to: Alexi Corham from Montville Township High School for her work, "Alter Ego;" Jacob DeBoer from Pequannock High School for his work, "Venison Stew;" Kasia Kalemba from Boonton High School for her work, "Gone But Still Here;" Lillian Thomann from James Caldwell High School for her work "The Metro."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize each artist for their participation by indicating their high school, their name and the title of their contest entries for the official RECORD.

Boonton High School: Kasia Kalemba, "Gone But Still Here;" Zenab Khan, "The Dreams Within A Dream;" Samantha Kutnik, "Packanack Lake, NJ;" Rosalita Smith, "America Works."

Bridgewater-Raritan High School: Nicole Thomas, "Bella."

Chatham High School: Zakary Blake, "Weight;" Antonia Chan, "Carnival of Hearts;" Brittany Leonard, "Nirvana."

Dover High School: Christian Aroca, "My Culture;" Gissell Gonzalez, "My Heritage;" Angela Perkins, "Celebration;" Ying Jing Zheng, "Pride Before Destruction."

Hopatcong High School: Jara Werner, "The Faces of Money."

James Caldwell High School: Angela Filan, "The Rebel Within;" Lillian Thomann,"The Metro."

Livingston High School: Christina Furman, "Never Forget;" Joanne Horng, "And then they invented satellites;" Kiley Mannion, "Freedom;" Danielle Stecki, "Faded Glory."

Madison High School: Amanda Evans, "Zen;" Rachel Fico, "Within Reach;" Amy Lando, "Buddy;" Vendela Larsson, "Chloe."

Millburn High School: Monica Carty, "Up Close Gallery;" Annie Dolan, "Edith & John;" Emily Draper, "Tidal;" Chanthia Ma, "Winter Solstice."

Montville Township High School: Dillon Chen, "42nd Street;" Alexi Corham, "Alter Ego;" Victoria Eng, "Indonesian Still Life;" Minjoo Kim, "Abandoned Sisters."

Morris Catholic High School: Gianna Riccardi, "Alice;" Jana Marie Cariddi, "I'm Alive;" Carissa Kelly, "Joe Ufer Goes to Say Anything;" Alexander Kuchta, "Safe Sex;" Ciara Mesevage, "Stressed."

Mount Olive High School: Sarak Berek, "Untitled;" Felix Izquierdo, "Japanese Dream;" Dia Saito, "Skyliner;" Lauren Wisnewski, "Subconscious."

Oak Knoll School of the Holy Child: Maclain Riccardi, "Oak Leaves;" Tian Mauer, "Room With A View;" Abigail Rollenhagen, "Sunken Ship."

Parsippany Christian School: Jessica Carducci, ''Love Is All Around;'' Troy Costa,''A Mother's Love;'' Austin Dimare, ''Dream in Color;'' Mariah Urban, ''Mademoiselle.''

Parsippany High School: Ashley Del Rio, ''Untitled.''

Pequannock Township High School: Stephanie Baryla, ''Angry Man;'' Rachel Ciavarella, ''Red Peppers;'' Jacob De Boer, ''Venison Stew;'' Emily Grimaldi, ''Love is Just Another Weapon.''

Pope John XXIII High School: Meredith Cahill, ''Will you play with me?'' Michelle Puglio, ''Maura.''

Ridge High School: Benjamin Callahan, ''Survive;'' Grace Cheung, ''Journey Through Equus;'' Andrea Ibarra, ''Max;'' Mike Sommer, ''Not Today.''

Roxbury High School: Jimmy Le, ''Details in Lines;'' Jonathan Melicharek, ''One word spoken, one decision made, one life taken;'' Ariel Mizrahi, ''I'm Shattered;'' Ashley Wolff, ''C.C. Self Portrait.''

Sparta High School: Jessica Ciona, ''Blue Shoe;'' Sydney Liebman, ''Missy's Stare;'' Meghan Salmeri, ''Spring in Washington;'' Stephen Vocaturo, ''Montego.''

Veritas Christian Academy: Ionela Corforte, ''Complex Simplicity.''

Watchung Hills Regional High School: Sophie Armenante, ''Orchid;'' Sofia Lizza, ''Organic;'' Lauren Merrill, ''Great Swamp 2011;'' Carolyn Thornton, ''Avonlea.''

West Morris Mendham High School: Carolyn Aluotto, ''Crystal Cantanta;'' Genevieve Asselin, ''Applause;'' Dana Barlock, ''Cradel Us;'' Hannah Lang, ''Ocean Treasures.''

Whippany Park High School: Run Wang, ''Secret Letters.''

Each year the winner of the competition has their art work displayed with other winners from across the country in a special corridor here at the U.S. Capitol. Thousands of our fellow Americans walk through the exhibition and are reminded of the vast talents of our young men and women. Indeed, all of these young artists are winners, and we should be proud of their achievements so early in life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating these talented young people from New Jersey's 11th Congressional District.

NATIONAL TRAIN DAY RESOLUTION

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation supporting the goals and ideals of National Train Day. National Train Day is on May 7th and celebrates the long history and critical importance of rail in the United States.

In May 1869 the ''golden spike'' was driven into the final tie at Promontory Summit, Utah, ceremonially completing the first transcontinental railroad and therefore connecting both coasts of the United States. Suddenly, the country was united in a way it never had been and the sound of a train whistle was the soundtrack of happy reunions and tearful farewells. It heralded the arrival of mail, supplies and change. The train station became a focal point of every community, from New York City's Pennsylvania Station to the tiny stations that dotted rural America.

Today, passenger and freight service are increasing dramatically, making this a perfect time to celebrate the strength of the railroad industry and passenger rail service in the United States. For many rural Americans, Amtrak represents the only major intercity transportation link to the rest of the country.

Indeed, Amtrak ridership and revenue have never been stronger. During 2010 Amtrak welcomed aboard more than 28.7 million passengers, the largest annual total in Amtrak's history. An average of more than 78,000 passengers rides more than 300 Amtrak trains per day.

We are experiencing a renaissance in passenger rail in this country, and if we want to keep up with our international competitors, we need to make a significant investment in passenger and high-speed rail. I've advocated for and support a dedicated source of funding for rail and would encourage the committee to include a minimum of $50 billion dollars for high-speed and intercity passenger rail over the life of the bill. Compared to the funding levels in the overall bill and the money being spent in other countries on rail, $50 billion is a drop in the bucket.

Although we have some very small thinking Governors, support for high-speed rail is still high. The FRA received more than 90 applications from 24 states, the District of Columbia, and Amtrak for the $2.4 billion that Florida just gave up. The requests total nearly $10 billion dollars.

Finally, I want to thank the hard working men and women who work at Amtrak and make it possible for millions of Americans to get to work, travel for business, and visit friends and relatives.

A TRIBUTE TO LILLIAN JOST ON THE OCCASION OF HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DANIEL E. LUNGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor my constituent, Lillian Mohr Jost, who will be 100 years old on May 8th. She is a remarkable woman and a proud American who has lived through, and participated in, many of our nation's most important events over the last century. Ms. Jost grew up in New York City, where her father and grandfather built pipe organs, including the one for the Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia in 1876. Thomas Edison recruited her uncle to refine the lead composition for his new invention, the phonograph. Ms. Jost remembers the glorious night in her childhood when electricity replaced the gas lamps on the streets of New York City.

When she was nine, she walked her mother (who was blind) to the polls for the first time—women having just that year gained the right to vote. Three years later, visiting Washington, D.C., with her parents, she read a small sign in a shop window that said, ''The President has died of apoplexy.'' In the next few days, she witnessed the arrival at Union Station of the already-sworn-in President Calvin Coolidge and the solemn pomp of Warren Harding's presidential funeral.

Ms. Jost graduated from Vassar College in 1932 and went on to Columbia University to become a librarian—this service would become her life's work. A passionate American, she took up flying lessons when World War II broke out, with the goal of joining the Women's Army Air Corp. Although the War, and the need for women pilots, ended before she achieved her desire, she was inducted into the Ninety Nines, that illustrious group of female pilots founded by Amelia Earhart.

As a member of the Civil Air Patrol, Ms. Jost drove the Military Brass when they arrived in New York from the battle front to be debriefed. She met her beloved husband Elmer at a military ball of the Old Guard of the City of New York, where he, too, appeared in Civil Air Patrol uniform. Their love brought forth four daughters, 16 grandchildren, 26 great grandchildren and a growing number of great-great-grandchildren.

As she turns 100, Ms. Jost remains devoted to her country, her church, to America's parks and wilderness, and to animal causes everywhere. She continues to be optimistic about the future, and is always vigilant for new things to learn and new adventures on which to embark. She recently took up the practice of yoga; she is an avid solver of crossword puzzles; and she keeps vigilant watch over the deer and other wildlife that frequent the yard of her Fair Oaks, California, home. She truly embodies the best of the American spirit. Congratulations, Lillian Jost!

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND PUBLIC SERVICE OF DARLENE JENSEN

HON. DEVIN NUNES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and work of Darlene Jensen, who passed away on April 13, 2011. Darlene was a legendary Tulare community leader. In fact, she was named Tulare Woman of the Year in 1993. For many people, Darlene was Tulare Woman of the Year, every year.

Darlene lived in Tulare her entire life. She was born on January 20, 1948, and attended Tulare Western High School and the College of the Sequoias before beginning a career in banking. She started at Security Pacific National Bank and worked for almost 20 years at the downtown Tulare branch of Wells Fargo, becoming a ''Star Manager.''

Many people will remember Darlene as the manager of Wells Fargo. But many more will remember her lasting contribution to the community of Tulare. At the time of her death, Darlene was president of the Tulare Improvement Board and vice-president of the Board of Utilities. For her public service, she was named Legislative Woman of the Year in 2001. She was also active in the St. Aloysius Catholic Church, Our Lady of Fatima Celebration, and past-president of the Lions Club.

This only begins to tell part of the story of Darlene's commitment to the people of Tulare. Her energy was prodigious. There were few groups, clubs, or events in Tulare in which Darlene was not in some way involved. They

all benefited from what has been called the ''Darlene touch.'' For example, one of her favorite events was the downtown Tulare Christmas Tree Lighting, where she and her mother, Agnes, would cook upwards of 5,000 cookies to give away.

For 63 years Darlene Jensen represented the best of Tulare. Everyone she knew was affected by her commitment to public service and passion for Tulare. She leaves behind a legacy that will be hard to equal. The people of Tulare will miss Darlene for years to come.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SMITHSONIAN FREE ADMISSION ACT OF 2011

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Smithsonian Free Admission Act, to reinforce 170 years of consistent Smithsonian policy of admitting the public to all permanent exhibits without charge. This policy has served the nation well. Families come to Washington to learn about their country through its public monuments and sites. While the private amenities here can be costly for the average family, Americans have looked forward to the free museums and other official offerings for generations. The Smithsonian's free admission policy reflects the intent of its founder, John Smithson, whose gift to the Federal Government carried the condition that the Smithsonian be established to increase the knowledge of the public, free of charge. The bill establishing the Smithsonian, introduced by Senator William C. Preston on February 17, 1841, stated explicitly that the Smithsonian would ''preserve and exhibit with no fee'' all works of art and science. This intent and tradition was interrupted without notice to Congress by the Smithsonian's Board of Regents with its casual comment that the Smithsonian would charge an admission fee for a permanent exhibit for the first time in its history, and on February 14, 2008, the Smithsonian opened the National Museum of Natural History's Butterfly Pavilion, a permanent exhibit, and instituted a fee for admission. Congress, of course, not the Board of Regents, should decide so basic a policy, especially when it departs from long-standing public policy. The admission fee for the Butterfly Pavilion sets a harmful precedent for future permanent exhibits, making it difficult to deny other Smithsonian entities from charging a fee and possibly encouraging other Smithsonian entities to structure their exhibits to fit the Butterfly Pavilion model.

The Butterfly Pavilion opened on February 14, 2008. Although the Smithsonian had previously charged fees for films and shows, the National Air and Space Museum's Planetarium, and the National Zoo's Christmas Lights special, the $6 admission fee for the Butterfly Pavilion marked the first time an admission fee was charged for a permanent exhibit. My bill requires a report to Congress in advance of any proposed admission fees for permanent exhibits and requires the Secretary of the Smithsonian to submit a plan for funding the Butterfly Pavilion without an admission fee.

The Smithsonian Modernization Act, which I am also introducing today, addresses the Smithsonian's fundraising capacity by restructuring and expanding the Smithsonian's Board, from a board almost half of whose members are public officials to a board consisting solely of private citizens, who will have greater experience and fundraising capacity than public officials.

The Smithsonian Modernization Act and similar measures, not admission fees, provide the most realistic vehicles to raise funds for the Smithsonian without cost to the government or to the public. Admission fees can bring in only token amounts. According to CRS, the Smithsonian has long prided itself on ''free access.'' Admission fees are not the answer for taxpayers, who have already paid through the Federal Government's 70 percent contribution to this public institution's annual budget. Federal taxpayers do not expect to pay again through an admission fee to a federally-financed institution.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

IN RECOGNITION OF C.L. THOMAS, SR.'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY AS PASTOR OF ELIZABETH MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to C.L. Thomas, Sr.'s 10th anniversary as pastor of Elizabeth Missionary Baptist Church in Mathews, Alabama.

Calvin L. Thomas, Sr. is the youngest of nine children and is the fifth son of James and Anna Thomas. He had the privilege of growing up in a spiritual and loving home where discipline was taught, house rules derived from biblical lessons and mother-wit was put in place that required particular actions and reactions.

His employment began at Winn-Dixie Stores at the age of 16 and at age 21 he was promoted to Assistant Manager. At 22, he pursued a career as an insurance agent at North Carolina Mutual. At 25, he was promoted to District Sales Manager in charge of two large cities, Montgomery and Birmingham, and was one of the youngest to achieve this goal.

Calvin's desire was to have his own business, so in 2000 he started T & T Insurance Group. In 2007, he founded the Kingdom Investors where he serves as President and CEO.

He has served as Deacon and Chairman of the Deacon Board of the Elizabeth Missionary Baptist Church. In 1999, God called him to the Ministry to preach at Elizabeth Missionary Baptist Church in February 2001 and was installed as Pastor on May 6, 2001.

He attended Samford University from 2000–2003, receiving a certificate in Christian training and doctrine of the books of the Bible. He studied the Principles of Communication, Prayer and Righteousness and Sermon preparation and preaching at Fresh Anointing International School of Ministry.

I congratulate Mr. Thomas on his 10th year as the pastor of Elizabeth Missionary Baptist Church and thank him for his service to the Mathews area.

ONGOING VIOLENCE IN SYRIA

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express deep concern about the unfolding humanitarian crisis in Syria. People all over the world have watched with awe as democratic movements in Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya have risen up against autocratic and corrupt regimes. We have witnessed humanity at its best, as people have shown the courage and bravery to peacefully protest in the face of violence. We have also unfortunately witnessed humanity at its worst, as desperate governments have lashed out in an effort to preserve their rule.

The Syrian government has historically been one of the most repressive in the Middle East, so it should be no surprise that the Syrian people have protested the many abuses they are subjected to. Hundreds of those protesters have tragically been killed at the hands of Syrian government forces, and thousands more have been detained. The human rights violations of the Syrian government must be condemned and the Syrian people should be allowed to exercise their fundamental freedoms.

These recent violations, as well as the Syrian regime's longstanding record of infringing on human rights, should raise grave concerns that many nations have embraced Syria's candidacy to sit on the U.N. Human Rights Council. The Syrian regime lacks any moral authority to protect human rights and its election to the U.N. Human Rights Council would mock the rebuke it just received from the same institution. If the United States and other nations are serious about protecting human rights, we will block Syria from sitting on the U.N. Human Rights Council as long as the current government is in place.

BRETT STEARNS TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Brett Stearns of Craig, Colorado. Mr. Stearns was an engine captain for the Bureau of Land Management and worked tirelessly to protect the natural beauty of Colorado.

It was while working in fire prevention at the Freeman Reservoir that he tragically passed away. He was, by all accounts, an excellent firefighter and his presence will be missed. Captain Stearns was an avid outdoor enthusiast from a young age and working for the BLM was a natural position for him. He worked hard to preserve the forests and open spaces of Colorado.

The Captain could often be seen running his favorite trail, which has since been renamed the Stearns Memorial Trail. It is a fitting tribute to someone so closely involved with his community and its outdoor recreation. The trail serves as a reminder of the sacrifices made by those who protect our open land.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Captain Brett Stearns today. His impact on the

community has been immense, and his efforts to protect Colorado's outdoor beauty contribute to its pristine state.

HONORING WILLIAM F. ALLEN, JR.

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize William F. Allen, Jr. William is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 388, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

William has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years William has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, William was the first in his troop to earn the Conservation Badge. William has also joined the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and joined the Order of the Arrow.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending William F. Allen, Jr. for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this week I was unable to participate in several votes. Had I been here I would have voted the following way:

H.R. 1213—Repeal mandatory funding provided to States in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to establish American Health Benefit Exchanges—AYE

H.R. 1214—Repeal mandatory funding for school-based health center construction—AYE

H.R. 3—No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act—AYE

H.R. 1230—Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act—AYE

A TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GABRIEL HAUGLAND

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievement of Lieutenant Gabriel Haugland of Clear Lake, Iowa who recently received the Combat Infantryman Badge for his service in the Iowa Army National Guard during Operation Enduring Freedom.

The Combat Infantryman Badge (CIB) was established on October 7, 1943 by the U.S. War Department. It is awarded to those soldiers who personally fought in ground combat while assigned to either an infantry or a Special Forces unit.

Lieutenant Haugland, a graduate of the University of Iowa and Drake University Law School, joined the Army National Guard in May of 2004. He recently returned from serving a deployment in Afghanistan with Bravo Company, 168th Infantry Battalion. His unit's mission was to secure the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, which consisted primarily of stopping the flow of foreign fighters, drugs, and guns into Afghanistan.

On January 8, 2011, Lieutenant Haugland's unit came under fire from the Taliban. He engaged in the fight, and thankfully was not wounded. However, he broke his leg three days later in a non-combat related accident and was sent stateside to recover. Lieutenant Haugland plans to resume his military career after his recovery.

Lieutenant Haugland is a true patriot and a true hero. I know my colleagues in the United States Congress will join me in thanking him for his service to our great country and in congratulating him for receiving the Combat Infantryman Badge. I wish him, his wife Carolyn, and their children the best of luck in the future.

RECOGNIZING MR. PHILLIP C. HOUSTON IN HONOR OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE GREENE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT

HON. STEVE AUSTRIA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. AUSTRIA. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Ohio's seventh congressional district, I am honored to recognize Mr. Phillip C. Houston for his 32 years of dedicated service to Greene County and congratulate him on his recent retirement.

Phil Houston grew up in the Akron area. He received his Bachelor's Degree from Olivet Nazarene College and a Master of Public Administration from Central Michigan University.

Throughout his 23 years as Director of the Department of Development for the Greene County Board of Commissioners, Phil has seen the department form into a full-service economic development organization that provides services in: small business loan assistance, structured retention and expansion, tourism, and housing down-payment assistance and education.

Originally, Greene County hired Phil to direct its annual $3 million comprehensive Employment and Training Act Program, funds that were in jeopardy of being revoked by the U.S. Department of Labor. Within two years, Phil had remedied all the problems and his department was acknowledged for having taken appropriate steps to course-correct.

Thanks to Phil's stewardship, the county generated a fundamental Economic Development Plan, and worked with the four cities, six villages and 12 townships throughout Greene County to consolidate their efforts to improve the county. In just the past few years, more than 40 projects ranging from infrastructure improvements to community building renovations and code enforcement have been accomplished through Greene County's Community Development Block Grant Program with Phil's oversight and direction.

Though he has made a career for himself in public service, Phil still managed to give back to his community as a volunteer. He has been involved with the American Economic Development Council, the Small Business. Administration, and the Dayton Area Technology Network. He has served as a member of the County Budget Review Committee, County Adult Day Care Board, County Jail Advisory Committee, Greene County Board of Education Business Advisory Committee, and the Adult Education Committee for Greene County's Career Center.

Phil's efforts have not gone unnoticed, and he has received numerous awards throughout the years. Some of these include the Governor's Excellence Award for Innovative Economic Development and the Ohio County Superintendent's Association's Outstanding Leadership award in 1992. He was also named Greene County Adult Education Volunteer of the Year in 1990 and NAIOP Public Official of the Year for Dayton in 1991. Additionally, Phil has received five National Association of Counties, NACO, achievement awards for: increasing sales opportunities; intergovernmental cooperative efforts; cutback management; accessibility for the disabled; and assistance to the homeless.

Phil and his wife, Teresa, have two children, Erika and Brooke, two grandchildren and a third on the way.

Phil's decades of service have proven him to truly be the epitome of selflessness and commitment. He has demonstrated sincere dedication to providing prosperity and knowledge to Greene County. It is his exemplary efforts that assist the progress of our nation in fairly and efficiently protecting our citizens.

Thus, with great pride, I commend Mr. Phillip C. Houston for his commendable service to the community and extend him the best throughout his hard-earned retirement.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 2011

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, since coming to Congress in 2001, I have strongly supported the longstanding policy that prohibits federal funding of abortion. However, I cannot in good conscience support H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding of Abortion Act, which goes far beyond current policy by using the tax code to punish families and small businesses for the private insurance that they already have.

The thirty-year precedent to restrict the federal funding of abortion, commonly known as the Hyde Amendment, has rightfully served as a guarantee to citizens that the federal government shall not use taxpayer dollars to pay for abortions beyond the unique exceptions of rape, incest, or life endangerment of the mother. The Hyde Amendment is a common sense measure to prevent the federal funding of something that many oppose on moral or religious grounds. I am certainly one of those people. However, this bill does much more than make this policy permanent federal law.

For the first time ever, H.R. 3 would expand the definition of federal funding to include tax deductions and credits of private income or expenses. In other words, current restrictions on government spending would also be applied to the private dollars families and small businesses decide to spend on health coverage. This is an unparalleled reinterpretation of federal funding that could have far-reaching consequences for families, businesses, and even religious institutions.

This bill explicitly prohibits individuals and small businesses that elect a private insurance plan with abortion coverage from claiming certain tax deductions, credits and exclusions for health care expenses, even if that abortion coverage is never used but happens to be part of a plan that otherwise works best for a particular family. Such a substantial change in federal policy would raise taxes on families and small businesses for private coverage that they are already struggling to afford.

This prohibition is also not equally applied to large employers, who can continue offering abortion coverage, creating an uneven and unjust application of abortion policy within the tax code. Further, since the IRS is charged with enforcing taxpayer compliance, this bill raises serious concerns over how the government might audit ''questionable'' benefit claims by women who receive an abortion as a result of sexual assault or legitimate life-threatening medical conditions.

It is also important to note that taking the unprecedented step of redefining ''federal funding'' to include the benefit of a tax exemption could raise political and legal questions for churches and other religious organizations which operate under similar restrictions as current law. Many religious institutions either receive segregated federal funds or tax exemptions to run activities such as adoption services, homeless shelters and food banks. This precedent challenges the very pro-life activities that these churches promote.

Although this bill contains many provisions that I do support, it simply goes too far by redefining the very meaning of federal funding.

Finally, we must not lose focus on the truly urgent priorities of Americans right now, namely economic security and deficit reduction. We are five months into this session and Republicans have yet to offer a single bill to help create jobs. I urge my colleagues to oppose the current version of this bill, stop allowing divisive social issues to dominate our time, and turn our attention to the true economic and fiscal challenges in front of us.

HONORING THE FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

HON. RICHARD B. NUGENT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker:

Whereas, our communities must place the highest value on preserving the role of prayer in our society and government, so that all Americans can continue to enjoy the benefits that our faith has bestowed upon us; and

Whereas, an appreciation for our history encourages dedication to the values and ideals which have enriched our nation; and

Whereas, in the highest traditions of our country, the Fifth Congressional District of Florida has provided an exceptional example of the power of faith in our society; and

Whereas, on this day, the citizens and leaders of the community are gathered to partake in a non-denominational day of prayer.

Therefore, I, Richard B. Nugent, Member of Congress representing the Fifth Congressional District of Florida, do hereby recognize the district's observance of the 60th National Day of Prayer.

A TRIBUTE TO JACOB POMEROY

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jacob J. Pomeroy for the rank of an Eagle Scout. Jacob is a 10th grade student from South Hardin High School in Eldora, Iowa.

The Eagle Scout rank is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Only about 5% of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance based achievement whose standards have been well-maintained over the years. To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, as well as completing an Eagle Project to benefit the community. Jacob's project was to construct a barn-themed sun shelter for the Joyful Noise Preschool and the Waukee United Methodist Church. Jacob also went above and beyond the requirements by completing more than the minimum required number of merit badges.

Jacob has been involved in scouting since he became a Tiger Cub more than 11 years ago. Jacob's father, John Pomeroy, is also an Eagle Scout and current assistant Scout Master to Troop 178 from Waukee, Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I am honored to represent Jacob Pomeroy and his family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues will join me in congratulating him on earning an Eagle Scout ranking and will wish him continued success in his future education and career.

CELEBRATING MAURA McNIEL'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 90th birthday of Mrs. Maura McNiel, a leading women's rights activist whose legacy impacts women in Dallas and all over the United States.

Maura McNiel was born in Minneapolis, Minnesota on April 4, 1929 and grew up inspired by integration in Minneapolis-area schools. She moved to Dallas in 1953 and, dedicated to improve the lives of people and the world around her, became involved in the civil rights movement and environmental issues. Soon after, Ms. McNiel immersed herself in the feminist cause, for which she is applauded today.

The list of Ms. McNiel's activities to improve the lives of others are endless: She spoke to reporters, politicians, organization leaders, and others and had a strong impact wherever she went. She founded Women for Change in 1971, the first women's center in Dallas, and then helped organize the Rape Crisis Center, the National Organization of Women and People for the American Way, Women's Coalition, Family Place (for battered women), the Southwest Credit Union, The Dallas Commission on the Status of Women and the Women's Issues Network.

But it was the personal touch she brought to her efforts that made each one a success.

She famously informed the all-male Rotary Club that just as birds flew better with two wings, marriages worked better as a partnership where both husband and wife shared responsibilities and demands. As her dialogue indicates, her approach was not antagonistic; rather, it was based upon building relationships. And that she did, with the Dallas City Hall, news organizations, and many, many others.

It was this both passionate and rational approach to women's rights that enabled her to successfully fight for Title IX in 1972, which expanded women's education opportunities. She understood that the success of a movement lies not just on its present, but also its future.

More importantly, she knew the importance of following words with action and personal sacrifice. As founding president of Women for Change, which created the first sanctuaries for family abuse victims, Maura took the lead by hosting the first woman in her own home.

A wonderful mother, Sunday school teacher, community leader, effective activist, Maura McNiel's work has led to achievements in women's studies, modern social work, advocacy on behalf of abused women, promotion of the Equal Rights Amendment, and passage of Title IX.

As her representative in Congress, it is my distinct pleasure to honor her today on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. I ask my colleagues to join Maura McNiel's family and friends in wishing her a blessed 90th birthday and continued health and happiness in the years to come.

SUPPORT PASSAGE OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 244, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT A PALESTINIAN GOVERNMENT WHICH INCLUDES HAMAS MUST BE PROHIBITED FROM RECEIVING UNITED STATES AID UNTIL THAT GOVERNMENT PUBLICLY COMMITS TO THE QUARTET PRINCIPLES

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my strong support for House Resolution 244, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a Palestinian government which includes Hamas must

be prohibited from receiving United States aid until that government publicly commits to the Quartet principles. The Quartet—the United States, the European Union, the United Nations, and the Russian Federation, require Hamas to recognize Israel's right to exist, to renounce violence, and to accept previous Israeli-Palestinian agreements.

Last week on April 27, 2011, Fatah and Hamas initialed a document of understandings as a foundation for a ''Palestinian National Accord'' agreement, which was signed by all of the Palestinian factions on May 4th in Cairo, under the aegis of the Egyptian transitional government and with the presence of Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas and Hamas Political Bureau head Khaled Mash'al.

That same night on Al-Jazeera TV, Foreign Minister of the Hamas Gaza Government, and a member of the Hamas delegation to the Cairo discussions, Mahmoud Al-Zahhar said: ''We believe that negotiations with the Israeli enemy are in vain . . . . It will be impossible for an interim government to take part in the peace process with Israel.''

Mr. Speaker, we should also be troubled by the announcement by a lead Fatah negotiator that Palestinian Authority Prime Minister Salam Fayyad, who has been a leader in developing the Palestinian economy in the West Bank as well as a primary peace negotiator with Israel, will not be a part of the interim unity government.

Hamas embraces violence against innocent women, children, and men and calls for the destruction of Israel in its charter. It has been a designated terrorist organization by the United States since 1995 and by the European Union since 2003. Hamas terrorists have murdered hundreds of innocent Israelis, kidnapped and refused Red Cross access to Israeli soldiers, smuggled Iranian arms into the Gaza Strip, and launched thousands of rockets and mortars into Israel, including more than 300 since the beginning of 2011.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and reaffirm the notions that a Palestinian government which includes Hamas, a U.S.-designated terrorist group, must be prohibited from receiving U.S. aid. The legislation further acknowledges that the United States House of Representatives has a deep interest in achieving a resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through the creation of a viable and independent Palestinian state living in peace alongside the State of Israel.

HONORING THE 275TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST REFORMED CHURCH OF POMPTON PLAINS

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the First Reformed Church of Pompton Plains located in Morris County, New Jersey which is celebrating its 275th Anniversary.

Forty years before the birth of our Nation, a small band of Dutch farmers gathered together in a new land. It was there that the First Reformed Church of Pompton Plains was dedicated on April 7, 1736, under the pastorate of the Reverend Johannes Van Driessen. The church prospered in its early years, with a membership of 72 by the spring of 1738. A new building was erected in 1771 on land donated by Theunis Dey. This new church building, the first in the community, was located on what is now the Newark-Pompton Turnpike, the site of the present church.

Throughout the years, the church grew physically and spiritually. One hundred years after it was built, the church was enlarged and improved under the leadership of Reverend John Van Neste Schenck. The church was rededicated on November 22, 1871, seven months after its 100th anniversary. It was also on that day that the church family mourned the passing of their energetic minister.

Addressing the needs of members near and far, several small chapels were built. The first, known as Grace Chapel, was built next to the church for the purpose of education. Other chapels were located in various nearby communities, including Wayne, Lincoln Park, and Towaco. Throughout the years many chapels came to form independent churches, most of which remain a part of the Reformed Church of America.

The 1900s brought tremendous growth to the church. With more people joining the congregation, the financial status of the church enabled the construction of a ''church house'' in 1926, and a fellowship hall, known as ''Friendship Hall'' in 1965. But the period also brought tragedy. On October 24, 1937, the sanctuary was almost completely destroyed by fire. While the actual cause of the inferno was never determined, faulty wiring seemed probable. The tragic loss, however, brought out the invigorating spirit of the congregation and its dynamic minister, the Rev. Eugene H. Keator. A year and a half later, on April 7, 1939, a new building, larger than the old, with a new steeple and bell, was dedicated. This remarkable historic Christopher Wren-style edifice was completed debt-free.

In 1953, the church acquired the 1788 stone Mandeville home, a one-time Pompton Plains post office, adjacent to the church proper. Today it is the church manse. Along with the sanctuary and Grace Chapel, it is presently undergoing consideration for inclusion in the State and National Historic Registries.

The remains of soldiers from the Revolutionary War to the present find their final resting place in the church cemetery. A walk about the grounds provides a glimpse into the church's vital part in our Nation's rich history. This year, in remembrance of the 150th Anniversary of the Civil War, the church will dedicate veteran's markers identifying more than 600 of our American heroes.

The First Reformed Church of Pompton Plains is a community of faith with ''Open Doors, Open Hearts and Open Hands.'' During this special year, under the spiritual leadership of Reverend Kathleen Edwards Chase, may their spirit continue to rise.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating The First Reformed Church of Pompton Plains as they celebrate its 275th Anniversary.

2011 14TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT ART COMPETITION

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the artistic ability of a young woman from my Congressional District, Noël Peterson from the Pittsburgh High School for the Creative and Performing Arts. Ms. Peterson is the winner of the 2011 14th Congressional District of Pennsylvania's High School Art Competition, ''An Artistic Discovery.'' Ms. Peterson's artwork, a charcoal drawing entitled ''Organization,'' was selected from a number of outstanding entries to this year's competition.

In fact, over 70 works from fifteen different schools in Pennsylvania's 14th Congressional District were submitted to our panel of respected local artists. It's a real tribute to her skill and vision that her work was chosen as the winner of this year's competition. I am certain that Ms. Peterson's family is proud of her artistic talents and this impressive accomplishment.

Ms. Peterson's artwork will represent the 14th Congressional District of Pennsylvania in the national exhibit of high school students' artwork that will be displayed in the United States Capitol over the coming year. I encourage my colleagues as well as any visitor to Capitol Hill to view Ms. Peterson's artwork, along with the winning entries from the high school art contests held in other Congressional Districts, which will be on display in the Capitol tunnel. It is amazing to walk through this corridor and see the interpretation of life through the eyes of these young artists from all across our country.

Stephanie Taylor from South Allegheny High School was awarded second place for her Acrylic on Canvas ''Rocky.'' Beth Gonzales from West Mifflin High School received third place for her self-portrait in charcoal. Alaina Schuster from Carlynton High School was awarded fourth place for her painting ''Berries.'' Jessica Clair from Penn Hills was given fifth place for her acrylic painting ''Portrait of a Misfit.''

In addition, Honorable Mention Awards were presented to works by Nicole Murphy from Carlynton High School, Cody Atkins from East Allegheny High School, Julianna Rinaldo from the Ellis School, Olivia Pasquarelli from Montour High School, Alexandra Fawcett from Penn Hills High School, Alesia Miller from Penn Hills High School, Christopher Winston from Pittsburgh Allderdice High School, Andrew Fusia from Riverview High School, Ethan Lyons from Serra Catholic High School, Brandi Krivansky from South Allegheny High School, Sara Savage from Woodland Hills High School, and Natalie Kerrigan from West Mifflin High School, who entered two mixed media works in the competition and received Honorable Mention awards for both of them.

I would like to recognize all of the participants in this year's 14th Congressional District High School Art Competition, ''An Artistic Discovery:'' from the Pittsburgh High School for the Creative and Performing Arts, Robert Almond, Sarah Axtell, David Becinski, Zoe Capcara, Noël Peterson, and Nicolette Santercangelo; from Carlynton, Nicole Murphy and Alaina Schuster; from East Allegheny

High School, Cody Atkins and Tyler Guger; from The Ellis School, Rachel Cooper, Shae LaPlace, Tessa McArdle, Hannah Mellor, Julianna Rinaldo, and Emilia Whitmer; from Montour High School, Chloe Carlini, Claire Crowley, Jenna Luche, Harley Murphy, Olivia Pasquarelli, and Rourke Stubna; from Our Lady of the Sacred Heart, Stefano Ceccarelli, Joseph David Goltz, Andrea Laffey, and Emma Mallick; from Penn Hills High School, Jessica Clair, Nicolette Deighan, Alexandra Fawcett, Selena Ford, Alesia Miller, and Chris Schwanke; from Pittsburgh Allderdice High School, Jeremy Saulsbury, Bowen Schmitt, Ester Turpini, Christopher Winston, and William A. Worth; from Riverview High School, Amanda Alcorn, Paige Condon, Victoria DiDominico, Andrew Fusia, Ashley Reid, and Heather Tabacchi; from Serra Catholic, Garrett Hudson, Ethan Lyons, Andrew Pricener, Paige Spang, and Olivia Saccameno; from South Allegheny High School, Alexis Carr, Brandi Krivansky, Megan Matejcic, Brianna Marie Smith, and Stephanie Taylor; from Sto-Rox High School, Amanda Anderson, Maxine Blackwell, Natalie Gamble, DeArra Linea Moore, Elizabeth Thornton, and Dane Worms; from Trinity Christian School, Rebekah Garard; from West Mifflin High School, Victoria Cooper, Chelsey Earnest, Beth Gonzales, Natalie Kerrigan, and Maggie Morgans; and from Woodland Hills High School, Jasmine Baldridge, Donovan Jones, Rachel Pampino, Sara Savage, and Kenny Thomas.

I would like to thank these impressive young artists for allowing us to share and celebrate their talents, imagination, and creativity. The efforts of these students in expressing themselves in a powerful and positive manner are no less than spectacular.

I hope that all of these individuals continue to utilize their artistic talents, and I wish them all the best of luck in their future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO MARGARET McGUIRE

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Margaret McGuire of Perry, Iowa on celebrating her 100th birthday.

Margaret was born on April 14, 1911 in Audubon, Iowa. The middle child of six, she quickly developed a passion for music and began learning how to play the violin in fourth grade. Together with her cello-playing sister Betty and a piano-playing friend, Margaret performed in a trio. Before graduating from Audubon High School in 1929, she utilized her violin skills in the high school's string orchestra and quartet.

It didn't take Margaret long to decide that music wasn't just her passion—she wanted to make it her profession. She graduated in 1934 from Simpson College with a bachelor's degree in music education. She eventually went on to earn a master's degree in Violin Technology at Drake University. With her education in hand, Margaret spent the next several decades teaching both general music and violin in public schools and in private lessons. She also played the violin in the Des Moines Symphony, the Central Iowa Symphony, and the Iowa State University Symphony.

Although music played a large role in Margaret's life, her family was even more important to her. She was happily married to Francis McGuire for many years, and together they had one daughter and three sons. Even though Francis has passed on, Margaret treasures the time she has with their children. Today, Margaret also has eight grandchildren and seven great-grandchildren.

What is Margaret's secret to a long and happy life? The spirit of optimism demonstrated in her oft-repeated saying, ''Count your blessings.''

I am extremely honored to represent Margaret McGuire in the United States Congress, and I wish her much happiness and health in her future years.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF U.S. ARMY CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER TERRY L. VARNADORE II

HON. HEATH SHULER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Chief Warrant Officer, Terry Varnadore II. A native of Mills River, North Carolina, Chief Warrant Officer Varnadore passed away at the age of twenty nine, on April 23, 2011, while serving our country in the Kapisa Province of Afghanistan.

Chief Warrant Officer Varnadore grew up in Western North Carolina surrounded by family. He had a passion for fishing and hunting, and spent a great deal of his life in the Great Smoky Mountains with his father and younger brother. Chief Warrant Officer Varnadore married the love of his life, Casey Varnadore, after graduating from Appalachian State University. They have a 4 year old daughter together, Ava Elizabeth. Mrs. Varnadore is expecting their second daughter in July.

Chief Warrant Officer Varnadore's lifelong dream was to become a helicopter pilot. Assigned to the 10th Combat Aviation Brigade, 10th Mountain Division, he flew an OH–58 Delta Kiowa Warrior Helicopter. His awards and decorations include the Air Medal, the Meritorious Unit Commendation, the National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Iraq Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon, the NATO Medal, the Army Aviator Badge, and the Combat Action Badge.

Mr. Speaker, Chief Warrant Officer Varnadore embodied the best qualities of an American soldier. He was selfless, dedicated, and brave. He was respected by his fellow soldiers and appreciated by the officers he served under. Through his commendable service, Chief Warrant Officer Varnadore has made Western North Carolina proud. It is my honor to commemorate him and I urge my colleagues to join me today in honoring Chief Warrant Officer Terry Varnadore II for the sacrifice he has made for the United States.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the special occasion of the centennial celebration of the Jewish Family Service in my hometown of Saint Paul. For 100 years, Jewish Family Service has served individuals, families and new Americans from all walks of life, regardless of ethnicity or religion. Founded in 1911, the organization was originally called Jewish Charities of St. Paul. By 1913, the Jewish Charities of St. Paul was renamed Jewish Welfare Association for the next 31 years. In 1946, the organization's name was changed to Jewish Family Service, the name that remains today.

Jewish Family Service epitomizes the best in a community coming together. It has been a lifeline for many new immigrants and refugee groups, providing human services, employment counseling, mental health services, and translation services for the elderly. While programming may have changed along with demographics during the past century, the noble mission of Jewish Family Service has not changed.

Today Jewish Family Service continues to serve all members of our community, including our newest Americans, including Somali, Latinos, Hmong and Russians, who are making their homes in the East Metro Twin Cities area. Our community's diversity is a strength. By assisting individuals and families as well as our new immigrants become productive and successful citizens in our community, Jewish Family Service is worthy of commendation and celebration. I offer my sincere congratulations to the staff and supporters of Jewish Family Service.

In honor of the 100th Anniversary of the Jewish Family Service, I am pleased to submit this statement for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

INTRODUCTION OF THE RECIPROCAL MARKET ACCESS ACT OF 2011

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Reciprocal Market Access Act. In the wake of the biggest economic crisis since the Great Depression, our country faces a difficult road towards recovery. As part of this effort, it is critical that we ensure that our trade policy is working as it should: to generate new opportunities for our businesses, strengthen American manufacturing capabilities, and reduce the unemployment rate that has risen to the highest level in decades.

American manufacturers of products ranging from optical fiber to autos and agriculture face continual problems with access to overseas markets. Our own trade negotiators do little to prevent this from happening, as it is often standard for trade agreements to open our

markets fully to foreign competitors, yet we gain little market access in return. The pending free trade agreement with South Korea is another example of a free trade agreement that opens our markets to foreign competition while failing to address serious market access concerns in Korea.

We must provide our negotiators with unequivocal guidelines so that they do not relinquish our domestic trade protections without gaining meaningful market access for American manufacturers in exchange. Unless other governments play by the rules and remove barriers to our exports, the U.S. should not acquiesce to their demands by further opening our market—which is already the most open market in the global economy. Unilateral disarmament in the face of foreign protectionist practices is unacceptable, and we must ensure that our trade negotiators do not undermine our industries and our workers.

The Reciprocal Market Access Act would instruct our trade negotiators to eliminate foreign market barriers before reducing U.S. tariffs. This bill would also provide enforcement authority to reinstate the tariff if the foreign government does not honor its commitment to remove its barriers.

This legislation also addresses a serious problem in the current trade negotiating process. Tariff and non-tariff sectoral barriers are compartmentalized, meaning that a tariff item can be reduced or eliminated by our negotiators without securing elimination of the non-tariff barriers that deny U.S. industry access to a foreign market. This legislation would give our government the right to revoke concessions to cut tariffs if our trading partners fail to implement negotiated commitments to eliminate barriers that had initially been identified by U.S. domestic producers for our negotiators.

The principle of reciprocity—the principle on which this legislation is built—is not new. In fact it is a principle that should be essential to any effective trade relationship. Cordell Hull, Democrat from Tennessee and Roosevelt's Secretary of State in 1933, was responsible for bringing this concept into the U.S. and global trade systems with the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1934. It was this act which formed the basis for the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the World Trade Organization (WTO). Mr. Hull developed the Act to move away from the negative consequences of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, which raised U.S. tariffs on thousands of imports to record levels. Smoot-Hawley established the United States as protectionist, and provoked a rash of retaliatory measures from our trading partners.

It is no longer the United States that is shutting its markets to foreign competitors. We have the most open market in the world, and continue to find ways to lower tariffs and eliminate market barriers. Yet this policy is often not reciprocated, as American manufacturers find significant barriers to foreign markets while they watch their own domestic market share dwindle. The result is quality American companies are forced to downsize or close their doors for good, and American workers are left jobless.

That is not free trade. Free trade involves a system where American companies are able to compete in markets uninhibited by barriers. It involves a level playing field for American companies and our trading partners. And I have no doubt that if given a level playing field, American companies and American workers can compete in any market.

The Reciprocal Market Access Act will mandate that at the very least any trade agreement does not put American companies and workers at a competitive disadvantage. It establishes what should be the standard for all trade agreements: a mutually beneficial trade relationship in which goods can be freely exchanged and that promotes economic growth.

HONORING J. WARREN GEURIN

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and pay tribute to J. Warren Geurin, a former congressional staffer and member of the Loudoun County School Board. Warren passed away April 30, at the age of 65 after having battled cancer for several months. Warren began his career on the Hill as the Minority Investigator on the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, serving our former colleagues Congressman Gene Taylor and Congressman Trent Lott. From 1980 to 1991 Warren served as a Minority counsel to the U.S. House Committee on Rules, working for former Congressmen Taylor, Lott, and Del Latta. Warren concluded his time on the Hill as legislative counsel to Congressman CHRIS SMITH. In 1992, Warren was appointed by President George H.W. Bush as Director of Congressional Affairs to then U.S. Department of Transportation Secretary Andrew Card.

Following Warren's congressional service, he worked in the private sector and later went on to serve as a three-term member of the Loudoun County School Board. Despite his diagnosis and worsening condition, Warren proved to be an inspiration, serving as chairman of the Committee on Academies and as a member of the Personnel Committee and the Minority Student Achievement Advisory Committee. Throughout his time on the School Board, Warren tirelessly advocated for children and Loudoun Schools and it was through his efforts which led to the successful completion of renovation projects at all of the schools in his district.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, it is my pleasure to honor the life of Mr. J. Warren Geurin, a great public servant, model citizen and a personal friend of mine. Warren will be honored and remembered by many, especially his widow, Susie; his two children Jennifer and Jeff; his many friends, colleagues and all who knew him.

A TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF MARSHALLTOWN

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievement of the City of Marshalltown in Iowa. The City of Marshalltown was recently selected to receive the 2010 Tree City USA Growth Award.

The Tree City USA Growth Award is given annually by the National Arbor Day Foundation and the Iowa Department of Natural Resource—Forestry Bureau to those cities who have dedicated themselves to preserving their public trees and stressing their importance to the community. These cities have gone above and beyond by enhancing their forest resources and demonstrating the value of trees in providing benefits for future generations. In order to receive this award, a city must meet the requirements in four categories: education and public relations, partnerships, planning and management, and tree planting and maintenance.

There are currently over 3,400 cities nationwide that are designated as a Tree City and over 135 million people live in these cities. Marshalltown was one of 24 cities in Iowa to qualify for this status.

I commend the City of Marshalltown for its commitment to preserving nature, in particular, its trees. I know that my colleagues in the United States Congress will join me in congratulating the City of Marshalltown in being selected to receive this award. It is an honor to represent the citizens of Marshalltown, and I wish their town continued success.

HONORING MICHAEL CAP

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I come to the floor to report the passing of a member of America's Greatest Generation. Michael Cap of Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania passed away on Wednesday afternoon at the Hollidaysburg Veterans Home. He was 101 years old.

I met Michael Cap only a few weeks ago, on April 20th, to present him with replacements for medals he was awarded for his service in the Army during World War II.

Mr. Cap served in Company F, 306th Infantry, 77th Infantry Division of the United States Army during the campaign in the Philippines. During his tour in the Pacific Theater, Mr. Cap was wounded in action twice including a wound he suffered after receiving shrapnel in his heart during the invasion of Leyte Island. For his bravery and honorable service during the war, Mr. Cap received 10 medals, which had been lost or misplaced over time after the war.

It was my honor to have had the opportunity to replace these medals and on April 20, I joined Mr. Cap and members of his family at the Hollidaysburg Veterans Home to present him with the following medal and awards:

The Purple Heart with 1 bronze oak leaf cluster; the Bronze Star; the World War II Victory Medal; the American Campaign Medal; the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with 3 bronze service stars with arrowhead; the Philippine Liberation Ribbon with 1 bronze service star; the Good Conduct Medal; the Combat Infantryman Badge—1st Award; the Expert Infantryman Badge; and the Honorable Service WWII Lapel Button.

Mr. Speaker, with Michael Cap's passing, one more veteran of World War II has left us. It seems with each passing day, we are losing a generation that defined American courage.

Michael Cap's generation fought to end the threat of totalitarianism and came home to build the American Dream in peace. Their example set the tone for future generations of soldiers, including the men and women now serving in uniform in the United States armed forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Let us not forget Michael Cap and those like him who stood up in the face of evil and totalitarianism and defeated it. America owes him and all our veterans a great debt.

REMEMBERING AND HONORING THE LIFE OF DEACON MAURICE JOSEPH WALSH

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr Speaker, I rise today to mourn the passing and honor the life of Deacon Maurice Joseph Walsh of Niantic, Connecticut. Deacon Walsh passed away on April 21, 2011 surrounded by his family at his home.

Maurice, or Moe as he was known to friends, lived a life replete with service to his country, church, and community. Ordained in the first Permanent Diaconate class in New England by Archbishop John F. Whealon, he served several parishes including the St. Agnes Parish in Niantic. He was a member of the 745th AAA Gun Battalion of West Hartford's U.S. Army Reserves, where he achieved the rank of Sergeant.

A student of banking at The University of Chicago and Williams College, Maurice worked at the Connecticut Bank and Trust Company for 35 years and eventually went on to start a family businesses with his sons—Maurice J. Walsh and Sons Real Estate Appraisals. Successful and industrious in his profession, he always found time to give back to a variety of causes. He was an active member of the Tinker Turner American Legion Post 128, Catholic Inter-Racial Council, and was a 4th Degree Knight of Columbus.

When he finally retired from the family business, Maurice saw it as an opportunity to give more. He took on a larger role as a Permanent Deacon and continued his tradition of broad, community-oriented service. He was well known for regular trips to Niantic's Bridebrook Rehabilitation Center where he and a group of volunteers he assembled would spend time with and provide spiritual guidance to its residents.

People like Deacon Walsh lived in the service of others. From a relatively young age, he went to great lengths to provide comfort and guidance to people in need of personal, civic, and spiritual help and continued this service through the age of 80. His impact in eastern Connecticut is unquantifiable. My thoughts and prayers go out to the Walsh family. He leaves behind his three sons Damien, Jeffrey, and Daniel as well as his loving wife Claire. Maurice will be dearly missed by his family, friends, and the countless people he served throughout his life.

HONORING NORMA ADELAIDE CARTER MURPHY

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life and accomplishments of Norma Carter Murphy, a constituent and family friend. On Saturday, May 7, 2011, family, friends, neighbors, students, classmates and co-workers will join together to honor Norma at the Cherry Point Marine Base in Havelock, North Carolina.

The middle child of Luke Eight Carter and Eunice Godette Carter, Norma Adelaide Carter was born on January 16, 1931. She attended Ole Godette Elementary School and the Palmer Memorial Institute in Sedalia, North Carolina, and graduated from Charles H. Darden High School in Wilson, North Carolina. Norma went on to earn a degree in Education from historic Howard University, and later earned her Masters Degree in Education from North Carolina Central University.

Norma began her long and distinguished teaching career at Queen Street High School in Beaufort, North Carolina and went on to teach in a variety of positions in North Carolina and Michigan for a period of 45 years.

Mrs. Murphy was always greatly loved by students and fellow teachers because of her passion, grace, energy, compassion and tireless focus on helping students succeed by achieving greatness.

Beyond the classroom, Norma has been extremely dedicated to her community. Along with eight other women, she chartered the New Bern Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta, Inc. in order to promote academic excellence, provide scholarships and support to the underserved, and to highlight and resolve social and political problems in the local community.

While residing in Michigan, Norma was appointed to the state Board of Marriage and Family Counseling and served in that position for many years. She has also been active with the League of Women Voters and many parent-teacher associations.

Nine years ago, Norma moved back to North Harlowe, North Carolina to the dwelling where she was born. She is now close to many members of her immediate family and enjoying life to the fullest.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing Norma Carter Murphy. She is truly a remarkable person deserving of our deepest well wishes for the enormous contributions she has made to her community and to the many young people she has taught and mentored over the years.

ROBERT LUCAS BEERS TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Robert Lucas Beers of Mancos, Colorado. Mr. Beers led a particularly vibrant life in southern Colorado as a prominent businessman, volunteer and veteran. His years of service in both private and public offices contributed to that prominence.

Mr. Beers was born in raised in Mancos, Colorado. After graduating from high school, he worked briefly in the Civilian Conservation Corps before attending Fort Lewis College. He later joined the executive board of the college and was one of the members responsible for its move to Durango.

In 1944, during the height of World War II, Mr. Beers joined the Army as a cryptologist. His work decoding intercepted messages was a major contribution to our victory in China, Burma and India. Before enlisting, he was already an accomplished pilot, serving in the Civil Air Patrol, and was a civil defense volunteer for many years.

After the war, Mr. Beers returned to Durango to begin his various business ventures and public service. He worked for a number of years in the oil and gas industry and was one of the founders of Basin Petroleum, a company that owned and operated several service stations in Colorado. He also served on the Durango City Council and was elected mayor of the city for a term, where he supported a number of initiatives including paving the city's streets.

Mr. Beers also volunteered on several boards during his career. Most notably he sat for two terms on the State Agriculture Board, Mercy Hospital and the Chamber of Commerce. His love of skiing was also a driving force behind the formation of the original San Juan Development Corp., which helped create Purgatory at Durango Mountain Resort.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Robert Beers today. The community he spent a lifetime working for owes him a great deal. There is no doubt his legacy will continue to impact Colorado.

A TRIBUTE TO THE MECHDYNE

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Marshalltown's high-tech, home-grown business Mechdyne for winning the Entrepreneur of the Month Award from the Iowa Farm Bureau.

Mechdyne Corporation is based in Marshalltown, but has offices all over the world including, Houston, Washington, D.C., Canada, the United Kingdom, and even the Middle East. Despite being able to customize solutions for clients all over the globe, Mechdyne hasn't neglected Iowa and recently provided East Marshall High School with top of the line technology to facilitate a more immersive learning experience, and stimulate student interest in high tech careers.

Mechdyne began its existence by specializing in virtual reality systems but now consults for and develops advanced 3D visualization solutions for a global array of customers. Their success is a testament to the "can-do" spirit of Iowans and an example of the unlimited potential we believe each person has.

Mr. Speaker, I could not be more honored to represent Mechdyne and its employees in the United States House of Representatives and I know that all of my colleagues in the

United States Congress will join me in congratulating them.

CONGRATULATING NAPSEC

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the National Association of Private Special Education Centers (NAPSEC) for their 40 years of excellent service and academic dedication to our country's individuals with disabilities. NAPSEC's educational therapeutic services, combined with four decades of experience are invaluable to the education community across the United States and to the dozens of partners in my home state of New Jersey.

Established in 1971, NAPSEC represents private specialized education programs including early intervention services, school programs, residential therapeutic centers, and college experience and adult living programs for individuals with disabilities and their families. NAPSEC's hundreds of affiliates offer much needed services to publically and privately placed individuals who are otherwise unable to receive an appropriate public education. Member programs also serve the needs of individuals who have graduated from high school including adults over 21 years of age.

I am inspired by the quality of care and expertise NAPSEC's partners provide to America's students with disabilities, including those with autism. Again, I offer NAPSEC my sincerest congratulations on 40 years of service to the disabilities community and look forward to NAPSEC's continued progress in the future.

HONORING LESLIE (LES) HAROLD HAYES

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the life and legacy of Leslie (Les) Harold Hayes—publisher emeritus of The Madera Tribune.

Les was born in 1928 in Emporia, Kansas. After working his way through school, Les enrolled in Emporia College where he earned a Bachelor's degree in Business with a minor in English and Journalism. In 1955 he received an offer from the Merced Sun Star, moved to California, and spent the next few decades climbing from typesetter to publisher while working at a series of papers around the Valley. In 1995 Les retired only to be asked to return in 1998.

When not busy reporting the news, Les actively engaged himself in the community: he was a member of the Lions Club, the Rotary Club, and the Madera County Historical Society. In 2006, Les received the Madera Chamber of Commerce ''Lifetime Achievement Award'' for his contributions to life in the county.

On April 6, 2011, at the age of 82, Les passed away. He leaves behind his wife, Chris, and five children.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Les Hayes and his many contributions. May we keep him and those he left behind in our hearts and prayers.

HONORING WILLIAM A. COOK

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute an exceptional Hoosier, William A. Cook. Sadly, we lost Bill on April 15. I wish to express my condolences to his family who knew him as husband, father, and grandfather.

To Indiana, Bill's leadership was a shining example of the type of leadership everyone should strive to achieve. Marked by common sense, his leadership embodied the qualities emblazoned in the Hoosier spirit. Bill's focus on service above self; both in building great businesses and in improving our community has left us all a better place to live, work, and raise a family.

As a man of faith, I believe we were put on this earth to love one another and to make the best of the gifts our Lord has provided. We are all blessed to live in a country that allows us to experience freedom and the opportunity to succeed. When I look at the life story of a man who built a business empire that began in a spare bedroom in an apartment, employed thousands around the globe, and provided life saving, and life-altering technology to millions more, all I can say is Amen. Well done.

Bill Cook exemplified the American dream in every way. The amazing narrative of his life will live on, not only through the Cook Group and the many companies that Bill created, but through his family and through the incalculable number of Hoosiers he helped through the years. I would like to thank his family for sharing Bill with us. We are a community that will not soon forget him.

KEEP TEACHERS TEACHING ACT

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution provides Congress with the authority to ''make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper'' to provide for the ''general Welfare'' of Americans. In the Department of Education Organization Act (P.L. 96–88), Congress declared that ''the establishment of a Department of Education is in the public interest, will promote the general welfare of the United States, will help ensure that education issues receive proper treatment at the Federal level, and will enable the Federal Government to coordinate its education activities more effectively.'' The Department of Education's mission is to ''promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.''

A TRIBUTE TO CHRISTENSEN CONSTRUCTION

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievement of Christensen Construction in Estherville, Iowa. This company was presented the Midwest Region Builder of the Year for 2010 by Butler Manufacturing at a convention held in Atlanta, Georgia.

Butler Manufacturing is a BlueScope Steel company that is based in Kansas City. The world's oldest steel building manufacturer, Butler Manufacturing has six regional manufacturing locations and over 1,200 Butler Builders nationwide. The Midwest Region consists of 13 states and 320 builders. The Builder of the Year Award is given annually to one builder in each region who has demonstrated excellence in selling Butler building and roof systems and has superior marketing skills.

Christensen Construction first became a Butler Builder in 1985. Since then, Christensen Construction has sold over $25 million in Butler products. The company was nominated for the award by Keith Huls of West Des Moines, this area's Butler manager. Huls said Christensen Construction received this award ''because of its history for outstanding sales along with its reputation for delivering the best value in products and services to their customers.''

I know my colleagues in the United States Congress will join me in congratulating Christensen Construction and its employees for receipt of this award. It is an honor to represent this company, its owner, and its employees in Congress, and I wish it the best of luck and success in the future.

RECOGNIZING THE REMARKABLE ACHIEVEMENTS OF CHICAGO ALDERMAN HELEN SHILLER

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Chicago Alderman Helen Shiller, who has been the Alderman of the 46th Ward since 1987. Alderman Shiller is retiring after 24 years of dedicated service to the residents of the 46th Ward and the City of Chicago. She is a tireless, passionate advocate for her constituents and for the community. She has been an especially powerful champion for those whose voices too often go unheard—the poor, immigrants, those who need affordable housing or shelter, the hungry.

Alderman Shiller is the Chair of the Chicago City Council's Committee on Human Relations, where she has a long and outstanding record of achievement. She played a key role in the passage of the human rights ordinance, recycling programs and city responsibility for public health and safety in the Chicago Public Schools. She initiated and passed a tough anti-apartheid ordinance in 1990. Her budget amendment tripled the city's AIDS budget in

1992. She co-sponsored the domestic partners ordinance extending benefits for unmarried couples. Throughout her aldermanic career, Alderman Shiller has fought for affordable housing and for city budget investments to make Chicago a more affordable place to live.

A strong voice for sustainability and green technologies, Alderman Shiller took the lead on a voluntary pilot program for multi-unit residential building recycling and created a task force to improve the city's recycling program. She is an advocate for LEED certification in all planned developments as well as in other development projects throughout the city.

In 1989, Alderman Shiller sponsored a resolution that created a sub-committee to focus on ways to end domestic violence. As a result of her leadership, the city now funds domestic violence counseling centers and programs for supervised visitations.

Alderman Shiller has continuously worked to keep the 46th Ward both economically and culturally diverse, while at the same time working to develop virtually every area of the ward. It is important to Alderman Shiller that the 46th Ward continue to be defined by its unique mix of people with very different economic and cultural backgrounds. She has worked on many models to retain this diversity and, with the City's Department of Housing, developed the Planned Purchase Price Assistance Program (now called CPAN), which provides opportunities for home ownership for working families.

Alderman Shiller led a comprehensive and inclusive community planning process resulting in the development of affordable housing and thriving retail development at Wilson Yard in the heart of Uptown.

Helen Shiller received her high school diploma from Woodstock Country School in Vermont in 1965. She attended the University of Wisconsin at Madison as a history major and received her BA in 1969. In 2005, she graduated from DePaul University's School for New Learning's Master's Program where her focus was public policy.

I am confident that Helen will continue to contribute to her community and city. I wish her the very best, and I am proud to call her my friend.

INTRODUCING THE INCREASING ACCESS TO VOLUNTARY SCREENING FOR HIV/AIDS AND STIS ACT OF 2011

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Increasing Access to Voluntary Screening for HIV/AIDS and STIs Act of 2011, which will help reduce the spread and morbidities associated with HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted infections (STIs).

Each year in the United States, almost 19 million new STIs occur and an estimated 56,300 Americans are newly infected with HIV. HIV/AIDS and STIs are syndemics. HIV infection can increase a person's risk for acquiring certain STIs, as well as affect their frequency, severity, and healing time, while STIs increase the risk of HIV transmission, impaired fertility, reproductive tract cancer, and adverse pregnancy outcomes.

Due to various factors, including stigma, a lack of health care coverage, and an inaccurate perception of risk among communities and providers, HIV and other long-term, initially asymptomatic STIs often remain undiagnosed or are diagnosed at later stages. This leads to higher rates of mortality, morbidity, disability, and transmission. Furthermore, the burden of HIV/AIDS and STIs falls disproportionately on different populations, with 15–24 year olds, men who have sex with men (MSM), and racial and ethnic minorities facing the greatest risk for STIs.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the United States Preventive Services Task Force recommend that voluntary screening for HIV/AIDS and other STIs be integrated into routine clinical care. All individuals engaging in sexual contact must have access to voluntary screening that is confidential, rapid, accurate, and medically appropriate. In addition, supporting scientifically based, culturally competent, and age-appropriate interventions is key to reducing the incidence of HIV/AIDS and other STIs.

The Increasing Access to Voluntary Screening for HIV/AIDS and STIs Act of 2011 takes an aggressive and multifaceted approach to combating HIV/AIDS and other STIs, including Chlamydia, gonorrhea, syphilis, hepatitis B, hepatitis C, and human papillomavirus (HPV), by increasing access to voluntary screening and other preventive methods while preserving patient rights and confidentiality.

Among other things, this bill requires Medicaid to cover voluntary screening for HIV/AIDS and other STIs as a mandatory service for all individuals 13 and older, including when such services are provided at a Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC). This legislation also requires the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) to provide Medicare reimbursement for voluntary HIV/AIDS and STI screening for all beneficiaries 13 and older.

In addition, this Act requires group health plans, insurance issuers providing group or individual health insurance coverage, and federal employee health benefits programs to cover routine screening for HIV/AIDS and other STIs; provides states with the support they need to cover low-income individuals infected with HIV until Medicaid is expanded in 2014 under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; and supports access to early medical and mental treatment by linking patients to appropriate medical and mental health services.

Lastly, this bill will help improve the accessibility and effectiveness of screening and other preventive services for groups that have been historically underrepresented in public health interventions for HIV/AIDS and other STIs, such as people living with disabilities, the transgender community, women living with severe physical disabilities, and women who have sex with women (WSW).

Mr. Speaker, HIV/AIDS and STIs remain a significant challenge to individual and public health. Through early detection and treatment, as well as comprehensive education for health care providers and communities, we can begin to reverse the tide of infections. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill, which combines the effectiveness of voluntary, routine screening with smart policy to improve the health of our communities and nation as a whole.

HONORING DELIA P. SANCHEZ

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of her recent honor, the 2011 Sydney & Thalia Potter Civic Leadership Award from the League of Women Voters of Hillsborough County, I rise to herald the achievements of Delia P. Sanchez, a champion for children in Florida. Ms. Sanchez is a wonderful example of the power of women to shape future generations and make a difference in their communities. Ms. Sanchez is a lifelong learner. She obtained her bachelor's degree from Florida State University in Social Work with minors in Education and Spanish in 1945 and went on to get her Master's in Social Work at Columbia University in 1947. Until 1991, nearly fifty years later, she took graduate level courses in areas such as Pupil Personnel Services, Education, and Rehabilitation.

All the while, Ms. Sanchez was affecting enormous change in lives of hundreds of children in the Tampa Bay area. One of the greatest services that Delia Sanchez provided to the Tampa community was to work with Congressman Sam Gibbons to bring the first Head Start initiative to Hillsborough County. She began her career as a Child Welfare Worker for the Florida State Welfare Board. From there Ms. Sanchez went on to work for the School Board of Hillsborough County as a School Social Worker and a Case Work Consultant, working her way up the ranks to eventually serve as the Administrative Supervisor for Head Start for nine years. Then, in the last three years of her career, she went into private practice to counsel troubled children.

Throughout her career and in her retirement, Ms. Sanchez has served as a board member or local representative to a number of community organizations. The list is too large to mention them all, but they range from the University of South Florida's Latin Community Advisory Committee, the Citizen's Advisory Council, the Child Abuse Council, the Ybor City Museum Society, to the National Association of Social Workers.

For all of her hard work in education and the lives of children, countless organizations have recognized her. To name a few, Ms. Sanchez is the recipient of the US State Department Fellowship Award, the American Red Cross Service Award twice, the Retired Social Worker Outstanding Achievement Award, the Hillsborough County Martin Luther King, Jr. Award, the National Head Start Association Lifetime Achievement Award and now the Sydney & Thalia Potter Civic Leadership Award. She is also a member of Sigma Delta Pi Spanish Honor Society, was named Social Worker of the Year by the National Association of Social Workers by the Tampa Bay Unit and then again by the Florida Chapter, received an honorary Doctorate from the University of South Florida School of Social Work, and in 1993 she was Hispanic Woman of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, Delia P. Sanchez is a woman of the highest regard who has dedicated her

life to helping others. I am proud to call her my neighbor, and I join many others to applaud her lifetime contribution to the Tampa Bay community.

A TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN ERIC NELSON

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievement of Captain Eric Nelson of Madrid, Iowa. Captain Nelson is a soldier in the Iowa Army National Guard. In May 2011, Captain Nelson will be presented the MacArthur Leadership Award in Washington, D.C.

The MacArthur Leadership Award is given by the United States Army to those company-grade officers that demonstrate the ideals for which General MacArthur stood: duty, honor, and country. It is presented annually to 25 officers that serve either in the Active Army, the Army National Guard, or the Army Reserves. Captain Nelson was the only Iowan selected this year to receive the award.

Captain Nelson recently returned in April 2011 from a year-long deployment in Kosovo. He served with the Iowa Army National Guard Company C, 2nd Battalion, 147th Aviation unit as part of the KFOR13 Peacekeeping Operations. His unit flew and maintained UH-60 Blackhawk helicopters while there, flying over 2,400 hours conducting border patrol, reconnaissance, and air movement flights.

I thank Captain Nelson for his honorable service to our country. I know that my colleagues in the United States Congress will join me in congratulating Captain Nelson in being selected to receive the MacArthur Leadership Award. It is an honor to serve as his representative, and I wish him the best of luck in the future.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. MIKE POMPEO

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 2011

Mr. POMPEO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Over the past 35 years, Republican and Democrat Presidents, as well as Republican and Democrat-controlled Congresses, have all agreed that American taxpayers should not be forced to fund abortions. Unfortunately, 14 months ago, with the passage of Obamacare, President Obama and Democrats in Congress rejected decades of consensus and abandoned the American people. Crafted behind closed doors and manipulated through the legislative process—despite major opposition by the American people—Obamacare not only attempts to destroy the American health care system, but it fails to protect the most innocent among us, the unborn.

H.R. 3 will fix this problem created by Obamacare, while also establishing a government-wide prohibition of funding for abortions. This bill prohibits funding for elective abortions and insurance coverage that would include abortion. It prevents health savings accounts (HSAs) from being used to pay for abortions and protects the rights of conscience by making the Hyde-Weldon provision a permanent fixture rather than having to be renewed annually. This legislation is not only essential policy, but it is also morally imperative.

Madam Speaker, the Obama Administration is openly hostile to pro-life policies. We cannot allow the administration discretion over abortion policy, as with Obamacare. The permanent establishment of the prohibitions in H.R. 3 will reverse the erosion of protections for the unborn advanced by the Obama Administration. We must act now to preserve the rights of the unborn for future generations.

I firmly believe that every unborn life is precious and should be protected. Therefore, absolutely no taxpayer money should be spent on abortions, directly or through subsidized health plans. The No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act ensures that these protections are permanently established. I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this important bill.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SIMON WIESENTHAL HOLOCAUST EDUCATION ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate Holocaust Remembrance Week, I am pleased to reintroduce the bipartisan Simon Wiesenthal Holocaust Education Act, along with Representatives ACKERMAN, PIERLUISI, BERKLEY, HASTINGS, RANGEL, WAXMAN, DEUTCH, and GRIMM. In keeping with the 2011 Holocaust Remembrance Week theme of ''Justice and Accountability in the Face of Genocide: What Have We Learned?'', it is important to provide educational opportunities for the youth of our Nation to understand the responsibility we all share for the human rights of others.

Named for the honored Holocaust survivor who spent his life working for justice for those murdered by the Nazis and to hunt down those who perpetrated such atrocities, this legislation would provide federal grants to educational organizations to teach students about the Holocaust. Through grants from the Department of Education, Holocaust organization programs would be able to apply for funds to improve the awareness and understanding of the Holocaust through classes, seminars, conferences, educational materials, and teacher training.

As the generations who survived the Holocaust pass away, we must ensure that we learn from their legacy and that it is remembered and honored. Over 11 million people, including 6 million European Jews as well as gypsies, the disabled and mentally ill, homosexuals, and others, were systematically and brutally murdered in the Holocaust as the Nazis swept across Europe, destroying entire villages and communities.

More than half a century later, persecution and murder on the basis of religion, ethnicity, and sexuality continue across the globe. We need programs in our schools that allow students to learn about the consequences of intolerance and hate, so that we can truly say, ''never again.''

The Simon Wiesenthal Holocaust Education Assistance Act is a positive step toward that end. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

SUPPORT OF THE FORCE PROTECTION AND READINESS ACT OF 2011

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Force Protection and Readiness Act of 2011.

This legislation will provide greater protections for our service women and men stationed in the U.S. and abroad. Sexual assault is a pervasive and serious problem throughout all branches of the military.

Over 65,000 servicemen and women have experienced some form of sexual assault or rape since 2002. In the Department of Defense (DoD) Annual Report on Sexual Assault in the Military for Fiscal Year (FY) 2009, there was a total of 3,230 reports of sexual assault involving military service members as either victims or subjects. This represents an 11 percent increase over FY 2008.

In 2008, in nearly half of all sexual assault cases the commander took no action, and only 13 percent of reported cases were prosecuted and referred to courts martial. These figures are far below civilian prosecution rates, where 40 percent of those arrested for rape are prosecuted. We must ensure that there is zero tolerance for sexual assault in the military services.

The Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services report released in December 2009 estimates that as many as 90 percent of sexual assaults go unreported. We hear too often that the reporting process may be as traumatic for the victim as the attack itself. In order to fully support and protect our troops, we must ensure the rights of sexual assault victims are upheld every step of the way.

If a victim cannot access essential care for fear of stigma, public embarrassment, threats to her career, or because they just do not know what resources are available, the military will continue to lose valuable female and male soldiers. These service members put themselves in harm's way to protect us and our Nation from threats at home and abroad. This bill ensures they are protected when dealing with the horrible tragedy of sexual assault.

The Force Protection and Readiness Act will expand the rights and protections of victims. First, it will create confidentiality protocols to protect victim rights and raise the propensity for a soldier to report their case by ensuring they receive adequate legal assistance and appropriate privileged communications with victim advocates. Second, it will ensure ease of base or organization transfer for victims or the offender, thereby decreasing fear of retaliation and bolstering victim reports. Third, it

will require that each service branch employ highly qualified experts to train and advise JAGs to handle and try sexual assault cases effectively. Fourth, it will ensure more complete sexual assault data reporting to better track DoD-wide reports and case disposition. Fifth, it will establish in statute a universal hotline to facilitate victim reporting and provide victims an immediate connection with sexual assault response coordinators.

We must put an end to what our former colleague and previous Army Secretary Pete Geren called "fratricide." We must keep the pressure on DoD to eliminate sexual assault in the ranks.

A TRIBUTE TO KEN BECKER

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of Ken Becker of Cresco, Iowa. For the last 34 years, Ken has worked as a journalist for the Cresco Times-Plain Dealer.

Throughout his career, Ken dedicated himself to documenting the stories and photographs of Cresco and its citizens, preserving the events and stories that have helped to make the town what it is today. Whether it was traveling with the high school basketball team to the state tournament, riding a snowmobile, or climbing the town's water tower, Ken was willing to do whatever it took to capture Cresco's history as it unfolded. His articles and pictures helped to keep the town's residents informed and interested in local happenings.

Ken believes the most important aspect of being a good journalist is to remember that "you aren't the story. The story is never about you as the writer. This is about what you're writing about."

I thank Ken for his strong and diligent work ethic. It is an admirable characteristic found in many citizens of Iowa, and one that I hope to see all Americans embody.

I know that my colleagues in the United States Congress will join me in commending Ken Becker for his decades of service at the Cresco Times-Plain Dealer. It is an honor to serve as his representative, and I wish Ken a happy and healthy retirement.

HONORING NURSES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND METROPOLITAN REGION

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing nurses in the District of Columbia and the metropolitan region during the celebration of National Nurses Week, May 6–12, 2011.

Nurses make up the largest percentage of the healthcare workforce. Washington, DC has the largest concentration of registered nurses. In addition to registered nurses, there are clinical nurse specialists, nurse anesthetists, nurse-midwives, nurse practitioners, and other nurses, who serve patients in our hospitals, community health clinics, doctor's offices, nursing homes, private homes, public and private schools, local and federal government agencies, and private businesses.

Nurses are often patients' primary point of contact, giving nurses the opportunity to get to know patients and their families. Nurses gain patients' trust and are essential to providing high-quality healthcare. Each year, we rightfully celebrate nurses during National Nurses Week for their contributions to patients in particular and to the healthcare system in general.

As a cosponsor of H. Res. 83, a resolution recognizing National Nurses Week on May 6 through May 12, 2011, I applaud the nursing professionals who serve the residents of the District of Columbia and the metropolitan region for their continued commitment to patient care. I ask the House to join me in applauding nurses in the District of Columbia, the metropolitan region, and the Nation.

RECOGNIZING PUBLIC SERVICE WEEK

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work that federal employees do, day in and day out, to make our country a better place.

Federal employees are on the front lines working to ensure that our government is running as efficiently and effectively as possible to provide the services taxpayers expect. They make our nation a safer and better place. They work in every congressional district of the country and thus it is incredibly appropriate that we honor their service this week.

Whether it's the FBI agent working to find a kidnapped child, the DEA agent keeping drugs out of schools, or the DOJ attorney prosecuting a child molester—all are federal employees graciously serving our nation.

We must also remember that there are intelligence agents risking their lives every day on the front lines side by side with our armed forces in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other fronts in the Global War on Terror who serve as federal employees. The first American killed in Afghanistan, Mike Spann, was a CIA agent and a constituent from my congressional district. Imagine the dangers a CIA employee or an FBI agent working side by side in Afghanistan with the U.S. military must encounter. A year ago January, I attended funerals for some of the seven CIA agents who were killed by a Taliban suicide bomber at Forward Operative Base Chapman near the Afghanistan-Pakistan border.

Federal employees also put their lives on the line here at home. The Border Patrol agent shot and killed in Arizona this past December who was working to stop the flow of illegal immigrants across our southern border was a federal employee.

The Immigration and Custom Enforcement agent who was killed and the two who were shot this past February outside of Mexico City were federal employees.

Doctors who tend to our veterans and wounded warriors in veterans hospitals and who are developing new prosthetic devices to help them recover, medical researchers at NIH working to develop cures for cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's, and autism—all are dedicated federal employees. These are individuals who could find more lucrative jobs in the private sector, but who are committed to public service. Dr. Francis Collins, the physician who mapped the human genome and serves as director of the National Institutes of Health, is a federal employee. The National Weather Service meteorologist who tracks hurricanes, the SBA staffer who helps a new business start up, the FDA inspector working to stop a salmonella outbreak—all are federal employees.

Though they often receive little praise for the work they do, federal employees provide many of the services that make this nation great. Today I thank them for their hard work and service to our country.

HONORING THE JOINT BALTIC AMERICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the Joint Baltic American National Committee, an organization founded 50 years ago to advocate for democracy in the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and to foster a strong relationship between those countries and the United States.

Founded at the height of the Cold War on April 27, 1961, the Joint Baltic American National Committee has been a powerful advocate for democracy and independence for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. After years of oppression and occupation by the Communist regime in the Soviet Union, the Baltic countries finally restored their sovereignty and regained independence in the early 1990s. Since that time, the Committee has worked to strengthen the relationship between those nations and the United States and to scrutinize Russian policy towards its neighbors in Eastern Europe.

Importantly, the Joint Baltic American National Committee was and continues to be a strong proponent of membership for Eastern European nations into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Union (EU). When the Baltic countries became members of both organizations in 2004, the Committee focused more of its attention on promoting democracy in Belarus, where Alexander Lukashenko continues to cling to power and oppress his people. Moreover, because of Russia's use of its energy resources as a weapon against its neighbors and the violation of Georgian sovereignty by the Russian military, the Committee has reinforced its work in support of a resilient security partnership between the countries of Eastern Europe and the United States. Today, the Committee continues to advocate for a strong U.S. role in the region, to promote democracy and human rights worldwide, and to bear witness to the legacy of communism.

Mr. Speaker, the Joint Baltic American National Committee has served the Baltic countries and their citizens with distinction. As we

congratulate the Committee on reaching its 50th year in existence, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering and honoring its work on behalf of the free people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the American citizens of Baltic heritage, and democracy for all of those still yearning to be free.

RECOGNIZING TOM BRIAN

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contribution to Oregon by my good friend Tom Brian, and congratulate him on his retirement following 32 years of public service to our great state.

Tom's commitment to improving his community, state, and nation were readily apparent from his early days as a deputy sheriff, city councilor, and mayor of the city of Tigard, to his service as a state representative and 12 years on the Washington County Commission.

Tom has deep and enduring roots in Oregon that have grounded his personal and professional life in special ways. He treasures Oregon, where he and his wife, Joene, have raised their three children: Becky, Sarah, and Kevin.

Tom believes in making a difference—and he's backed up that belief with action. Over the last decade, Tom's vision as a commissioner deserves much credit for Washington County's robust job growth. His tireless collaborations with Intel, Solar World, and the many small businesses throughout Washington County have created a business-friendly climate that has made it a magnet for economic development.

Tom grew up in Monmouth, Oregon, where he attended Central High School and graduated from the Oregon College of Education in 1970, now Western Oregon University. After serving as a Polk County deputy sheriff from 1969 to 1973, an opportunity arose for Tom to join the Oregon Council on Crime and Delinquency, where he became its executive director until 1979.

In 1979, Tom started a career in real estate and also began his life in elected public office, earning election to the Tigard City Council. He later became the city's mayor.

Tom was recruited to run for the Oregon Legislature in 1988. Tom rose quickly through the legislative ranks and became the chairman of the Revenue Committee and served on the Ways and Means and Judiciary committees. Tom was an innovator and collaborative leader in the legislature. His hard work, steadfast dedication to Oregon, great wit, and solid character earned him respect from both sides of the aisle.

In 1999, Oregon's term limit law ushered Tom from the legislature after 10 years. Still committed to making a difference, Tom ran for and earned a position on the Washington County Commission. Tom served there for 12 years before retiring in January of this year as its chairman.

Mr. Speaker, Tom's leadership has been recognized with numerous awards and accolades, including the First Citizen of the City of Tigard, the Guardian of Small Business, Outstanding Service to Farm Families, and Transit Legislator of the Year, just to name a few.

Tom has served and continues to serve ably on a long list of boards, commissions, and philanthropic endeavors. As chairman of the Tigard Old Fashioned 4th of July Celebration, a board member of the Clean Water Institute, and a board member of Willamette Valley Vineyards, Tom Brian stays busy working to make life better in his community.

Tom is a husband, father, leader, and friend. He set a tremendous example for the many Oregon leaders he mentored over the years, instilling in them the core values of commitment to others, self-sacrifice, and decisive leadership.

Max Williams, one of Tom's close friends and a former state representative, said of him, ''You taught me not to be afraid of—or avoid—the difficult issues. Being out there 'on the limb' was necessary because that is 'where all the fruit is' when it comes to making meaningful and positive change.''

Tom took risks and he pushed for progress; because of that, he made a real and positive difference.

Today I rise to recognize my friend Tom Brian for all that he has accomplished and for his invaluable contributions to his community. I invite my colleagues to join me in thanking Tom for his service and wishing him and his family many great and healthy years ahead.

A TRIBUTE TO THE JACOB POMEROY

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jacob J. Pomeroy for the rank of an Eagle Scout. Travis is a 10th grade student from South Hardin High School in Eldora, Iowa.

The Eagle Scout rank is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Only about 5% of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance based achievement whose standards have been well-maintained over the years. To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, as well as completing an Eagle Project to benefit the community. Jacob's project was to construct a barn-themed sun shelter for the Joyful Noise Preschool and the Waukee United Methodist Church. Jacob also went above and beyond the requirements by completing more than the minimum required number of merit badges.

Jacob has been involved in scouting since he became a Tiger Cub more than 11 years ago. Jacob's father, John Pomeroy, is also an Eagle Scout and current assistant Scout Master to Troop 178 from Waukee, Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I am honored to represent John Pomeroy and his family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues will join me in congratulating him on earning an Eagle Scout ranking and will wish him continued success in his future education and career.

HONORING CAPT. CHARLES E. RIDGLEY, JR.

HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to mourn the loss and honor the life of Army Captain Charles E. Ridgley, Jr., who died April 16, 2011, in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

A Maryland resident, Captain Ridgley was serving in Nangarhar Province, Afghanistan, and died of injuries sustained from a grenade attack by a suicide bomber on Forward Operating Base Gamberi. Four other brave American soldiers were killed in the attack.

At the time of his death, Captain Ridgley was assigned to the 17th Combat Support Battalion, based in Fort Richardson, Alaska. He had just two weeks left of his first overseas assignment before he was due to come home.

After overcoming a challenging childhood, Captain Ridgley joined the Army after earning his diploma from Walbrook Senior High School. He was inspired by his uncle's military service in the U.S. Air Force and participated in ROTC at Walbrook. He was commissioned a quartermaster officer in January 2007 and was assigned to Fort Richardson. While there, he earned his Bachelor's Degree in business administration with a concentration in global logistics from the University of Alaska. He was working toward his Master's Degree when he was deployed to Afghanistan.

Known as responsible and family-oriented, Captain Ridgley took great pride in his daughter and great care of his mother. Captain Ridgley also worked as a martial arts instructor who enjoyed mentoring the children of fellow soldiers. He deeply valued education and ethics.

Mr. Speaker, many Maryland soldiers have died in support of the global war on terror. Once again, we hang our heads with sorrow at the loss of another life. I ask that you join with me today to honor the life and memory of Captain Ridgley, a true Maryland hero.

Captain Ridgley will be forever remembered as a dedicated soldier who greatly loved his country and faithfully served his fellow Americans by fighting for this great nation. He risked his life to serve our country and deserves our unending admiration and appreciation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CONSTRUCTION QUALITY ASSURANCE ACT OF 2011

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my colleague Rep. MAZIE HIRONO, I am introducing the Construction Quality Assurance Act of 2011. This bill is designed to stop bid shopping on federal construction contracts. It would require prime bidders on low-bid projects valued at $1 million or more to list each subcontractor on work categories of $100,000 or more with their bid submissions. Substitutions of listed subcontractors after contracts are awarded would be allowed only

in exceptional circumstances and only with the consent of the contracting officer.

The bill would impose financial penalties for improper substitution of listed subcontractors. The bill would also apply to subcontractors. Both prime contractors and subcontractors would be subject to debarment or ineligibility determinations in cases where there are two infractions of the prohibitions over any three-year period.

Restoring equitable safeguards in the low bid system will assure that agency practice will conform to the highest standards adhered to by industry professionals and contractor associations, and will reflect best practices followed by a great many other public procurement systems nationally and internationally.

CONGRATULATING KRAFT FOODS' OSCAR MAYER PLANT IN COLUMBIA, MO, WHICH IS CELEBRATING ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kraft Foods' Oscar Mayer plant in Columbia, MO, which is celebrating its 25th anniversary on May 7th.

The plant opened in 1985 and is now a 183,000-square-foot structure located on 30 acres. It has been a formidable force in boosting Columbia's economy, employing over 600 people in the area. Twenty of the plant's employees have dedicated their service since the plant opened over two decades ago, contributing considerably to the plant's ranking as one of the top ten employers in the city.

The Oscar Mayer plant has also played a significant role in contributing to the community of Columbia and its citizens. Over the past 26 years, the plant has produced over 28 billion hot dogs in the last 25 years, enough for over 100 trips around the world laid end-to-end. On average, the Columbia plant donates 70,000 pounds of hot dogs to the Central Missouri Food Bank annually, which is the only source of protein for the food bank. Through Kraft Foods' contributions programs, the facility donates to non-profit organizations for the alleviation of hunger and to promote healthy lifestyles, to support the social service and cultural activities of its employees in the communities where they live and work, and to provide humanitarian aid.

Contributions made by the Kraft Foods facility in Columbia have done much to greatly enhance both the business climate and the quality of life for the entire population of the city, in addition to building upon the great sense of pride in those individuals associated with it.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in wishing the employees of the Columbia Oscar Mayer plant and the citizens of Columbia, MO, congratulations on reaching this significant milestone.

HONORING DOTTIE BERGER MACKINNON

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to herald the achievements of Dottie Berger MacKinnon and to acknowledge her valuable contributions to the Tampa Bay community. Dottie is a community activist, child advocate, and former Hillsborough County Commissioner.

Dottie Berger MacKinnon is one of the founders of Joshua House, a safe haven for abused, abandoned, and neglected children, in Tampa and she has passionately supported the children served there since 1992. After founding the institution she helped the group establish a $1.2 million endowment through the Community Foundation of Tampa Bay in order to ensure that they can continue the work that she started there long into the future. This is one of the truly incredible philanthropic establishments in Tampa Bay. Joshua House continues to change the lives of the children who pass through its doors today.

In addition to her service as a founder of Joshua House, she also served the community as a Hillsborough County Commissioner from 1994–1998. Her impressive service as a County Commissioner inspired those around her and on May 4, 2011 Dottie will be honored with the Ellsworth G. Simmons Good Government Award by the Hillsborough County Commissioners in recognition of the significant role that she played in improving government through leadership and vision.

Not finished with her incredible work for children yet, from 2005–2009 she worked tirelessly to develop, create and co-found A Kid's Place, a residential care facility for foster siblings. Before A Kid's Place opened in 2009, kids who were taken away from abusive homes were often separated from their siblings. Rescued children now stay at comfortable houses at A Kid's Place for up to a month while officials work to find stable homes for groups of brothers and sisters. Her work with A Kid's Place continues to this day, as they just opened up a fifth residence hall due to her tireless work and fundraising.

The achievements of Dottie Berger MacKinnon are truly remarkable, heroic even. She has been recognized as a true difference maker in the lives of the children of Tampa Bay. Although she now battles cancer, she still works unrelentingly in her quest to improve the lives of children in the Tampa Bay area. I stand with the rest of the community in awe of the work she has done and continues to do for the children of Tampa Bay. I am honored to have been invited to the Hillsborough League of Women Voters 2011 Annual Award Luncheon where Mrs. Dottie Berger MacKinnon will be receiving a Lifetime Achievement Award. I can think of no better candidate to receive this honor than Dottie, she is truly an inspiration to everyone in the Tampa Bay community.

A TRIBUTE TO TRESSA BARTHOLOMEW

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today congratulate Tressa Bartholomew of Carlisle, Iowa on recently celebrating her 106th birthday on March 30, 2011. Today she has four children, thirteen grandchildren, 29 great-grandchildren, and 43 great-great-grandchildren.

There have been many changes that have occurred during the past one hundred and six years. Since Tressa's birth we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television and the Internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and the birth of new democracies. Tressa has lived through nineteen United States Presidents and twenty-five Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime the population of the United States has more than tripled.

I congratulate Tressa Bartholomew for reaching this milestone of a birthday. I am extremely honored to represent her in Congress and I wish her happiness and health in her future years.

HONORING JOE WAZ

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Joe Waz for his 17 years of service to Comcast Corporation, where he worked as Senior Vice President of External Affairs, and to the Comcast Foundation, where he served as Public Policy Counsel and President.

Mr. Waz has announced his retirement from Comcast Corporation, and although he will be greatly missed, his hard work and contributions have made a positive impact on the industry and ensure he will not be forgotten. In May 2002, Mr. Waz received the Vanguard Award, the highest honor presented by the cable industry, for his service in government and community relations.

Not only is Mr. Waz recognized nationally for his expertise in telecommunications public policy, he is also a leader in community investment and service. Under Mr. Waz's leadership, Comcast Corporation has made 219 investments to 120 different groups in Connecticut since 2006. More than $2.9 million has been given in grants to groups ranging from the University of Hartford, the Connecticut Police Chiefs' Association, and the American School for the Deaf. In further commitment to the public interest, Joe also serves as a chairman of the Settlement Music School, the oldest community school of the arts in the U.S., and has previously served on the boards of the National Coalition for Cancer Survivorship, and the Federal Communications Bar Association Foundation.

On a personal note, I have known Joe since we attended the University of Connecticut School of Law together. I got to know him as a hard working, serious student of the law,

who upheld the highest traditions of diligent, ethical practice.

It comes as no surprise to me that after leaving Comcast Corporation, Mr. Waz will work as a Senior Fellow at the Silicon Flatirons Center for Law, Technology, and Entrepreneurship at the University of Colorado, and serve as the first chairman of the Broadband Internet Technology Advisory Group.

I congratulate Mr. Waz on his successful 17 year career with Comcast Corporation, salute him for his commitment to community service, and wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING HILTON KELLEY

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hilton Kelley, a leader in the battle for environmental justice on the Texas Gulf Coast. Hilton Kelley is an advocate for communities living in the shadow of polluting industries. A life-long resident of Port Arthur, Texas, Hilton joined the Navy which eventually brought him to the San Francisco Bay Area where he began working as a stunt man and actor on several major movies and television shows including CBS's Nash Bridges.

During a visit home, 21 years after he left Port Arthur, Hilton found his community sickened by industrial pollution and on the brink of economic collapse. Hilton realized then that in order to save his community, he needed to first tackle the environmental problems first. He launched Community In-power and Development Association, CIDA, and began training local residents to monitor air quality. As a result of Hilton's advocacy, the local refinery installed state-of-the-art equipment to reduce harmful emissions and also negotiated with them a $3.5 million fund to help entrepreneurs launch new businesses in the community.

Hilton recognizes the disproportionate burden from pollution on communities of color, low-income people and indigenous communities needs to be reduced. These Americans are experiencing the highest rates of morbidity and/or death from asthma, cancer, learning disabilities, lead poisoning, lupus, and several other diseases. Hilton continues to work tirelessly to bring attention to the disproportionate burden of pollution on the most vulnerable members of our society advocating for regulations on the Gulf Coast and serving on the EPA's National Environment Justice Advisory Council.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Hilton Kelley for his determination and hard work to these causes. Our country is a better one because of Hilton Kelley.

OPEN AND TRANSPARENT SMITHSONIAN ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Open and Transparent Smithsonian Act to further ensure that the Smithsonian Institution is accountable to the public for the taxpayer funds it receives. This bill provides that, for the purposes of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and the Privacy Act, the Smithsonian shall be considered a Federal agency.

The bill complements my Smithsonian Modernization Act and my Smithsonian Free Admission Act. I introduce these bills today, to make the Smithsonian accountable for the 70 percent of its funding that comes from annual Federal appropriations. Although the Smithsonian was created by Congress as a Federal trust, it receives the great majority of its funding from the Federal Government, much like Federal agencies, and had always been treated as a Federal agency. However, in the 1990s, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit found that the Smithsonian is not a Federal agency for purposes of FOIA and the Privacy Act. Indeed, the Smithsonian's website clearly states that it is "not an Executive Branch agency, and FOIA does not apply to the Smithsonian."

This lack of transparency is of great concern, particularly in light of the Smithsonian's recent history of secrecy and corruption. In 2007, an independent review committee found that the Smithsonian Board of Regents had violated many principles of good management during the tenure of Lawrence Small as Secretary of the Smithsonian. The report indicated that the Board had failed to provide desperately needed oversight, had overcompensated the Secretary, and had allowed the creation of an "insular culture." The report further found that the Smithsonian's deputy secretary and chief operating officer, Sheila Burke, had frequent absences from her duties because of outside activities, including service on corporate boards, for which she earned more than $1.2 million over 6 years. Importantly, the report indicated that Smithsonian leaders took great measures to keep secret these missteps and mismanagement.

While the Smithsonian now has new leaders who are moving away from the mistakes of the past, its transparency should not depend on who is in charge. An entity supported primarily by the Federal Government must be accountable to the American people. The American people have a right to know that their interests are being served.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

HONORING LCPL RONALD DOUGLAS FREEMAN

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life, sacrifice, and heroism of Marine Lance Corporal Ronald Douglas Freeman of Plant City, Florida.

LCpl Freeman, a minesweeper, was killed while conducting combat operations for Operation Enduring Freedom on April 28th, in Helmand Province, Afghanistan.

U.S. Marine Corps minesweepers are greatly admired for their fearlessness and diligence in leading patrols into enemy territory while providing safety and security for their peers by searching for buried explosives. LCpl Freeman personified this bravery and dedication while searching his patrol's area for explosives on the day of this death.

Outside of the Marines, Dougie—as he is known to his family and friends—was an outstanding father, worker, son, and brother. He was admired by many in the community, especially by his younger brother and older sister. He was extremely dedicated to his family and wanted nothing more than to be the best father he could be to his two young children.

Mr. Speaker, though proud to have such a fine example from the Tampa Bay community, it is with great remorse that I rise to commemorate the life of LCpl Freeman. I am in awe of the young men and women like Ronald Freeman who choose to serve their countrymen in the armed forces. As professionals in all that they do, they exhibit honor, courage, and commitment in every pursuit. Their sacrifices, like that of LCpl Freeman, will not be forgotten.

CONGRATULATING SARA GABRIELLE, JAREK BAKKEN AND DANIEL YEHIELI

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sara Gabrielle, Jarek Bakken, and Daniel Yehieli, second prize winners of C–SPAN's Student Cam competition. Sara, Jarek and Daniel created a fantastic video entitled "The Price Tag of the American Dream" which details the challenges of paying for college.

Sara, Jarek and Daniel do an excellent job of highlighting the struggles that so many college students face today. Rising costs have limited access to an affordable higher education for many potential college students. I was pleased to see that this video explains many of the new benefits available to students as a result of the recent student loan law. Pell grants, college tax credits and the income-based repayment plan will be valuable tools that will make college more affordable for millions of Americans.

Sara, Jarek and Daniel's video illustrates both the challenges that many college students face today as well as the tools that are available to make college more affordable. I'm proud to represent Sara, Jarek and Daniel in Congress and wish them the best in their future endeavors.

Daily Digest

CORRECTION

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2701–S2754

Measures Introduced: Twenty-two bills and nine resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 888–909, S. Res. 165–172, and S. Con. Res. 15.

Pages S2730–31

Measures Passed:

12th Annual National Charter Schools Week: Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 158, congratulating the students, parents, teachers, and administrators of charter schools across the United States for ongoing contributions to education, and supporting the ideals and goals of the 12th annual National Charter Schools Week, and the resolution was then agreed to, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:

Pages S2749–52

Reid (for Paul) Amendment No. 318, to amend the preamble. **Pages S2749–52**

V–E Day 66th Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 166, commemorating May 8, 2011, as the 66th anniversary of V–E Day, the end of World War II in Europe. **Pages S2752–53**

Cinco de Mayo: Senate agreed to S. Res. 167, recognizing the historical significance of the Mexican holiday of Cinco de Mayo. **Pages S2752–53**

Commemorating Law Enforcement Officers: Senate agreed to S. Res. 168, commemorating and acknowledging the dedication and sacrifice made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty.

Pages S2752–53

Authorizing Testimony, Documents and Legal Representation: Senate agreed to S. Res. 169, to authorize testimony, documents and legal representation. **Pages S2752–53**

Appointments:

United States Capitol Preservation Commission: The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 100–696, appointed and reappointed the following Senators as members of the United States Capitol Preservation Commission: Senator Durbin (reappointment), and Senator Nelson (NE) (appointment) vice Senator Landrieu.

Page S2753

FAA Reauthorization Bill Conferee—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senator Isakson be added as a conferee for the FAA Reauthorization Bill, H.R. 658.

Page S2749

Cole Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of James Michael Cole, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General. **Page S2749**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, May 5, 2011, a vote on cloture will occur at approximately 5:30 p.m., on Monday, May 9, 2011. **Page S2749**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 4:30 p.m., on Monday, May 9, 2011, Senate resume consideration of the nomination, and that there be one hour of debate, equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination. **Page S2753**

Chen Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Republican Leader, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Edward Milton Chen, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, that there be 3 hours for debate, equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on confirmation of the nomination; and that no further motions be in order to the nomination. **Page S2749**

Messages from the House: **Page S2729**

Measures Referred: **Page S2729**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S2702, S2729**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S2729, S2753**

Executive Communications: Pages S2729–30
Executive Reports of Committees: Page S2730
Additional Cosponsors: Pages S2731–32
Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S2732–47
Additional Statements: Page S2728
Amendments Submitted: Pages S2747–48
Notices of Hearings/Meetings: Page S2748
Authorities for Committees to Meet: Pages S2748–49

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:15 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, May 9, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on pages S2753–54.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities received a closed briefing on Department of Defense plans and programs relating to counterterrorism, counternarcotics, and building partnership capacity from Garry Reid, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Combating Terrorism, James A. Schear, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Partnership Strategy and Stability Operations, and William F. Wechsler, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Counternarcotics and Global Threats, all of the Department of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT BUDGET

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine legislative proposals in the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development's fiscal year 2012 budget, after receiving testimony from Shaun Donovan, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 46, to reauthorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000;

S. 52, to establish uniform administrative and enforcement procedures and penalties for the enforcement of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act and similar statutes;

S. 275, to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for enhanced safety and environmental protection in pipeline transportation, to provide for enhanced reliability in the transportation of the Nation's energy products by pipeline, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 363, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey property of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to the City of Pascagoula, Mississippi;

S. 453, to improve the safety of motorcoaches, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 485, to expand the boundaries of the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Underwater Preserve, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 646, to reauthorize Federal natural hazards reduction programs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 692, to improve hurricane preparedness by establishing the National Hurricane Research Initiative, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nomination of Scott C. Doney, of Massachusetts, to be Chief Scientist of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and a promotion list in the U.S. Coast Guard.

CYBER SECURITY

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine a joint staff discussion draft pertaining to cyber security of the bulk-power system and electric infrastructure and for other purposes, after receiving testimony from Patricia Hoffman, Assistant Secretary of Energy for Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability; Joseph McClelland, Director, Office of Electric Reliability, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; Gerry Cauley, North American Electric Reliability Corporation, and David K. Owens, Edison Electric Institute, both of Washington, D.C.; and William Tedeschi, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

ENFORCING AMERICA'S TRADE LAWS

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness concluded a hearing to examine enforcing America's trade laws in the face of customs fraud and duty evasion, after receiving testimony from Allen Gina, Assistant Commissioner, Office of International Trade, Customs and Border Protection, and J. Scott Ballman, Jr., Deputy Assistant Director, Homeland Security Investigations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, both of the Department of Homeland Security; Ronald K. Lorentzen, Deputy Assistant

Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration; Robert L. Mahoney, Northwest Pipe Company Tubular Products Group, Portland, Oregon; Richard Adee, Adee Honey Farms, Bruce, South Dakota, on behalf of the American Honey Producers Association; Roger B. Schagrin, Committee to Support United States Trade Laws, Annapolis, Maryland; Karl G. Glassman, Leggett and Platt, Incorporated, Carthage, Missouri; and Marguerite Trossevin, Jochum Shore and Trossevin PC, Alexandria, Virginia, on behalf of the Retail Industry Leaders Association.

U.S. POLICY IN PAKISTAN

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine assessing United States policy and its limits in Pakistan, after receiving testimony from Samina Ahmed, International Crisis Group, Islamabad, Pakistan; and Moeed Yusuf, United States Institute of Peace (USIP), and Michael Krepon, The Stimson Center, both of Washington, D.C.

SOCIAL MEDIA COMMUNICATIONS IN DISASTERS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Disaster Recovery and Intergovernmental Affairs concluded a hearing to examine understanding the power of social media as a communication tool in the aftermath of disasters, after receiving testimony from Craig Fugate, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security; Renee Preslar, Arkansas Department of Emergency Management Deputy Public Information Officer, North Little Rock; and Suzy DeFrancis, American Red Cross, Shona L. Brown, Google.org, and Heather Blanchard, CrisisCommons, all of Washington, D.C.

IMPROVING HEALTH QUALITY AND PATIENT SAFETY

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine improving health quality and patient safety, after receiving testimony from Carolyn M. Clancy, Director, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Department of Health and Human Services; Timothy L. Charles, Mercy Medical Center, Cedar Rapids, Iowa; and Philip S. Mehler, Denver Health, Denver, Colorado.

RACIST STEREOTYPES ON INDIGENOUS PEOPLE

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine stolen identities, focusing on the impact of racist stereotypes on indigenous people, after receiving testimony from Tex G. Hall, Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara Nation, New Town, North Dakota; Suzan Shown Harjo, The Morning Star Institute, Washington, D.C.; Charlene Teters, Institute of American Indian Arts, Santa Fe, New Mexico; Stephanie A. Fryberg, University of Arizona, Tucson, on behalf of the American Psychological Association (APA); Chaske Spencer, Urban Dream Productions, New York, New York; Jim E. Warne, Warrior Society Development, San Diego, California: and Tina Osceola, Hollywood, Florida.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 59 public bills, H.R. 1735–1793, and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 252–254, were introduced. **Pages H3106–09**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H3111**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend William Byrne, St. Peter's Catholic Church, Washington, DC. **Page H3065**

Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act: The House passed H.R. 1230, to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain offshore oil and gas lease sales, by a recorded vote of 266 ayes to 149 noes, Roll No. 298. **Pages H3078–94**

Rejected the Luján motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 171 ayes to 238 noes, Roll No. 297. **Pages H3092–93**

Rejected:

Holt amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 112–73) that sought to remove provisions in the bill that would ''deem'' the safety and environmental review done in 2007, prior to the BP spill, sufficient for new offshore oil and gas leasing. The amendment would allow lease sales to go forward, but require new environmental and safety reviews, following the BP spill (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 240 noes, Roll No. 295) and

Pages H3088–89, H3091

Connolly amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 112–73) that sought to ensure that Lease Sale 220 does not interfere with Naval or other DOD operations (by a recorded vote of 176 ayes to 240 noes, Roll No. 296). **Pages H3089–90, H3091–92**

H. Res. 245, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 1229) and (H.R. 1230) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 245 ayes to 167 noes, Roll No. 294, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 241 yeas to 171 nays, Roll No. 293. **Pages H3067–78**

Member Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Heller, wherein he resigned as Representative for the Second Congressional District of Nevada, effective Monday, May 9, 2011 at 1:30 p.m. **Pages H3094–95**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon tomorrow, May 6th, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Tuesday, May 10th for morning hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business. **Page H3095**

Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group: Representative Pastor. **Page H3095**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3077, H3077–78, H3091, H3091–92, H3093, and H3094. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 3:41 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FOREST PLANNING RULE

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry held a hearing to review the U.S. Forest Service's proposed Forest Planning Rule. Testimony was heard from Harris Sherman, Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, Department of Agriculture; John R. Bortz, Jr., Commissioner, Warren County, Warren, Pennsylvania; and public witnesses.

DC COURTS AND COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY—APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and Related Agencies held a hearing on DC Courts and Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency FY 2012 Budget. Testimony was heard from Eric T. Washington, Chief Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals and Chairman of the Joint Commission of Judicial Administration; Lee F. Satterfield, Chief Judge, DC Superior Court; and Adrienne R. Poteat, Acting Director, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency.

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES—ARMY—APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Cemeterial Expenses—Army FY 2012 Budget. Testimony was heard from Katherine Condon, Executive Director, Army National Cemeteries Program.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION—APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing on American Battle Monuments Commission FY 2012 Budget. Testimony was heard from Max Cleland, Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a markup on H.R. 1540, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes. The bill was forwarded, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a markup on H.R. 1540, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes. The bill was forwarded, as amended.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a hearing on Policies and Priorities of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Testimony was heard from Kathleen Sebelius, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

AMERICAN ENERGY INITIATIVE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing on the American

Energy Initiative. Testimony was heard from Howard K. Gruenspecht, Deputy Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration; Margo T. Oge, Director, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, EPA; Patrick Davis, Program Manager, Vehicle Technologies Program; Department of Energy; and public witnesses.

NEED TO MOVE BEYOND SGR

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''The Need to Move Beyond the SGR.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SECURITY ISSUES IN EUROPE AND EURASIA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia held a hearing on Overview of Security Issues in Europe and Eurasia. Testimony was heard from Daniel Benjamin, Coordinator for Counterterrorism, Department of State; Mark Koumans, Deputy Assistant Secretary—International Affairs, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

POLITICAL TRANSITIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia held a hearing on Shifting Sands: Political Transitions in the Middle East, Part 2. Testimony was heard from Michael H. Posner, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Department of State; and Tamara Wittes, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, Department of State.

ENSURING COMPETITION ON THE INTERNET

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition and the Internet held a hearing on Ensuring Competition on the Internet: Net Neutrality and Antitrust. Testimony was heard from the following FCC officials: Julius Genachowski, Chairman; and Robert McDowell, Commissioner.

OFFICE OF COMMERCIAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics held a hearing on Office of Commercial Space Transportation's Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request. Testimony was heard from George C. Nield, Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation, FAA; Gerald Dillingham, Director, Physical Infrastructure, GAO; and public witnesses.

SMALL BUSINESS SIZE STANDARDS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Capital Access and Tax held a hearing entitled ''Professional Services: Proposed Changes to the Small Business Size Standards.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EPA MINING POLICIES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing on EPA Mining Policies: Assault on Appalachian Jobs—Part I. Testimony was heard from Leonard Peters, Secretary, State of Kentucky Energy and Environment Cabinet, Teresa Marks, Director, State of Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a markup of H.R. 1383, Restoring GI Bill Fairness Act of 2011; H.R. 802, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a VetStar Award Program; H.R. 1657, to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the enforcement penalties for misrepresentation of a business concern as a small business concern owned and controlled by veterans or as a small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans; and legislation regarding the Five year extension of Housing Grant Authority under Section 2102A of Title 38; and H.R. 1671, Andrew Connolly Veterans' Housing Act. H.R. 1383 was forwarded as amended. H.R. 1657, H.R. 802, and H.R. 1671 were forwarded, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs held a markup of H.R. 1407, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2011; H.R. 1484, the Veterans Appeals Improvement Act of 2011; and H.R. 1627, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for certain requirements for the placement of monuments in Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes. All three bills were forwarded, as amended.

STATE AND LOCAL DEFINED PENSION PLANS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing on transparency and funding of State and local defined benefit pension plans. Testimony was heard from Walker Stapleton, Treasurer of Colorado; and public witnesses.

MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM AND GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM FY 2012 BUDGET OVERVIEW

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing on Military Intelligence Program and General Defense Intelligence Program FY2012 Budget Overview. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses. This was a Closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 6, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Joint Meetings

Joint Economic Committee: to hold hearings to examine the employment situation for April 2011, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of May 9 through May 14, 2011

Senate Chamber

On *Monday,* at 4:30 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of James Michael Cole, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General. At approximately 5:30 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of James Michael Cole, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Appropriations: May 10, Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Coast Guard, focusing on an examination of operational and recapitalization requirements, 10 a.m., SD–138.

May 11, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the National Institutes of Health, 10 a.m., SD–124.

May 11, Subcommittee on Department of Defense, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Guard and Reserve, 10 a.m., SD–192.

May 12, Subcommittee on Department of Defense, to receive a closed briefing on the proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the United States Special Operations Command, and the United States European Command, 10:30 a.m., SVC–217.

May 12, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Secretary of the Senate, the Senate Sergeant at Arms, and the United States Capitol Police, 2:30 p.m., SD–138.

Committee on Armed Services: May 10, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, to hold closed hearings to examine proliferation prevention programs at the Department of Energy and the Department of Defense in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program; to be immediately followed by an open hearing in SR–232A, 2:30 p.m., SVC–217.

May 11, Subcommittee on Personnel, to resume hearings to examine the Active, Guard, Reserve, and civilian personnel programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program, 1:30 p.m., SR–232A.

May 11, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to hold hearings to examine military space programs 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, 2:30 p.m., SD–106.

May 12, Subcommittee on SeaPower, to receive a closed briefing on threats faced by our naval forces and the capabilities of our naval forces to respond to those threats in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program, 2:30 p.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, May 10, to hold hearings to examine reviewing the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission's final report, 10 a.m., SD–538.

May 12, Full Committee, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Dodd-Frank implementation, focusing on monitoring systemic risk and promoting financial stability, 10 a.m., SD–538.

May 12, Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation and Community Development, to hold hearings to examine the need for national mortgage servicing standards, 2 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: May 10, to hold hearings to examine the Transportation Worker Identification Credential Program, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

May 11, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine manufacturing our way to a stronger economy, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

May 12, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine economic ramifications of cyber threats and vulnerabilities to the private sector, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: May 10, to hold hearings to examine new developments in upstream oil and gas technologies, 10 a.m., SD–366.

May 11, Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine S. 114, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement for a park headquarters at San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, to expand the boundary of the Park, to conduct a study of potential land acquisitions, S. 127, to establish the Buffalo Bayou National Heritage Area in the State of Texas, S. 140, to designate as wilderness certain land and inland water within the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan, S. 161, to establish Pinnacles National Park in the State of California as a unit of the National Park System, S. 177, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Gold Hill Ranch in Coloma, California, S. 247, to establish the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, New York, and the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, S. 279, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a study to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing Camp Hale as a unit of the National Park System, S. 302, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue right-of-way permits for a natural gas transmission pipeline in nonwilderness areas within the boundary of Denali National Park, S. 313, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue permits for a microhydro project in nonwilderness areas within the boundaries of Denali National Park and Preserve, to acquire land for Denali National Park and Preserve from Doyon Tourism, Inc, S. 323, to establish the First State National Historical Park in the State of Delaware, S. 403, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Molalla River in the State of Oregon, as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 404, to modify a land grant patent issued by the Secretary of the Interior, S. 508, to establish the Chimney Rock National Monument in the State of Colorado, S. 535, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands within Fort Pulaski National Monument, S. 564, to designate the Valles Caldera National Preserve as a unit of the National Park System, S. 599, to establish a commission to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the American Civil War, S. 713, to modify the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield in the Commonwealth of Virginia, S. 765, to modify the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument, S. 779, to authorize the acquisition and protection of nationally significant battlefields and associated sites of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 under the American Battlefield Protection Program, S. 849, to establish the Waco Mammoth National Monument in the State of Texas, and S. 858, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Colonel Charles Young Home in Xenia, Ohio as a unit of the National Park System, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

May 12, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine carbon capture and sequestration legislation, including S. 699, to authorize the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program to demonstrate the commercial application of integrated systems for long-term geological storage of carbon dioxide, and S. 757, to provide incentives to encourage the development and implementation of technology to capture carbon dioxide from dilute sources on a significant scale using direct air capture technologies, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: May 10, to hold hearings to examine perspectives on deficit reduction, focusing on Social Security, 10 a.m., SD–215.

May 11, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: May 10, to hold hearings to examine steps needed for a successful 2014 transition in Afghanistan, 10 a.m., SD–419.

May 11, Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South and Central Asian Affairs, to hold hearings to examine human rights and democratic reform in Iran, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: May 11, to hold hearings to examine diverting non-urgent emergency room use, focusing on if it can provide better care and lower costs, 10 a.m., SD–430.

May 12, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the middle class, focusing on if the American dream is slipping out of reach for American families, 9:45 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: May 10, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia, with the Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security, to hold joint hearings to examine a roadmap for a more efficient and accountable Federal government, focusing on implementing the ''Government Performance and Results (GPRA) Modernization Act,'' 2:30 p.m., SD–562.

May 11, Full Committee, business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SD–342.

May 12, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine ten years after 9/11, focusing on if intelligence reform is working, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: May 10, Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology and the Law, to hold hearings to examine protecting mobile privacy, focusing on smartphones, tablets, cell phones and privacy, 10 a.m., SD–226.

May 11, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights, to hold hearings to examine the AT&T/T–Mobile merger, 10:15 a.m., SD–226.

May 12, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 350, to require restitution for victims of criminal violations of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, S. 623, to amend chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, relating to protective orders, sealing of cases, disclosures of discovery information in civil actions, an original bill entitled ''Fighting Fraud to Protect Taxpayers Act of 2011,'' and the nominations of Bernice Bouie

Donald, of Tennessee, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Henry F. Floyd, of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, Kathleen M. Williams, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, Nelva Gonzales Ramos, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, Richard Brooke Jackson, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, Sara Lynn Darrow, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois, and Virginia A. Seitz, of the District of Columbia, and Lisa O. Monaco, of the District of Columbia, both to be an Assistant Attorney General, Denise Ellen O'Donnell, of New York, to be Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, and Donald B. Verrilli, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Solicitor General of the United States, all of the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: May 11, business meeting to consider the nomination of William J. Boarman, of Maryland, to be Public Printer, Government Printing Office, S. Res. 116, to provide for expedited Senate consideration of certain nominations subject to advice and consent, and S. 739, to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to establish battery recharging stations for privately owned vehicles in parking areas under the jurisdiction of the Senate at no net cost to the Federal Government, 2 p.m., SR–301.

Select Committee on Intelligence: May 10, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

May 12, Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, May 12, full Committee, hearing to review pending free trade agreements, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, May 11, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing on National Endowment for the Arts FY12 Budget, 9:30 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

May 11, Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on Defense Health Program, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

May 11, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, hearing on the Government Printing Office, Congressional Budget Office, Members and Public Witnesses, 10 a.m., HT–2, Capitol.

May 11, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing on National Endowment for the Humanities FY12 Budget Oversight, 11 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

May 12, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing on Smithsonian Institution FY12 Budget Oversight, 9:30 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

May 12, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, hearing on the House of Representatives FY 2012, 11 a.m., HC–5, Capitol.

May 13, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, hearing on U.S. Capitol Police, FY 2012, 10 a.m., HT–2, Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, May 11, full Committee, markup of the following: H. Res. 208, Directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any document, record, memo, correspondence, or other communication of the Department of Defense, or any portion of such communication, that refers or relates to any consultation with Congress regarding Operation Odyssey Dawn or military actions in or against Libya; and H.R. 1540, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, May 11, Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training, hearing on Removing Inefficiencies in the Nation's Job Training Programs, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

May 12, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing on Reviewing Workers' Compensation for Federal Employees, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

May 13, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, hearing on Examining the Costs of Federal Overreach into School Meals, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, May 13, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing FCC Process Reform, 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, May 11, Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy and Technology, hearing entitled "Monetary Policy and the Debt Ceiling: Examining the Relationship Between the Federal Reserve and Government Debt," 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

May 11, Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled "Legislative Proposals to Address the Negative Consequences of the Dodd-Frank Whistleblower Provisions," 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, May 10, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights, hearing on Governance, Democracy, Human Rights, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation in Africa: The FY2012 Proposed Budget, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

May 11, full Committee, hearing on the Peace Corps at 50, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

May 11, Subcommittee on the Asia and the Pacific, hearing on Piercing Burma's Veil of Secrecy: The Truth Behind the Sham Election and the Difficult Road Ahead, 2:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

May 11, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on UN Climate Talks and Power Politics: It's Not about the Temperature, 2:30 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

May 12, full Committee, hearing on Export Controls, Arms Sales, and Reform: Balancing U.S. Interests, Part 1, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, May 11, Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Management, hearing entitled "On the Border and in the Line of Fire: U.S. Law Enforcement, Homeland Security and Drug Cartel Violence." 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

May 12, Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, hearing entitled ''Taking Measure of Countermeasures (Part 2): A Review of Efforts to Protect the Homeland Through Distribution and Dispensing of CBRN Medical Countermeasures.'' 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on House Administration, May 11, full Committee, hearing on GPO—Issues and Challenges: How Will GPO Transition to the Future? 1:30 p.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, May 11, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, hearing on the USA PATRIOT Act: Dispelling the Myths, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

May 11, Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement, hearing on legislation regarding the Secure Visas Act, 1:30 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, May 11, full Committee, hearing on American Energy Initiative: Identifying Roadblocks to Wind and Solar Energy on Public Lands and Waters, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

May 12, Subcommittee on Water and Power, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 470, to further allocate and expand the availability of hydroelectric power generated at Hoover Dam, and for other purposes; H.R. 489, to clarify the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the C.C. Cragin Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes; and H.R. 818, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow for prepayment of repayment contracts between the United States and the Uintah Water Conservancy District, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

May 12, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans, and Insular Affairs, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 295, to amend the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998 to authorize funds to acquire hydrographic data and provide hydrographic services specific to the Arctic for safe navigation, delineating the United States extended continental shelf, and the monitoring and description of coastal changes; H.R. 670, to convey certain submerged lands to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in order to give that territory the same benefits in its submerged lands as Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa have in their submerged lands; H.R. 991, to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to allow importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada before the date the polar bear was determined to be a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; H.R. 1160, McKinney Lake National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act; H.R. 1670, Sikes Act Amendments Act, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, May 10, full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Future of Capital Formation,'' 12:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

May 11, Subcommittee on National Security, Homeland Defense and Foreign Operations, hearing entitled ''USAID: Following the Money,'' 1:30 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

May 11, Subcommittee on TARP, Financial Services and Bailouts of Public and Private Programs, hearing entitled ''Transparency as an Alternative to the Federal Government's Regulation of Risk Retention,'' 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

May 12, Subcommittee on Health Care, DC, Census and the National Archives, hearing entitled ''The District of Columbia's Fiscal Year 2012 Budget: Ensuring Fiscal Sustainability,'' 8:45 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

May 12, Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service and Labor Policy, hearing entitled ''Where Have All the Letters Gone?—The Mailing Industry and Its Future,'' 1:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

May 12, full Committee and the Committee on Small Business, joint hearing entitled ''Politicizing Procurement: Will President Obama's Proposal Curb Free Speech and Hurt Small Business?'' 1:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

May 13, Subcommittee on Government Organization, Efficiency, and Financial Management, hearing entitled ''Department of Homeland Security Financial Management,'' 10 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, May 10, full Committee, hearing on H.R. 1231, Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act, 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, May 11, full Committee, hearing on Review of Hydraulic Fracturing Technology and Practices, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

May 13, Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight and Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, joint hearing on Nuclear Energy Risk Management, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, May 12, Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations and Regulations, hearing entitled ''Green Isn't Always Gold: Are EPA Regulations Harming Small Businesses?'' 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, May 11, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, hearing on EPA Mining Policies: Assault on Appalachian Jobs—Part II, 10:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, May 12, full Committee, markup of pending legislation, 3 p.m., 334 Cannon.

May 13, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on The Federal Recovery Coordination Program: From Concept to Reality, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, May 12, full Committee, hearing on the burdens that the tax code imposes on American companies and how such burdens place them at a competitive disadvantage as they try to sell goods and services around the world, 9 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, May 13, full Committee, hearing on FY 2012 Budget Overview, 10 a.m., HVC–304, Capitol. This is a closed hearing.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, May 9

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 4:30 p.m.), Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of James Michael Cole, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General. At approximately 5:30 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of James Michael Cole, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Friday, May 6

House Chamber

Program for Friday: The House will meet in pro forma session.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Alexander, Rodney, La., E812, E814
Austria, Steve, Ohio, E819
Bilirakis, Gus M., Fla., E812, E831
Braley, Bruce L., Iowa, E814, E831
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E817
Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E824
Castor, Kathy, Fla., E826, E830
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E824, E830
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E816
Denham, Jeff, Calif., E825
Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E812
Doyle, Michael F., Pa., E821
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E816, E821
Graves, Sam, Mo., E819
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E820, E826
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E811
Holt, Rush D., N.J., E812
Israel, Steve, N.Y., E811
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E814, E820, E831
Johnson, Sam, Tex., E819
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E814, E815
Langevin, James R., R.I., E819
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E819, E820, E822, E823, E824, E825, E827, E828, E829, E830
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E830
Lungren, Daniel E., Calif., E817
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E822
McCotter, Thaddeus G., Mich., E828
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E827, E829
Marino, Tom, Pa., E811
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E813, E818, E828, E831
Nugent, Richard B., Fla., E820
Nunes, Devin, Calif., E817
Pence, Mike, Ind., E815
Peters, Gary C., Mich., E814, E818
Pompeo, Mike, Kans., E827
Price, David E., N.C., E825
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E818
Rokita, Todd, Ind., E825
Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E829
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E825
Shuler, Heath, N.C., E822
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E823
Sires, Albio, N.J., E814
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E822, E827
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E825
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E815
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E816, E818, E824
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E811
Walden, Greg, Ore., E829
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E823, E828
Wu, David, Ore., E815

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.