United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 10, 2011 No. 63

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 10, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM GRAVES to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

PROTECTING CONSUMERS FROM HIGHER GAS PRICES

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, 1 year after the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, Americans are paying record gas prices. In northern Virginia, gas that used to cost $3 per gallon now costs more than $4 per gallon.

This gas price hike is a result of instability in the Middle East and possible oil speculation and is a reminder of our dangerous dependence on foreign oil.

Sadly, our Republican colleagues are not advancing legislation to help our hard-pressed consumers. Their plan would line the pockets of Big Oil, which saw its profits skyrocket 30 percent in line with rising gas prices.

Fortunately, there are positive steps we can take to promote energy independence in America and to protect consumers: improve vehicle efficiency, boost production of domestic renewable energy, and convert oil industry tax breaks into gas price relief for our consumers.

America owns 1.5 percent of the world's oil but consumes 22.5 percent; so we can't drill our way to energy independence. The only way to end our dependence on foreign oil and reduce gas prices is by improving automobile efficiency and developing new sources of clean, domestic energy. Energy independence is going to depend on reducing our oil consumption and shifting to domestic forms of energy like wind, solar, biofuels, and gas. Energy independence will save consumers money and protect us from the instability of the Middle East.

At the end of 2010, Congress extended tax credits for biofuels and the production of wind and solar energy. These tax credits increased wind energy production by nearly 43 percent in just 2 years. So extending them is an important step to increasing the supply of domestic energy.

Under the authority of the Clean Air Act, President Obama and automakers recently announced an agreement to improve the efficiency of automobiles by 30 percent by 2016. This agreement will save consumers $3,000 for each car purchased 5 years from now. Here is another way of looking at it: If you could save 30 percent at the pump, better vehicle efficiency would more than offset the recent spike in gas prices.

Unfortunately, oil companies and their allies here in Congress are trying to roll back much of this progress. Republican Speaker BOEHNER forced through legislation which would repeal much of the Clean Air Act, hurting American consumers and undermining our national security.

Last week, the leadership in the House passed legislation to short-circuit safety rules for oil production off America's coasts, increasing the likelihood of another Deepwater Horizon catastrophe. Their legislation would also allow oil exploration that would impede naval operations off the Chesapeake Bay in Virginia. This week, they want to attempt to pass a bill allowing for more oil drilling even if it interferes with military bases or endangers coastal economies.

I do not support reckless efforts to allow unregulated oil drilling which endangers coastal economies and national security. Last week, I introduced amendments to these oil drilling bills. One would strike the anti-safety language and add a provision to repeal $37 billion in oil company tax loopholes. The amendment would remit this money to American drivers. Averaged among licensed drivers, my amendment would give $185 to every licensed driver in America, reducing the equivalent price of gasoline by 27 cents a gallon. The other amendment was written to protect national security. It simply requires that the Commander in Chief, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, certify that before we drill for oil off the coast of Virginia that it does not hamper national security and naval operations. I was shocked that all but a handful of Republicans voted to kill this commonsense amendment.

Since the leadership has blocked efforts to include real gas price relief in their oil drilling bills, I am introducing standalone legislation to assist consumers. The bill, entitled the Gas Price Relief Act, would terminate tax loopholes for oil companies while rebating the savings to our hard-pressed commuters throughout America.

Printed on recycled paper.

There are many positive steps, Mr. Speaker, we can take to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, steps that will include clean energy, renewable energy, and efficiency in our vehicles. That's the path we need to take if we are going to reduce our reliance on foreign oil and achieve genuine energy independence.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Georgia) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Reverend Jane Wood, Jerusalem-Mt. Pleasant United Methodist Church, Rockville, Maryland, offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, God of our past, present, and future, we look to You today as we begin this session of the United States House of Representatives.

We thank You this afternoon for those who are assembled here. They have been given a great privilege and an awesome responsibility.

Bestow upon them the wisdom, discernment, and knowledge they need. Be very near to each of them, and may this day be a day of accomplishment.

By Your grace, enable these Representatives to continue on the ''path to a more perfect Union.''

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. POE of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the whole number of the House is 432.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 9, 2011 at 10:05 a.m.:

That the Senate has added additional conferee H.R. 658.

Appointments:

United States Capitol Preservation Commission.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PUTTING THE GULF BACK TO WORK ACT

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I have said many times on this floor and in meetings with constituents, this country does not have an energy strategy, and the only thing worse than not having an energy strategy is having bad energy policy. Yet the answer lies right here in our own backyard. We have the resources, but this administration continues to block access.

Today we're voting on H.R. 1229, the Putting the Gulf Back to Work Act. It is crucial to restoring our own capabilities to produce energy by moving forward with permit applications in a sensible amount of time.

It's deplorable that businesses, like Leed Petroleum in Lafayette, Louisiana, with 22 employees, cannot get back to work and have no options unless we hold these regulators' feet to the fire and force them to do their jobs. These independent producers and service companies, the backbone of American energy production, deserve answers and real solutions.

With oil and gas prices skyrocketing, there is no excuse for any delays to offshore energy production. The people of this country are tired of uncertainty. They are tired of dependence on foreign oil, and they're tired of record gas prices.

The bottom line is we must begin the path toward a solid energy policy to get Americans back to work. There's no excuse for delay.

HONORING ISRAEL ON HER 63RD BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and to celebrate the State of Israel on her 63rd birthday.

Sixty-three years ago, Israel was founded against all odds, through enormous courage and after a difficult struggle. Now she is the beacon of freedom and hope throughout the region.

As the only true democratic society in the Middle East, Israel has built a technologically advanced and thriving economy. Israel's a world leader in biotechnology research and is home to some of the world's great entrepreneurial success stories. Her people enjoy freedom of expression in all forms, and she boasts one of the strongest records on human rights.

The United States, as the first country to recognize Israel's independence, forged an unbreakable bond with Israel through our shared values and goals, and the partnership and cooperation between our two countries has never been stronger. The United States is committed to ensuring Israel's ability to defend herself and will continue to provide the most advanced assistance in security and the most robust economic aid.

In 63 years, Israel has persevered against all odds, against foreign armies, terrorism, and those who deny her right to exist.

Today we reaffirm the bond between the United States and Israel, that it will not be broken. And today the United States stands firmly with our great ally Israel in true friendship and celebration.

WHOSE SIDE IS PAKISTAN ON?

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, after years of funneling money to Pakistan, we still don't know whose side they are on in this war on terror.

We have given Pakistan $12 billion in foreign aid since 2002. We have reimbursed them $9 billion for their military operations in the war on terror. It's time we freeze the foreign aid to Pakistan until we get some answers about their knowledge of bin Laden's whereabouts.

We cannot continue to give Pakistan money in the hopes they will be our friend and ally. We did not trust them enough to give them advance notice of the bin Laden operation. We even had detailed plans to fight the Pakistanis if they interfered with the capture of bin Laden.

Bin Laden was able to live in a mansion right under the nose of the Pakistan military academy for years, but government officials say they didn't know where bin Laden was. That statement defies the evidence, and that ''dog just won't hunt.''

And that's just the way it is.

BOEING BEING BULLIED BY UNIONS AND THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

(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, the National Labor Relations Board has filed a complaint against the Boeing Corporation to stop thousands of jobs at the currently built 1.2 million square foot production facility in South Carolina. This is the second line for 787 jetliners which are so popular due to 20 percent less fuel use than any other airplane of its size.

Manufacturing employees locate in South Carolina due to the welcoming climate provided by the right-to-work laws, with trained workers educated at world-class technical colleges. Boeing has a right to contract to work where it's in the best interest of its shareholders and workers.

I appreciate Governor Nikki Haley leading the defense of our workers against the Obama administration's attack. I am grateful Attorney General Alan Wilson is recruiting fellow attorneys general across America to protect jobs. South Carolina is fortunate to have America's youngest Governor and America's youngest attorney general energetically standing up for freedom of American workers.

Welcome to Washington Adjutant General Bob Livingston, former 218th commander in Afghanistan, with Legislative Liaison Matt Nichols.

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

MASSACHUSETTS FUTURE

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, we only need to look at Massachusetts to see a preview of what is in store if we fail to repeal ObamaCare.

Just a few years ago, it was predicted that the Massachusetts health reform would reduce emergency room care by getting patients in to see primary care physicians. But a new survey shows that only half of primary care physicians are able to accept new patients right now. It now takes 48 days to see an internist for a routine checkup. Premiums in Massachusetts remain among the highest in the Nation. Low reimbursements in the Commonwealth Care health plan mean that only about half of doctors accept the State-managed insurance.

Far from solving Massachusetts' health care crisis, the health reform law has created problems of its own. The Massachusetts Medical Society finds that the environment for physicians continues to deteriorate, despite billions in government spending—just a sample of what awaits the Nation under ObamaCare.

□ 1410

TAXES, PENALTIES, AND FEES IN PPACA

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, the Patient Protection Affordable Care Act, billed as a health care bill, is actually a tax bill. It is riddled with fees and penalties that will drive up the cost of health care by imposing taxes on families and businesses.

Included in the law was a tax increase on nonmedical expenditures from a health savings account. There has always been a 10 percent penalty, but now it jumps to 20 percent.

In addition, beginning next year, employers who have 50 full-time employees for the previous calendar year must offer health coverage that meets the minimum essential benefit coverage requirement of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and that coverage requirement is likely to cost $52 billion over the next 10 years, hardly the way to foster job creation in an economy that desperately needs jobs.

The individual mandate starts out as a tax; then it is a penalty. Oh, now it's back to a tax again. The administration creatively changed its position when it realized that the mandate was indeed a tax, even though it violated the President's own pledge during the campaign not to raise taxes on middle class Americans to pass his signature health care legislation.

The taxes in the health care law will affect everyone inevitably and cannot help but drive up the cost of health care in this country.

STOP THE PAIN AT THE GAS PUMP

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, with Americans feeling pain at the gas pump, I am so glad that the House remains focused on lowering the cost of energy and creating an environment for positive job growth.

American energy production has been handcuffed by a moratorium that the President has placed on new oil, natural gas, and coal production right here in the United States. Mr. Speaker, there is simply no reason that a country with the largest fossil fuel reserves in the world should be suffering through another energy crisis, a crisis that has already cost America thousands of jobs, forced manufacturers to relocate overseas, and made a gallon of gas unaffordable.

The folks that get hurt the most are our seniors on fixed incomes, small businesses, and the poor. This administration apparently thinks the best way to help these folks is to raise their energy taxes and then lend Brazil billions of dollars to drill for oil, while our workers and our factories stand idle.

What we need is a dose of common sense when it comes to our domestic energy policy. We have to use our own oil, natural gas, and coal to create jobs and stop the pain at the pump.

GAS PRICES

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with concern over oil prices and the effect these high prices have on the American consumer.

In my district in northeast Indiana, fuel prices are around $4.10 a gallon. Just this morning, WANE TV reported gas prices in northeast Indiana will be at $4.29 by the end of today. At $4.29 a gallon, many of my constituents will not get out of the gas station for under $80.

The Third Congressional District of Indiana is rural and geographically expansive, causing many constituents to fill up their gas tanks two to three times a week simply from commuting to and from work. For many, this cost makes their total monthly expenditure for gas at or above their rent or mortgage payment.

When President Obama took office, we saw gas prices at a national average of $1.84. Now we are told gas prices could be as high as $5 by Memorial Day. We cannot continue the status quo and expect Hoosiers to pay at the pump.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1229, the Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act, and H.R. 1231, Reversing the President's Offshore Moratorium Act, sponsored by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. These bills, along with H.R. 1230, the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act, that the House passed last week, will help us move away from our dependence on foreign oil by opening restrictions placed on the Outer Continental Shelf, allowing us to tap into our domestic resources. Doing this will provide jobs to more Americans and lower our gas prices.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio) at 4 p.m.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. 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. 1229.

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

There was no objection.

PUTTING THE GULF OF MEXICO BACK TO WORK ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. 1229.

□ 1601

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. 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, 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 Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, families and businesses across the country are struggling with skyrocketing gasoline prices that in many places have already passed $4 per gallon. Everyday activities, such as commuting to work or taking the kids to soccer practice, have strained family budgets, forcing Americans to make tough choices and sacrifices. Unfortunately, rising gasoline prices are not the only energy crisis currently hurting our country. For over a year, communities along the Gulf of Mexico have suffered through a real and then de facto moratorium on offshore drilling imposed by the Obama administration. The administration's intentional slow-walking of drilling permits has cost 12,000 jobs according to their own estimates. According to economist Dr. Joseph Mason, this could cost over 36,000 jobs nationwide if businesses and their employees are not allowed to return to work soon. Over the past month, the Natural Resources Committee has heard from numerous small businesses in Louisiana that have had to lay off hundreds of people, eliminate benefits and diminish their savings just to try to stay afloat.

The bill being considered by the House today will help address all of these concerns. It will put the people and businesses along the gulf back to work by requiring the administration to act on new drilling permits in a timely manner. For Americans across the country who are suffering from rising gasoline prices, this bill acts now to expand American production to help lower costs. H.R. 1229, the Putting the Gulf Back to Work Act, sets a firm time line for the Secretary of the Interior to act on permits. Let me be very clear. Action does not necessarily mean approval. Action simply means that the Secretary must make a decision either to approve or to deny a permit. The bill gives the Secretary 30 days to act, along with two 15-day extensions. This 30-day time frame is consistent with the time line for approving exploration plans, which are far more complicated. A deadline is necessary in order to stop the endless bureaucratic delays and inaction that are currently taking place and to provide companies with some certainty.

There are over 50 permitted projects in the Gulf of Mexico that were under way when the Obama administration imposed the moratorium in May 2010. Nearly a year later, over 40 of those same 50 projects have yet to resume work. This bill would give the Secretary 30 days to restart these projects that have already been approved.

I want to stress that H.R. 1229 will have an immediate impact on jobs and energy production. Each drilling platform supports 800 to 1,400 jobs. Each permit that is issued translates into several hundred people returning to work. In addition, there are production wells just waiting for permits to resume work, meaning that more American energy could come online within months of a permit being issued. Perhaps most importantly, H.R. 1229 also makes significant safety improvements. U.S. offshore drilling helps create American energy and American jobs, but it must be done in a safe and responsible manner.

The bill reforms current law by requiring a drilling company to obtain a permit to drill from the Secretary. Currently, such a permit is not required by law, only by regulation. The bill further reforms the law by requiring the Secretary to conduct a safety review. The bill ensures that all proposed drilling operations must, quote, meet all critical safety system requirements, including blowout prevention, and oil spill response and containment requirements.

Finally, this bill establishes an expedited judicial review process for resolving lawsuits relating to gulf permits. This reform ensures that ending the de facto moratorium imposed by the Obama administration isn't replaced by paralyzing and frivolous lawsuits that could take years to resolve.

What we will see today during the course of this debate are two very different approaches to America's energy future. Republicans are pursuing an all-of-the-above energy approach to American energy production to create jobs, generate revenue, lower gasoline prices, and strengthen our national security. The Obama administration and congressional Democrats, on the other hand, want to make energy more expensive. Their agenda is to raise taxes to make energy production more difficult and costly. We saw proof of this last Congress when they did everything they could to push through the job-destroying Waxman-Markey national energy tax. Now they are trying to increase taxes on American energy producers.

While Americans are looking for solutions to lower gasoline prices, the Democrats' proposals would increase prices even higher. How in the world higher prices and taxes on energy would help Americans at the gas pump is beyond me.

It's time for Congress to take steps to end the economic pain in the gulf by allowing people to return to work. It's time to ease the pain of high gasoline prices by expanding American energy production. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation to create jobs, to lower prices, including the price of gas at the pump, and to strengthen our national security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1229. Need I remind the Members of this body that 1 year and 19 days ago, the Deepwater Horizon oil rig exploded, killing 11 workers and creating economic and environmental havoc. For 87 days following the explosion, more than 4 million barrels of oil spewed from the blown-out Macondo well, coating nearly 1,000 miles of gulf coastline and temporarily closing over 88 square miles of some of the Nation's most productive fishing grounds. Yet this Congress has not enacted a single legislative reform to improve the safety of offshore drilling. Instead, the majority now brings forward in the name of spurious claims a bill to encourage more domestic offshore drilling without applying the lessons learned from the gulf blowout. With the spurious claim that more domestic offshore drilling will lower gas prices, they claim that we have to grease the skids, we have to open the doors, we have to give further breaks to the oil companies.

□ 1610

Now, sadly, it seems their motto is ''Ignore the spill. Drill, baby, drill.''

Frankly, the majority's trio of offshore drilling bills were written as though the Deepwater Horizon disaster had never occurred. That's why I refer to them as the ''amnesia acts.'' Collectively, they will make offshore drilling less safe while opening up vast new swaths of our coastlines without adding any new safety requirements or environmental safeguards on the oil and gas industry.

So today we are taking up the second ''amnesia act.'' H.R. 1229 would impose artificial and arbitrary deadlines on the Department of the Interior to approve permits to drill. Specifically, this legislation would require the Department to act on a permit to drill within 30 days. After 60 days, whether or not—whether or not, let me emphasize that—the safety and environmental review has been completed by the Interior Department, the drilling application would be deemed approved.

Need I remind my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, that offshore drilling in U.S. waters was determined by the spill commission, the bipartisan, independent spill commission, to be four times more deadly than in other parts of the world prior to the Deepwater Horizon tragedy. It was four times more deadly to drill in the gulf by the same companies than to drill, for example, in the North Sea, hardly a comfortable environment. Now, under this bill, we could actually have less careful oversight and review of offshore drilling than we had before the Deepwater Horizon disaster.

This bill is a dangerous solution in search of a really nonexistent problem. Since the implementation of new safety and environmental standards in June of last year, the Department has added staff, improved its review, and has issued 52 shallow water drilling permits. Only six more permits currently are pending. Since the oil industry demonstrated the capability to contain a deepwater blowout in mid-February, we think, the Department has issued permits for 13 new deepwater wells. There are only 12 permits in the queue for approval; yet the majority is claiming we've got to grease the skids, that we've got to remove any impediments for the oil companies, that we have to ''drill, baby, drill.''

Ironically, the enactment of H.R. 1229 could halt this progress. This bill could hamper new permits being issued or stop new permits altogether because the Department might be forced to deny permits if the safety and environmental reviews are not completed in the arbitrary 60 days.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, this legislation would issue a blanket extension of existing leases. In contrast to this across-the-board approach, the Department is working on a case-by-case basis to extend existing leases affected by the temporary suspension of new drilling, where such action is warranted, not on a blanket basis but on the basis of the actual facts, of the actual evidence. H.R. 1229 would give a free ride to companies even if their leases are many years from expiring.

With regard to the comment that has been made already in this debate, that this is about prices at the gasoline pump, need I remind my colleagues—now, this was under the George Bush administration—that in 2008, the Energy Information Administration said, if all drilling over the entire east coast Continental Shelf were opened up, the effect on oil prices would be ''insignificant.''

H.R. 1229 also contains language designed to close the doors of the courthouse to citizens who believe that the Federal Government is not complying with the law. Imagine that. Citizens who are trying to be diligent citizens would not be able to make sure that the law is being applied. Citizens from Florida or Alabama would be forced to bring any lawsuits regarding energy projects in the Gulf of Mexico to Louisiana or Texas courts. In addition, H.R. 1229 contains language that would prevent attorneys' fees from being awarded in successful cases—a deterrent if I've ever heard of one. These provisions are aimed at environmental plaintiffs, but will almost certainly impair the legal rights of many other potential plaintiffs, including other oil and gas companies.

In the wake of the Deepwater Horizon disaster, the principles guiding offshore drilling should be smart and safe. If H.R. 1229 is enacted, the guiding principles will be fast and loose. This is the wrong response to the largest oil spill in U.S. waters. We should not rush to allow drilling permits to be deemed approved without the appropriate safety and environmental checks. We should not provide blanket extensions to existing leases. We should not close the doors of the courthouse to American citizens. We should not pass this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to a new member of the Natural Resources Committee, a member who is jumping in and making an immediate impact on the need for increasing our energy production, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, today we are taking up the Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act, which will accomplish two very important goals: create jobs and help lower energy costs. It will end the Obama administration's de facto drilling moratorium in the gulf in a way that is safe, transparent, and responsible.

A study from Louisiana State University predicted that keeping this permitorium in place for 18 months could cause the loss of more than 36,000 jobs nationwide. We simply can't afford the Obama administration's job-killing policies. Rather than putting Americans back to work, they're seriously impacting America's energy production. The ''March 2011 Short-Term Energy Outlook'' from the Energy Information Administration noted that production from the Gulf of Mexico is expected to fall by 240,000 barrels per day this year.

If we're going to become energy secure, we need to increase our energy production, not limit it; and we need to commit ourselves to developing our own resources. The Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act will help do that.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a Member who is doing an excellent job of pointing out the need for bringing jobs and production back online in Louisiana and in the gulf, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak on this important issue, H.R. 1229.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, it is one of a trifecta of bills that we're passing out of the House, once and for all and after 40 years, to begin actually putting together a cogent energy policy for this country. Now, before I talk about it, I do want to make a couple of comments.

Our President has been saying over and over again that our energy production, our oil production is at the highest level it has ever been. ED MARKEY, the ranking member of the committee said the same thing. Mr. Salazar of Interior, Mr. Bromwich just the other day, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ said the same thing.

Why are you saying this?

Very clearly, right now we are producing oil at a level of 6 million barrels a day, down from a high in 1972 of 9 million barrels a day; and off the gulf coast, where you claim that production is its highest ever, we were down from 1.7 million barrels a day last year to 1.59 million today, and it will be going down by another 225,000 barrels of oil per day by next year.

For heaven's sake, there's a reason we have a structural increase in the cost of our energy. It is, very simply, that we're constraining the output of oil. So let's get on it. Let's finally start producing oil in this country, and let's become energy independent once and for all.

Louisiana is being hurt in two ways. Number one, of course, is the increasing price of gasoline; but it's also jobs. As the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) just mentioned, Dr. Joseph Mason from Louisiana State University, from my home State, said that we're looking at a loss of 36,137 jobs over an 18-month period out of the gulf coast alone. In February, Seahawk Drilling, which owned and operated 20 rigs on the gulf coast, filed chapter 11 due to the Obama administration's de facto moratorium.

□ 1620

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman.

We have lost 12 rigs so far to such countries as Nigeria, Egypt, the Congo, and Brazil, and guess who we just gave $2 billion to drill oil? Brazil, of all places. So we gave them the rig, we gave them the money so they can drill oil to sell back to us and to put tax money into their coffers. For heaven's sake, this is crazy.

So in conclusion, I'd like to say today, let's get our Louisiana and Texas and other people back to work. Let's invest in our energy across this country, and let's get the gas prices down.

Mr. HOLT. The gentleman used the term ''trifecta.'' It's a curious selection of words because, indeed, you could see the oil companies right now lining up at the ticket window to cash in their trifecta winnings if this goes forward.

The oil companies are currently sitting on 60 million acres of public land onshore and offshore in which they are not producing. The oil industry is sitting on more than 11.5 billion barrels of oil, nearly as much as they could ever get from drilling up and down the east coast and the west coast. This is where they should be directing their attention, but instead, where are they directing their attention as they bring in profits that for this year looked to be something like $100 billion? They are using those profits not to provide more resources for the American people but to buy back stock. Exxon, which had about a $10 billion profit in the first quarter of this year, just the first three months, used most of its money, more than half of it, to buy back stock.

So it is curious that my colleague used the phrase ''trifecta'' because, indeed, this is a bonanza, a big winning ticket for the Big Oil companies.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to yield 1 minute to a new member of the committee who represents a district right on the gulf coast and is passionate about what is happening and not happening down there and what should be happening, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle should listen to this story. It's a true life story very well. It talks about the face of Big Oil, and I'm going to tell you what it is.

There's a little community in my district named Coteau Holmes which has been around since the Cajuns were kicked out of Acadian and settled down into Louisiana. It's a fishing village. There's a gentleman down there who graduated high school in 1968 and began to work in the oil and gas industry, and for 30 years, he worked in the oil and gas industry. He raised two children in that oil and gas industry, never asked the government for anything other than to ply his trade.

The experience he gained in the Gulf of Mexico led him to work on the first Deepwater projects in the Gulf of Mexico. He worked for Shell Oil and Gas—Big Oil—and guess what. When he retired, he was making in excess of $1,750 a day. He put two kids through college.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LANDRY. If this is not the American Dream that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim to tout so much, what is? This is a gentleman who doesn't have a college education. Who actually his children were the first generation in his entire family ancestry to ever make it to college, and he could not have paid for them to go to college if not for the opportunity to drill in the Gulf of Mexico.

My colleagues should understand that down there we create jobs. We create good-paying jobs, not minimum-wage jobs, the type of jobs that provide for the American family and allow the American Dream to be a reality.

Mr. HOLT. We are indeed concerned about jobs. For the example that my friend from Louisiana gives about someone whose livelihood is at stake, I could produce dozens of others, maybe a shrimp fisherman. You know, my friends maybe remember the ''Forrest Gump'' movie. They've seen those pictures. In fact, my friend from Louisiana probably has been out on one of those shrimp boats. Well, they were sitting idle. They were sitting idle for weeks and weeks.

The breeding grounds, the fisheries, were and still are in jeopardy. People all over the country are not buying the fish that drank of this black gold. In fact, 88,000 square miles, as I said earlier, of fisheries were polluted by this tremendous spill, and need I remind my colleagues that the coastal communities of the Gulf of Mexico, the heart of offshore drilling, that the jobs that are dependent on tourism and fishing exceed all the natural resource extraction and mining jobs by a factor of five, five times as many jobs dependent on tourism and fisheries.

Yes, we should learn the lesson, rather than hurrying through these permits. We should learn the lessons of last year's oil spill and protect those jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona, who's a new member of the committee and understands these issues well, Mr. GOSAR.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, the people in my district are hurting. Rising gas prices are cutting deep into family budgets. Food prices are skyrocketing. Communities that are home to destination locations like the Grand Canyon are bracing themselves for fewer summer visitors because families simply cannot afford to travel.

Main Street America can no longer afford inaction from the President and his administration, and that is why I stand here today in support of H.R. 1229. The bill not only will put thousands of Americans back to work, it would increase our production of oil here at home and lower the cost of gas.

It is time we put our country back to work and use our resources here at home instead of abroad, and it is time the government makes a serious commitment towards energy independence and an all-of-the-above approach that America wants.

Mr. HOLT. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Santa Barbara, California (Mrs. CAPPS), who has experienced firsthand the economic cost of oil spills.

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague from New Jersey for recognizing me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1229. A year ago BP's Deepwater Horizon rig exploded in the Gulf of Mexico, leaving 11 people dead and over 1,000 miles of shoreline oiled. It also left the local economy in shambles. The once lucrative fishing and tourism businesses were devastated by this spill. Many gulf residents are still struggling, and yet the oil industry would have us believe it suffered greatly during the temporary moratorium on new drilling. The fact is the gulf produced 1.6 million barrels of oil per day last year, an all-time record, and still the industry is clamoring for more.

Today, we're considering another bill on their wish list that sidesteps safety and environmental safeguards. H.R. 1229 forces this administration to unreasonably rush the permitting process for drilling activities. These permits are a final review opportunity for the Federal Government to ensure that everything is in place before an oil company drills deep into our ocean floor, but the majority is using the strain of high gas prices to push Americans into thinking that drilling is safe and that hurrying these permits will bring down costs.

□ 1630

It's as if we learned nothing from the BP oil disaster. Mr. Chairman, we cannot say drilling is safe when Congress has not taken necessary steps to strengthen protections for rig workers and the environment. We cannot say drilling is safe when the industry has yet to prove it has better means of preventing or cleaning up a spill than we saw that it did a year ago, and we cannot say drilling is safe when the government lacks the resources it needs to police an industry that for years policed itself, to perilous ends.

While the Obama administration has started acting on the lessons of the spill, Michael Bromwich, the head offshore drilling regulator, told the New York Times that his agency ''still lacks the resources, personnel, training, technology, enforcement tools, regulations, and legislation that it needs to do its job properly.''

Mr. Chairman, we know how to reduce the risk of oil spills. The President's oil spill commission laid out a list of recommendations for how Congress can prevent another spill from occurring. Many of my colleagues have amendments to put those recommendations in place. I hope this House will adopt them so we can say that drilling is safer.

Vote ''no'' on H.R. 1229. Let's not promote reckless drilling that will fail to

lower gas prices and endanger our coastlines. Let's instead strengthen safety and environmental safeguards for offshore drilling and support a quicker transition to cleaner, safer energy policy for America.

Mr. LAMBORN. I would like to inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining for both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Then I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, when I was listening to the gentlelady from California and her colleagues, I was reminded of Mark Twain's warning that we should be careful to get out of an experience only the wisdom that is there and then stop, lest we be like the cat that sits on a hot stove lid. That cat will not sit on a hot stove lid again—and this is good—but, also, it will not sit on a cold stove lid again.

The cost of the irrational reaction by this administration to what was, in essence, a mechanical failure of a blowout preventer is horrific, as measured in unemployed families, higher energy prices, lost business to shops throughout the region, and lost royalties to the Nation's Treasury. It is said that the economic damage done by this administration in response to the oil spill could be far greater than that done by the oil spill itself, and I believe it. I would suggest a little common sense will go a long way, and this bill provides it.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, earlier the gentleman mentioned Brazil. The bill before us would grant a blanket extension for leases in the gulf that are about to expire. And according to the Interior Department, this amendment would extend about 100 leases and costs about $6 million over 10 years. Well, 12 of those leases that would be extended automatically belong to Petrobras, the Brazilian oil giant. It would, indeed, provide a windfall given from American taxpayers to the State-owned Brazilian oil giant Petrobras. Yes, this bill in front of us now.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida, Representative CASTOR, who, unlike some of the debaters today, is someone who actually lives on the Gulf of Mexico.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1229.

This Republican proposal is very poor public policy. And as a Member who represents a community that is dependent on the gulf coast's economy, frankly, it is appalling for my Republican friends to press to eliminate safety standards on oil companies who want to continue to drill and come closer and closer to our beautiful beaches. Really, it is beyond the pale. And I have to ask, did my colleagues not learn anything from this disaster?

In our economy on Florida's gulf coast, we depend on clean water and clean beaches, and when you bring up a bill like this, it feels like a direct challenge to our economic recovery. We have not recovered. The hotels and motels on the beach, the seafood industry, all the mom and pop shops who are dependent on the tourism industry, we are still struggling to come back. We want to adopt the recommendations of the oil spill commission that recommends stronger safety standards, something like that which was passed on a bipartisan basis here in the House last year.

Now to add insult to injury, my Republican colleagues recently passed a budget that gives taxpayer subsidies to the Big Oil companies. In the face of a burgeoning debt and deficit and in the face of huge profits by the oil companies, why should the American taxpayers be subsidizing the bottom line of the most profitable corporations in the world? Instead, it is time for a meaningful, comprehensive energy strategy to lower gas prices because it appears that that's what we all are in agreement to do. But to do that, it's not to eliminate safety standards for drilling. That's silly. What we should do is end the giveaways to Big Oil, eliminate the $5 billion in subsidies and loopholes that the oil companies receive each year. Let's prohibit Wall Street speculators from artificially driving up oil prices. Let's develop super-efficient cars and clean alternative energies that will create good jobs in America and then bring down gas prices.

Mr. Chairman, finally, I caution the oil companies and their friends in Congress that the BP Deepwater Horizon blowout was only 1 year ago. Most of the necessary safety standards and recommendations of the bipartisan oil spill commission have not been adopted. No one should be pressing for unbridled drilling without ensuring that another blowout disaster would never happen again. Otherwise, many of us on the gulf coast view the blind-eyed push as a serious threat to our multibillion dollar tourism and fishing industries and our coastal environmental resources.

Florida's long-term economic health is dependent on clean water and clean beaches and clean oceans. Our economy is struggling right now. I am confident that Florida's economy will recover, but Florida's long-term economic outlook will suffer immensely if we have to suffer through another blowout disaster.

Mr. Chairman, we need an honest dialogue on energy solutions based on facts. Americans are clamoring for comprehensive long-term energy solutions so we are less dependent on foreign oil.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that anyone who reads the bill will see on the bottom of page 1 and the top of page 2, ''Safety review required. The Secretary shall not issue a permit under paragraph one without ensuring that the proposed drilling operations meet all, A, critical safety system requirements, including blowout prevention; and B, oil spill response and containment requirements.''

So when we look at the facts, we should start with the text of the bill itself.

At this point, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the State of Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman.

I wanted to respond to a couple of things from the other side. First of all, Mr. LANDRY and I are both from Louisiana. We are not potted plants. We are actually from a State that is on the coast. In fact, Mr. LANDRY lives, actually, on the coast. So I think we speak from experience and knowledge on that.

With respect to seafood, yes, there is a problem with the seafood. It's a perception problem. Seafood in Louisiana is the safest seafood in the world. We have just got to get that message out to the American people.

Let's talk about subsidies. We hear about subsidies. Well, you know there is a profiteer when it comes to oil: 36 to 63 cents per gallon is swept off the top. And who profits from that? The government profits from it. And what does the government do with much of that money? It puts it into so-called alternative energy with so-called phony green jobs that we are yet to see being produced, wind and solar, et cetera.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. FLEMING. Now, it's also been suggested, Well, perhaps we should punish these evil oil companies by taxing them. Mr. Chairman, who pays the taxes? It's the consumers. It's the American people. You add a 10 percent tax to oil exploration or gasoline or whatever, and it's us, it's we—we are the ones who will have to pay that, not the oil companies.

□ 1640

Like any company, they pass these costs along to the consumer. So I want to see gas prices go down, not up, like the other side.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the ranking member on the full committee, and someone who has done as much as anyone in this body to create green jobs in America over the decades.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey very much, and I thank him for his leadership on these issues. We're partners in this effort to try to move toward a new energy direction.

So last week we had a debate on the issue of whether or not the $4 billion

that the oil industry gets in tax breaks per year from the American consumer should be taken away at this time when ExxonMobil reported $10 billion worth of profits in the first quarter, that is just January, February and March. Shell reported $8.8 billion; BP, $7.1 billion; Chevron, $6.2 billion; ConocoPhillips, $3 billion. That's in the first 3 months of this year.

But you know what the argument is, from the Republican side, is that they would be punished if the consumer, if the taxpayer didn't also give them an additional $4 billion in tax breaks.

So let's just look at this chart. This is how much they made as people are pulling up to the pump paying $3.80, $4, $4.20 all across America. Now, you know what the oil companies could do? They could say, You know what? I think we made too much. I think what we should do in the first quarter is just lower the price at the pump so we don't make so much. Maybe we don't have to have the consumer paying $4 a gallon. Maybe we, ExxonMobil, maybe we could have made 9.7. Maybe Shell could have made 7.8, maybe BP could have made only $6.1 billion, maybe Chevron could have made only $5.2 billion. In other words, maybe they each could have made $1 billion less, and that would be $4 billion in the first quarter.

But, no. They decide that if the war in Libya is going to take 1.2 million barrels of oil off the market, if the Saudi Arabians are going to take 800,000 barrels of oil off the market, that that's a free market. And so if the price goes up to skyrocketing heights, we have a right to take all that extra money out of the consumers' pockets. That's the free market. The war in Libya is a free market. Saudi Arabia taking 800,000 barrels off the market, that's a free market.

Now, the American consumer, they look at it and they say that's not a free market. The American taxpayers, they look at it and they say that's not the free market. We're sending over more bombers. We're sending over more troops. We're adding more to the defense budget of the country. Why would we do that? What does that have to do with the free market? What does this increase in defense expenditures and the number of young men and women that we send over to the Middle East to protect this cordon of oil tankers coming into the United States have to do with the free market?

But nonetheless, that's the argument of the Republicans and, by the way, of ExxonMobil and Shell and BP. They deserve these profits, they say, just for 3 months.

By the way, you can multiply each one of these numbers by at least four, at least the next three quarters of 2011 as well, and project ExxonMobil making $40 billion this year and Shell 34 or $35 billion, et cetera, et cetera.

But the Republicans say they still need the extra $4 billion from the taxpayer pocket. So they dip into one pocket, the consuming pocket, and they tip the consumer upside down, and they take all this money out of their pockets. And you don't see any restraint on the part of the oil companies taking advantage of the war in Libya. And then they want to dip into the other pocket of the consumer, the consumer as a taxpayer, and then they say you can't take away those tax breaks either.

So that's a very interesting position to have to defend at this point in time, especially since they're saying that they want to cut back on the benefits for Grandma on Medicare. They want to cut back the budget by 70 percent on wind and solar, on geothermal and biomass. They want to cut back the budget to help Grandma stay in a nursing home with Alzheimer's.

But one thing you should never touch, and that's the $4 billion for ExxonMobil, Shell and BP from the taxpayers, even as they're reporting the largest profits in the history of the world that any corporation's made.

And now, today, they have the temerity to come out here on the floor and they're looking for more. What this first bill that we're about to consider does is it legislates possible intimidation of Federal safety reviewers and puts a time clock on looking at the most controversial leases.

Now, mind you, just 1 year ago in the Gulf of Mexico we were looking with amazement at the worst single environmental disaster in American history, and that is BP with no idea about how they were going to stop 4 million barrels of oil going into the Gulf of Mexico. They had no idea how to stop it. And the American people, the world was tuned into the spill cam, almost, you know, fixated on this complete lack of safety, complete lack of preparation to protect the life and the livelihoods of the people who live around the Gulf of Mexico.

So what's the response of the Republican Party 1 year later? Is it to pass a safety bill? Is it to implement the recommendations of the BP Spill Commission, this blue ribbon panel of experts that identified that there are systemic failures in the safety precautions built into drilling in the United States? Is it to deal with the fact that they identified that there are four times higher fatalities on American rigs as there are on European rigs drilling off the shores of Europe?

No. All that legislation is stopped dead in its tracks. What they argue is we have got to give, you know, kind of a shot clock. You know how in the NBA, when you're watching TV and you only have 24 seconds to shoot a basketball, and so that creates a real intensity or else you lose the ball? Well, that's kind of what they want to say now to the Department of the Interior. We're putting you on a shot clock. You have 60 days. You have 60 days to decide: Is that drilling rig safe? Have the precautions been put in place to ensure that a catastrophic accident can't happen?

And if you don't make a decision in 60 days, Department of the Interior, on a rig that's out there at 3,000 or 5,000 or 10,000 feet and off the shore miles and miles and you can't figure it out, Department of the Interior—now, mind you, this is the same company that couldn't figure it out a year ago, and they're amongst the wealthiest companies in the world. But if you, the Department of the Interior, if you can't figure out what we can do, we the company can do in 60 days, we get to have the lease and we get to go ahead.

□ 1650

It is kind of like the NBA, except the consequences aren't that your home team loses; it's that your home team loses its job, your home team loses its environment because another catastrophic accident has occurred. That's what they do with this bill. They put a shot clock on it.

So I think if the American people are looking at the absurdity of this situation with these companies, look at the companies that are lobbying for this: ExxonMobil, Shell, BP, Chevron, and ConocoPhillips. These are the companies that 1 year ago said that they could evacuate walruses from the Gulf of Mexico. They had an emergency response plan in the event of a spill. Well, the problem was, of course, that they each had put it in writing; they had each put it in as an application to the Department of the Interior to drill in the Gulf of Mexico. But walruses, as every sixth grade child knows, have not lived in the Gulf of Mexico for 3 million years. So these are the companies that we are now supposed to trust.

Put it on a shot clock, they say. Just let the Department of the Interior try to figure out everything that we are planning for Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Texas.

And, by the way, the way the gulf stream works is pulling a lot of that pollution, if it's bad, in God knows how many directions, and the fish that get exposed to it put into the food chain with endocrine disrupters, cancer-causing agents, potentially harming families. But 60 days is all you have got.

It's kind of like the NBA, when we think that's how oil drilling should be, too, because we trust these companies. They are obviously the most safety conscious companies that this world has ever known, because we can see how really responsible they are in dealing with consumers.

They had a chance not to charge $4 a gallon because we are having a war in Libya and the Saudi Arabians took 800 barrels off the market, believe it or not, our friends the Saudis, over the last 6 weeks. But now we are just going to pretend that they are really good and responsible companies, and for them, so they can get all the leases that they want, they are on a shot clock—60 days.

Good luck to the Department of the Interior. Good luck to the environment. Good luck to the consumer.

Good luck to the taxpayers if another accident occurs.

So, ladies and gentlemen, we are going to have an incredible debate here on this issue, because these are the same people that just passed the budget that cut the wind and solar budget by 70 percent.

You know, if you are a kid in America and it is 2011 and you are looking at this debate, you're saying to yourself: They cut the solar and wind budget in 2011 by 70 percent, and they are giving the oil companies unlimited profits, unlimited tax breaks, and unlimited access after 60 days to wherever they want to drill off of the coastline? Now, that's an upside-down agenda.

And you have already heard some of the denigrating comments about wind and solar, which does reflect, I hate to say it, a deep-seated attitude about these renewable energy resources. But, you know, politics.

And I think America is all about the future, and the future is about wind. It's about solar. It's about moving to all electric vehicles. It's about the agenda that they just pretty much defunded in their budget that they had the votes here on the House floor.

So I would urge that we would defeat this piece of legislation.

And their legislation, they say it's all of the above, but do you want to know what it is? It's oil above all. That is really what it is all about. Give the oil companies everything they want, and slash the budget for renewables. Slash the budget for all the other new technologies that we need to enhance our future.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how much time is remaining to our side and if any remains on the other side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 15 minutes remaining. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, I have been listening very closely and I still haven't heard a clear answer as to how $4 billion of additional taxes on energy companies will translate into lower costs at the pump. Now, I don't think it can be done, but I haven't even heard a cogent argument to establish that. So I am still listening, and maybe I will hear that later.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, who lives on and represents a district on the Gulf of Mexico, Mr. LANDRY.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Chairman, I do. I live on the coast. I represent most of coastal Louisiana. And what I wonder is, where were my colleagues in 2008? I was not in this body; they were.

They were worried about my shrimpers? In 2008, almost every shrimp boat from Venice to Delcambre was at the dock. Why? Because they had run diesel to just about $5 a gallon. You see, it takes energy for those shrimpers to go out there on the Gulf of Mexico.

They worry about the tourism in Florida? There are already multiple articles in the paper that say that high gas prices are killing tourism in Florida.

This is a responsibility bill. You see, they want to punish those who make a profit while they give taxpayer money to those who fail, who are too big to fail. They punish the companies who make profits in this country while they give our money to those who fail to make a profit.

It amazes me, because what really matters here, what really creates jobs not only in my district but in everyone else's district is affordable energy. Affordable energy is what powers the U.S. economy.

If they want to bring the profits of those four Big Oil companies down, they should vote for this bill. Because when we drive the price of oil down and when we drive the price at the pump down, we are going to drive those profits down and we are going to take away our dependency on those foreign countries that are making way more profits than those private companies.

So I urge my colleagues to remember that the responsible thing to do is to vote for this bill so that we can bring the price at the pump down.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the issue of safety that has been raised a couple of times here.

I quoted from the bill text earlier to show that there, indeed, are safety requirements that have been put into the bill as part of H.R. 1229:

The Secretary will not issue a permit unless critical safety system requirements, including blowout prevention and oil spill response and containment requirements, have been satisfied.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to another gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague yielding to talk about this important legislation; because, Mr. Chairman, as I just got back home from New Orleans over the weekend, of course people all throughout the gulf coast, people all throughout the country are frustrated and angry about the high gas prices we are paying at the pump.

In south Louisiana you don't need to look any further than the area that I represent to see the devastating impact of this administration's policies, not only on high gas prices but also on jobs.

We have lost over 13,000 jobs in south Louisiana just because of this administration's refusal to let our people go back to work, people that were drilling safely, exploring for energy in America, that are literally on the verge of being put out of business because this administration won't let them go back to work where there are known barrels of oil, billions of barrels in some of these areas in the Outer Continental Shelf that are closed off because of this administration.

They say there is no moratorium anymore, but we call it a permitorium, because they don't allow companies to go back to work, hiring people, creating jobs, allowing our country to become energy independent.

If you look at the results of their policies, not only has it yielded higher gas prices at the pump, but for anybody on the other side that suggests that cutting off the supply has nothing to do with the price of oil, they need to go back and take a basic economics course.

I don't think OPEC could have developed a better policy than what they have got right now, because they are saying basically we are not allowing our people to go back to work in the United States, but the President wants to encourage drilling in Brazil. He asked the Saudis to produce more energy. We have got billions of barrels in America, and our people can't even go back to work.

So this legislation at least says, enough of this delay, enough of the foolishness and the games and blaming everybody else while gas prices continue to skyrocket. Prices have more than doubled at the pump since President Obama took the oath of office, and it is his policies that are causing this.

So I am glad that this leadership is bringing legislation to the floor here in the House to finally say we are going to do something about it; we are not going to look the other way. Our plan isn't to raise billions more in taxes so people pay even more at the pump and so we are even more dependent on foreign oil. We are actually going to make America energy independent by saying let's let our people go back to work.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I will conclude by saying this: If you go throughout south Louisiana and you see the 13,000 jobs that we have lost; you talk to families who are hanging on by a vine; you talk to small business owners who barely can make ends meet and they are just struggling to hold on to their business, and all they want to do is go back to work, and this administration is saying ''no.'' But, no, they want to drill in Brazil. They want our people across the country to pay higher gas prices.

There is a better way. There is an answer. There is a solution, and that is in this legislation being brought forward. I urge that my colleagues from across the country vote to lower gas prices and pass this bill.

□ 1700

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman and the others from the Natural Resources Committee on the Republican side who have spoken on this issue or are with the Energy and Commerce Committee and made great comments about how we do need to do what

we can in Congress to lower the price of gasoline. We do that by increasing production. The two go together. We don't do it by increasing taxes on the energy producers. We allow for policies to allow for more production.

We have to pass H.R. 1229 to make sure that, whether it is deliberate or not, this administration will not continue to stonewall the permitting process. It is a long and lengthy process. There are multiple environmental reviews that take place. Then to hold it up at the last and not allow for a permit to be issued is just not acceptable. All the work has been done when it becomes time to issue the permit.

So what this bill says is you have 30 days, with a couple of extensions, if necessary, to make the final decision. And you don't have to issue the permit. You can say no, if that is the best decision. Just take action, and let's have a little certainty in the business world and in the economy of our country, especially the Gulf of Mexico and the coastal States like Louisiana that are so heavily affected.

On the issue of safety, Mr. Chairman, we all do share the goal of wanting to make sure that offshore drilling is the safest in the world. Significant and fundamental changes have taken place over the past year to improve offshore drilling safety and response. Regulations have been enhanced and strengthened, standards have been increased, new technology has been developed, reviewed, tested and is being currently deployed.

BOEMRE Director Michael Bromwich came to our committee and testified in front of the Natural Resources Committee and he said, ''We have confidence that offshore drilling can be conducted now more safely than it had been before and that we would be better able to deal with a blowout than we were before.''

Now, if anyone on the other side of the aisle wants to act as if nothing has been changed and there have been no safety reforms imposed, they are indicting the Obama administration in saying that they have turned a blind eye to the situation since the BP crisis took place, and that is simply not true. As I said a minute ago, new regulations have been imposed and standards have been strengthened. So I am not going to sit here and indict the administration on the safety aspect. There have been a lot of safety regulations by bureaucratic regulation put into place.

This bill does acknowledge that two additional things will be part of our law when this bill passes. H.R. 1229 says, number one, the Secretary will issue a permit. The need for a permit has not been ever codified, so we are requiring that a permit has to be issued before drilling can take place. Number two, the Secretary is to conduct a safety review. That is being mandated and put into law.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 1229. We are going to be looking at some amendments shortly.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1229, the Putting the Gulf Back to Work Act, and I thank Natural Resources Committee Chairman HASTINGS for yielding me time.

At a time when hardworking Georgians are paying $3.88 per gallon at the pump, it is critically important that we enact commonsense energy production policies to reduce our dependence on foreign oil and create jobs. Unfortunately, the Obama Administration has adopted policies that have stifled energy production in this country, and have led to 12,000 jobs lost during the moratorium imposed in the Gulf of Mexico last year.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 1229 will end the ongoing ''de facto'' moratorium caused by the White House's refusal to approve permits in the Gulf by requiring the Department of the Interior to grant permits for exploration of oil and natural gas. This commonsense legislation will create thousands of jobs, help recapture $4.7 million that the Federal Government is losing on a daily basis from a lack of energy production, and will lead us to greater energy independence.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1229.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to H.R. 1229 and H.R. 1230.

In April 2010, our Nation watched as millions of gallons of oil spilled into the Gulf of Mexico from an oil drilling rig off the coast of Louisiana. We saw photos of the disaster that ensued, the impact on our environment (including the damage caused to marine and coastal wildlife) and the devastating economic impact on communities in the Gulf Coast region. From the loss of fishing jobs and revenue from tourism to the harm of biodiversity in fragile wetland ecosystems and marine life breeding grounds, this oil spill caused immense destruction to a resource rich area.

I am concerned that without changes to the offshore drilling industry standards, a disaster like the Deepwater Horizon explosion of April 2010 could happen again. Today, the majority in the House is asking us to pass H.R. 1229 and to forget about the tragic events of last April and the inadequacies of our national energy policy in order to grant Big Oil access to the Gulf with less oversight—rushing lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico at an unprecedented pace and without proper environmental review. This bill is not only ill-advised, but it is unnecessary as well because the Obama Administration is already moving forward with the lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico with added reviews to ensure sound safety and environment protections.

In addition, H.R. 1230 would require the Interior Department to hold additional lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico over the next 4 to 8 months and open the eastern seaboard for drilling by requiring a lease sale off the coast of Virginia this year. This bill would require the Interior Department to rely on environmental reviews for these areas done by the Bush Administration prior to the Deepwater Horizon disaster, with many of the same demonstrably flawed and dangerous assumptions and inadequate review processes as the BP lease that led to the disastrous spill in April 2010. The majority in Congress is using rising gasoline prices as an excuse to grant large, multi-national energy companies greater access to even more of our precious shores, including on the Atlantic Coast which could affect New Jersey in the event of a spill.

I believe opening our coastal waters and protected wilderness areas to oil drilling is harmful, ineffective, and a step in the wrong direction that will damage our environment. We are currently drilling at a higher rate than we ever have and onshore production increased by 5% in 2010. Production in the Gulf of Mexico is at an all time high. Yet, of the 41 million acres of public lands now leased for oil and gas development, just 12 million acres are producing. Offshore, 38 million acres of the outer continental shelf are leased for oil and gas drilling, but just 6.5 million acres are producing. We have approved drilling leases on land where no drilling is taking place; the potential for higher production is there without expanding leasing to environmentally sensitive wildlife refuges or populated shore regions.

Moreover, the proposed drilling will not significantly lower gas prices. According to a 2009 study from the Energy Information Administration, opening up waters that are currently closed to drilling off the East Coast, West Coast and the Gulf coast of Florida would yield an extra 500,000 barrels a day by 2030, meaning that gas prices might drop a total of 3 cents a gallon. And that is years away. In the meantime, Big Oil companies continue to rake in record profits while taxpayers subsidize their costs. The American people have had enough, New Jersey has had enough and I have had enough. We need to stop Big Oil subsidies and explore alternatives.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LANDRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOMACK, 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. 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

ASSESSING PROGRESS IN HAITI ACT

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1016) to measure the progress of relief, recovery, reconstruction, and

development efforts in Haiti following the earthquake of January 12, 2010, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1016

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 ''Assessing Progress in Haiti Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) On January 12, 2010, an earthquake measuring 7.0 on the Richter magnitude scale struck the country of Haiti.

(2) According to the United States Geological Survey (USGS)—

(A) the earthquake epicenter was located approximately 15 miles southwest of Port-au-Prince, the capital of Haiti; and

(B) the earthquake was followed by 59 aftershocks of magnitude 4.5 or greater, the most severe measuring 6.0.

(3) According to the Government of Haiti, more than 316,000 people died as a result of the earthquake, including 103 citizens of the United States and more than 100 United Nations personnel.

(4) According to the United Nations and the International Organization for Migration—

(A) an estimated 3,000,000 people were directly affected by the disaster, nearly one-third of the country's population; and

(B) more than 2,100,000 people were displaced from their homes to settlements.

(5) Casualty numbers and infrastructure damage, including to roads, ports, hospitals, and residential dwellings, place the earthquake as the worst cataclysm to hit Haiti in over two centuries and, proportionally, one of the world's worst natural disasters in modern times.

(6) The Post Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) conducted by the Government of Haiti, the United Nations, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and other experts estimates that damage and economic losses totaled $7,804,000,000, approximately 120 percent of Haiti's gross domestic product in 2009.

(7) Haiti is the poorest, least developed country in the Western Hemisphere with, prior to the earthquake—

(A) more than 70 percent of Haitians living on less than $2 per day; and

(B) a ranking of 149 out of 182 countries on the United Nations Human Development Index.

(8) House Resolution 1021, which was passed on January 21, 2010, on a vote of 411 to 1 expressed—

(A) the House of Representatives' ''deepest condolences and sympathy for the horrific loss of life'' caused by the earthquake; and

(B) bipartisan support for Haiti's recovery and reconstruction.

(9) The initial emergency response of the men and women of the United States Government, led by the United States Agency for International Development and United States Southern Command, was swift and resolute.

(10) United States urban search and rescue (USAR) teams were immediately activated after the earthquake and deployed from Fairfax County, Virginia, Los Angeles County, California, Miami-Dade, Florida, the City of Miami, Florida, and Virginia Beach, Virginia, to assist the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Disaster Assistance Response Team (DART), and New York City's first responders asked the Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) to activate a New York City urban search and rescue shortly thereafter.

(11) A month after the earthquake, the House of Representatives unanimously passed House Resolution 1059 which expressed gratitude to these USAR units, and highlighted that the 511 United States rescue workers comprised roughly one-third of the entire international USAR effort in Haiti, and more than 130 people were rescued from under the rubble in Haiti by these units.

(12) Individuals, businesses, and philanthropic organizations across the United States and throughout the international community responded in support of Haiti and its populace during this crisis, sometimes in innovative ways such as fundraising through text messaging.

(13) The Haitian diaspora in the United States, which was integral to emergency relief efforts—

(A) has annually contributed significant monetary support to Haiti through remittances; and

(B) continues to seek opportunities to partner with the United States Agency for International Development and other agencies to substantively contribute to the reconstruction of Haiti.

(14) Significant challenges still remain in Haiti as it works to recover and rebuild.

(15) According to the International Organization for Migration, approximately 680,000 people remain in spontaneous and organized camps in Haiti.

(16) According to numerous nongovernmental organizations and United States contractors, the pace of reconstruction has lagged significantly behind the original emergency relief phase.

(17) The widespread irregularities that occurred in the elections held in Haiti on November 28, 2010, led to outbursts of violence which undermined the recovery efforts.

(18) On October 21, 2010, an outbreak of cholera was detected in the Lower Artibonite region.

(19) Initial efforts to contain the epidemic were disrupted by Hurricane Tomás and resulting widespread flooding, which led to the spreading and entrenchment of the disease throughout the country.

(20) According to the Haitian Ministry of Public Health and Population, as of March 28, 2011—

(A) approximately 4,766 people have died from cholera; and

(B) approximately 270,991 have been infected from the disease.

(21) According to the Pan American Health Organization and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, cholera could spread to as many as 400,000 people within the first year of the epidemic, potentially causing 7,600 deaths at the current case fatality rate.

(22) The United States has provided more than $62,523,017 worth of assistance to combat the cholera epidemic, including by assisting with stockpiling health commodities, equipping cholera treatments centers, providing public information, and improving water and sanitation systems.

(23) The efforts to combat the cholera epidemic have helped to drive the mortality rate from cholera down from nearly 7 percent to 1.7 percent of all contracted cases as of February 25, 2011.

(24) Throughout the series of crises, the people of Haiti continue to demonstrate unwavering resilience, dignity, and courage.

(25) On March 20, 2011, presidential and parliamentary elections were held in Haiti without major disruptions or problems.

(26) At the international donors conference ''Towards a New Future for Haiti'' held on March 31, 2010, 59 donors pledged over $5,000,000,000 to support Haiti.

(27) The United Nations Office of the Special Envoy for Haiti estimates that nearly $1,900,000,000 has been disbursed, with an additional amount of approximately $2,000,000,000 committed.

(28) Haiti will need the support of the international community in order to confront the ongoing cholera epidemic and to promote reconstruction and development.

SEC. 3. REPORT.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President, in consultation with the heads of all relevant agencies, including the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of Defense, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall transmit to Congress a report on the status of post-earthquake humanitarian, reconstruction, and development efforts in Haiti, including efforts to prevent the spread of cholera and treat persons infected with the disease.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include a description, analysis, and evaluation of the—

(1) overall progress of relief, recovery, and reconstruction in Haiti, including—

(A) programs and projects of the United States Government;

(B) programs and projects to protect vulnerable populations, such as internally displaced persons, children, women and girls, and persons with disabilities; and

(C) projects to improve water, sanitation, and health, and plans for improvements in these areas in the long-term;

(2) extent to which United States and international efforts are in line with the priorities of the Government of Haiti and are actively engaging and working through Haitian ministries and local authorities;

(3) coordination among United States Government agencies, and coordination between the United States Government and United Nations agencies, international financial institutions, and other bilateral donors;

(4) mechanisms for communicating the progress of recovery and reconstruction efforts to Haitian citizens, as well as recommendations on how these can be improved;

(5) mechanisms through which Haitian civil society, including vulnerable populations, is actively participating in all major stages of recovery and reconstruction efforts, and recommendations on how these can be improved;

(6) mechanisms through which the Haitian diaspora is involved in recovery and reconstruction efforts; and

(7) suitability of Haiti to receive aliens who are removed, excluded, or deported from the United States pursuant to United States law, and steps Haiti is taking to strengthen its capacity in this regard.

(c) USE OF PREVIOUSLY APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—Funding for the report required under subsection (a) shall derive from existing discretionary funds of the departments and agencies specified in such subsection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1016, a bill introduced by my

friend Congresswoman BARBARA LEE of California which requires a report to Congress regarding the status of post-earthquake humanitarian reconstruction and development efforts in Haiti.

This bill supplements my efforts under the Haiti Act, which I introduced last Congress, to exercise greater oversight over the disbursement of U.S. assistance to Haiti to ensure that it is meeting the intended recipients and purposes, that it is advancing U.S. priorities, that it is promoting Haiti's recovery, and that it is not being derailed by waste, duplication or corruption.

This past January, Mr. Speaker, I traveled to Haiti with Secretary Clinton's Chief of Staff and point person on Haiti to observe some of the tremendous work the United States is doing and to learn about U.S. plans for the future as well.

Much progress has been seen in Haiti over the past 16 months. More than 2 million cubic meters of rubble have been cleared, there is now a better medical system and increased access to more clean water than before the earthquake, and the interim Haiti Reconstruction Commission has approved 86 reconstruction projects, accounting for about one-third of the total pledges made by international donors last year.

However, Mr. Speaker, with each stated achievement, we are reminded of how much further Haiti has to go. Hundreds of thousands of Haitians are reportedly still without safe and secure sustainable shelter. A recent U.N. report found that peacekeepers in Haiti may have contributed to the environmental contamination which could have led to the cholera outbreak, crime is reportedly on the upswing, rising food and gasoline prices will make day-to-day survival even more difficult for many of the people of Haiti, and Haiti is still dealing with lingering questions regarding the recently announced parliamentary election results.

In order for progress in Haiti to continue, it is important that allegations of election corruption are resolved quickly, that the concerns of the Haitian people are put to rest, and that the duly-elected parliamentarians are seated as soon as possible.

This weekend, President-elect Martelly is scheduled to be inaugurated; and as the new government takes office, it has its work cut out for it. The new leadership must make a commitment to root out corruption at all levels in order to build trust within Haiti and with all of Haiti's partners.

□ 1710

The President-elect's recent statements regarding his intent to pursue allegations of electoral fraud in the parliamentary election results are a step in the right direction. The government must also make certain that the Haitian people are fully consulted on the direction in which their country is heading and that they will have opportunities to create a better future for themselves and their families. Civil society and local governments must increasingly become a partner at the table of Haiti's future.

With the security situation reportedly deteriorating, it will be important for Haiti's new leaders to commit to the necessary resources to support the expansion of the Haitian National Police as well as implement updates to the criminal code and other reforms to strengthen its judicial system. I understand the United States intends to work with the new Haitian government to help Haiti become a more business-friendly environment.

As a proud representative of Florida's 18th Congressional District, I can tell you firsthand the interest of U.S. businesses, organizations, and private citizens, including the Haitian diaspora, to participate in the recovery and the development efforts in Haiti—and that only continues to grow stronger. More importantly, it is imperative that the United States take every appropriate measure to ensure that our funding and our efforts in Haiti and around the world are not squandered. This includes accountability for U.N. contractors who owe a duty of care for the civilians whom they are there to protect.

The report called for in this bill, H.R. 1016, will provide Members of Congress and the public an opportunity to see what is working and, yes, to see what is not working. I would also note that the funding that will be needed to develop this report is directed to be pulled from already appropriated funding. Further, CBO found that the cost of this report in this bill is so minimal that it did not meet the threshold of an estimate.

I would like to thank Ranking Member BERMAN and his staff for working with us on this measure. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues in support of our oversight efforts, and I'm so pleased to join Congresswoman WILSON's efforts in making sure that we can provide our great partner, Haiti, with the resources it needs to build itself up.

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this bill, the Assessing Progress in Haiti Act. A year and a half ago, on January 12, 2011, the world for the Caribbean island of Haiti and for too many of my constituents changed forever. An earthquake measuring an incredible 7.0 on the Richter scale shook the Earth in Haiti. It killed elected officials, toppled the President's palace, the Senate, and all of the Cabinet buildings. People are still missing. The effect of this earthquake is still being felt today. Basic needs such as food, water, clothing, shelter, and health services are lacking.

Thanks to our military—the U.S. Coast Guard, which performed thousands of hours of rescue in the first 24 hours of the earthquake; the U.S. Marine Corps, which provided stability and protection; the U.S. Army, which helped to establish logistics and additional protection; the U.S. Navy, with floating hospitals and surgeons; and the U.S. Agency for International Development—this disaster was not the total disaster it could have been. USAID worked then and continues to work coordinating and implementing programs with other international organizations.

Adding further hurdles to the recovery operation has been the widespread outbreak of cholera last October. Cholera, a disease caused due to the lack of access to clean, clear water, has killed hundreds of Haitians and has further set back progress in one of our closest Caribbean neighbors. The people of Haiti deserve the opportunity to live in a clean, safe, and economically thriving country. The people of America deserve and want to know how their tax dollars are being spent, and need to know that the $1.8 billion invested in Haiti will speedily facilitate Haiti's transition to a bastion of comfort and economic stability. That is why I support House bill 1016, the Assessing Progress in Haiti Act.

This bill provides for one of the first times a strong, fair, and objective accountability of how the people's money is being spent in Haiti. This report will also analyze how well the United Nations and other organizations and groups are coordinating their efforts to reduce duplication. Finally, this bill thanks the heroic efforts of Miami-Dade County's urban search and rescue teams, which hail from the 17th Congressional District of Florida, who volunteered their time, effort, and energy to save lives. These people saved lives and helped find loved ones for those trapped in the rubble of the earthquake and for those who were worried about the safety and well-being of their loved ones.

I also would like to thank respectively the chairman and ranking minority members of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, CONNIE MACK and ELIOT ENGEL, and their staff for making this happen. Representative ENGEL was kind enough to carry the language of my amendment during subcommittee consideration, and Chairman MACK and both the Democratic and Republican staff worked tirelessly toward a compromise that worked for both sides. I also want to thank our full committee chairman, and one who I am so proud of, my Florida colleague, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, for managing this language in her amendment during full committee consideration of this bill.

Perhaps a bright spot in this ongoing calamity is that Haitians recently elected a new President, Michel Martelly, with whom we expect to work arm-in-arm with to help rebuild Haiti. His inauguration is next weekend. On Saturday, I traveled to Haiti. I

met with Mr. Martelly. I met with the senators as they debated their new constitution. I'm hoping that that constitution will help guide them towards the next centuries in Haiti.

There are 1,400 tent cities—not tents; tent cities—that house 850,000 residents in the streets of Haiti. No running water and one porta-toilet for every 80 residents. Families are huddled under the tents—mostly women and children. And because the national prison was destroyed during the earthquake, armed bandits roam the tent cities and sexual abuse against women and girls is rampant. The police force is extremely compromised and not trained. The army is nonexistent. And many bodies have not been found from this earthquake. It is inhumane to send anybody back to such conditions. We must help rebuild Haiti. We must support Haiti. We must support the new President from this moment on. We must include the peasants and the agricultural community at the table of negotiation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is an affirmation of the generosity and will of the American people to come to the aid of a country in our neighborhood that desperately needs our help. The report required by this bill should help us channel our assistance efforts to make them as effective and efficient as possible. The Haitian people deserve nothing less.

I strongly urge passage of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. 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 H.R. 1016, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

□ 1720

Ms. WATERS. I would like to thank the gentlelady from Florida for extending time to me to rise in support of this bill.

I am now—and have been for many years—a big supporter of the people of Haiti. I am the proud author of H.R. 4573, the Haiti Debt Relief and Earthquake Recovery Act. It was that bill that freed up $828 million that they would have had to have paid out for their debts, money that can now go toward helping with the earthquake response.

Immediately following the earthquake, there was an outpouring of sympathy from people in the United States and around the world; and I am very appreciative for what our government did and for what the people of this country did—individuals, churches. We've not always had our politics right in Haiti, but we sure rose to the occasion with regard to this devastating earthquake that hit Haiti.

The international community pledged a total of $9.9 billion in reconstruction funds, including $5.3 billion for the first 2 years. Yet, more than 1 year later, little, if any, of the money has reached the people of Haiti. According to the U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID, 680,000 displaced people are still living in tent camps, and the conditions in many of these camps are appalling. There is a critical need for food, clean water, and sanitation facilities. A deadly outbreak of cholera has already killed more than 4,800 people and has infected more than 280,000 people. The effects of the epidemic were exacerbated by the lack of clean water and sanitation infrastructure. Foreign aid without transparency will accomplish nothing.

We owe it to the Haitian people and the American people to find out how much of this money has actually been delivered to Haiti and where that money went. That is why I strongly support this bill, which requires the President to report on the status of post-earthquake relief, recovery, reconstruction, and development efforts in Haiti. The report must evaluate coordination among various international agencies and donors, the extent to which U.S. and international efforts are in line with the priorities of the Government of Haiti, and mechanisms for Haitian civil society to participate in recovery efforts.

I am in awe of the strength and resiliency of the Haitian people. We owe it to them to assist them in their time of need. We also owe it to them to make certain our assistance reaches the people who need it the most.

As I said, we've not always had our act together in Haiti. Well, there has been a new election, and they've elected a President. There was a lot of turmoil and disorder around this election, but it's over now; it has been done, and we want to work with the new government to make sure that there is transparency and that we do know what happened to this money. So I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, who is the author of this legislation.

Ms. LEE. First, let me thank the gentlelady from Florida for yielding and for her leadership on so many issues, especially as it relates to her community, her district, Haitians, Haiti, and the Haitian diaspora.

I rise in support of H.R. 1016, the Assessing Progress in Haiti Act, legislation which I authored to direct the United States Government to report on the status of humanitarian, reconstruction, and development efforts in the aftermath of the tragic earthquake of January 12, 2010.

Let me thank Chairwoman ROS-LEHTINEN for her leadership and for her assistance in helping bring this bill to the floor. I also thank Ranking Member BERMAN, Chairman MACK, Ranking Member ENGEL, the staffs of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my staff, as well as the Republican and Democratic leaders' offices for bringing this bill to the floor.

I would also like to acknowledge the hard work of my Congressional Black Caucus colleagues. You just heard from Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS in terms of her leadership and her commitment to the people of Haiti and of so many others who have worked tirelessly in support of the Haitian people in ongoing United States humanitarian and reconstruction efforts in Haiti.

Today, we are provided with an opportunity to not only remember those who have lost their lives but to reaffirm the commitment of the United States to support Haitians as they struggle to combat the ongoing cholera epidemic and to rebuild their neighborhoods, their country, and their lives following the devastation of January 12.

Following the earthquake, many of us came together to pass a bill that I authored, H. Res. 1021. This was passed by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 411–1. This resolution expressed solidarity with the Haitian people and our support for the long-term reconstruction needs of the country. Through the bill on the floor today, we are provided with the next step—with an opportunity to assess the progress that we have made, the extraordinary challenges that remain, and the areas in which improvement is greatly needed.

As many of us have been many, many times over the years, I traveled to Haiti immediately following the earthquake and again in November during Haiti's recent elections. Once again, let me just say that I saw real progress being made. Of course, the cholera outbreak, an ongoing devastating setback, though, revealed the ramped-up capacity of Haiti's national laboratory. The lab was able to identify the cholera strain very rapidly, improving our ability to respond to the outbreak—a feat that would really have been impossible just a year earlier. However, significant improvements remain desperately needed.

The unprecedented relief effort has given way to a sluggish, at best, reconstruction effort. Part of this pace can be attributed to the sheer magnitude of the problems Haiti faces as well as Haiti's legal and bureaucratic hurdles, including the lack of an adequate land tenure policy. Without a doubt, though, part of the blame rests in the lack of urgency—mind you, the lack of urgency—on the part of the international community.

At the International Donors' Conference in March 2010, 58 donors

pledged over $5.5 billion to support Haiti's Action Plan for Recovery and Development. According to the United Nations, as of March of this year, only 37 percent of these funds have been disbursed. This is unacceptable. If we are to break the cycle of disaster-emergency relief-disaster, in which Haiti has been trapped for many years, we must act with the same sense of urgency in reconstruction as we did immediately following the quake.

In addition to delivering on our promises, we must ensure that those promises are in line with the will of the Haitian people. The international community recognized early on that, if our efforts were to be sustainable, they had to reflect the priorities of the people of Haiti. The establishment of the Interim Haiti Recovery Commission was a very good idea in this regard; and moving forward, we must ensure that it is inclusive, transparent, and adequately resourced.

Additionally, we must substantially improve our communication with and the participation of Haitian civil society. The United States and the United Nations are sponsoring outreach for civil society organizations; however, many Haitians still hold the perception that recovery efforts are dominated by exclusive foreign actors. Unless civil society, which are the people of Haiti, is involved in every major stage of the post-earthquake response, this perception will remain, and it will prove detrimental to the sustainability of our efforts.

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. In this vein, we must give special priority to programs that protect vulnerable populations, including internally displaced persons—women, children, persons with disabilities, and others. We must ensure that these populations are significantly involved in recovery efforts, which reinforces their protection. The United Nations Secretary General, for example, has specifically stated that women should be involved in security decisions that affect their daily lives as a means of combating the alarming level of gender-based violence since the earthquake.

On the topic of vulnerable populations, we must take a critical look at the resumption of deportations to Haiti. Given the fragile state in which Haiti remains, I call on the Department of Homeland Security to halt deportations until it proves that its policy does not violate international human rights laws and until it demonstrates that Haiti is able to support the influx of deportees. If we are truly committed to helping our neighbors, we must ensure that we are not assisting Haiti with one hand while undermining its stability with the other.

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

□ 1730

Ms. LEE. Finally, we must continue to support the Haitian Public Health Ministry to prevent the spread of cholera, treat those affected with the disease, and build up health systems. The international community must plan for the long-term presence of this disease, unfortunately, which is now endemic, and provide the necessary resources to ensure that this planning is thorough and complete.

Throughout this unceasing series of tragedies and crises, Haitians have continued to demonstrate unwavering resilience, dignity, and courage.

So I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity this past Saturday to go to Haiti and take a helicopter ride to survey all of the damage on Haiti and all of the hope for Haiti, all of the islands and the connecting islands of Haiti to see what was happening.

The African diaspora, which is mostly members of District 17, they all want to help rebuild Haiti. They will apply for contracts; and if dual nationality is granted, they will also run for office and lend their expertise to the recovery of Haiti.

We all know that TPS expires in June. TPS, temporary protected status, was extended to the Haitian nationals. We, along with the Congressional Black Caucus, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, and Congressman PAYNE, were working on trying to extend that deadline for at least another year. Haiti is in no disposition to accept any further deportations.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of H.R. 1016, a bill to measure the progress of relief, recovery, reconstruction, and development efforts in Haiti following the earthquake of January 12, 2010, introduced by Representative BARBARA LEE of California.

Immediately following the earthquake, Congress passed a bipartisan resolution expressing our determination to aid Haiti through this tragedy. I strongly believe that our nation needs to once again pledge unwavering support to continue to lead an aggressive, coordinated effort to aid Haiti's ongoing recovery and reconstruction.

In the wake of the disaster, the American people and the global community rallied in solidarity with the Haitian people to provide one of the largest relief efforts in history. And today, nearly one and a half years after this tragedy, we must renew our support for the people of Haiti as they struggle to combat an ongoing cholera epidemic, curb post-election violence, and rebuild their neighborhoods, livelihoods, and their country.

As this legislation stipulates, President Obama, "in consultation with the heads of all relevant agencies . . . shall transmit to Congress a report on the status of post-earthquake humanitarian, reconstruction, and development efforts in Haiti . . ." and analyze the recovery efforts being made in Haiti to date, and ensure that "our government is in line with the priorities of the Government of Haiti and actively engaging and working through Haitian ministries and local authorities" to assist the island nation in their attempt to recover.

As the representative of Florida's Third Congressional District, I have been a staunch advocate for the Haitian people throughout my congressional career of nearly 20 years, and have led numerous Codels to the island nation of Haiti. Moreover, as a Member from Florida with a large Haitian community in my district, and considering the island nation is located less than 700 miles from the Florida Keys, I feel it is my duty to do everything I can to provide assistance and improve the lives of the Haitian people.

Certainly, even before the January 12th earthquake, Haiti was the least-developed country in our Hemisphere and one of the poorest in the world. The island nation had a per capita income around $400, horribly acute economic inequality, and over 80 percent of its 9 million inhabitants surviving below the poverty level. To me, this is entirely unacceptable, particularly given the island's proximity to the state of Florida.

In October 2009, just two months before the earthquake, I led a Congressional delegation to Haiti to meet with President René Préval to discuss issues ranging from improving the nation's infrastructure, the high unemployment rate and poor standard of living. Yet the horrific earthquake that struck last January 12th made a dire situation for the majority of the people of Haiti unimaginably worse.

Today, the nation remains devastated. A million displaced Haitians remain in tent camps. Mountains of rubble are piled in the streets, and billions in assistance pledged by the international community has yet to be delivered. Meanwhile, there have been many quests regarding the recent elections and incoming government's ability to capably lead in recovery and development efforts.

As I'm sure everyone here knows, the massive earthquake that struck Haiti killed 230,000 people, displaced an estimated 2 million people from their homes, and affected one third of the country's population. The main port, the presidential palace, the parliament, the majority of ministry buildings, more than 50 hospitals and health centers, 1300 educational institutions, and more than 100,000 homes were left in ruins. The earthquake, which came less than 2 years after a series of devastating hurricanes, left millions of people in the Western Hemisphere's poorest country living in absolutely horrific conditions.

Immediately following the earthquake, there was an outpouring of sympathy from people in the United States and around the world. American families opened their hearts and contributed millions to non-profit organizations that were working around the clock to save lives. The United States Government provided emergency medical care and distributed food, water, and tents to the displaced, and world governments committed more than $9 billion in aid for reconstruction at a donors' conference in March, including more than $1 billion pledged by the United States.

For my part, immediately following the earthquake, along with the local community and tremendous assistance from church leaders, we organized food and clothing drives, and encouraged people to make donations to

non-profits on the ground in Haiti. With assistance of area churches, businesses, local community leaders and nonprofit organizations, we transported seven 53-foot tractor-trailers filled with supplies with nearly $50,000 it food, water and other items from the Jacksonville and Orlando areas to Haiti's shores, and had the Coast Guard's assistance in their delivery to Food for the Poor, a non-profit group operating in Port-au-Pays, on the north side of the island.

As a key Member of the House Transportation Committee and Chair of the Railroad subcommittee, I will continue to work hard on Capitol Hill to find ways in which the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure can provide technical assistance to the nation; in particular, in the area of rebuilding the ports, roads and general infrastructure system throughout the island. Indeed, getting the ports up and running, including improving customs procedures, is an essential element in the nation's struggle to turn the corner and prosper economically. If successfully carried out, this advancement would be a key component in the nation's efforts to successfully recover and prosper in the future, and improve the standard of living for the proud, hard-working people of the island nation Haiti.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I also have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1016, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUTTING THE GULF OF MEXICO BACK TO WORK ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). 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 further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1229.

□ 1734

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 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, with Mr. WOMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment printed in the bill is adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1229

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 ''Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act''.

TITLE I—AMENDMENT TO THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT

SEC. 101. AMENDMENT TO OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 11(d) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1340(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) DRILLING PERMITS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall by regulation require that any lessee operating under an approved exploration plan—

''(A) must obtain a permit before drilling any well in accordance with such plan; and

''(B) must obtain a new permit before drilling any well of a design that is significantly different than the design for which an existing permit was issued.

''(2) SAFETY REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall not issue a permit under paragraph (1) without ensuring that the proposed drilling operations meet all—

''(A) critical safety system requirements, including blowout prevention; and

''(B) oil spill response and containment requirements.

''(3) TIMELINE.—

''(A) The Secretary shall decide whether to issue a permit under paragraph (1) within 30 days after receiving an application for the permit. The Secretary may extend such period for up to two periods of 15 days each, if the Secretary has given written notice of the delay to the applicant. The notice shall be in the form of a letter from the Secretary or a designee of the Secretary, and shall include the names and titles of the persons processing the application, the specific reasons for the delay, and a specific date a final decision on the application is expected.

''(B) If the application is denied, the Secretary shall provide the applicant—

''(i) in writing, clear and comprehensive reasons why the application was not accepted and detailed information concerning any deficiencies, and

''(ii) an opportunity to remedy any deficiencies.

''(C) If the Secretary has not made a decision on the application by the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date the application is received by the Secretary, the application is deemed approved.''.

(b) DEADLINE FOR CERTAIN PERMIT APPLICATIONS UNDER EXISTING LEASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the amendment made by subsection (a), a lease under which a covered application is submitted to the Secretary of the Interior shall be considered to be in directed suspension during the period beginning May 27, 2010, and ending on the date the Secretary issues a final decision on the application, if the Secretary does not issue a final decision on the application—

(A) before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, in the case of a covered application submitted before such date of enactment; or

(B) before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date the application is received by the Secretary, in the case of a covered application submitted on or after such date of enactment.

(2) COVERED APPLICATION.—In this subsection the term ''covered application'' means an application for a permit to drill under an oil and gas lease under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, that—

(A) represents a resubmission of an approved permit to drill (including an application for a permit to sidetrack) that was approved by the Secretary before May 27, 2010; and

(B) is received by the Secretary after October 12, 2010, and before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 102. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASES.

(a) DEFINITION OF COVERED LEASE.—In this section, the term ''covered lease'' means each oil and gas lease for the Gulf of Mexico outer Continental Shelf region issued under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) that—

(1)(A) was not producing as of April 30, 2010; or

(B) was suspended from operations, permit processing, or consideration, in accordance with the moratorium set forth in the Minerals Management Service Notice to Lessees and Operators No. 2010–N04, dated May 30, 2010, or the decision memorandum of the Secretary of the Interior entitled ''Decision memorandum regarding the suspension of certain offshore permitting and drilling activities on the Outer Continental Shelf'' and dated July 12, 2010; and

(2) by its terms would expire on or before December 31, 2011.

(b) EXTENSION OF COVERED LEASES.—The Secretary of the Interior shall extend the term of a covered lease by 1 year.

(c) EFFECT ON SUSPENSIONS OF OPERATIONS OR PRODUCTION.—The extension of covered leases under this section is in addition to any suspension of operations or suspension of production granted by the Minerals Management Service or Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement after May 1, 2010.

TITLE II—JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY ACTIONS RELATING TO OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF ACTIVITIES IN THE GULF OF MEXICO

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS FOR TITLE.

In this title—

(1) the term ''covered civil action'' means a civil action containing a claim under section 702 of title 5, United States Code, regarding agency action (as defined for the purposes of that section) affecting a covered energy project in the Gulf of Mexico; and

(2) the term ''covered energy project'' means the leasing of Federal lands of the Outer Continental Shelf (including submerged lands) for the exploration, development, production, processing, or transmission of oil, natural gas, wind, or any other source of energy in the Gulf of Mexico, and any action under such a lease, except that the term does not include any disputes between the parties to a lease regarding the obligations under such lease, including regarding any alleged breach of the lease.

SEC. 202. EXCLUSIVE VENUE FOR CERTAIN CIVIL ACTIONS RELATING TO COVERED ENERGY PROJECTS IN THE GULF OF MEXICO.

Venue for any covered civil action shall not lie in any district court not within the 5th circuit unless there is no proper venue in any court within that circuit.

SEC. 203. TIME LIMITATION ON FILING.

A covered civil action is barred unless filed no later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the final Federal agency action to which it relates.

SEC. 204. EXPEDITION IN HEARING AND DETERMINING THE ACTION.

The court shall endeavor to hear and determine any covered civil action as expeditiously as possible.

SEC. 205. STANDARD OF REVIEW.

In any judicial review of a covered civil action, administrative findings and conclusions relating to the challenged Federal action or decision shall be presumed to be correct, and the presumption may be rebutted only by the preponderance of the evidence contained in the administrative record.

SEC. 206. LIMITATION ON PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.

In a covered civil action, the court shall not grant or approve any prospective relief unless the court finds that such relief is narrowly drawn, extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of a legal requirement, and is the least intrusive means necessary to correct that violation.

SEC. 207. LIMITATION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES.

Sections 504 of title 5, United States Code, and 2412 of title 28, United States Code (together commonly called the Equal Access to Justice Act) do not apply to a covered civil action, nor shall any party in such a covered civil action receive payment from the Federal Government for their attorneys' fees, expenses, and other court costs.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 112–73. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, strike ''and'' after the semicolon at line 4, strike the period at line 6 and insert ''; and'', and after line 6 insert the following new subparagraph:

''(C) all requirements of all applicable statutes and regulations, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, and any law protecting fishing and recreation jobs.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, following last year's BP Deepwater Horizon disaster, one would think that a foundational and critical element of any bill related to offshore deepwater oil drilling would be to improve our safety and environmental safeguards based on the lessons that we learned the hard way from a horrific national tragedy, costing jobs and reducing health and damaging the environment.

While H.R. 1229 does include a provision that states that the Secretary shall not issue a permit without ensuring that the proposed drilling operation meets critical safety system requirements and oil spill response and containment requirements, it fails to make mention of and omits requiring the Secretary to ensure that critical environmental and economic laws are adhered to, a prolific problem leading up to the Deepwater Horizon spill.

Mr. Chairman, for years an ongoing problem in issuing permits for offshore drilling has been the Department of the Interior's failure to follow requirements set out under our Nation's foundational environmental protection laws and fisheries laws. These laws, like the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Protection Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the Magnusson-Stevens Fishery Act, protect wildlife as well as fisheries and beaches that sustain the gulf's fishing and tourism industries.

In the gulf region, the number of jobs dependent on tourism and fishing is five times the number of jobs related to the oil and gas industry.

While reforms within the Obama administration are moving in the right direction, the fact is that this bill, in its current form, leaves out a major chunk of what should be included in any safety or oversight review that we require of the Secretary, and I'm grateful for the rule for allowing a full discussion and vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a May 2010 New York Times article, entitled, ''U.S. Said to Allow Drilling Without Needed Permits,'' outlines the roots of this problem in detail. The article clearly explains how the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Department of the Interior's drilling permit agency is required to get permits for drilling where it might harm endangered species and marine animals.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, is partially responsible for protecting endangered species and marine mammals. It said on repeated occasions that drilling in the gulf does affect these animals. That's simply science. The records show that permits for hundreds of wells, including the BP disaster well itself, were granted without getting the permits required under existing Federal law.

Federal records show that NOAA instructed the minerals agency that continued drilling in the gulf was actually harming wildlife and needed to get permits in compliance with Federal law; but, sadly, those permits were never sought.

With regard to the National Environmental Protection Act, the government has time and time again performed cursory environmental assessments, failed to integrate NEPA analyses with related Federal statutes, and even exempted entire projects from NEPA review, including the Macondo well. In the past, the only way to ensure permits have complied with NEPA has unfortunately been through lawsuits. My amendment would require these assurances from the Secretary before the permit is issued.

[From the New York Times, May 13, 2010]

U.S. SAID TO ALLOW DRILLING WITHOUT NEEDED PERMITS

(By Ian Urbina)

WASHINGTON.—The federal Minerals Management Service gave permission to BP and dozens of other oil companies to drill in the Gulf of Mexico without first getting required permits from another agency that assesses threats to endangered species—and despite strong warnings from that agency about the impact the drilling was likely to have on the gulf.

Those approvals, federal records show, include one for the well drilled by the Deepwater Horizon rig, which exploded on April 20, killing 11 workers and resulting in thousands of barrels of oil spilling into the gulf each day.

The Minerals Management Service, or M.M.S., also routinely overruled its staff biologists and engineers who raised concerns about the safety and the environmental impact of certain drilling proposals in the gulf and in Alaska, according to a half-dozen current and former agency scientists.

Those scientists said they were also regularly pressured by agency officials to change the findings of their internal studies if they predicted that an accident was likely to occur or if wildlife might be harmed.

Under the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Minerals Management Service is required to get permits to allow drilling where it might harm endangered species or marine mammals.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, is partly responsible for protecting endangered species and marine mammals. It has said on repeated occasions that drilling in the gulf affects these animals, but the minerals agency since January 2009 has approved at least three huge lease sales, 103 seismic blasting projects and 346 drilling plans. Agency records also show that permission for those projects and plans was granted without getting the permits required under federal law.

''M.M.S. has given up any pretense of regulating the offshore oil industry,'' said Kierán Suckling, director of the Center for Biological Diversity, an environmental advocacy group in Tucson, which filed notice of intent to sue the agency over its noncompliance with federal law concerning endangered species. ''The agency seems to think its mission is to help the oil industry evade environmental laws.''

Kendra Barkoff, a spokeswoman for the Interior Department, said her agency had full consultations with NOAA about endangered species in the gulf. But she declined to respond to additional questions about whether her agency had obtained the relevant permits.

Federal records indicate that these consultations ended with NOAA instructing the minerals agency that continued drilling in the gulf was harming endangered marine mammals and that the agency needed to get permits to be in compliance with federal law.

Responding to the accusations that agency scientists were being silenced, Ms. Barkoff added, ''Under the previous administration, there was a pattern of suppressing science in decisions, and we are working very hard to change the culture and empower scientists in the Department of the Interior.''

On Tuesday, Interior Secretary Ken Salazar announced plans to reorganize the

minerals agency to improve its regulatory role by separating safety oversight from the division that collects royalties from oil and gas companies. But that reorganization is not likely to have any bearing on how and whether the agency seeks required permits from other agencies like NOAA.

Criticism of the minerals agency has grown in recent days as more information has emerged about how it handled drilling in the gulf.

In a letter from September 2009, obtained by The New York Times, NOAA accused the minerals agency of a pattern of understating the likelihood and potential consequences of a major spill in the gulf and understating the frequency of spills that have already occurred there.

The letter accuses the agency of highlighting the safety of offshore oil drilling operations while overlooking more recent evidence to the contrary. The data used by the agency to justify its approval of drilling operations in the gulf play down the fact that spills have been increasing and understate the ''risks and impacts of accidental spills,'' the letter states. NOAA declined several requests for comment.

The accusation that the minerals agency has ignored risks is also being levied by scientists working for the agency.

Managers at the agency have routinely overruled staff scientists whose findings highlight the environmental risks of drilling, according to a half-dozen current or former agency scientists.

The scientists, none of whom wanted to be quoted by name for fear of reprisals by the agency or by those in the industry, said they had repeatedly had their scientific findings changed to indicate no environmental impact or had their calculations of spill risks downgraded.

''You simply are not allowed to conclude that the drilling will have an impact,'' said one scientist who has worked for the minerals agency for more than a decade. ''If you find the risks of a spill are high or you conclude that a certain species will be affected, your report gets disappeared in a desk drawer and they find another scientist to redo it or they rewrite it for you.''

Another biologist who left the agency in 2005 after more than five years said that agency officials went out of their way to accommodate the oil and gas industry.

He said, for example, that seismic activity from drilling can have a devastating effect on mammals and fish, but that agency officials rarely enforced the regulations meant to limit those effects.

He also said the agency routinely ceded to the drilling companies the responsibility for monitoring species that live or spawn near the drilling projects.

''What I observed was M.M.S. was trying to undermine the monitoring and mitigation requirements that would be imposed on the industry,'' he said.

Aside from allowing BP and other companies to drill in the gulf without getting the required permits from NOAA, the minerals agency has also given BP and other drilling companies in the gulf blanket exemptions from having to provide environmental impact statements.

Much as BP's drilling plan asserted that there was no chance of an oil spill, the company also claimed in federal documents that its drilling would not have any adverse effect on endangered species.

The gulf is known for its biodiversity. Various endangered species are found in the area where the Deepwater Horizon was drilling, including sperm whales, blue whales and fin whales.

In some instances, the minerals agency has indeed sought and received permits in the gulf to harm certain endangered species like green and loggerhead sea turtles. But the agency has not received these permits for endangered species like the sperm and humpback whales, which are more common in the areas where drilling occurs and thus are more likely to be affected.

Tensions between scientists and managers at the agency erupted in one case last year involving a rig in the gulf called the BP Atlantis. An agency scientist complained to his bosses of catastrophic safety and environmental violations. The scientist said these complaints were ignored, so he took his concerns to higher officials at the Interior Department.

''The purpose of this letter is to restate in writing our concern that the BP Atlantis project presently poses a threat of serious, immediate, potentially irreparable and catastrophic harm to the waters of the Gulf of Mexico and its marine environment, and to summarize how BP's conduct has violated federal law and regulations,'' David L. Perry, a lawyer acting on behalf of Kenneth Abbott, a BP contractor, wrote in a letter to officials at the Interior Department that was dated May 27.

The letter added: ''From our conversation on the phone, we understand that M.M.S. is already aware that undersea manifolds have been leaking and that major flow lines must already be replaced. Failure of this critical undersea equipment has potentially catastrophic environmental consequences.''

Almost two months before the Deepwater Horizon exploded, Representative Raúl M. Grijalva, Democrat of Arizona, sent a letter to the agency raising concerns about the BP Atlantis and questioning its oversight of the rig.

After the disaster, Mr. Salazar said he would delay granting any new oil drilling permits.

But the minerals agency has issued at least five final approval permits to new drilling projects in the gulf since last week, records show.

Despite being shown records indicating otherwise, Ms. Barkoff said her agency had granted no new permits since Mr. Salazar made his announcement.

Other agencies besides NOAA have begun criticizing the minerals agency.

At a public hearing in Louisiana this week, a joint panel of Coast Guard and Minerals Management Service officials investigating the explosion grilled minerals agency officials for allowing the offshore drilling industry to be essentially ''self-certified,'' as Capt. Hung Nguyen of the Coast Guard, a co-chairman of the investigation, put it.

In addition to the minerals agency and the Coast Guard, the Deepwater Horizon was overseen by the Marshall Islands, the ''flag of convenience'' under which it was registered.

No one from the Marshall Islands ever inspected the rig. The nongovernmental organizations that did were paid by the rig's operator, in this case Transocean.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Although well intended, this amendment is duplicative and would add delays to the permitting process and production of American-made energy. It is the responsibility of the Department of the Interior as overseers of permitting in the gulf to ensure safe and environmentally responsible drilling in the gulf.

Since the spill last year, the Department of the Interior has made extensive changes to permitting requirements for offshore operations. Every drilling permit is required to go through multiple environmental reviews before the application can be approved. This begins with an initial programmatic environmental impact statement and is followed by a lease sale-specific environmental impact statement and continues with additional environmental reviews as drilling activities move forward.

□ 1740

In carrying out its responsibilities, the department already must comply with numerous environmental statutes, regulations, and Executive orders. These regulations include the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Fishery Conservation and Management Act. And I may have left some out. This demonstrates the redundancy in this amendment and why it is not necessary.

Administration officials and even Director Bromwich have stated on numerous occasions to both the Natural Resources Committee and the American people that they would not permit operations if they did not believe they meet all the requirements to be conducted safely, efficiently, and in an environmentally responsible manner. The Interior Department already complies with these particular environmental regulations when approving permits. And the fact that the Department is permitting operations, although at a slower pace than I would like to see, demonstrates that they have confidence in the regulations that the agency has set for offshore drilling operations. The real effect of this amendment, whether intended or not, is more delays to offshore energy production and more lengthy and burdensome lawsuits.

So, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and I urge a ''no'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, this underlying legislation's very basic safety review provision simply doesn't address the broad swath of problems that need to be addressed by any serious offshore drilling bill. My amendment is a simple way of ensuring that the many shortcomings are at least considered by the Secretary, as articulated in Federal law, and are discussed during this debate.

Unfortunately, this bill does not take into account the lessons our country learned from the terrible BP Deepwater disaster. In addition to accepting my amendment, I certainly hope that the committee will address these problems with even stronger language in any future work it does on this bill or on the issue of offshore drilling in general with regard to safety and the environment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the proponent of this amendment in his zeal to ensure that the environment is properly addressed, but those concerns are properly addressed in the permitting policy. The problem is that we had a company with around 800 safety violations, British Petroleum, that was allowed to continue drilling, and you wonder why. Could it be that they were negotiating at the very time of the blowout with Democrats in the Senate for making the big announcement that they supported the administration's cap-and-trade bill? Could it be that they were going to be involved in the carbon credit business and would work with the administration?

Perhaps a better question than the effect on the environment is, How close will the applicant for a drilling permit be politically with this administration? Because what we see time after time is a situation of political payback. We see crony capitalism. If you're a good buddy at GE, you're going to do well. If you're on Wall Street and you contribute four to one to this administration over its opponent, then you're going to do well. You may have to endure being called a fat cat from time to time; but, otherwise, we're going to make sure your profits exceed anything you have ever seen before.

We have seen this administration rush to Libya. We have seen this administration rush, appropriately, to help our friend Japan. We have seen them rush all over the place. But when it came to really helping the gulf coast region, this administration rushed in and did more damage to people's lives by putting this moratorium on than the spill itself did. At some point, it's time for the administration to stop the political payback game.

Perhaps Louisiana would be better off if they dissociated themselves from Texas. We know that you can have 500,000 acres burned and have it be a disaster area. You can have 2 million in Texas, and they won't come to your help because this administration is partisan and bitterly so. But it's time for this administration to quit playing political games and help people where they need it in our own country, on our own gulf coast.

Let's vote ''no'' on the amendments and get this bill through.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 6, insert the following (and redesignate accordingly):

''(3) CONSULTATION WITH INDEPENDENT SAFETY ORGANIZATION.—In making any determination under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall consult with one or more independent safety organizations that are not affiliated with the American Petroleum Institute.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, we just heard a pretty good discussion here a moment ago about the safety issues in the gulf. And the legislation before us seems to ignore every one of the recommendations that the bipartisan, independent commission made about how to conduct deepwater drilling in a safe manner. Actually, BP did have a terrible record. I am pleased that my colleague from Texas pointed out the 800 violations that BP had. There was, however, a bit of a problem for at least 11 members of the gulf oil industry: They died as a result of the inattention to safety.

The proposal that I have before us deals with one of the recommendations that the commission made, and that is that there be an independent safety organization created to provide an additional level of review of the requirements that drilling be done safely. The legislation before us ignores that recommendation by the commission and basically says that the American Petroleum Institute is quite capable of doing this. Well, the independent, bipartisan commission, said, ''The American Petroleum Institute is culturally ill-suited to drive a safety revolution in the industry. For this reason, it is essential that the safety enterprise operate apart from the American Petroleum Institute,'' and I could not agree more, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment would require that, as the Secretary is trying to determine whether permit applications meet the critical safety requirements, he must consult with an independent safety organization, and that organization must not be affiliated with the American Petroleum Institute.

Now the institute has said, No problem; we'll create our own. Well, I'm sorry, but that's not the way to provide the appropriate safety standard. We don't need to have more deaths. We don't need to have more blowouts. We need to do the drilling safely, and that it be done in a manner that ensures that lives will not be lost and that oil will not be spilled in the ocean. That's what this amendment does by providing an outside independent organization with the requirement that they consult with the Secretary on the applications. We do not change the 50-day requirement. That remains in place; so there is a timeframe. We don't change any of the requirements with regard to losses and the rest, which I think are inappropriate; but nonetheless, we don't change that in this legislation.

I would ask for the adoption of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

I do oppose this amendment. Although well intended, the Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act itself makes drilling already safer by requiring that the Secretary ensure that any proposed drilling operation be subject to a safety review—it's there in the bill already—and that it meet established critical safety system requirements, including blowout prevention and oil spill response and containment requirements, and this has to be done before the issuance of a permit.

□ 1750

The decision to approve individual permit applications is the responsibility of the Department of the Interior. I don't believe it should be farmed out to other organizations that may or may not have the background, the expertise, or the resources to evaluate drilling permits.

In fiscal year 2011, House Republicans voted to increase funding for the Department of the Interior in order to ensure that they have the resources to safely, responsibly, and effectively approve permits.

The Interior Department has a responsibility, as it drafts legislation, to solicit public comment; and they do take advice and counsel from all Americans, including those with expertise in these areas. However, once the standards are set, it is the responsibility of the government to enforce the standards.

Oversight is the Federal Government's responsibility, and it should not be delegated to outside organizations. Whether intended or not, this amendment would slow down and make more complicated the already lengthy and involved permitting process. So I urge opposition to this amendment, and urge opponents to vote ''no'' on it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. An interesting discussion from my colleague from Colorado. I would note that there are numerous examples where the Federal Government does rely upon outside safety organizations. For example, the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations provides safety standards for our nuclear industry, specifically, not allowing the nuclear power industry to do

the safety reviews, but, rather, an outside organization.

We're simply calling for a level of review that is not associated with those two organizations that caused the problem. The Department of the Interior, and I was the Deputy Secretary of the Department of the Interior in the 90s, has some familiarity of the comings and goings, the shortcomings as well as the strength of that Department.

This particular section of the Department of the Interior has proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that, over time, it has not been able to regulate properly the safety and other elements of the natural gas and oil industry. We need to provide an outside level of review on the safety requirements, both to keep the Department of the Interior on the proper course and the industry itself on the proper course.

That's what the amendment does. I think it makes an eminent amount of sense, and we're really talking about both environmental issues here, that is, the health of environment in the coast, which was seriously compromised, and also the well-being of the men and women that work on these oil platforms. And we know that their fate has been jeopardized in the past and should not be jeopardized in the future.

I ask for an ''aye'' vote on this amendment, both here and later on the floor.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that there is a public comment period that is available right now, and that is a proper and appropriate forum for an outside group to make the kind of standards-related comments that would be possibly helpful.

But when it comes to actually issuing the permit, that is something that should be delegated to the Federal Government. They do have the resources. In fact, they have expanded resources to do a better job of that, hopefully, in the future.

So, for those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I would urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 112–73.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 6, insert the following (and redesignate accordingly):

''(3) OTHER SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations required under paragraph (1) shall ensure that the proposed drilling operations meet requirements for—

''(A) third-party certification of safety systems related to well control, such as blowout preventers;

''(B) performance of blowout preventers, including quantitative risk assessment standards, subsea testing, and secondary activation methods;

''(C) independent third-party certification of well casing and cementing programs and procedures;

''(D) mandatory safety and environmental management systems by operators on the outer Continental Shelf;

''(E) procedures and technologies to be used during drilling operations to minimize the risk of ignition and explosion of hydrocarbons; and

''(F) ensuring compliance with other applicable environmental and natural resource conservation laws, including the response plan requirements of section 311(j) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(j)).

''(4) REGULATORY STANDARDS FOR BLOWOUT PREVENTERS, WELL DESIGN, AND CEMENTING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In promulgating regulations under this subsection related to blowout preventers, well design, and cementing, the Secretary shall ensure that such regulations include the minimum standards included in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), unless, after notice and an opportunity for public comment, the Secretary determines that a standard required under this subsection would be less effective in ensuring safe operations than an available alternative technology or practice. Such regulations shall require independent third-party certification, pursuant to subparagraph (E), of blowout preventers, well design, and cementing programs and procedures prior to the commencement of drilling operations. Such regulations shall also require recertification by an independent third-party certifier, pursuant to subparagraph (E), of a blowout preventer upon any material modification to the blowout preventer or well design and of a well design upon any material modification to the well design.

''(B) BLOWOUT PREVENTERS.—Subject to subparagraph (A), regulations issued under this subsection for blowout preventers shall include at a minimum the following requirements:

''(i) Two sets of blind shear rams appropriately spaced to prevent blowout preventer failure if a drill pipe joint or drill tool is across one set of blind shear rams during a situation that threatens loss of well control.

''(ii) Redundant emergency backup control systems capable of activating the relevant components of a blowout preventer, including when the communications link or other critical links between the drilling rig and the blowout preventer are destroyed or inoperable.

''(iii) Regular testing of the emergency backup control systems, including testing during deployment of the blowout preventer.

''(iv) As appropriate, remotely operated vehicle intervention capabilities for secondary control of all subsea blowout preventer functions, including adequate hydraulic capacity to activate blind shear rams, casing shear rams, and other critical blowout preventer components.

''(v) Technologies to prevent a blowout preventer failure if the drill pipe is moved out of position due to a situation that poses a threat of loss of well control.

''(C) WELL DESIGN.—Subject to subparagraph (A), regulations issued under this subsection for well design standards shall include at a minimum the following requirements:

''(i) In connection with the installation of the final casing string, the installation of at least two independent, tested mechanical barriers, in addition to a cement barrier, across each flow path between hydrocarbon bearing formations and the blowout preventer.

''(ii) That wells shall be designed so that a failure of one barrier does not significantly increase the likelihood of another barrier's failure.

''(iii) That the casing design is appropriate for the purpose for which it is intended under reasonably expected wellbore conditions.

''(iv) The installation and verification with a pressure test of a lockdown device at the time the casing is installed in the wellhead.

''(D) CEMENTING.—Subject to subparagraph (A), regulations issued under this subsection for cementing standards shall include at a minimum the following requirements:

''(i) Adequate centralization of the casing to ensure proper distribution of cement.

''(ii) A full circulation of drilling fluids prior to cementing.

''(iii) The use of an adequate volume of cement to prevent any unintended flow of hydrocarbons between any hydrocarbon-bearing formation zone and the wellhead.

''(iv) Cement bond logs for all cementing jobs intended to provide a barrier to hydrocarbon flow.

''(v) Cement bond logs or such other integrity tests as the Secretary may prescribe for cement jobs other than those identified in clause (iv).

''(E) INDEPENDENT THIRD-PARTY CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall issue regulations that establish appropriate standards for the approval of independent third-party certifiers capable of exercising certification functions for blowout preventers, well design, and cementing. For any certification required for regulations related to blowout preventers, well design, or cementing, the operator shall use a qualified independent third-party certifier chosen by the Secretary. The costs of any certification shall be borne by the operator. The regulations issued under this subparagraph shall require the following:

''(i) Prior to the commencement of drilling through a blowout preventer at any covered well, the operator shall obtain a written and signed certification from an independent third party approved and assigned by the appropriate Federal official pursuant to paragraph (3) that the third party—

''(I) conducted or oversaw a detailed physical inspection, design review, system integration test, and function and pressure testing of the blowout preventer; and

''(II) in the third-party certifier's best professional judgment, determined that—

''(aa) the blowout preventer is designed for the specific drilling conditions, equipment, and location where it will be installed and for the specific well design;

''(bb) the blowout preventer and all of its components and control systems will operate effectively and as designed when installed;

''(cc) each blind shear ram or casing shear ram will function effectively under likely emergency scenarios and is capable of shearing the drill pipe or casing, as applicable, that will be used when installed;

''(dd) emergency control systems will function under the conditions in which they will be installed; and

''(ee) the blowout preventer has not been compromised or damaged from any previous service.

''(ii) Not less than once every 180 days after commencement of drilling through a blowout preventer at any covered well, or upon implementation of any material modification to the blowout preventer or well design at such a well, the operator shall obtain a written and signed recertification from an independent third party approved and assigned by the appropriate Federal official pursuant to paragraph (3) that the requirements in subclause (II) of clause (i) continue to be met with the systems as deployed. Such recertification determinations shall consider the results of tests required by the appropriate Federal official, including testing of the emergency control systems of a blowout preventer.

''(iii) Certifications under clause (i), recertifications under clause (i), and results of and data from all tests conducted pursuant to this paragraph shall be promptly submitted to the appropriate Federal official and made publicly available.

''(5) RULEMAKING DOCKETS.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than the date of proposal of any regulation under this subsection, the Secretary shall establish a publicly available rulemaking docket for such regulation.

''(B) DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED.—The Secretary shall include in the docket—

''(i) all written comments and documentary information on the proposed rule received from any person in the comment period for the rulemaking, promptly upon receipt by the Secretary;

''(ii) the transcript of each public hearing, if any, on the proposed rule, promptly upon receipt from the person who transcribed such hearing; and

''(iii) all documents that become available after the proposed rule is published and that the Secretary determines are of central relevance to the rulemaking, by as soon as possible after their availability.

''(C) PROPOSED AND DRAFT FINAL RULE AND ASSOCIATED MATERIAL.—The Secretary shall include in the docket—

''(i) each draft proposed rule submitted by the Secretary to the Office of Management and Budget for any interagency review process prior to proposal of such rule, all documents accompanying such draft, all written comments thereon by other agencies, and all written responses to such written comments by the Secretary, by no later than the date of proposal of the rule; and

''(ii) each draft final rule submitted by the Secretary for such review process before issuance of the final rule, all such written comments thereon, all documents accompanying such draft, and all written responses thereto, by no later than the date of issuance of the final rule.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, 1 year has passed since the Deepwater Horizon accident. Yet BP, Transocean, Halliburton, and Cameron continue to argue in court which of them deserves more blame for the 11 deaths and environmental devastation.

BP continues to fight the estimates of the amount of oil spilled in order to minimize its liability. And more than 1 year after the beginning of this disaster, Congress has still not passed any legislation to improve the safety of offshore drilling and ensure that the lessons of the BP spill are incorporated into future drilling.

The co-chairs of the independent BP commission have testified before the Natural Resources Committee that the accident could have been prevented, and the commission found that the root causes of the disaster were systemic to the entire industry. Their extensive reports documented numerous specific failures of the cementing, well design and testing and maintenance associated with the Deepwater Horizon well.

And recently, the Department of the Interior's contractor, Det Norske Veritas, released its report on the forensic investigation of the Deepwater Horizon blowout preventer, and here's what they found: the results indicated that the drilling pipe inside of the blowout preventer had buckled due to the force of the blowout; and the cutting devices, therefore, couldn't fully sever the drill pipe and seal off the well.

According to the forensic report, contrary to the claims of the oil industry that blowout preventers are fail-safe devices, it seems unclear whether blowout preventers can actually prevent major blowouts at all once they are underway.

But here we are today with the Republicans bringing out legislation that has no meaningful safety protections for the industry.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

This amendment was already rejected by a bipartisan vote of the full Natural Resources Committee and, once again, I urge opposition to it. This amendment micromanages and dictates specific safety and blowout preventer standards for permit applications. Many of these standards would do little or nothing different than what is already being done by the Department of the Interior.

However, these restrictions would, if this amendment passes, be etched into law, making Congress the technical arbiter and micromanager of Outer Continental Shelf regulations, and reducing the flexibility and ability of the Department to adapt to new technology and new development in drilling safety. So if we're lagging behind developments in the industry, this would actually prevent us, or could prevent us, from adopting those new and better standards in the future.

The technical standards proposed in this amendment have not been subject to a thorough review or understanding of the impacts of such changes. This is particularly troubling when you consider that this language was written before we even knew why the blowout preventer failed.

H.R. 1229 already takes steps to increase the safety of offshore drilling by requiring the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a safety review to ensure that the proposed drilling operations meet ''critical safety system requirements, including blowout prevention and oil spill response and containment requirements.'' That language is lifted straight out of the bill.

So my colleagues on the other side are acting as if nothing has changed and no safety reforms have been made. By doing so, they are ignoring the facts on the ground and the actions of their own party's administration. I'm not willing to indict the administration and say that they have done nothing in this regard.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1800

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, here is the BP Blue Ribbon Commission report that was conducted to investigate and to make recommendations as to what the causes were and what can be done to prevent it from happening again. Right now, nothing that is in this report has been implemented in terms of legislation here on the House floor. So I will tell you what my bill does. It will require multiple lines of defense against a blowout and ensures that these defenses are redundant so that failure of one does not lead to cascading failures of the entire system as occurred with BP's Macondo well.

First, the amendment sets minimum standards for blowout preventers, including a requirement that blowout preventers operate as intended even when the force of an ongoing blowout shifts the drill pipe out of position.

The amendment also requires new standards on safe well design and cementing to ensure multiple redundant barriers within the well against uncontrolled oil or gas blow that could lead to a blowout.

The amendment also requires independent third-party certification of blowout preventers and well designs.

Finally, the language ensures that if the Department of the Interior finds by some other measures that it has or may one day require would provide an even higher level of safety, that the Secretary can substitute those better alternatives instead.

This is the direction we should be heading in.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. I would like to point out to my colleague that one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), H.R. 56 puts into law a portion of that report. And since he is so interested in making sure that some of the information in the President's report becomes law, I certainly hope he

will cosponsor that legislation. I am sure those in the gulf would appreciate that piece.

I didn't know that he was an expert in oil and gas drilling. Because when I go back home and I talk to those in Louisiana, they tell me that they have already instituted safety guidelines above and beyond what the gentleman from Massachusetts puts forth here.

The industry is safer today than it was the day before the Deepwater accident. In addition to that, we have the ability now, today, in the Gulf of Mexico, that no one else has in the world, to cap the type of incident that happened in the Gulf.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

I agree with the gentleman from Louisiana; I am not an expert on drilling. We are congressional experts. And that is an oxymoron, a contradiction in terms, like ''jumbo shrimp'' or ''Salt Lake City night life.'' There is no such thing. We rely upon real experts.

Here are the real experts: The Blue Ribbon Commission put together to study what went wrong and what needs to be done, and that is what my amendment will do. My amendment is very close to the legislation that passed 48–0 out of the Commerce Committee last year and was later adopted by the House. So all we are doing is just reflecting what all of these experts recommended and were finally incorporated.

So we can ignore the experts, but then we roll the dice. And, once again, a part of our coastline could be held hostage to an oil company that was trying to save money but at risk of endangering the lives and the livelihood of millions of people off of the coastline off of our country.

I urge an ''aye'' vote for the Markey amendment.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would close by saying that the experts that we should rely on are those that are in the Department of the Interior, Director Michael Bromwich with BOEMRE and all the way down, who have been working on this for the last year. They have extensive regulations. Some of what is proposed are actually regulations right now.

And while the bill does call for certain safety standards to be satisfied and met, we have delegated the responsibility for the exact language and implementation of those regulations to those who deal with this 8 hours a day, day in and day out, week in and week out, year in and year out. So there is a balance. We give the broad parameters. They carry out, as a regulatory agency, every last final detail.

And Congress, as has been admitted, does not have the technical expertise to foresee every single development and foresee every single problem that could arise. So while overseeing, we have to do some delegation. This bill does that. We strike that fine balance.

And the administration's department has been doing a strong job of strengthening the safety requirements. I do take issue with the pace of their permitting. But as far as the safety implementation, they have put very aggressive safety measures into place.

For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I would urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DOLD). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 112–73.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 6, insert the following (and redesignate the succeeding paragraph accordingly):

''(3) WORST-CASE DISCHARGE SCENARIO CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall not issue a permit under paragraph (1) without certifying that the applicant—

''(A) has calculated a worst-case discharge scenario for the proposed drilling operations; and

''(B) has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the applicant possesses the capability and technology to respond immediately and effectively to such worst-case discharge scenario.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The amendment that I propose is a very simple and a commonsense amendment. First of all, let us recall where we come from.

Title 43, section 1340, entitled ''Geological and Geophysical Explorations,'' is what is the subject of H.R. 1229; specifically, subsection D, entitled ''Drilling Permits.''

Under that subsection, it states: The Secretary may, by regulation, require any lessee operating under an approved exploration plan to obtain a permit to drilling any well in accordance with such plan.

What the amendments are proposing here today and what my amendment addresses is what is set forth at page 4. And I propose that it amends after line 6 and includes a subsection 3, which addresses the worst-case discharge scenario certification. This amendment requires: The Secretary shall not issue a permit under paragraph 1 without certifying that the applicant, first, has calculated a worst-case discharge scenario for the proposed drilling operations; and, B, has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the applicant possesses the capability and technology to respond immediately and effectively to such worst-case discharge scenario.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking here to the people, the people across this Nation and in the world who watched the worst-case scenario, what happened in the BP oil spill. What we are simply saying is that before any permit is issued, that the Secretary take the precaution of, first, having assessed what that worst-case scenario could be; and, second, that applicant who is seeking this permit has both the capability and technology, and has demonstrated as such, to address that worst-case scenario.

Mr. Chairman, it is a simple statement and it is a requirement that the people would like to see. No one wants to sit there and experience a BP oil spill again.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1810

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.

I do oppose this amendment because it is duplicative and unnecessary. This amendment attempts to expand upon the language in the bill that already mandates that the Secretary conduct a safety review to affirm oil spill response and containment capability prior to issuing a permit. We believe that the Department of the Interior already requires that applicants must calculate worst-case discharge before approving a permit.

On June 18 of last year, the Department issued a notice to lessees outlining the information requirements and standards to be met before a permit could be approved. In the notice it is required that a lessee ''describe the assumption and calculations that you used to determine the volume of your worst-case discharge scenario.''

This exact language, this exact intention has already been addressed, so I would oppose this amendment as redundant and unnecessary.

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

Ms. HANABUSA. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chair, if this amendment is duplicative, it should not be an issue, because what it does do is it contains the language that the people want to hear. The people want to hear, What is the worst case scenario? I also contend that it really does not do that. It is not duplicative.

What is contained in the bill is the statement of critical safety system requirements, including blowout prevention and oil spill response and contamination requirements. It does not say ''the worst case scenario'' and it does not require the applicant to show, to show the Secretary that it has the capability and the technological ability to address that. So it is not duplicative.

But to the extent that the opposer would like to say that it is duplicative, then I believe that they should not object to this because, after all, it does say what people want to hear. People want to be guaranteed that the BP oil spill does not happen again.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee who has a district in the State of Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

Mr. CASSIDY. Rarely are the goals of our country as aligned as they are now. Clearly we need economic recovery with good jobs and with good benefits for those who frankly right now have a problem with unemployment. As it turns out, we also have the goal of increasing our energy security and, lastly, a goal of protecting our environment. Now, let's just go through these in order.

As regards jobs, let's just talk about the oil and gas industry. The President, the administration's estimates of the economic impact of the moratorium and the permitorium are hundreds of thousands of jobs lost and about $2.5 billion in lost economic activity.

This is not just the gulf coast and it is not just the oil rig workers. It is also those who work on pipelines. It is boat builders. Indeed, as it turns out, one of the boat builders in Louisiana is the largest customer worldwide of Caterpillar engines. An engine that is built in the State of Illinois using steel from the Midwest is used on the coast of Louisiana to build boats to service those rigs. Needless to say, those Caterpillar engines are not now being ordered. That steel order going to Caterpillar to build these is not being done. So the jobs that ripple out are not just in the gulf coast, but go all the way across the country.

We also have a goal to increase our energy security. Prior to Macondo, one-third of the domestically produced oil in the United States came from the Outer Continental Shelf. Since we have limited further exploration, we have lost that potential to increase our domestic supply of energy, to increase our security, to insulate us, if you will, from those issues in North Africa which are currently driving up our fuel prices.

Lastly, we have a goal to protect our environment. Oh, we all care about that. In Louisiana, we particularly care about that. We do not take this for granted. But in Louisiana, we realize you have to be both pro-business as well as pro-environment, and we take that very seriously.

So what are the facts on this? The President right after the Macondo bill appointed a blue ribbon commission from the National Academy of Engineering. These engineers that the President picked said that the causes of the oil spill are identifiable and correctable and that a prolonged moratorium will not, will not, will not appreciably improve safety.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CASSIDY. So what we have seen since, though, is not a recommendation that the President's blue ribbon commission is right, but rather a regulatory hurdle set upon regulatory hurdle set upon regulatory hurdle. Now we have a notice to lessees which demands that which this amendment also demands, so we are going to have not just a notice to lessees, but we are going to have this amendment on top of it. At some point your hostility to an industry becomes hostility to workers, becomes hostility to our energy security and, frankly, becomes a hostility to our environment.

I oppose this amendment. I think it is bad for our workers, I think it is bad for our economy, and I think it is bad for our environment.

Ms. HANABUSA. May I inquire of the Chair as to how much time is remaining on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Hawaii has 1¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. HANABUSA. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chair, I am sure that the gentleman from Louisiana has no intentions of saying that anyone who may want an amendment to this bill is somehow hostile or somehow anti-jobs, anti-energy security and anti-environment, because that is not the intent.

This bill has been labeled Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act. We have no objection to that, Mr. Chair. But why can't it also say Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act Safely? That is all that is being requested here.

Let's look at what happened at the BP oil spill. Let's just make sure it doesn't happen again. Another spill like that, by taking these precautions, can be avoided, and by doing that, by doing that, we will not be faced with a situation where someone from that district would say we are hostile because we are not encouraging jobs or not encouraging energy security or not encouraging the environment. This is exactly what we are trying to do. We are trying to do all of these, and it has a ripple effect throughout the Nation.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I have no other speakers, so at this point I am going to wait and close as soon as the gentlelady is done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chair, I request an ''aye'' vote on this amendment. It is a very straightforward, commonsense amendment. It addresses what the people want to hear and want to know, that we are ready to address the worst-case scenario, and the Secretary will not issue a permit until it is addressed, it is not only identified, but that the applicant has both the technological skills plus the capabilities to do it and prevent such a spill.

We are all interested in the jobs and the economic security of the gulf and all the neighboring States in that area, plus its ripple effect. That is why we want to see that it never happens again, and that is why we want the people, the people, to be confident that we in Congress have addressed their concerns.

I request an ''aye'' vote.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I will close by saying that this amendment, though well intended, is duplicative; and I think that has been admitted by the other side and therefore is unnecessary.

I would urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA).

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 5 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 112–73.

Mr. HOLT. 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 5, strike lines 5 through 9 and insert closing quotation marks and a following period.

The Acting CHAIR. 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.

□ 1820

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Chair.

H.R. 1229 includes language that would add a timeline to the permitting process for offshore oil and gas drilling. This provision states that, ''If the Secretary has not made a decision on the application by the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date the application is received by the Secretary, the

application is deemed approved.'' My amendment would simply strike this section. In other words, as it stands in the legislation before us, if for whatever reason—incomplete information, new information—the Secretary has not made a decision whether or not to approve the application, then the application will be considered from then on approved.

There are a number of provisions in this bill that could make offshore drilling less safe. My amendment is aimed at perhaps the most dangerous of those provisions. This bill short-circuits existing requirements to protect oil industry workers and those who depend on marine resources for their livelihoods and so forth. Ensuring that environmental and safety standards are met—so that the new permits will not result in a repeat of the Deepwater Horizon disaster—is really too important to allow permits to go through the door prematurely and automatically simply because of an arbitrary timeline imposed by this legislation.

Depending on the dedication of a particular Secretary to safety and environmental protection, H.R. 1229 would produce either precipitous automatic approval of an application to drill or unjustified rejection of a valid application if the review is not completed within the allotted time. Either way, the imposition of an arbitrary deadline is bad policy. It's based on a presumption that environmental and safety reviews are worthless and that there is really no value in getting the review right.

My amendment would leave in place the permitting timeline set in H.R. 1229, creating the sense of urgency my colleagues are seeking. But it would remove the automatic approval of drilling applications after that 60-day timeline. If we've learned anything from the Deepwater Horizon disaster, it is that we must do more—not less—to protect those who work in the oil industry and those who depend on offshore resources and onshore resources for their livelihood.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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.

The legislation on the floor today is designed to put Americans in the gulf region back to work and to ensure that permits are processed in a timely fashion and that bureaucratic delays are not hampering the Nation's energy production. There are critics of the timeline that is proposed in this bill on both sides of that timeline. Some say it's too short. Others say it is too long. It's important that people understand that nowhere in this bill do we require the administration to do anything but reach a decision, whatever that decision might be. They may deny an application at any time in the process as long as they provide a clear description of why they are doing so.

Prior to the incident in the gulf, the administration was very capable of processing permits in 5 to 15 days on average. The 30-day timeline in the bill is significantly longer, and allows the administration extensions. In the end, the administration must reach a decision. The provision this amendment proposes to remove is the final deadline that the administration must meet and one that should be firm to ensure that decisions are made in a timely manner and that no de facto moratorium or permitorium is instituted.

This amendment, if adopted, would simply further delay offshore energy production. It would continue to allow the Department to arbitrarily impose a de facto drilling moratorium that could cost thousands of jobs and allow higher prices on energy with less supply.

I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. May I ask the Chair the time remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. Each side has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, my friend from Colorado talked about the harm that this bill would do and why it's important that the application be approved even if the review is not complete, even if the review is not yet done right. I wonder if the gentleman from Colorado thinks that maybe a student should graduate even if he hasn't taken the exam because the semester is coming to an end. Well, time's up. I guess we should just declare the student duly passed—even if the review hasn't been done.

That's a question. If the gentleman feels that a student should be deemed passed because the semester is coming to an end, even if the review of that student's work has not been completed. I would yield to the gentleman if he cares to answer that. If not, I will continue.

This legislation might make sense if we thought there was some economic need for it, if we thought that there was some safety need for it, if we thought it was important to grease the skids and move through the environmental review quickly. But none of those things apply. This will not bring down prices. Certainly, release of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve would do more for prices at the pump than this. This won't make a bit of difference in the price at the pump, this legislation. It certainly won't help support an important but troubled industry. Actually, this industry is not troubled. This industry is going to take home about $100 billion dollars in profits this year. We don't need to grease the skids and make things easier for this industry because getting the review right would subject them to undue hardship. No. In fact, this is a very dangerous provision in a bill that is part of the set of ''Amnesia Acts.'' The bill is part of these three bills that pretend that there are no lessons to be learned from 2010; the bill that pretends the gulf oil blowout never occurred; that wills amnesia on the policy of the United States so that we forget that the worst oil spill in history from which there are real lessons to be learned never occurred.

I urge passage of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I want to apologize. I was confused as to whether the gentleman was asking a rhetorical question or really wanted to have a colloquy. By the time I figured that out, he had moved on to the remainder of his argument. I would have been happy to and hopefully in the future I could have a colloquy on that with him.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. The gentleman must not understand that he wants to reinstate the de facto moratorium that is plaguing the Gulf of Mexico with this amendment. It is exactly what he's trying to put in place, which is allow the administration to drag its feet not only on the wells on the drilling in deep water but also on the Shelf as well. He must also be confused, because what the Democrats have proposed, what the other side has proposed in removing the tax breaks for these companies, would make oil and gas—the Congressional Research Service has reported that proposal would make oil and natural gas more expensive for U.S. consumers and likely increase our foreign dependence.

What are we here to do today? We're here to bring relief to Americans at the pump and get the Gulf of Mexico back to work.

Mr. LAMBORN. I will conclude by saying that what this bill wants to accomplish is that the administration must reach a decision on whether a permit should be issued. This amendment proposes to remove the final deadline that the administration would have to meet and one that should be firm to ensure that decisions are made in a timely manner and that no de facto moratorium is instituted.

□ 1830

This amendment would simply further delay offshore energy production. That does not help jobs. It does not help the supply or cost of energy in this country. It would allow the Department to arbitrarily impose a de facto drilling moratorium that would cost thousands of jobs.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. 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. 7 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 112–73.

Mr. POLIS. 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 5, strike the closing quotation marks and second period at line 9, and after line 9 insert the following new subparagraph:

''(D) This paragraph shall not apply before the date the Secretary publishes a determination that the agency or bureau of the Department of the Interior that administers this section has been given adequate staff and budget resources to properly review and process every application for a permit under this subsection in order to ensure that no application is processed without thorough review.''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1229 would impose an artificial and arbitrary 30-day deadline, with up to two 15-day extensions, for a total of 60 maximum days for Interior Department action on drilling permit applications. If at the end of the 30- to 60-day period Interior has not acted by approving or disapproving the permit, the permit is ''deemed'' approved automatically even if the environmental and safety review processes haven't been completed. If the Secretary decides that the agency hasn't had enough time to approve the permit, then his only choice is to deny the permit, undoubtedly leading to additional lawsuits from companies.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation doesn't get to the root of the problem. We all know through the numerous hearings last year that one of the fundamental causes of the BP spill was a lack of not only enough inspectors but a lack of inspectors with high levels of expertise and engineering knowledge. You wouldn't referee a game by doing away with the rules because the referee didn't know them; you'd get a better referee.

If the Department isn't going to be given enough resources and expertise to do the job right and on time, the Department shouldn't be forced to do the job too fast. We should be working to make government more efficient and more effective. My amendment addresses the root of this issue by lifting the arbitrary timeline requirements if the Department isn't given the necessary resources it needs to properly process applications expeditiously. I urge a ''yes'' vote on my amendment.

Mr. Chair, instead of taking this opportunity to correct the fundamental problems underlying the BP Deepwater Horizon oil spill, this bill simply moves to cut any last semblance of oversight or safeguards our country has placed on the inherently risky process of offshore deepwater oil drilling.

H.R. 1229 would impose an artificial and arbitrary 30-day deadline, with up to two 15-day extensions, for a total of 60 days maximum, for Interior Department action on drilling permit applications. If at the end of that 30- to 60-day period Interior has not acted by approving or disapproving the permit, the permit is ''deemed'' approved automatically even if the environmental and safety reviews have not been completed.

This is the exact wrong legislative response to the BP disaster. Rather than acting to make off-shore drilling safer and smarter, the underlying bill would make drilling faster and more reckless. Under this bill, we could actually have less rigorous oversight and review of offshore drilling than we had before the Deepwater Horizon disaster.

By imposing an artificial and arbitrary deadline, the bill heavily biases the permitting process toward approval, placing undue burdens on reviewers to accelerate the process regardless of safety and environmental concerns.

If the Secretary decides that the agency hasn't had enough time to approve the permit, then his only choice is to deny the permit undoubtedly leading to additional lawsuits from companies and the unrelenting onslaught of industry and Republican criticism. This bill is simply a catch 22 for the Department to either risk another disaster, or open up the Department even more to the vitriolic and false claims from industry and the Majority party of being anti-business or anti domestic energy—not that the facts have kept that misinformation from being spread in the past.

Mr. Chair, this legislation doesn't get to the root of the problem. We all know through the numerous hearings last year that one of the fundamental causes of the BP spill was a lack of not only enough inspectors, but a lack of inspectors with high levels of expertise and engineering knowledge. Prior to the spill, the few inspectors the government did have simply had to take the oil companies' word that everything was in order.

I'm sure we all remember when the big five oil companies were caught pointing the finger of blame squarely at BP in a hearing last year, only to have it disclosed moments later that every one of their spill response documents and other application material was not only identical, but included completely inaccurate information, listing for example walruses as a critical species for the Gulf of Mexico and citing as an emergency contact a professor from Florida Atlantic University, who had long since passed away.

We shouldn't have to take a company's word for it when there is so much at stake. We should ensure that the watchdogs have the tools they need to verify that everything is done properly. This is what my amendment aims to do. Congress shouldn't set an arbitrary timeline if Congress doesn't give the Department enough resources they need to properly do their job within that timeline.

In fact, the recommendations of the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon spill contain an entire section on ''The Need for Adequate Funding for Safety Oversight and Environmental Review,'' which lists a number of policy options letting the oil companies, not the American people, foot the bill. Sadly, the underlying legislation includes none of them.

Mr. Chair, you wouldn't referee a game by doing away with the rules because the referee didn't know them; you'd get a better referee.

The fact is that the regulators been grossly underfunded and understaffed in the past. With the Continuing Resolution's partial step toward reversing the ''shameful'' and years-long underfunding of offshore oversight, it was only half of what's needed to do the job right. The Director of the agency that oversees permitting, Michael Bromwich, just last month said: ''That is less than we need, but it is a significant sum, especially in a constrained budget environment where the funding of most other agencies is being cut. We desperately need more environmental scientists and more personnel to do environmental analysis. We desperately need more personnel to help us with the permitting process and much more.''

If the Department isn't going to be given enough resources and expertise to do the job right, then the Department shouldn't be forced to do the job fast. Instead of creating unnecessary catch 22's for government, we should be working to make government more efficient and more effective. My amendment addresses the root of this issue by lifting the arbitrary timeline requirements if the Department isn't given the necessary resources it needs to properly process applications.

I yield back 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. I will do my best to be brief.

The purpose of H.R. 1229 is to get residents of the gulf back to work in producing offshore energy. It is not only good for them; it is good for the entire country.

This amendment, whether intended or not, would allow the administration to continue to impose a de facto moratorium that would delay American energy production and keep thousands of people out of work. The residents of the gulf are simply in a holding pattern, waiting for their jobs to come back. Some of them are even seeing their jobs outsourced to other countries as rigs leave the Gulf of Mexico, bound for other parts of the world.

Now, there is an established process for the administration to propose and advocate for funding and resources, which is different from what this amendment addresses. This annual process, the budget process, provides ample opportunity for considering what is needed to safely and responsibly oversee offshore energy production. Let us note that the House Republican majority, in enacting a budget, acted to increase funding for reviewing and approving offshore permits for the current year, which was not done by the Democratic Congress last year.

This amendment would delay American energy production. For that reason, I oppose it. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. 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 Colorado 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 A of House Report 112–73 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

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. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) 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 167, noes 245, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

AYES—167

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
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
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—245

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
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
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (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—19

Capps
Conyers
Giffords
Green, Al
Hastings (WA)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson, Sam
Langevin
Manzullo
Nunnelee
Paul
Reed
Reyes
Speier
Tsongas
Waxman

□ 1857

Messrs. FLAKE and TURNER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. HAYWORTH, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. McCOLLUM 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. GARAMENDI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) 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 169, noes 240, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 300]

AYES—169

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
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
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran

Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—240

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
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—22

Bishop (NY)
Carney
Conyers
Giffords
Green, Al
Hastings (WA)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson, Sam
Langevin
Manzullo
Meehan
Nunnelee
Paul
Reed
Reyes
Rogers (AL)
Ross (FL)
Speier
Tsongas

□ 1904

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 300, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 300, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) 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 237, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

AYES—176

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

NOES—237

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
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, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
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
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
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 (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

Becerra
Conyers
Giffords
Green, Al
Hastings (WA)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson, Sam
Langevin
Manzullo
Nunnelee
Paul
Reed
Reyes
Speier
Tsongas

□ 1912

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, today I was unavoidably detained and missed the votes on:

Polis (CO) Amendment (#1). Requires review of permits by the Interior Department to take into consideration all applicable safety, environmental and fisheries laws, such as the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "no"' on this amendment.

Garamendi (CA) Amendment (#2). Implements the independent BP spill commission's recommendation by requiring that in reviewing a drilling permit, the Secretary consult with an independent drilling safety organization not affiliated with the American Petroleum Institute. Had I been present, I would have voted "no"' on this amendment.

Markey (MA) Amendment (#3). Implements offshore drilling safety reforms recommended by the BP Spill Commission and would set specific new minimum standards for blow-out preventers, cementing and well design. Had I been present, I would have voted "no"' on this amendment.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. DOLD, 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. 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1231, REVERSING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S OFFSHORE MORATORIUM ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–74) on the resolution (H. Res. 257) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 856

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered as the first sponsor of H.R. 856, a bill originally introduced by Representative HELLER of Nevada, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1380

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor from the bill, H.R. 1380.

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

There was no objection.

PUTTING THE GULF OF MEXICO BACK TO WORK ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1229.

□ 1915

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 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, with Mrs. ADAMS (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 112–73 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 112–73.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 9, before the closing quotation marks insert the following:

"(4) ESTIMATIONS REQUIRED IN PERMIT APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary shall require that each application for a permit to drill a well include detailed estimations of—

"(A) the amount of oil and gas that is expected—

"(i) to be found in the area where the well is drilled, in the case of an exploration well; or

"(ii) to be produced by the well, in the case of a production well; and

"(B) the amount by which crude oil prices and consumer prices would be reduced as a result of oil and gas found or produced by the well, and by when the reductions would occur.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, speeding up the permitting process and thereby making it easier to drill off our country's shores in the manner that this bill does will do little to help Americans at the gas pump.

According to the Energy Information Administration, even tripling our current offshore drilling capabilities by the year 2030 would lower gasoline prices only 5 cents per gallon more than if we continued at the current levels.

At maximum output, the United States holds less than 2 percent of the world's oil reserves, not nearly enough to significantly impact the price per barrel, which is set on a global level primarily by the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries that we reference as OPEC.

In reality, the United States is already producing more oil per day than it ever has, yet gas prices are still around $4 per gallon. Though production in our country has actually increased every year since 2005, crude oil hit a record $147 per barrel over the same time period, demonstrating that there is little correlation between drilling levels in the United States and the price of oil.

More drilling will put our businesses, as well as our environment and health, at an increased risk with little return to the average American. By itself, the United States consumes one quarter of the world's oil. What drives the price of oil more than any other factor is the large scale and high demand for it worldwide.

The only way we can reduce gasoline prices is to decrease our country's demand for fossil fuels by increasing our energy efficiency, improving the fuel mileage of our cars, and developing real renewable energy resources. Federal policies should focus on making these changes, not on dangerously restricting Federal oversight of the industry.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1920

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam 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.

Madam Chairman, the intent of H.R. 1229 is to put Americans in the gulf back to work and to ensure a steady domestic supply of oil for our citizens and our consumers, thereby lessening our dependence on foreign sources of oil.

I must oppose this amendment. The effect of the amendment is that we are going to hold ourselves hostage to foreign energy unless we can prove that domestic energy meets some abstract standard and satisfies some bureaucrat.

Where I disagree with this amendment the most is the assumption that domestic energy production might not be good for America and might not be allowed. More supply cannot help but to lower prices, reduce dependence, generate revenue and create jobs. I see all these results of domestic energy production as good: good for America, good for consumers and good for our balance of trade. This is true whether the impact from a single well is sufficient in and of itself to move the price of oil prices overseas or not. The real result of this amendment would be that we don't create jobs, revenue and more energy.

For these reasons, Madam Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no.''

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Let me respond to my colleagues first by saying that I hope no one in the gulf is sitting out there holding their breath waiting for this named bill here, H.R. 1229, ''Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work.''

Let me talk real here about what is getting ready to happen. The Republicans will pass this particular measure. It will go to that black hole over in the Senate and never become the law of the United States. And the administration has made it very clear that if this measure were to pass, it is not going to in fact be permitted under the aegis of the President's veto, which they cannot overturn.

So while people in Mississippi and people in Louisiana are suffering floods right now, compounding all of the circumstances that they have had to put up with with the BP oil spill, here we are dillydallying, making like we are going to do something to create work in the gulf. We are not going to do one single, solitary thing, and if we could do nothing more, we ought to tell the people the truth.

If we drilled everywhere you say drill in America, we still would only have 1.97 percent of all of the oil in the world. Canada has more oil than we do, and we get plenty of it from them. Mexico almost has as much as we do. How dare we come here and talk about 2 weeks of oil that ain't going to reduce gas none and suggest to people it's going to put people back to work. Balderdash.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chairman, I would just point out that it is skewing the statistics and not accurate to say that the U.S. only has 2 percent of the world's oil reserves. When you look at Btus, energy production, we have more energy available in this country than any other country in the world; and looking at oil specifically, we have 145 billion barrels of recoverable oil, according to the CRS. So that is much larger than what some people say.

On the point of whether the President has taken a position, this is the Statement of Administration Policy on this bill, and there is no veto threat in here. So if we are fortunate to see this bill not just pass the House but the Senate as well, I am sure the White House will seriously consider this, and I would be hopeful that it would be signed into law.

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. DEUTCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part A of House Report 112–73.

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, beginning at line 1, strike section 202 (and redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Chairman, a little more than a year ago, the BP Deepwater Horizon oil drilling vessel exploded in the Gulf of Mexico. Over several months, millions of gallons of oil were dumped into the gulf. The oil spill caused irreparable damage to delicate ecosystems, damaged natural barriers that protect States along the Gulf of Mexico from deadly storm surge, and was devastating to local jobs and livelihoods along the gulf coast. Indeed, the oil spill caused significant harm to my State of Florida's environment and economy from which we are still recovering.

My amendment will have no impact on the overall bill. While I do oppose weakening the Federal review process of lease applications for energy development, production and exploration of the Gulf of Mexico, the purpose of my amendment is simply to correct an injustice to the residents of Florida and Alabama in the bill as it is written. My amendment would strike section 202, which imposes an exclusive venue in the Fifth Circuit for civil actions relating to the leasing of Federal lands in the Gulf of Mexico for energy development, production and exploration.

Under this provision, litigation relating to leases on energy development can only be filed in a district court in the Fifth Circuit. And while the Fifth Circuit includes the Gulf States of Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas, two States that comprise substantial gulf coastlines, Florida and Alabama, are in the 11th Circuit, and it makes no sense that the residents of these States will have to travel to the Fifth Circuit to have their cases heard. The effect of this section would be to prevent the district courts in Florida and Alabama from considering civil cases related to the issuance of leases for energy development, production and exploration off the coastlines of these States.

Congress has no business telling courts within a State that they are prohibited from considering issues involving a lease for energy development, production and exploration that have the potential to cause irreparable environmental and economic damage to the gulf coast area of that State.

In addition, requiring these cases to be moved from Florida and Alabama to a State within the Fifth Circuit will cause substantial hardship for the parties involved in the litigation, substantial hardship for the witnesses who would need to testify, and would result in substantial costs. Striking this exclusive venue provision would ensure that Florida and Alabama courts could hear these cases and reach a just result that reflects the needs of that State.

Section 202 does provide an exception only in cases in which there is no proper venue in a court within the Fifth District. However, this exception fails to address these very serious concerns. The parties involved in litigation on leasing would first have to determine that there is no court within the Fifth Circuit that would be able to consider the case. Only after determining that there was no court in the Fifth Circuit, then the parties will be permitted to file in Florida or Alabama.

In short, section 202 will prohibit the courts in Florida and Alabama from considering and rendering a decision in lawsuits on leases for energy development, production and exploration off their coasts. My amendment would strike the section. It makes no changes to the overall bill. It provides a simple solution to address this bill's unwarranted restrictions on which courts

will be able to review these leases should they pose a threat to the gulf coast area. I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam 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.

In order to ensure that there is a circuit court that is familiar with the legal issues surrounding civil actions involving gulf energy production, it is important that venue be restricted to the Fifth Circuit so that those district and appeals court judges would have the essential experience and legal precedent to fairly rule on these technical cases. For that reason, I oppose this amendment.

The Fifth Circuit, as was pointed out earlier, does include Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas, all Gulf Coast States. If various district courts and courts of appeal throughout the country were able to hear these cases, there may be a result of having no uniformity in decisionmaking, and judges who do not have as much expertise or background could be making vital decisions in which the energy security of our Nation hangs in the balance.

□ 1930

It is essential that there be one Federal judicial circuit that understands the technical aspects of these cases with judges who have a background in understanding offshore energy policies and practices. That will ensure that all cases are handled fairly and expeditiously and uniformly without any confusion or delay. By requiring all cases to go through the Fifth Circuit, we accomplish this important goal.

For that reason, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. As a former judge—and as a State and Federal judge—I would urge my colleague from Colorado to understand something. Circuit judges don't of necessity have specific specialty in the area they live. A judge may go on the bench in the Fifth Circuit and have studied patent law all of his life and know nothing about oil.

Mr. DEUTCH. May I ask how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Chair, the gentleman's opposition to this amendment is premised on a very interesting, and I would respectfully suggest dangerous, interpretation of what is our responsibility as Members of this House. The gentleman spoke of the need to have uniformity of decisionmaking. Uniformity of decisionmaking. As I understand the role of the Federal judiciary, the role of our court system is to provide justice. The role is not to ensure that we have the same decision in every court.

My amendment simply says that if you are a judge in the State of Florida or a judge in the State of Alabama, that you are in a position just as well as a judge in Texas or these other Gulf States to make a determination about how the law should be interpreted—the idea that judges have to have a sufficient background, and that if courts throughout the country were able to hear these, we would not be able to reach a logical conclusion.

The fact is we're not asking courts throughout the country to hear these cases, Madam Chairman. We're asking the judges within the States whose coastlines would be dramatically affected and have been affected in the case of spills like the Deepwater Horizon.

Madam Chairman, I would respectfully suggest that if our goal here is to seek justice, then we must seek justice in those courts in the States that have seen the damage.

I ask for the adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. If the gentleman wanted to make sure that the judges of Alabama and Florida were included, then maybe the amendment should have been written that way, and I think we would have a strong point of debate and that would be a legitimate item to discuss. However, that's not how the amendment is drafted. The amendment talks about letting in judges of the entire country, circuits of the entire country. For that reason, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. DEUTCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. I would like to confirm. Therefore, if the language in the bill were very clear that for cases to be brought affecting the leasing and the exploration of oil in the gulf, that if those cases could be brought in any of the Gulf States, including Florida and Alabama, then the bill's sponsor would not oppose this amendment?

Mr. LAMBORN. Reclaiming my time, I would say that we would have a more legitimate issue to debate. We could go into that. But it's too late, the amendment doesn't say that. And so that's not an option in front of us.

Mr. DEUTCH. So just to confirm, the gentleman's position is that in fact the courts in Florida and Alabama are just as well equipped to hear these cases as are the courts in Texas and the other Gulf States.

Mr. LAMBORN. I would say that those judges certainly would have a closeness to the situation that would be helpful. But the circuit, I believe it's the 11th Circuit, includes a number of other States that are not as situated like Alabama and Florida. So in choosing the Fifth Circuit, all the States there are Gulf Coast States.

Mr. DEUTCH. If the gentleman would yield for one final question, I would also note that while the Natural Resources Committee has acted on this bill, this provision very clearly should have been debated in the Judiciary Committee where all of these issues could have been worked out. It is for that reason, given what we have to work with, that I would again ask for adoption of my amendment, which helps to bring justice and some clarity to what is otherwise a murky provision in this piece of legislation.

Mr. LAMBORN. Reclaiming my time, my understanding is the Judiciary Committee did not have any problems with this particular revision. But having discussed all the issues around this amendment, I would urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part A of House Report 112–73.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment as the designee of the maker of the amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 11, strike ''**EXPEDITION**'' and insert ''**QUALITY ABOVE SPEED**''.

Page 9, line 14, strike ''expeditiously'' and insert ''justly''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, this amendment, the scrivener of same, is JARED POLIS, our colleague from Colorado. I can't resist, however, departing from the preparation that he has undergone to suggest that if my other friend from Colorado's logic is followed, then I gather that the circuit courts of the United States, all 13 of them, must be the courts of last resort. And if you followed your logic to its conclusion, I guess we would eliminate the United States Supreme Court because, of course, those nine people wouldn't know anything about what the circuits had done, wherever they came from.

Madam Chair, when reading this bill, and particularly the section on judicial review, the phrase ''rush to judgment''

came to mind to Mr. POLIS, because that's exactly what this bill directs our courts to do. Instead of hearing and deciding a case based on the case's merits, this bill tells the courts that speed, not justice, should be their top priority.

Madam Chair, the integrity of any law enforcement is only as good as the court's ability to review and enforce it. We all learned in civics class that one of the strengths of our Nation is its system of checks and balances. Passing legislation that tilts the courts in favor of one side or another is hardly in line with this most fundamental of American values, yet this is what much of what H.R. 1229's judicial review section does.

Mr. POLIS' amendment that I offer as his designee is a modest amendment that promotes the integrity of that review and the integrity of our Nation's principle of fair and impartial courts. H.R. 1229 as a whole gives an even greater handout to the well-funded legal teams employed by the big oil companies, at the expense of protecting our health, our communities, our environment, and justice in general.

The underlying bill in section 204 states: ''The court shall endeavor to hear and determine any covered civil action as expeditiously as possible.'' Exactly who does it help when the courts are directed to make decisions in haste at the expense of research and deliberation? It only helps those who can afford teams of high-priced lawyers and lobbyists who know where and when to push the pressure buttons of influence.

My colleague's amendment simply replaces the word ''expeditiously'' with the word ''justly,'' as the courts should be deciding cases based not simply on speed but on the law. Undoubtedly, the judicial review provisions in H.R. 1229 have been included to promote the misleading argument commonly used by the majority party and the big oil companies alike that frivolous lawsuits by local communities and environmentalists strangle the industry and stall domestic drilling. Yet quarter after quarter, oil companies continue to reap record profits and are developing more domestic energy than ever before. Exxon actually is ahead of us. They're in the business of talking about gas while we around here are dilly-dallying about oil.

Furthermore, this misleading hard-luck story leaves out a critical fact—that the industry is just as active in using the courts to get its way as any public health or environmental watchdog. But the industry has much more money for such legal actions, already giving it an unfair advantage.

□ 1940

In fact, recent lawsuits have been filed against the government by Alaskan oil companies to overturn critical habitat restrictions, by oil companies against the EPA for ethanol standards, and numerous suits against the Department of the Interior by industry over the temporary ban following the BP disaster.

Let's remember that the point of judicial review is to ensure that the law is followed and to provide a check and balance when it is not. The underlying bill is, in effect, saying that following the law no longer matters. It doesn't matter if justice is served or if a case is heard properly. It only matters if it appears that way.

Madam Chair, the east front of the Supreme Court building contains the following inscription: ''Justice, the guardian of liberty.'' Should any company in our country have the right to pursue profits and the prerogative of our capitalist system? Of course. But even our Founders recognized that this should be done within the confines of the law. Justice, meaning impartial courts and stringent checks and balances, is the guardian of our liberties and freedom as Americans. Instead of promoting a rush to judgment and a blind rubber stamp within the courts, we should, instead, promote integrity and a system of rigorous checks and balances, as these are truly fundamental American values.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, 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.

Let's stand back and look for a moment at the big picture. This administration has been held in contempt of court for slow-walking permits and is currently trying to appeal a Federal judge's warning that ordered them to act on stalled deepwater permits. While the administration continues to hold up the permitting process, thousands of Americans remain unemployed, and American energy is locked up.

This legislation encourages courts that are hearing permitting cases to act as expeditiously as possible. Environmental groups are already working to prepare lawsuits aimed at stalling and holding up offshore energy production. This bill encourages the courts to work expeditiously so that lawsuits can be settled quickly.

Now, in seeking to replace the word ''expeditiously'' with ''justly,'' we are doing something that is totally unnecessary. Those of us supporting this bill already assume that the courts will act justly. That's what they're appointed for, and that's what we expect and require them to do. So it is superfluous and unnecessary to say that they have to act justly when that's what they're going to do. At least that's our assumption over here anyway. Yet we need to say that they act expeditiously as well as justly because of the slow-walking nature of this current administration's approach to permitting.

The effect of this amendment, were it to be adopted, would slow down American energy production at a time when prices are skyrocketing. We need judges to move cases in an expeditious manner so that we can use American energy. This bill ensures that everyone will have their day in court, but it also ensures that the slow walking of permits by this executive branch will not continue.

I urge a ''no'' vote and for my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part A of House Report 112–73.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 10, beginning at line 3, strike section 207.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, H.R. 1229, in my opinion, is an irresponsible giveaway to the oil industry, which has taken enormous profit at American taxpayer expense. Section 207 of the bill repeals the Equal Access to Justice Act, thereby eliminating the awarding of attorneys' fees to litigants bringing successful legal challenges, be they expeditious, just or not, to offshore oil and gas activities, making this kind of litigation prohibitively expensive.

As the BP oil spill demonstrated, there has been a lack of Federal oversight of the drilling industry. Consequently, legal challenges have become the only enforcement mechanism for many related laws and regulations. Removing the judiciary system from the equation makes it even less likely that large oil and gas companies will comply with environmental and safety standards. Let me insert something here.

As to the commission that was set up under BP, a colleague of mine on the Rules Committee said that BP has been accountable. Only 3.8 percent, $3.8 billion of the $20 billion, has been left to 177,000 claimants. That ensures, among other things, that by 2013, at the expiration of the commission's term, there will be money left over.

Guess what my friends at Fox News reported? They reported that the money goes back to BP. How crazy can we be around here?

Eliminating the awarding of attorneys' fees means the traditional groups that bring lawsuits on environmental

or safety grounds, such as fishermen, small business owners and environmental groups, will no longer be reimbursed for the cost of successfully litigating these kinds of claims. The idea that the bill will somehow eliminate an excess of lawsuits is ridiculous. Since litigation is by its nature so expensive, these cash-strapped plaintiffs usually only bring those lawsuits with the most likelihood of success. Without the possibility of receiving attorneys' fees, legal challenges will effectively become impossible.

Madam Chair, section 207 of H.R. 1229 only helps large oil companies avoid having to comply with U.S. law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, 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.

The Equal Access to Justice Act provisions in this bill are necessary to avoid costly delays to domestic energy development based on the extreme anti-energy agenda of a few groups. The Equal Access to Justice Act was intended to allow people and small businesses with limited financial means the ability to challenge the actions of the Federal Government. However, it is now being abused by deep-pocketed special interest organizations.

For example, in 2005, the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense Council received nearly $200,000 in taxpayer dollars after suing the Federal Government in an offshore energy project in California. The Sierra Club has annual revenues of $85 million, and the Natural Resources Defense Council has annual revenues of over $100 million.

There is no justification for forcing the American taxpayer to pay the attorneys' fees of special interest groups that have ample funds of their own. Wealthy, ideological groups opposed to more American-made offshore energy can continue to sue to their hearts' content, but taxpayers shouldn't have to foot the bill.

I oppose this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same. Taxpayer dollars should not go to lawsuits being filed by special interests that are making millions and millions of dollars in annual revenue. I urge a ''no'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, when you're flabbergasted, the easiest thing to do is to not say anything else. I just can't believe that we're doing this useless legislation while people in the gulf are hurting the way that they are. It's senseless.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Chair, the Equal Access to Justice Act restrictions in this bill is necessary to avoid costly delays to domestic energy development based on the political agenda of a few groups.

EAJA was established in 1980 as means for small businesses and individuals to seek judicial redress from wrongful government action.

It allows for party's to seek reimbursement of attorneys' fees from the taxpayers.

Payment of these fees comes directly of out agency budgets, in this case the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

EAJA was intended to allow people and small businesses with "limited financial means" the ability to sue the Federal Government without having to worry about the costs associated if they prevail.

However, it is being abused by deep-pocketed organizations with a political agenda.

For example, in 2005 the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense Council received nearly $200,000 dollars in taxpayer dollars after suing the Federal Government on an offshore energy project in California.

The Sierra Club has annual revenue of $85 million dollars, and the Natural Resources Defense Council has annual revenue of over $100 million dollars.

There is no justification for forcing the American taxpayer—particularly those on the gulf coast—to pay the attorney's fees of political advocacy organizations that have ample funds of their own.

That is not what EAJA was intended to accomplish, and restricting its use in this bill is both necessary and appropriate.

Environmental groups can continue to sue to their hearts' content—and they will because suing the Federal Government is their modus operandi—but taxpayers shouldn't have to foot the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1950

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMBORN) having assumed the chair, Mrs. ADAMS, 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. 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

JOBS AND THE MAKE IT IN AMERICA AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ADAMS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening about jobs and particularly about the Make It in America Agenda, but before I begin, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Michigan to begin this conversation.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Thank you, Representative CICILLINE.

I represent the city of Detroit. In fact, the congressional district that I represent includes metropolitan Detroit. Over the last 10 years, metropolitan Detroit has lost more jobs than any other metropolitan area in this country, but it wasn't just Detroit and its metropolitan area that's lost jobs. Other areas, other cities, other metropolitan regions in the country have lost millions of jobs over the last 10 years.

Now, during this same timeframe, this country has been investing our tax dollars to build bridges, to repair roads, to build hospitals, sewer systems, schools, to build industrial parks that will promote more business, to actually develop businesses and free enterprise models that are successful. Now, many of the American people may not have seen the benefits of this type of investment because all of the work that I am talking about that was funded by tax dollars was done in Afghanistan, and the people who directly benefited from these projects were the people of Afghanistan.

My position is this: we need to create jobs in America. We need to keep the jobs that we have here so they don't go overseas like they have in the past. In order to do that, I'm proposing let's take a share of the money that's intended to go to Afghanistan, redirect it to the United States to create jobs right here, jobs for the American people, because we're the ones that actually need it, and it makes sense. The money that we are investing in Afghanistan comes from U.S. taxpayers. Let's spend it in a way that benefits the taxpayers and creates jobs right here in the United States.

Now, I do understand that we've got to stop terrorism from breeding in other countries, and we certainly don't want other safe havens for terrorism to develop overseas. But in light of the fact that bin Laden is now gone, I'm asking this Congress, this administration to reassess our mission in Afghanistan. Let's take a part of the over half a trillion dollars—and that's trillion with a ''t''—in military assistance that we've spent in Afghanistan over the last 10 years, let's take a share of that and return it home to protect our people right here in the United States.

Yes, we are at risk of a terrorist attack, but more than likely that risk is increasingly coming from within the U.S. So let's fully equip and fund the first line of defense against terrorism in this country, which is our first responders. It is our local police, our local firefighters, our local emergency

medical providers that we call on to help protect the American people. So I'm proposing let's take a share of that military assistance that's going to Afghanistan, and let's invest it in our local police, fire, and emergency medical providers to protect our citizens right here at home.

Then, finally, over the past 10 years, taxpayers have invested nearly $30 billion—and that's billion with a ''b'', so we get these figures clear and the magnitude of our investment—we invested nearly $30 billion in Afghanistan for non-defense spending, much of it going toward economic development and civilian assistance. Let's take a portion of that funding and redirect it to the United States to create jobs right here.

My point is this: it takes money to create jobs, and more accurately, it takes public funds that can be leveraged effectively to create the investment that yields jobs. We've been spending that money for over a decade in another country. Bin Laden is now gone. Let's reevaluate our role in Afghanistan, and while we're doing that, let's take a share of our precious tax dollars—people, this is your money and we need it right now—to create jobs, to fight foreclosures, to invest in manufacturing. It is our manufacturing capacity that made our country strong, that created the best products that were sold around the world. It's our manufacturing strategy and capacity that transformed the city that I represent, the city of Detroit, from the motor capital of the world to the arsenal of democracy back in World War II.

Metro Detroit and this country's ability to innovate and create and manufacture saved this country and saved this world from fascism. If we invest a portion of the money right now that we're spending overseas in Afghanistan and winding down in Iraq, and we invest it right here in cities like Detroit and Elkhart, Indiana, and Louisville, Tennessee—these are other cities that also have lost a lot of jobs—we can make America stronger.

We want to fight terrorism. We need to be a strong country, but the strength of our country comes from within. It comes from protecting the American people, and the most effective way to do that: invest in homeland security, support our local police and fire, and invest in jobs in America so that U.S. citizens can be financially stable and hopefully prosperous. This is how we built this country in just a little over 200 years into one of the greatest countries human civilization has ever known. We've done it by investing the people's money into the innovation and capacity to create jobs. It's through investing in the U.S.

I know I've been going on a little bit longer, but my point is this: I'm asking the American people who are watching tonight, call your Member of Congress, ask—demand, if you wish—that a share of your money that's going overseas right now be returned back to you to create jobs here, to protect our homeland, and also, to reduce our overall debt and deficit.

□ 2000

We've been spending the money, over $500 billion alone in the last 10 years in Afghanistan. This administration is slated to wind down that expenditure. Let's take a portion of that back to help our people, to make America strong again.

And you know why it's so important for America to be strong and not some other country? Because we believe in democracy. We, the people, actually have a voice, through folks like me, who you hired. I have the constitutional duty to be your voice here, not just for metro Detroiters, but for all of you who understand the value in manufacturing. That's the reason why my dad risked everything 80 years ago in the midst of the Great Depression to leave his homeland in India, to come here as a dream so that he could live his life as fully as he chose it and to raise a family. I am his only son, and he was so honored to see, many decades ago, the first Indian American elected to Congress. And I am here too as a legacy of an immigrant's courage to make a difference for himself, his family, and his country.

My point is this, people: It's our money. And you work hard for that money. And yes, we invested it overseas because we were trying to stop the people that were determined to wipe us out. And we got the ringleader. We took him out. Let's take a share of our money back and return it to our people. Let's create jobs here. Call your Member of Congress. Do it tonight. Leave them a voicemail message. Tell them, We need you, as a Member of this body that's constitutionally committed to represent the people, we need you to use a share of our money to help American families become financially stable again and to help this country's economy really endure in a prosperous way to help bring democracy and freedom throughout the world. I really am just so committed that we take a share of our funds right now to create jobs here.

I was born and raised in the city of Detroit, and it's heartbreaking to see what's happened to Detroit. But also too, there is so much promise there in Detroit because we still have the greatest talent in manufacturing. We have great research universities there in Michigan, including Wayne State University that I'm proud to represent. And we have the plants and the land to actually build new manufacturing operations. This country has the superb ability to innovate and outwork and outhustle and outsmart any of the competition around the world. All we have to do is this: return some of our money, our tax dollars, back to the U.S. so that we can prosper again.

Some of us are doing well, but I know overall—and I will close—that many American families are not feeling that financially secure, and I understand that. Look, I have been through hard times myself as a young man. That's why I am stressing the fact, turn a share of our tax dollars back to our people so we can do what's best, innovate, invest, and create jobs.

Thank you so much. God bless America.

Mr. CICILLINE. One of the things I know that we all share as new Members of the Congress, as freshmen, is that we've been here for about 4 months, Madam Speaker; and we've had conversations and debates about cutting Pell Grants and cutting Head Start. We've endured attacks on women's health and NPR, attacks on the environment, and most recently, efforts to end Medicare as we know it. We really haven't had before this Congress a jobs agenda, at a time when Americans are suffering from some of the highest unemployment in a generation.

We all recognize that we need to cut spending, we need to be responsible in our management of the national debt. One of the key ways that we can do that is to grow our economy and get Americans back to work. And I believe, Madam Speaker, that one of the key ways that we can do that is to rebuild the manufacturing base in our country. There is no way we can maintain our position as a great economic power without making things in America. Making things in America is really a key part to rebuilding the economy of this country.

My home State of Rhode Island is one of the States that have been hardest hit in this economic downturn. Rhode Island was the first New England State to enter the recession, and it's currently facing the fifth-highest unemployment in America. But Rhode Island has a strong tradition of manufacturing. It's the birthplace of the American industrial revolution. This helped build the middle class and provided good-paying jobs for working families. In fact, Rhode Island used to produce one-third of the costume jewelry in the entire United States, yet our manufacturing sector has been really hard hit, especially in these particularly difficult economic times. According to the Alliance for American Manufacturing, there were 71,100 manufacturing jobs in Rhode Island in 2000; and by the year 2008, that number had dropped to 47,900. Rhode Island lost 15 percent of its manufacturing jobs during the period of 2008 to 2009 alone. And from 2001 to 2008, Rhode Island lost 10,500 jobs due to trade with China.

When was the last time, Madam Speaker, that you went into a store and found something made in America? Manufacturing jobs all across this country have seen a steep decline, from 20 million jobs in 1979 to about 12 million today, and the middle class has been left behind. And that's why this past week, when we launched the Make It in America agenda, I became so hopeful about this Congress' attention on manufacturing. This agenda is really about reversing manufacturing job

loss. It's about investing in good-paying jobs, world-class education, top-notch research, and sound infrastructure. We need to create an environment that encourages American manufacturers to innovate, grow, keep, and create good jobs here in the United States. When we Make It in America, our middle class will succeed. This agenda is based on the conviction that when more products are made in America, more families will be able to ''make it'' in America. The agenda is really intended to create the conditions to help American businesses produce goods here, to innovate, and create jobs.

It also includes being smart about the investments we make, to out-educate, to out-innovate, and out-build our international competitors. The President has already signed six Make It in America bills into law, many of them which enjoyed bipartisan support because business and labor leaders alike recognize that the Democratic agenda of making it in America is good for our country and is central to the future of our competitiveness, our jobs, and our leadership in the world.

This past week, we outlined a series of bills that represent really a cross-section of the legislative package, a dynamic agenda that will continue to evolve during the 112th Congress but is really focused on how we support the manufacturing sector again. Some of these bills have already been introduced. Others will be introduced in the coming weeks. The agenda includes the development of a national manufacturing strategy, directs the President to work with industry leaders, labor leaders, other stakeholders to develop a national manufacturing strategy for our country, to set appropriate benchmarks and measurements. Every other nation we're competing with that is serious about manufacturing has a national manufacturing strategy. The agenda also includes the Build America Bonds, expanding the Build America Bonds, the creation of a national infrastructure development bank.

If we're going to compete in the 21st century, we need to have an infrastructure which supports that competition. We need to have roads and bridges and transit systems and the ability to move information to compete in the 21st century. It includes making the research and development tax credit permanent and more generous to encourage job creation. It includes the creation of small business startup savings accounts, a reform of the Chinese currency system to give our American manufacturers a fighting chance to compete in the global marketplace. And it includes the Make It in America Block Grant, which I have drafted. This is a block grant which will help American manufacturers retrofit their factories, retrain their workers, buy new equipment, increase their exports, and make their facilities more energy efficient so that they can compete more successfully in the 21st century.

□ 2010

It's an ambitious agenda, but it's really about recognizing that we have got to start making things again in this country; that manufacturing was an important part of the history of America, an important way we built up the middle class in this country and became a world economic power.

We can no longer act as if manufacturing is not important. We need to make things here again so people can go into stores and buy things made in America. We need to start exporting goods made in America all over the world because we make the best products, we have the best workers, and stop exporting jobs.

This is an agenda which I hope will earn bipartisan support, that will be a key to helping rebuild the economy of our country and rebuilding our strong manufacturing base.

Madam Speaker, I think the most urgent priority we face is getting Americans back to work. Americans have been very hard hit in this recession. Members hear it all the time from constituents back at home. What are you doing to get people back to work, to get this economy back on the right track?

This Make It in America agenda, I believe, provides a real opportunity to again rebuild the manufacturing base of this country so that we can make things here again, and so that American families can make it as well.

At the same time, in addition to investing in this agenda, we also need to invest, as the President said, in education so that we can out-educate, so that our kids can compete, not just with the kids in the neighboring town or the next State, but kids in China and India and Germany and all over the world. That's who they're competing with in the 21st century. And we need to make sure they have the tools and skills necessary to compete successfully in the global economy.

In addition, we have to invest in science and research and innovation so we can continue to make the new discoveries, make the new inventions, create the new products that will allow us to lead the world and to again maintain our position as a world economic power. And that's why we think about the balance that we have to strike in managing the serious responsibility of reducing spending, eliminating programs that don't work, cutting waste, and at the same time, investing in the things that are necessary to keep our country strong—education, innovation and infrastructure.

And so, Madam Speaker, I hope that this Congress, the 112th Congress, will be known as the Congress that restarted and reinvested in making things again in America.

I know that my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) has focused as well on creating jobs, bringing some balance to our Federal budget, and understands the urgency, particularly in coming from one of our great New England States, of rebuilding and manufacturing.

I'd like to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Thank you for yielding.

I just came here to advance statements by our fellow freshmen and my neighbor from Rhode Island because here we are in a virtually empty Chamber, sitting here talking about jobs.

Before I became a Member of Congress, just a few months ago, my job, and I was fortunate to have one, was the job of a district attorney. Now, the intricacies of that job are not well known, but one of the responsibilities we have in our State is, when there is an unattended death, a death that, for instance, did not occur in a hospital, it's important that that be investigated for any indications of foul play from a criminal standpoint. So, as a result, the troopers attached to my unit and my prosecutors reviewed the deaths of people.

I must say, just to put this in context in a very personal sense to me, one of the most tragic and heart-wrenching parts of that job was coming upon the scenes of suicides. And in the course of that, over the last couple of years, we actually saw situations where people, depressed, hopeless, took their own lives. And they left indications that I won't get into as to the reason they did that.

So many of those people were out of work, chronically out of work. Their homes were falling apart. Their families were falling apart, and hope had been extinguished. There were notes. There were indications. There was the way you go back and talk to a family and say what brought the person to this to make sure you knew just what happened.

That is the most powerful way, I think, that you can understand why we are here in this Congress trying to put people back to work. We have to do everything we can do in our power to do this. To be out of work is human misery, and it's a misery that extends to spouses, sons and daughters; conversations where one of these instances where the person that took their life was told that they would never be able to afford to go to the college they were accepted to.

So when we have this discussion here in this Congress, I hope we don't continue to have this discussion about jobs in empty Chambers. I hope it becomes the focal point of our open sessions because, frankly, there hasn't been enough of that discussion.

I came here imbued with a sense of challenge and responsibility, that I would do everything that I could to try and stop this human misery from occurring in families and individuals. So I hope as we go forward and we look at Make It in America, we look at other platforms and policies to try and put people back to work, we don't forget

these aren't people just called our constituents. These are real people, people suffering more than they ever should.

In my own district, as people are ready to go through the tourist system and the wealthier people come to celebrate their vacations, they're doing it in a region where the unemployment is 16 percent, and too many people are out of work.

I hope, as we go forward, that as freshmen, we come forward and remember what we said in the campaign just a few months ago, focus on what we said we would do. And I hope that kind of freshman enthusiasm is contagious, and I hope we're having robust discussions about putting people back to work, not here in an empty Chamber but in a full Chamber with ideas teeming so that we can accomplish that very important mission.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the distinguished gentleman and my good friend from Massachusetts, and I think it is a really important point that he makes tonight.

We talk about the urgency of job creation and about the enormity of the challenges facing our country. But behind all of these numbers and the unemployment rate, these statistics, are real families and real people who we see every single day in our districts all across this country, who are anguished and worried.

People often describe the American people are angry. I don't see anger. What I see in the American people is anxiety. People are worried about the future. They're worried about whether or not this economy is ever going to get on the right track, whether or not we are going to really be successful in growing jobs and getting people back to work. And they look at the proceedings of this Congress and they say, Where's the conversation about creating jobs? Where's the emphasis on putting Americans back to work? And they grow more anxious.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for reminding all of us that we're here fighting for real people who are counting on us to do the right things to get them back to work, to get this economy back on track and to put our country's fiscal house in order. These are big challenges, but they're challenges we have to meet.

I will end by, again, reminding everyone that this agenda—and I want to really acknowledge the leadership of our minority whip, STENY HOYER, who really has led the charge on Make It in America and the legislation that's contained in that agenda, specific bills which I hope will earn bipartisan support, that really get at this issue of how we grow the manufacturing base in this country, which provided such strong support to the middle class and a real opportunity to fulfill the American Dream and to ensure that America can compete internationally and sell our goods all over the world.

I hope we can come together in this Congress and work quickly to pass the legislation that is part of the Make It in America agenda so that we can be sure American families can make it.

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

□ 2020

PRICE OF GASOLINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMASH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, with all the issues that we deal with here in Congress, the American people deal with other issues at home. Some of those issues are connected, and some of those issues they don't see the connection. But they do wonder about something.

They wonder about the fact that gas prices in some places in this country January of 2009, when the President came into office, were unleaded $1.32 a gallon; mid-range, $1.42; super range, $1.52. Gas prices in April of 2011 over here somewhere in this country, looks like it could be Texas because our numbers are about there, $3.99 for regular, $4.09 for mid-range, $4.19 for the super, the ethyl, as they used to say in the old days.

So since the President has taken office, something that affects every life in this country: the price of gasoline. Because whether we like it or not, whether we come up with alternative energy sources or not, whether we have new ideas about high-speed trains, subways, elevated railways, buses, the majority of the people in the United States move around by automobile; and the majority of those automobiles are driven using one of two fuels, either gasoline or diesel.

Now, neither one of these charts shows a diesel price; but amazingly enough, back when I was a youngster, diesel was the cheapest fuel we had available. But diesel prices are no longer cheap. Diesel prices are competitive, usually around the mid-range price of gasoline. But there are people who have good reasons to drive diesel vehicles. And so whether we like it or not, whether it fits our congressional legislative program or not to have gasoline and diesel being the fuel that moves people around this country, it is a fact. And you may think otherwise all you wish, but it is a fact.

There are no wind cars where you hook a sail up and hope that the wind is blowing towards Washington, DC tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock so everybody can get to work. It is not happening.

So everybody gets up and everybody goes out, and most everybody, unless they have one of the brand-new electric cars, starts their vehicle with gasoline or maybe diesel, and they go to work or they go on vacation or they travel to see their relatives, or whatever the purpose of their trip.

So let's be frank. Until we come up with alternative sources that move people from point A to point B in the United States of America, we are bound to gasoline and diesel. And in the 3-year track record of this administration, we have seen, I understand it is reported, the highest gasoline prices in the history of the country, even higher than the famous Jimmy Carter days when Jimmy Carter had us waiting in long, long ration lines and paying extremely high gasoline prices. At $4 a gallon, I think we topped even the numbers that came under President Carter almost two decades ago.

So here we are, we have gone full circle in a Democrat Presidency, and here we are back with the issue of gas prices.

Now, why are gas prices so important to people? Because it is how we get where we are going to go. If you are taking your kid to soccer game or to baseball practice or football practice or lacrosse up here in the East, or track and field, or whatever your young people are doing, you have got to get them there; and in most instances they can't walk and they can't ride a bike. They have to go in an automobile. And when you move them from game to game, they go in automobiles. And when they go to take their tests for entry into college, they have to go to an independent location. Many times they travel there by automobile.

You have to pick up the laundry. You have to pick up the groceries. You have to do a million things; get the kids to school on time, get the kids home from school, take the wife out on a date. Unmarried people are dating, and that's part of their date costs. And at a time when we have some of the highest unemployment in modern times, we bumped back above 9 percent, I understand now, so there is a lot of people out of work.

Those people who are out of work, some of them are drawing unemployment, and some of them are just trying to figure out a way to make do until they can find another job. And to have a roughly $3 increase per gallon in the cost of their fuel to move them around the country, people feel that immediately. It is literally sticker shock to go in and start filling up your tank.

I have a fairly small tank in my car. My wife's got a little larger tank, so more of a sticker shock. I drive a hybrid, so I'm getting some pretty good gas mileage. But still, I watch that thing go up to $54 to fill up my tank and watch my wife's go up to $65, $70 to drive.

I have a daughter who is working part time and going to college. Sometimes she has to go for testing; in fact, today she went for testing in a town about 40 miles from where we live to take a test, and it is a full tank of gasoline up there and back for her in the little car she drives, or almost. And she works hard. She will work all day and maybe 2 days at her job to pay for a tank of gasoline. So it immediately affects your budget.

But it is not just the cost of this fuel to the individual. It is the fact that it is killing the recovery in this country, this new increase in gasoline costs and fuel costs.

Now, we move goods from one place to the other. In Texas we are blessed to have the Rio Grande Valley where we produce wonderful fruits and vegetables, and we compete around the country with our fruit and vegetable crops. But the prices of those things are going up, and they are going up very quickly. All of a sudden, you are seeing tomatoes are $2.50 a pound.

Now, you say how do you know this? One of the great questions they always like to ask a Congressman is, what is the price of bread in your town? What is the price of milk? Because they think that we don't know. Well, I can assure you, my wife will back me up on this, I have shopped for our family in the grocery store since the day I got married, and I continue to do so.

We live away from town, and usually I would be leaving my work in town and it was easier for me to grab the groceries than for my wife to drive 8 or 10 miles from where we live out in the country into town. So I can honestly say I watched avocados go from $1 apiece to $2 apiece in 2 days in Round Rock, Texas, at one of the better stores where the prices are kept low where we regularly shop. I'm fortunate enough to have a job, but there are people who don't. And avocados may be a luxury to some people. That's just an example that I noticed because it shocked me to see them double in price in a 48-hour period, and so I thought about it.

□ 2030

But that's not all. The price of everything is going up. Now, why is that? Transportation costs. We move our products to market and we move our products to wholesalers, retailers, and it all takes transportation, and that transportation has now almost trebled in costs in a very short period of time.

People say, why? We hear from our Democrat colleagues here in the Congress, the ''why'' is the evil oil companies, the evil major oil companies, and they name names; ExxonMobil, ConocoPhillips, Chevron. I will not use all the names. There are a bunch of them, and they get used every day in this Congress. They are making horrendous profits and they are the cause of gasoline going up. But the price of oil is going up, and that is part of why prices go up.

The thing is we don't know. We all speculate to some extent. But I think it is a pretty easy, commonsense position to take that the more supply we have with the demand, and we are the demand capital of the world on burning gasoline and diesel. We outshine anybody else on the face of this globe in the use of those products. And we have relatively cheap prices as compared to the other countries, especially those countries that have no production. They can get very expensive very quickly.

Until very recently, there was no oil or gas at all to amount to anything in what we now call Western Europe. Today, there is. They have found it offshore. They have found it on the land in Holland, in Norway and other places. Norway is, I think, something like the third biggest producer of offshore oil in the world now. They are doing extremely well and running their economy in a very frugal manner. They are very smart people and they should be commended. We should do so well.

I happened to go to Norway with Chairman Obey with the Appropriations Committee when the Democrats were in control, and we went to see the offshore production in Norway. They are doing a good job. But the prices for gasoline are probably three times as much in Europe as they are here, and in other places even more.

But it makes sense that the law of supply and demand always works. It's kind of like gravity, the law of gravity. If you drop something, it's going down. Well, the law of supply and demand has been proven over and over and over to be what drives the market for anything. So if we have the opportunity to increase our supply in this country and we have the demand, then why wouldn't that have an effect on our price? I think that is a reasonable thing to talk about.

The Obama administration has, I would say, a dismal record in assisting us in finding oil and gas. Of course, we are all familiar with the fact that we had a bad oil leak in the gulf, and nobody in any way is saying that was good. In fact, that was a terrible, terrible thing to our environment, a terrible thing that panicked the country to some extent, especially some of the southern States that border on the Gulf of Mexico, and it messed up some beaches pretty nastily and probably had some effect on the wildlife and sea life in the ocean. We will probably be learning in the future how much.

As a result of that, we put a moratorium on drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. But oil and gas is found in the Gulf of Mexico, especially oil, but to some extent natural gas, in abundance in some places, and many of those places are deepwater. Deepwater drilling is extremely expensive. The rigs are $1 billion, with a ''b,'' piece of equipment, and the cost of drilling those wells is very expensive. But they are successful. We have had wells, even the BP well that blew out was putting out a phenomenal amount of oil. If that had been sealed and that production had been put into play, it would have had an effect on the availability of oil in the United States. Just that one well would have had an effect. But they put a moratorium on that, and the decrease in oil production from this decreased the amount of production by 360,000 barrels of domestic oil per day.

The Obama administration has leased less offshore and onshore acres for energy production than any other President since Ronald Reagan. In 2009, the administration indefinitely delayed leases for oil shale in the West, which kept these resources off limits. Over 2 trillion barrels of oil from oil shale are currently sitting idle due to these delays. The Obama administration has kept all new offshore exploration off limits until at least 2017. That is over 80 billion barrels of oil in the Atlantic, Pacific, Alaska and Gulf of Mexico.

The Trans-Alaska Pipeline System, which could be transporting 2.2 million barrels of oil per day, is running at less than one-third capacity because companies cannot get permits to produce oil in Alaska. The administration has essentially shut down production in the State by withholding the necessary permits. The Keystone XL pipeline, which could eventually bring 1.5 million barrels of oil per day to America, is being prevented by endless delays by the State Department.

America is the third largest oil producing Nation in the world. The above actions are a clear sign to the world that we are closed for business. If we are closed for business and we are number three, then how much more valuable does that make the product that number two and number one and those behind us are producing, therefore driving up the cost of that product? The less you have in the market, the higher the cost, if there is a demand, and there is clearly a demand worldwide.

In fact, one of the things you are seeing on the price of oil is the fact that at one time we were the biggest market by far. In fact, the Europeans really didn't even come close to being the market for oil and gas that the United States is. But today these booming new upcoming economies, China, the fastest growing economy in the world right now, do you think they can have that fast growing economy without energy? Of course not.

Energy is the driving force behind manufacturing. It is the driving force behind development of a nation. Those folks need to get where they need to go just like everybody else does, and they have many of the innovative things that America is starting to talk about today.

The Secretary of Transportation has just let out a bunch of money to build some high-speed rail. China already has high-speed rail, the highest speed rail in the world. They have speeds of up to 250 miles per hour. We are not even going to come close to that on our rail projects. But they are still now the biggest competitor for trying to make forward purchases. They are trying to buy future purchases so they can ensure they have the fuel they need in the future to meet their demands.

We have a product that we sell for that. They are called ''futures'' on the exchange, and you are buying oil to be delivered at a later time at a set price. And when futures become in big demand and when the price of oil in the future is looked at by countries and by industries to make these purchases ahead of time to get cheaper fuel to

run your industry, then it drives up the costs in the market. The market goes up. Something is in demand and the market needs it not only today, but sees a projection to need it in 6 months, in a year, in 5 years and in 10 years, and they are willing to pay for the right to purchase it at a certain price, the prices go up.

□ 2040

That's the market. So I think that, first off, we're not ever going to get anywhere if we don't have an energy plan that is about all energy in the United States. And I would argue that with the use of the regulations and the failure to lease and the failure to lift moratoriums, and even after you lift moratoriums, failure to give drilling permits, all the things that this administration has done, it has been an anti-oil and gas industry—and I'm sure coal, also—and anti-hydrocarbon administration. They don't deny that at all. They are anti-hydrocarbons. They don't like coal. They don't like oil and gas. They are opposed to them. And through regulations and through failure to do the necessary leasing they are keeping closed natural resources that are available to Americans. And, hey, let's get this straight. Before the Middle East; before Russia, and the Soviet Union prior to that; before offshore Norway, before onshore Holland; before the North Sea; before the Gulf of Mexico; before Indonesia; before all these places where we now produce oil and gas, we started out by producing oil in Pennsylvania. We later made a huge gigantic oil find in Texas. And Texas is now defined by oil and gas by many.

We are the pioneers of oil and gas in the world, the United States of America. All the improvements in drilling procedures and in closing down wells, in saving oil without blowouts, in fighting oil fires, in any category you can come up with to do with oil and gas, the United States of America has led, as it usually leads in all things, but it has led in the oil and gas industry. We are the experts. In fact, when we went to Norway and asked the Norwegians what they would do if they had a blowout like the British Petroleum blowout, they said, We'd call the experts; the people in the United States. The companies that are drilling the wells, they're the experts, not us. Then why all of a sudden in this administration have we decided that a major industry in this country is of no consequences because you want to change the way the American people get around, and you want to change the way we do business in this country? So you hold votes on the floor of this House, whether it's something called cap-and-trade, and it fails—passes the House; can't get through the Senate. Dies. So you do it with regulations. Just get the regulators to shut them down and that will do just as good as passing cap-and-trade.

You want to know what this does to you folks that are looking for a job. Well, Texas, at one time in the very near past, within the last year, had the lowest unemployment in the Nation until we shut down drilling offshore and along the gulf coast, and we lost tens of thousands, possibly hundreds of thousands of people, that are connected with this industry. And it's not just the greasy drillers that drill the oil wells. It's the food service people that bring it out there. It's the helicopter people that transport people. It's the shipping industry that transports the fuel. It's the pipeline industry that puts it in the pipeline and delivers it. It's the refining industry. All of these people are affected when you shut down the local source, which is what this administration has done. And then we say to ourselves, Why has the price of gasoline gone up? Well, it seems to me part of the problem has got to be an administration hostile to this very industry. It's awfully hard when the regulators, EPA and others, have painted a target on your back to prevent you from producing.

We've made a phenomenal natural gas find in this country. We have found, which if I had told you this 4 years ago that we would bust up rocks and find natural gas, you would say that I needed to have some serious psychiatric examination, because it makes no sense to anybody that you can bust up rocks and produce natural gas. But we've discovered shale gas. And now, although we've got shale gas in Texas—and we're mighty proud of it—this shale gas now touches multiple States in this country. It goes right up through the South, right up through the Midwest, right up into Pennsylvania, where they have already done some serious shale oil work. And I know there's some up in New York State, although they don't seem to be interested in producing it.

So a belt of product stretches all the way across our country. Natural gas. And yet immediately there's some people who are telling you, I can smell that gas in my water well. Well, I've got news for you. Natural gas doesn't smell. So if you smell that gas in your water well, you've got a city gas line leaking someplace in your house, because you put the smell in the gas when you sell it to the retail customer so you can smell the gas if it's leaking in your house. But there's no smell of natural gas. But people have come up here to Congress and said, They drilled a well right around the corner from me, and now my water smells like natural gas. It doesn't make sense because natural gas doesn't smell. I can tell you that from personal experience it does not smell because I have dug up the machine on a job I had that smells. That was one of the nastiest jobs I ever had, because you got that smell all over you, but that's a different story. We need an energy policy that works, not an anti-energy policy.

Let's look at an anti-energy policy. Year One, 2009. February 4, 77 Utah oil and gas lease areas withdrawn from development. One of the things we talk about is Alaska, we talk about Texas, we talk now about Pennsylvania, we talk about many other places where there is now production. But what we don't talk about because we haven't been able to get in there to do it is the basin which Utah sits in the middle of, but it goes up into Idaho, it goes over into Wyoming, it goes up into Montana. There's a large potential field and discovered field in North Dakota of oil and gas. But the Utah oil leases were withdrawn from development. February 10. These were all actions of the administration. Offshore leasing plan delayed for 6 months.

February 25, shale oil research and development leases delayed in Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah. March 30, 3 million acres of Federal land removed from energy production by Omnibus Public Lands Management Act passed by a Democratic Congress. June 29, 29 million acres of Federal land removed from solar energy development plans, leaving just 670,000 solar acres. So even the so-called clean energy is having roadblocks by this administration.

Uranium mining blocked for 2 years on 1 million acres of land in Arizona. That was in July. August, 24,000 acres in Wyoming oil and gas leases withdrawn. September, new Outer Continental Shelf lease plan postponed until 2012. October, 60 of the 77 Utah oil and gas leases permanently canceled. November, Obama administration found to have approved the least oil and gas leases annually ever recorded in the United States history. So in the first year of this administration they started out with a clear policy of getting rid of our energy, not going after our energy. Even solar.

Year Two. January 6, new regs issued to restrict oil and gas development on Federal lands. January 26, Virginia offshore leases delayed.

□ 2050

January 28, restricted shale oil lease terms, cutting industry offers 85 percent. February 1, $40 billion in oil and gas industry tax and fee increases introduced in FY 2011 budget proposal. February 17, the administration unilaterally shuts down Yucca Mountain, the Nation's only repository for spent nuclear fuel, jeopardizing the future of nuclear energy.

That's not oil and gas, but that's energy.

March 12, 61 Montana oil leases withdrawn. March 31, majority of Outer Continental Shelf closed to future production. May 6, ban on all gulf drilling over BP spill. July 12, President defies Federal court order overturning the gulf drilling ban. October 12, the President finally says gulf drilling ban lifted, but refuses to issue new permits, keeping a de facto ban in place in contempt of Federal court. November 18, Interior Department plans no new gulf leases until 2012. December 1, the administration reinstates the illegal gulf

drilling ban to introduce the entire Pacific/Atlantic Coasts, Eastern Gulf, and parts of Alaska.

So they reinstated the ban to cover the whole coasts of the country. Oh, yes, we've got one more here—year three, 2011.

January 14, revoked West Virginia coal mine permit, costing 250 American jobs. February 2, a Federal judge finds Interior Department in contempt of court over de facto drilling ban. February 15, announced further delays to U.S. oil shale production by deciding to re-review the current rules for commercial oil shale leasing. February 28, continued the de facto drilling ban while issuing a token deepwater permit. March 4, the President appealed the Federal court ruling to issue stalled deepwater permits.

When I saw that shale oil, I saw my friend from Pennsylvania stand up. I yield to my good friend whatever time he may need to talk about the great things that are happening in Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my good friend from Texas for hosting this hour.

I actually do think this administration has an energy policy, and it's all about shutting down all of the domestic use of the resources we've been blessed with in this country. It's about cutting our supply, eliminating our domestic supply.

When I looked at your chart you had in terms of gas prices reflecting 2009 and 2011, I know at the White House the President is asking the Attorney General to put together a task force and is trying to find the bad guys of who's causing gas prices to be so high right now, which are pushing over $4 a gallon. There's only really one thing that impacts gas prices, and that's supply and demand, and demand around the world is going up. As you really captured nicely in the documentation, Congressman, the problem is that this administration has shut down access to domestic supply, and we're making us more and more foreign-dependent. Right now, with what's happening in Libya, we only get 2 percent of our oil resources from them. Just that 2 percent with what's happening in that country, we're seeing gas prices now push over $4 a gallon.

I'd like to contrast that with the shale gas that you talked about because, in Pennsylvania, we are blessed with it. Also, let me claim my heritage. I have the privilege of representing Titusville, Pennsylvania, where Edwin Drake drilled that first well 151 years ago, and we're very proud of that. Also, the 17 counties I represent in Pennsylvania are right in the heart of the Marcellus natural gas shale, and in the middle of one of the worst recessions we've had since the Great Depression, gas prices—and you captured them—are spiking at just record heights. If we had a chart there that showed natural gas prices, it actually is a record low. It's a little over $4 a cubic foot. Normally, in importing our domestic gas from other countries, natural gas would probably be somewhere around $11 or $12 a cubic foot, but today, it's $4-something a cubic foot in the middle of the worst recession. This winter was a tough winter in Pennsylvania, and the folks all over the State, including those in center city Philadelphia, are paying some of the lowest gas rates, which is only because natural gas is domestically produced.

It just speaks to the importance of a strong domestic supply program, but the policies of this administration make that almost impossible for our oil. They're going after natural gas, trying to stop that as well, and that is driving up costs. I find that it's not only so terribly damaging on our economy and jobs but that it's just immoral when we've been blessed with these resources. They were provided to us for a purpose, which was to be able to use them and go after them and do it as good stewards, and we know how to do that today.

Mr. CARTER. If my friend would yield just for a minute, what is the unemployment rate in Pennsylvania right now?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. The unemployment rate is lower than the national average is. I have a couple counties in particular. Tioga County is one of them, which is in the heart of the Marcellus natural gas. It is probably the first time in history that that county's unemployment is below both State and national averages, and it's because of the natural gas industry.

Mr. CARTER. It's because of those new jobs that were created by this marvelous find in Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. It is, and all the related jobs. Absolutely. You're right.

It's not the drilling jobs, but it's the hotel jobs and it's the restaurant jobs. I've got manufacturers right now that are sitting with jobs that they can't fill. We hear a lot about unemployment, but these are good jobs. They pay a significant amount of money per hour with good benefits. It's a great employer, and they're sitting there with these job openings, looking for folks to fill them. Now, some of the people they've had working for them have moved on into the gas field, and they've created new opportunities. So producing domestic energy produces domestic jobs, and it's so important.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time for just a moment, a lot of people don't realize that, when you're talking about the production of oil and gas, there is much more to putting up a rig on a piece of land than just driving out there and putting it up. You build roads. You build fences. Road builders don't drill a single drop of oil or gas, but they build the roads. That's a job. That's multiple jobs. In Louisiana, in the marshy parts of the country, they used to build wooden roads to get out to these rigs. All this creates jobs for all the side industries of the oil and gas industry. Just like any other industry, there are side industries that feed the big industry, and they all create jobs in a country that dropped below 9 percent but has now jumped back this month above 9 percent again, after one of the longest stretches of high unemployment in the country. I'll just use my family as an example.

My daddy was born in Kentucky, and my mother was born in Tennessee. In fact, where my mother lived may be pretty close to being underwater right now. In fact, she lived right close to the river in Tennessee. In the Great Depression, there were no jobs in their part of the country, but there were jobs in Texas because of the oil industry, so they both came down to Texas to get jobs in the oil industry. Now, they both ended up in the oil industry, but they started out where my mother was in the secretarial pool for business and my daddy was a teacher, an accounting professor; but they got jobs in the oil business, and it was always good to our family.

I don't lay any bones about it. I was raised in an oil and gas family, and my dad was a gas man. I've seen it make our State prosper, and of all the producing States that I've ever visited, they've prospered. Look at what it has done for Alaska. Look at Louisiana. Look at New Mexico and Oklahoma and what it has done for those States and those economies. To take and target an industry and go after that industry the way this administration has done—but not only that, I don't even understand the Yucca Mountain deal. I don't understand the no uranium leases. Now the President, in a couple of speeches, said we'll switch to nuclear. I think that may have changed now since the Japan disaster.

□ 2100

But we can't do it without uranium. There's a new process, you maybe could, but that's a different story. Historically, you can't do without uranium. You've got to have the location to store spent fuel. Americans need to wake up and say, wait a minute, we need energy.

I just was talking to people today that said the EPA was going to try their best to shut down wood-burning fireplaces. My gosh, I mean, how are we going to get warm? You guys up north, how are you going to get warm in the winter time if you're going to take away your coal and your natural gas and the price of oil is going to be through the roof and you can't afford that? You can't even burn wood in your own fireplace? What's wrong with this picture?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, you're right. The demand side impacts gas prices as well, and it has been very well documented that two countries in particular are increasing their thirst for oil, and it's going to drive up the demand for oil worldwide, and that is China and India. It's expected just

within the next few years the demand for oil is going to go up 10 to 12 million barrels a day. That's in addition to what the world is using today; and if that occurs and we don't increase our domestic supply, we don't have a board big enough to show where that red line is going to climb to in terms of gas prices.

It is absolutely critical. That's why I'm so proud. I'm on the Natural Resources Committee. We passed out of there a matter of a number of weeks ago not one but three pieces of legislation. Last week, the House passed out of the House of Representatives H.R. 1229, Putting the Gulf Back to Work Act. This week we're going to be working on H.R. 1230, Restoring American Offshore Leasing Act, and that will make a difference.

Now, critics will say, oh, well, it would be a year or more until you produce one barrel of oil once we pass that act, and that is true because it takes awhile to get that rig set up and get it produced, but we only have to look back to 2008 when President Bush and this Congress finally lifted the Outer Continental Shelf ban moratorium, and on the day that that was lifted and Congress lifted that and we gave the approval to go ahead with issuing permits again, on the day they voted on it, the price of gas in 2008 was four-something a gallon. The very next day it was two-something a gallon.

It makes a difference. It communicates that America is willing to use its own resources, that America is not going to be dependent on the Middle East, on Libya, and on Saudi Arabia, on places that are so volatile today that we don't know if there's a revolution or demonstrations or riots or terrorism that we're not going to have access to that 30 percent of our energy resources that we use today.

The best predictor of future performance is past performance. So we know if the Senate does the right thing and passes these acts that we're going to have and will pass out of the House of Representatives and the President signs it, gas prices will come down; but, unfortunately, the best predictor of future performance is past performance, and under this administration, they're going to continue to limit and eliminate our Americans' access to the domestic resources that we have right here in this country.

Mr. CARTER. The great surge in the cost of gasoline that we were just talking about, that surge was the result of basically two things. You named one of them. The other one was they had a small fire in an Illinois refinery, but the speculators look and they say, we're fighting capacity shutdown and we have a limited refining capacity because we haven't built a major refinery in this country in 25 years.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Right.

Mr. CARTER. Because of the burdensome rules we've come up with and the fact that we can't permit them. So they look at refining capacity and they look at the other issue, and they say, wait a minute, if there's not a shortage now, there's going to be, and they run the price up. Then when that opens up, hey, the market gets back to normal again, and every time that happens the driving public of America suffers. They're suffering today, and they're suffering on top of the highest unemployment, longest period of high unemployment in modern times just about.

This is one of those what we call kitchen-table issues, when the family gathers around the kitchen table to figure out how they're going to make the budget work especially if Mom or Dad are laid off. One of the things they're looking at is the cost of that fuel, fuel to heat their homes or cool their homes. Down where we come from, we want it cool. They look to see how much it's going to cost them to get to and from school, to and from work, how they're going to conserve energy, maybe they're going to car pool. They're making these kinds of decisions, and yet the government seems to be making these gigantic decisions to shut off supply and then wonder why we have an energy crisis in this country.

This is not rocket science. This is the law of supply and demand. We have the biggest demand. If we can't meet our demand, we've got to go to foreign oil. If there's a fight in Libya, we may not use much of that foreign oil right now, but somebody else does; and if it's at risk, then they are going into another market to get their oil and that makes our market go up. It's all worldwide market in our oil and gas.

I don't understand why people think they're gouging you. They're making excessive profits, and I understand the payment on CEOs and I am not defending any payment on CEOs in any industry. It's not just the oil industry that pays big bucks for CEOs; but if you look at the history of the oil and gas industry, their percentage on investment is lower than most average manufacturing facilities, somewhere between 6 and 8 percent return on their investment. And you say what investments? Well, I think I said earlier, those offshore drilling rigs that drill in the Gulf of Mexico and now have all been moved off the coast of Africa, Indonesia and off the coast of Brazil, those rigs cost $1 billion, and they can cost you operational-wise in a 24-day period almost $1 million to operate. They are expensive. And if you hit nothing but dust when you get down to the bottom of that well, you have blown a whole lot of money out the door, and that's just lost. Then you drill the next well to try to get it back. We've gotten better at looking for it and finding it, but it's still a gambler's business when you get down to it.

But this is caused by the government to a great extent. You can't create an environment of uncertainty in any market, I don't care what the market is. If you create the idea of uncertainty, it affects the market. It also affects the psyche of the people, and that's kind of what I don't think they're getting.

So their solution is to tax it. If it moves, tax it. The problem with that is do you really think the CEO of Exxon is going to pay the taxes if we increase taxes on the oil and gas industry? No. You and I are going to pay those taxes when we fill up our tank. If you go and ask the question, they will tell you at your local filling station. They used to publish it in Texas on the pump how much of a gallon of gasoline was taxed. It's a whole bunch. Direct and indirect tax make up a large amount of the cost of gasoline, always have, and I come from a time where we used to have 19 cents a gallon gasoline in Texas. Try that on for size. I could go buy a dollar's worth of gas and drive all week.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

I think a point in terms of the profits that oil companies make, it really is what most industries, whether it's a manufacturer or service industry, make right around 6 to 8 percent; but yet you have to answer who is benefiting from that. I would find it hard to believe that there's not a lot of Americans that benefit from that because their pension programs are investing in the portfolios they may have. Their pensions are investing in those types of companies and benefiting from that 6 to 8 percent margin that these companies are delivering.

Those who will speak against using oil, they say, well, we don't have enough. We use so much, but we only have 2 percent of the proven reserves. Here's the facts. Frankly, when they define proven reserves, they just look at conventional. They don't look at unconventional. They don't consider shale gas. They don't consider shale oil. They just look at conventional reserves. Then they really don't look at probable.

□ 2110

For probable, there is 10 to 20 times that much available in terms of probable. And then when you get the estimate, there is enough oil out there to really, I think, meet the needs of this country for as long as we need to. Now, I'm not saying forever because I think at some point, there will be a new energy source that comes along. It may be generations until we get that. It may be hydrogen-fueled cars. I don't know what it is, but we are going to have that kind of new science in the future. But we have plenty of oil to meet our needs right now.

In terms of natural gas, what we know now from all the reserves in Texas and Pennsylvania and the Outer Continental Shelf and, frankly, throughout the West, we have at least 200 years of natural gas, and that's just what we know about. And the unknown is—but it's pretty consistent—is that the technology gets better and better

and better. It's only with the advent about 60 years ago of the development of horizontal drilling that we have been able to really access the full potential that we are getting now on natural gas. I know that the engineers and the scientists out there are looking at new and better ways to get out more of this resource that God has really blessed us with as a country.

I think we really do need an energy policy in this country, and it ought to be one that is centered around the full use of and access to domestic energy resources. We ought to be doing the research too, obviously, for new development. And energy efficiency is important as well, whether it's transportation or heating or electricity or appliances being more energy efficient with it. But those three things alone, all centered on domestic use of energy resources, that's the kind of energy policy this country needs.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, I agree with you 100 percent. It's the same thing when we took over this House floor 3 years ago in the dark because they turned out the lights on us, turned off the mics, and we talked for about 2 or 3 weeks on, what we want is all of the above. We are for every energy resource that is available, but we want that energy resource to be as available as possible to be competitive in the market. I mean, everybody's got their own little bailiwick. And corn farmers love ethanol, but it's got to compete. Sun has to compete. Wind has to compete.

They invariably call us oil and gas guys ''anti-wind people.'' Wrong. Texas has the largest wind farm in the United States. There's no State with more of those wind turbines than the State of Texas because out in the West, the wind blows all the time. It's like a gold mine for wind. What do you think Boone Pickens is talking about when he's talking about all that wind energy out there? And his idea of putting natural gas-burning cars on the road is a good idea. I support it. Because when we hear that now with the discovery of shale gas and the ability—we just started to tap it. It is just a small part of the future.

By the way, it would be real interesting to find out if some of our colleagues that are so opposed to natural gas, if they knocked on his door and said, Sir, we would like to talk to you about making a lease for a share of the profits on drilling for natural gas on your property. And I wonder if they would say, Oh, no. I wouldn't take that, those hundreds of thousands of dollars that I might make from you developing that resource. No, I don't believe in that stuff. I don't think so. Whenever you produce wealth, wealth enhances a nation. And your natural resources are a part of the wealth of the Nation, always have been and, my friend, they always will be.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I just want to come back to the point you talked about in terms of ethanol, wind, solar. It could be anything. Anytime that you take a new energy to commercial level, commercialize it, but you do it artificially, you do it with subsidies, you use taxpayer dollars to sustain it in the market, that's just wrong. And it's not real. If something is ready for prime time, if it is ready to be commercialized, it will stand on its own. It will create a market that people want to come and buy it and use it. So as we look forward to an energy policy, I think we need to be very careful about what we artificially commercialize, what we subsidize.

Natural gas is real. Oil is real. Both of them will stand on their own. It doesn't need subsidies in order to provide energy for folks. It will do it in a way that is market proven. But there are other markets out there—and you've named a couple of them—that if we take away those subsidies today, they would collapse. They wouldn't exist. So, frankly, I think that's a disservice to the American taxpayers.

Why are we commercializing energy resources? You know, I do believe in research; and that's where our focus should be, as opposed to prematurely commercializing something that doesn't stand on its own. I have a lot of appreciation for the national energy labs in this country. They are scientists. They don't have an agenda. They are just looking for that new energy source, and they are very credible in what they do. And that's where our emphasis should be, not prematurely commercializing energies that are unsustainable. We really should make sure we invest in research and development.

Mr. CARTER. Within the last 3 years, I have met two different individuals—one of them very recently—who have a scientific plan to refine garbage at your garbage dump, solid waste, normal throw-it-in-your-garbage-can stuff, go out there and, through a multiple process, produce gasoline and capture all the CO_2 to be used—in Texas we take CO_2, put it back down in the ground in old wells, and reenergize those wells to bring more oil to the surface. And the leftovers, after this burning process to create the gasoline, refine the gasoline out of garbage, leaves an ash that is good to plow into fields in certain parts of the country to refurbish the fields.

That's the kind of thinking we want. That's great. That's a good idea. And because we're talking energy and we're having energy policy, those good ideas come to the fore. That's what we want. That's how we're going to solve this problem. But we're not going to solve it by shutting down what we have now in hopes that there is going to be this miraculous overnight discovery that's just going to make everything great, like we find some kryptonite or something, and it runs the whole country. Wrong. It ain't going to happen.

This is a frustrating time for those of us that are in energy-producing States because we have people that literally don't like the production of energy, but they complain about the production of energy. They want to tax it.

By the way, the majors, the big boys, they don't get subsidies on their stuff. That's for wildcatters. They drilled, but most of their production is overseas. And we, to some extent, by having bad energy policy in the United States, we have driven people to the benefit of other people in the world. Nobody thought about drilling off the coast of Australia or drilling off the coast of Indonesia, which is a very unstable volcanic area over there, until they were kind of pushed out of American waters. And then they started looking in places like the North Sea, off the coast of Africa, Nigeria, Indonesia; and these are now major production fields. They've benefited from our lack of foresight under some administrations to continue to enhance our native industry. More power to them. That's good for them. But we have it here too.

I still think there is plenty of oil in Alaska and lots of it. And they haven't even started looking for natural gas up there. They probably have got as much natural gas as anybody. There's an international thing going on; most people don't even know about it. I learned it from the Coast Guard. Because of the receding ice from the North Pole—and I won't get off into global warming here today, if that's it—whatever it is, because it's receding, there is now a waterway. There is now a northwest passage across the top of North America. You can sail from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Also, if that water stays open, you can drill for natural resources there. The unclaimed international water gets claimed by who puts the most activity in that water. And one of the questions is, the Russians are pouring in ships and trawlers and other things into that whole area up there, the part we claim is so much. The Canadians claim so much. But there is a lot more that seems to be developing. And why are they after it? It's not for fish, my friend. It's oil and gas.

I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for joining me.

□ 2120

DISPELLING THE POLITICAL FOLKLORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I actually didn't intend to do this this evening, but I got so frustrated with a number of the things I've been watching, both on television and from our brothers and sisters in this body, it became time to actually bring some of the slides we actually do in our town halls back in Arizona. I like to refer to it as a combination of truth on the

numbers and also dispelling some of the political folklore that is rampant, both in this town.

I'm going to say a number of things this evening that I promise you will offend all sorts of Members, all sorts of this Washington, D.C. But, look, I'm a freshman. I've been here 140-some days, and Washington, D.C., has systemically not told the truth to the American people. I don't know if they're fearful of looking the American people in the eyes and saying, Look, here's what we've done to your future, your kids' future, your grandkids' future is so scary that they don't get reelected.

Well, I got elected to come here and do the numbers, and so my goal is very, very simple. The numbers are straight up. The numbers come from 2010 on a lot of the charts, so we know exactly what was actually spent. On a number of charts outside that, we're also going to use the President's numbers.

But let's run through this. We were just watching Judge CARTER a couple of minutes ago walk through some of the economic impacts of what happens with drilling. I'm going to even touch, through this, on the folklore of, well, let's go tax Big Oil and what it actually produces.

First of all, the slide right next to me, this one we put together just to make it simple and visual. Imagine a country that borrows 42 pennies, 42 pennies out of every dollar we spend. We all know that's not sustainable. We can't do this. You couldn't do it in your family budget. Think of it. Over the last couple of years, it's been tough out there. Your family, my family, we all cinched our belts. The American families got tough and did what was necessary.

What did the Congress do? What did this government do? What did Washington, D.C., do? They just kept spending. But the way they spent is they found people who were willing to buy U.S. sovereign debt, and they kept borrowing. And today we now borrow 42 cents out of every dollar.

Now, why is that so terrifying? Well, it's terrifying because you start to realize the speed the debt is growing, and then you start to understand some of the other drivers in that debt.

One of the things that happened January 1 this year, you know, what was the big change? Baby boomers. Every 8 seconds, someone turns 65 in this country for the next 18 years. So think of that. Ten thousand a day for the next 18 years.

That's why you see many of us around here saying we need to tell the truth how devastatingly ugly these numbers are, and that if we step up and deal with it now, we can fix it. But you can't deal with it with a bunch of silly rhetoric.

So let's walk through some more of these slides.

Right here is the 2010, and you see this blue. The blue is, we'll call it mandatory spending, entitlements, Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest on the debt. But look, when you step up, when you step up to what is functionally four budget years from now, because we just did the 2012 budget, looking at 2016, you start to realize the growth in the spending, the growth in the entitlements. One of the things that keeps not being shared with the American people is, when you look at our 2010, and the 2011 number here would be out a little bit further, we don't take in enough revenue today to even cover the mandatory spending. If you see our revenue line, it cuts through right about here.

So think of that. Every dime of defense is borrowed. Every single dime of discretionary is borrowed. And we're about $100 billion short on even covering the entitlements, the mandatory spending. We borrow a little piece of those dollars that go into the entitlements, and it continues to explode in the future years.

I know these are a lot of slides, but when we get down to the ending part, I think you're going to find some of them sort of fun. But we first have to walk through sort of an understanding of the pie chart.

This is 2010. 2010, the mandatory spending was sitting about 63 percent, 62 percent of all the spending in government. Defense Department, other discretionary. And when I said ''all the spending in government,'' understand things like Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac aren't even part of this. They're off the books on this.

Now, when you look at this line here, that blue, look how fast it starts to move up. In 2016, it goes from here, where we're about 63 percent, and now we hit 72 percent. Think of that.

We just did what? The 2012 budget. 2016, four budget cycles from now, the mandatory spending, the entitlements are consuming 72 percent of our budget. The amazing thing is, in that cycle, the money that is going to discretionary, actually, we predict to go down in those 4 years.

So you start to understand the mandatory is consuming what we are. You get folks who start to raise their hands at some of the town halls and say, well, why not just raise the marginal tax rates? Let's go out and tax everyone a little bit more.

There's some fascinating math on that, and we've got 60 years of history looking at it. This is one of my favorite charts. For someone that wants to follow this, you can actually go—and I have a tough last name—it's Schweikert.house.gov. You'll see these charts on there.

This is when we had very high marginal tax rates back in the forties, fifties, early sixties, very high marginal tax rates. Over here is where we have very low marginal tax rates. And there's this normalizing effect. There's actually a couple of Ph.D.s who've written very detailed papers on this normalizing effect. Or even during times of very high marginal tax rates and very low marginal tax rates, guess what happens? We take in about 18.2 percent of gross domestic product.

I don't know. Maybe in the math out there, maybe in the logic out there, maybe in the human nature there, when you tax people a lot, they find other ways to take their income. Maybe when you tax them low, they are willing to work more hours. But somehow, high marginal tax rates, low marginal tax rates, we basically take in the same percentage of gross domestic product, of GDP. It hits that 18.2 percent.

So when folks look at you in the eye and say, oh, just raise marginal tax rates—we're going to tax the rich more; we're going to tax everyone more—it doesn't do it. It doesn't take care of this massive debt that is consuming us as a people.

What you have to do is you have to grow that line, which is the size of the economy. You must grow this economy. Because as you start to look through these numbers, you come to the realization, yeah, we have a huge spending problem. But we can never cut enough. We have to grow, because it's two sides of this pendulum, and both of them have to be in motion. We have to grow, we have to cut the spending, and we have to deal with the reality that the mandatory spending, the entitlements, are eating us alive.

□ 2130

Let's actually start to walk on some of what I would like to refer to as political folklore.

When we hold many of our town halls back in my district, and I am blessed to represent Arizona's Fifth District. It is an amazingly wonderful place. It is Scottsdale and Tempe, Fountain Hills, Ahwatukee, and Mesa, and we will often get hands that will pop up in the back of the room and say, ''Mr. SCHWEIKERT, or DAVID, why don't we do this. If we go out there and tax Big Oil, we could balance the budget. Right?''

They mean well. I believe the participants at our town halls really mean well when they raise that hand, because they have seen members of this body tell them that, and they haven't been told the truth.

When you look at the numbers, here is 2011, hard dollars. You can call them subsidies, you can call them depletion allowances, you can call them incentives to drill and produce more petroleum products, but the gray here is fossil fuels. And just for comparison, we also put the $8.72 billion of the subsidies that go into green energy. But for the fun of it, let's just talk about this part right here, the $2.44 billion that is in 2011.

Well, think about this. If you are borrowing about $4.7 billion every single day, how can a Member of Congress look in the camera, look at you, and say, ''Well, if we would just tax Big Oil more, maybe that would help solve the debt problem?'' It doesn't even make a drop in the bucket.

We can have a little fun with this, because I have been trying to find a way

to talk about big numbers. I was blessed in my previous life; I lived in a world of big numbers. But how do you visualize $1 trillion? How do you visualize $1 billion? How do you visualize $1 million for many people? So we have been playing with the idea of, Let's make it time.

So your government right now is borrowing about $4.7 billion every single day, every single day. So let's just think about it, $4.7 billion every single day. Those taxes on Big Oil—let's make it this. Let's make it taxes on all. Let's just remove those depletion allowances, those tax credits, which are also tied to depreciation that all other businesses get. But let's just wipe them all out. Guess what it buys you? It buys you about 2.2 minutes of borrowing a day.

Now, how many of you feel like you have been told that?

You know, once again, we are engaging often around this place in political theater instead of math. That's been one of my greatest frustrations in my short time here: I wish I saw more Members carrying around their financial calculators so they could look the American people in the eye and tell them the truth.

But think about that. The whole, we will call it, fossil fuels subsidies, tax credits, depreciation allowances, incentives to drill would buy you about 2.2 minutes a day. Oh, come on. And that's just assuming that every dollar came in, and you didn't slow the economy down and didn't slow energy drilling down or energy production down. So this is just throwing your hands up and saying, let's just pretend for a moment that we got rid of those, and it becomes pure income.

Let's actually go to the next level, because there's always that other person that raises their hands and says, ''Well, DAVID, I have heard that if we would go out and we would tax the rich more.'' Remember, that lame duck Congress last December extended what a lot of folks call the Bush tax cuts. Now, around here we often call them the Bush-Obama tax cuts because President Obama is the one who signed them in December. But they extended those tax cuts. And weren't those tax cuts for the rich, and wouldn't that balance the budget?

Well, back to that small problem called math. Let's pretend for a moment that they hadn't happened, and let's pretend that it didn't slow down the economy, and let's pretend every dime that some folks have predicted came in. A lot of this place operates in a fantasy world. Why can't we? So we never had the tax extensions that happened in December. What would it buy you? Well, we once again borrow $4.7 billion every single day. It would buy you about 28 minutes. Think of that, 28 minutes.

So now I'm at my town hall. I've had two hands go up. The first one saying, ''Well, DAVID, if we would tax Big Oil, then that would balance the budget.'' Well, what did we learn on the last slide? That was about 2.2 minutes of borrowing every day.

And then the other hand goes up saying, ''If we would tax the rich more.'' As a matter of fact, why don't we do in this slide that tax extenders never happened, so everyone, rich, poor, middle class didn't get the benefit of that extension of the tax cuts last December? Well, guess what. That buys you 28 minutes.

So think about it. We are doing really well here. We are up to 28 minutes plus 2.2 minutes. So now, let's see, what if we do this, because there's always the other hand that goes up and says, ''DAVID, I bet you we could balance the budget and wouldn't have this debt and deficit if we did this: We tax Big Oil. And those Bush-Obama tax extenders that happened last December in the lame duck session, we never had that, because those help the rich. Oh, and by the way, if we had never had the wars, you know, if we didn't have Afghanistan, if we didn't have Iraq—and I believe actually in our number here it didn't even have Libya—we could balance the budget then. Couldn't we?''

So we actually, literally a couple hours ago, sat down and said, Let's add it up, and let's make it on a per hour basis so the American people can understand the crazy spending that's going on around this place and how fast the numbers are eroding on us.

Back again to our math: We borrow $4.7 billion every single day. And let's go back to our pretend world. Every dime of those oil subsidies and depreciation allowances and tax credits come in, and it doesn't actually slow down jobs or the economy and every dime of those taxes were to come in. Even though probably if you did that, you would slow down the economy and people would work less and you would have less dollars. But we are living in our fantasy world here. And because we didn't have the wars, none of that money would be going out the door, even though certain portions of that are actually already built into the defense budget. But every dime that is equated to Iraq, Afghanistan, and now Libya.

What would it buy us? Well, we are borrowing that $4.7 billion a day. Guess what? It buys you 3 hours of borrowing.

Think about what you have heard around here, and how many people you have seen walk up in front of a microphone and a camera look you in the eye and say, ''Well, if we did these things, we wouldn't have this debt?'' They are not telling you the truth. All those together are only 3 hours of borrowing.

And, let's see. If I remember correctly, there's like, what, 24 hours in a day? I'm looking for some honest discussion about the other 21 hours a day. You've got to go back to those first boards that I put up and have an honest discussion about entitlements, about the mandatory spending, because they are what are exploding on us. They are what are consuming us as a people.

We can do this. We can save the future for our kids and our grandkids. We can make sure that these programs exist. But we have to do it rationally, and we have to for once do it honestly, fact-based, maybe someone actually holding a calculator. Because the rhetoric around here, the political folklore around here, when they are willing to look you in the eyes and base their whole world on something that only buys you 3 hours of borrowing a day, you are not being told the truth.

We try to add literally two to four slides a week. We are engaging in a little project. We are a freshman office, but we have some very smart young people who are very good with their calculators, and we are trying very hard to find a way to make these gigantic numbers digestible so we can all understand them so we can have a rational conversation of how we save our country.

If you will go to Schweikert.house.gov, you are going to find a number of these slides. As a matter of fact, all of them are on there, and every week, I promise you, there are going to be more coming. And maybe if we all start to tell each other the truth about the math, we can actually tell the truth about how we are going to save the country.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 11, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1480. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Etoxazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0063; FRL-8867-5] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1481. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Escherichia coli O157:H7

Specific Bacteriophages; Temporary Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0274; FRL-8868-4] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1482. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Agency, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Glyphosate (N-(phosphonomethyl)glycine; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0988; FRL-8866-8] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1483. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's ''Major'' final rule — Truth in Lending [Regulations Z; Docket No. R-1393] (RIN No.: 7100-AD55) received April 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1484. A letter from the Director, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updating Regulations Issued Under the Fair Labor Standards Act (RIN: 1215-AB13, 1235-AA00) received April 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1485. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicaid Program; Federal Funding for Medicaid Eligibility Determination and Enrollment Activities [CMS-2346-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ53) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1486. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Oil and Hazardous Substance Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List: Deletion of the Speigelberg Landfill Superfund Site [EPA-HQ-SFUND-1983-0002; FRL-9291-6] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1487. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Stage I Vapor Recovery Rule [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0545; FRL 9295-1] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1488. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Divison, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0998; FRL-9295-3] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1489. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: Florida; Prevention of Significant Deterioration [EPA-R04-OAR-2006-0130-201111(a); FRL-9293-4] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1490. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan; Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0743; FRL-9279-1] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1491. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0139; FRL-9292-9] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1492. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Substantial Inadequacy of Implementation Plan; Call for Utah State Implementation Plan Revision [EPA-R08-OAR-2010-0909; FRL-9294-9] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1493. A letter from the Deputy Chief, CGB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Structure and Practices of the Video Relay Service Program [CG Docket No.: 10-51] received April 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1494. 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. (Decatur, Illinois) [MB Docket No.: 10-264] received April 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1495. A letter from the Deputy Chief, CGB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010, Section 105, Relay Services for the Deaf-Blind Individuals [CG Docket No.: 10-210] received April 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1496. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Improving Public Safety Communications in the 800 MHz Band New 800 MHz Band Plan for Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands [WT Docket 02-55] received April 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1497. A letter from the Assistant Chief, Broadband Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Fixed and Mobile Services in the Mobile Satellite Service Bands at 1525-1559 MHz and 1626.5-1660.5 MHz, 1610-1626.5 MHz and 2483.5-2500 MHz, and 2000-2020 MHz and 2180-2200 MHz [ET Docket No.: 10-142] received April 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1498. A letter from the Division Chief, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Review of the Emergency Alert System [EB Docket No.: 04-296] recieved April 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1499. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of Additional Changes from the Annual Review of the Entity List; Removal of Person Based on Removal Request [Docket No.: 110222154-1181-01] (RIN: 0694-AF13) received April 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1500. A letter from the Financial Assistance Program Manager, Office of Aquisition and Property Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Department of the Interior Implementation of OMB Guidance on Drug-Free Workplace Requirements (RIN: 1093-AA12) received April 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1501. A letter from the General Counsel, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting the Conferences's final rule — Disclosure of Records or Information received April 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1502. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reorganization of Regulations on Control of Employment of Aliens [EOIR No. 166F; AG Order No. 3260-2011] (RIN: 1125-AA64) received April 10, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1503. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Krewe of Charleston Mardi Gras Boat Parade, Charleston Harbor, Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2010-1151] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1504. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Ninth Coast Guard District Sector Realignment; Northern Lake Michigan and Lake Huron [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0929] (RIN: 1625-ZA29) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1505. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Havasu Landing Regatta, Colorado River, Lake Havasu Landing, California [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0018] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1506. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Duluth Ship Canal, Duluth-Superior Harbor, MN [Docket No.: USCG-2010-1030] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1507. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; Cruise Ships, Port of San Diego, California [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0038] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1508. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Mavericks Surf Competition, Half Moon Bay, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2010-1093] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1509. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Patriot Challenge Kayak Race, Ashley River, Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0039] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1510. A letter from the Commander, US Coast Guard, Deputy CG-0943, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Great Lakes Pilotage: 2011 Annual Review and Adjustment

[Docket No.: USCG-2010-0517] (RIN: 1625-AB48) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1511. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Recurring Events in Northern New England [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0110] (RIN: 1625-AA08; AA00) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1512. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Hydroplane Races within the Captain of the Port Puget Sound Area of Responsibility [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0996] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1513. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Dredging Operations; Delaware River, Marcus Hook, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0127] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1514. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Miami International Triathlon, Bayfront Park, Miami, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0010] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1515. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Hudson River South of the Troy Locks, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0794] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1516. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Buffalo Bayou, mile 4.3, Houston, Harris County, TX [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0100] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1517. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inflatable Personal Flotation Devices [USCG-2011-0076] (RIN: 1625-AB60) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1518. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — General Regulations Governing U.S. Securities; Sale and Issue of Marketable Book-Entry Treasury Bills, Notes, and Bonds (Department of the Treasury Circular, Public Debt Series No. 1-93); Regulations Governing Book-Entry Treasury Bonds, Notes and Bonds Held in Treasury/Reserve Automated Debt Entry System (TRADES) and Legacy Treasury Direct; Regulations Governing Securities Held in TreasuryDirect received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1519. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare Program; Inpatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System — Update for Rate Year Beginning July 1, 2011 (RY 2012) [CMS-1346-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ23) received May 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

1520. A letter from the Regulation Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare Program; Hospital Inpatient Value-Based Purchasing Program [CMS-3239-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ55) received May 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REED: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 257. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–74). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CRAVAACK (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 1801. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for expedited security screenings for members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 1802. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the volume cap for private activity bonds shall not apply to bonds for facilities for the furnishing of water and sewage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 1803. A bill to amend the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to improve truck parking facilities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 1804. A bill to prohibit discrimination in State taxation of multichannel video programming distribution services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1805. A bill to extend the sunset of certain provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. GUINTA:

H.R. 1806. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that Bluefin tuna may not be treated as an endangered species or threatened species; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1807. A bill to provide for the sale of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and acquisition of refined petroleum product, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ALTMIRE (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1808. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out programs to develop and demonstrate 2 small modular nuclear reactor designs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 1809. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to ensure health care coverage value and transparency for dental benefits under group health plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1810. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to encourage research and carry out an educational campaign with respect to pulmonary hypertension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 1811. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for employment and reemployment rights for certain individuals ordered to full-time National Guard duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 1812. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to establish a small business growth pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 1813. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny tax benefits to large oil companies and distribute the amounts raised to licensed drivers in order to provide relief from high gas prices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H.R. 1814. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny certain tax benefits to persons responsible for an oil spill if such person commits certain additional violations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WEST, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BACA, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 1815. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Lena Horne in recognition of her achievements and contributions to American culture and the civil rights movement; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 1816. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for AmeriCorps educational awards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 1817. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for the development of State statistical literacy plans and to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants for statistics-related teacher professional development and the improvement of statistics education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 1818. A bill to designate Mt. Andrea Lawrence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 1819. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide for State management of population segments of gray wolves in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1820. A bill to fight criminal gangs; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Financial Services, 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. PLATTS (for himself and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 1821. A bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FORBES, Mr. JONES, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 1822. A bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for appropriate procedures under such title for verification of citizenship status; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1823. A bill to modernize, shorten, and simplify the Federal criminal code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 1824. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to make modifications with respect to the board of directors of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.J. Res. 57. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States allowing the States to call a limited convention solely for the purposes of considering whether to propose a specific amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. LONG):

H. Res. 255. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that effective sharing of passenger information from inbound international flight manifests is a crucial component of our national security and that the Department of Homeland Security must maintain the information sharing standards required under the 2007 Passenger Name Record Agreement between the United States and the European Union; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. BARTLETT):

H. Res. 256. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of May 8, 2011, through May 14, 2011, as Williams Syndrome Awareness Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARNAHAN (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SHULER, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H. Res. 258. A resolution honoring and supporting women in the Middle East and North Africa for their bravery and leadership and calling on the United States Government and the international community to recognize their vital role in democracy movements and promote the rights and empowerment of women and girls in the region; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H. Res. 259. A resolution recognizing Chief Master Sergeant Donald G. Robinson, Jr., for his service in the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H. Res. 260. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H. Res. 261. A resolution expressing commitment to the objectives of the Program of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H. Res. 262. A resolution supporting efforts to raise awareness, improve education, and encourage research and treatment of the psychosocial needs of children, adolescents, and young adults diagnosed with a childhood cancer and their families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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. CRAVAACK:

H.R. 1801.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 1802.

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 United States Constitution.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 1803.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1,

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1804.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1805.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 1806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution which allows the Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 1808.

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. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado:

H.R. 1811.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 1812.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:
H.R. 1813.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1
By Mr. ENGEL:
H.R. 1814.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:
Article I, Section 1;
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1;
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.
By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:
H.R. 1815.
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 and Clause 3 of Section 8 in Article 1 relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce.
By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:
H.R. 1816.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and as further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.
By Mr. LOEBSACK:
H.R. 1817.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution which grants Congress the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States.
By Mr. MCKEON:
H.R. 1818.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.
By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:
H.R. 1819.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Constitutional authority for this legislation is found in the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution.
By Mr. PALLONE:
H.R. 1820.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
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. PLATTS:
H.R. 1821.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States) and clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce) and clause 18 (relating to laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution of the foregoing powers).
By Mr. ROHRABACHER:
H.R. 1822.
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. SENSENBRENNER:
H.R. 1823.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and the First, Second, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Eighth Amendments to the United States Constitution.
By Mr. WOLF:
H.R. 1824.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, as found in Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. CULBERSON:
H.J. Res. 57.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article. V
The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 5: Mr. LANDRY.
H.R. 23: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 27: Mr. SABLAN and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 44: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 49: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 50: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 85: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 104: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 139: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WU, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FARR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. CHU, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 140: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 142: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 178: Mr. OLSON and Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 186: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 190: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 191: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 198: Ms. MOORE and Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.
H.R. 238: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 328: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 365: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 420: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 422: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 432: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 440: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 452: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. LANDRY, and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 457: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 459: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. COLE, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 466: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 511: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 530: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 567: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 575: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 589: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 607: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MICA, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 613: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 631: Mr. RUSH, Mr. MORAN, Ms. CHU, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 640: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 674: Mr. ISSA, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 676: Mr. CLAY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 679: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 683: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 689: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 704: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 718: Mr. BARROW, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HOLT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 721: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 743: Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 749: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 750: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 780: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 798: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 802: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 812: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 820: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 822: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. HURT.
H.R. 831: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 835: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 838: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 854: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 870: Ms. MOORE and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 876: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 883: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 894: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, and Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 905: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 938: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 941: Mr. CRITZ, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 942: Mr. TIBERI and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 959: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 965: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 972: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 987: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 990: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 991: Mr. BOREN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
H.R. 992: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 999: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1000: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1002: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WEST, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 1004: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1016: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1017: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1031: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1041: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 1044: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1048: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1057: Mr. SCHOCK, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1058: Mr. PETERS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BOREN, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 1074: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1085: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1089: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1106: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1149: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1159: Mr. PAUL, Mr. HALL, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1161: Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 1187: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 1206: Mr. TERRY, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1259: Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 1262: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1278: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1284: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1338: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1340: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1342: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 1351: Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WU, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1386: Mr. TERRY, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1388: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1391: Mr. BERG, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. COBLE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 1397: Mr. KIND and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1399: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1402: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1406: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 1407: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1412: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1418: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1419: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1421: Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 1425: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1426: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1439: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1444: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1466: Mr. BACA and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1475: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 1477: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1484: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1498: Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 1500: Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 1515: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MORAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 1530: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1533: Mr. GRIMM, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1538: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1547: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 1558: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 1571: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 1574: Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WU, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1579: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. POLIS, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1585: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1587: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1588: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 1591: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 1609: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. REED, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1619: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1620: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 1621: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ISSA, and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 1637: Mr. QUAYLE.
H.R. 1639: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 1649: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1681: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1683: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. REED.
H.R. 1686: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1689: Mr. LYNCH and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1700: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 1705: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1715: Mr. LONG and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1716: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 1723: Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 1735: Mr. OLVER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1744: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1748: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1755: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1774: Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 1775: Mr. REHBERG and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1788: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1791: Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. MICA.
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. RIVERA and Mr. STIVERS.
H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 20: Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H. Res. 25: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. TIPTON.
H. Res. 111: Mr. OLVER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. BUERKLE.
H. Res. 137: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KIND, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H. Res. 157: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. OLVER.
H. Res. 165: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Res. 177: Mr. MORAN and Ms. LEE of California.
H. Res. 198: Ms. CHU.
H. Res. 227: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. UPTON.
H. Res. 228: Mr. LONG and Ms. JENKINS.
H. Res. 234: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. FARR.
H. Res. 239: Mr. SCHOCK.
H. Res. 241: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. KING of New York.
H. Res. 244: Mr. WEINER and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H. Res. 254: Mr. LAMBORN.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative HASTINGS of Washington or a designee, to H.R. 1231, the Reversing President Obama's offshore Moratorium Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 1380: Mr. PEARCE.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 10, 2011 No. 63

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, Your kingdom is above all earthly kingdoms.

Empower the Members of this body with the wisdom, courage, and strength needed for our times. Infuse them with a passion to act in ways that honor Your Name. Preserve their health and strength by Your mercy and power, and may they find Your grace sufficient for every need.

Lord, bless also the citizens of this great land. Give them the wisdom to pray for our governmental leaders so that all people may live quiet and peaceful lives in all goodness and holiness.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN 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 10, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. SHAHEEN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m. today. The majority will control the first 30 minutes and the Republicans will control the next 30 minutes. The Senate will recess from 12:30 until 2:15 today for our weekly caucus meetings.

We are working to set up the debate and vote on the nomination of Edward Chen to be a district judge from the State of California. Senators will be notified when that vote is going to be scheduled.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

SOLVING CHALLENGES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, later today the President is expected to speak in El Paso about our Nation's immigration policy. Getting immigration policy right is one of the more difficult challenges we face as a nation, and Republicans are committed to meeting it. As with most serious challenges, however, the only way we will make progress is by working on a solution that is acceptable to both parties. For Republicans, that means the President will have to present a plan that takes amnesty off the table and focuses instead on making a real commitment to border and internal security. If the President does these two things, he will find strong bipartisan support. If he doesn't, he won't.

Another difficult challenge we are solving only by working together is bringing down the Nation's debt. To that end, Members of both parties met with the Vice President last week at Blair House. The participants had what all sides agreed was a productive meeting, and they will meet again this afternoon. Unfortunately, there still seems to be a serious disconnect between the two parties on this issue. There are still those on the other side who think we can put off difficult decisions until after the next Presidential election or even beyond. Republicans strongly disagree. In our view, doing nothing about the debt would be far more dangerous in the long run than failing to raise the debt ceiling. I have said this before, and Speaker BOEHNER reiterated the point yesterday in New York. The warning bells are simply too loud to ignore this crisis any longer, and the debt limit debate presents us with a prime opportunity for meaningful, positive action.

If the last financial crisis taught us anything, it is that we can't afford to play with fire when it comes to economic forces this great. We need to get serious now before the crisis we know

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

is coming. That means entitlement reform needs to be on the table. This is a serious crisis. We must do something serious. Entitlement reform needs to be a part of it. That is the only way we will send a message to the world that we are actually willing to make the tough decisions needed to get our fiscal house in order. That is the only way the markets, the American people, and the rest of the world—especially those who hold so much of our debt—will believe we are on the right track.

As we prepare for a second round of talks, I would renew the call to get serious about this looming crisis and do something serious. I renew my pledge this morning to do what it takes to make sure we avert it without raising taxes or building in automatic tax increases in the future which would only destroy jobs. We can avert this crisis without doing harm to the economy or slowing down any economic recovery. That means no tax hikes now, and it means not rewarding the failure of a future Congress with automatic access to more taxpayer dollars. Above all, it means serious reforms. We need to summon the courage to make some tough decisions right now.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. REID. Madam President, briefly, first to comment on immigration reform, we have spent a great deal of time on the Senate floor the last two Congresses dealing with immigration reform. We worked hard in coming up with a solution, and we have a solution. We were working with President Bush toward coming up with a solution to immigration reform. The problem was that even President Bush—even President Bush—could not get his Republican colleagues to join with us in doing something about immigration reform.

Our immigration system is broken, and it needs to be fixed. But it is so important that the President in El Paso today talks about the need for immigration reform because he knows and we all know, as even President Bush knew, that immigration reform is necessary. The problem is that we can't get Republicans here in the Senate to help us. It is quite simple.

We know we have to do something about border security. We have done a lot in that regard. Have we done enough? No. There is more that can be done, but we have done a lot in that direction, and rightfully so. Just within the last year or so, we provided $650 billion for more border security. That was on a bipartisan basis. We passed that. That was important.

We also have to do something about our guest worker program. At any one given time, we have thousands and thousands of guest workers here. Why? Because it is necessary, and it has been for a long time. Take the Chesapeake Bay. We have learned that we have people who come in—seasonal workers—who can do the work on the clams and the stuff on the great Chesapeake Bay. We have about 1.5 million agricultural workers in our country, and we have a system that doesn't work even for them. We have to do this. Our agricultural industry depends on it.

We also have in our country today 11 million people who are undocumented. There isn't anybody with an ounce of common sense who thinks we can deport 11 million people. We can't do it fiscally, and we can't do it physically. Therefore, we should do something about the 11 million people who are here. How should we do that? Put them on a pathway to legalization. It doesn't mean amnesty. It means that they would pay penalties and fines, that they would go to the back of the line, not the front of the line. They would have to learn English. They would have to stay out of trouble. They would have to pay taxes. There are certain things they would be required to do.

Finally, we have to do something about the unworkable employer sanction provision that was put into the 1986 law. It hasn't worked. Prior to that time, the burden was on the government to make sure people who came to work throughout America were legal. We shifted that responsibility to employers. They can't do that. It is a catch-22 now. The way the law is set up now simply doesn't work. We have, since 1986, computerization which has taken over much of the world, and through that we can work toward having an employer sanction program in our country that will work.

My point is that President Obama should be commended for talking about immigration reform. It is necessary.

My friend the Republican leader should also understand that we have tried, and for our Republican people to talk about immigration reform and not vote accordingly is something the people of America have witnessed now for many years.

OIL COMPANY SUBSIDIES

Mr. REID. Madam President, saving money requires a lot of very difficult choices: Which programs do we cut in these tough times? Which priorities are more important than others? As we have seen in the Senate and across the country over the last few months, a lot of people have a lot of different answers to these questions.

Democrats believe we have to get our spending under control, and we have to look at what needs to be cut. But we need to have a fair program, one that looks at what we are going to do long term with the equities of our spending programs. We have to look at what we do with revenues to make sure they are fair and balanced. So there are a lot of choices.

My friend, the Speaker of the House, gave a speech last night in New York. He talked about raising the debt limit and some of the things he thinks would be necessary in order to get that done. But I would direct the attention of my friend, the Speaker, to one way it would go very quickly to solving some of these problems. We know there is waste in the Federal budget and the Tax Code, but what I want to direct the attention of my friend, the Speaker, to is these five big oil companies.

We, as taxpayers, are giving billions and billions of dollars every year to these companies—billions every year. Every cent of it is taxpayer money to oil companies that already are more than successful.

These oil companies made $36 billion in profits during the first quarter of this year. I repeat that: $36 billion in profits during the first quarter of this year. ExxonMobil alone made 70 percent more this year than they did last year. Exxon holds the record for making more than any corporation in the history of our country in years past. These oil companies, I repeat, made $36 billion in the first quarter.

The industry's $36 billion in quarterly profits means they are making about $12 billion a month or $4 billion a week, and yet the U.S. Government is giving these companies billions of dollars in corporate welfare every year. That is unnecessary. Why are taxpayers on the hook for oil companies that are doing just fine on their own?

If we are serious about reducing the deficit, what an easy place to start, I say to my friend, the Speaker of the House of Representatives. It is a no-brainer. Let's use these savings from these taxpayer giveaways to drive down the deficit, not drive up the profits of oil companies.

We need to make one thing very clear: Wasteful subsidies have nothing to do with gas prices. These oil handouts have existed for decades. Prices have continued to rise. Oil executives' paychecks have also continued to rise.

In the State of Alaska they are paying $8 or $9 a gallon for gasoline. In the State of California, there are places where you pay as much as $5 a gallon for gasoline. Here at an Exxon station along the waterfront, I looked out the other day, and the gas prices there were within a few cents of being $5 a gallon. That is in our Nation's Capital. So that money Americans are paying at the pump is not related to those subsidies I have talked about, but those profits are proof enough they do not need them. The companies do not need those subsidies. Even big oil CEOs, such as the head of Shell, and Republicans in Congress—even my friend, the Speaker—have said on occasion these subsidies are not necessary.

Some of our conservative colleagues have a hard time stomaching giving a hand to those who need it the most. But we should all agree—in the interest of fairness, common sense, and saving taxpayer money—that we cannot continue with this corporate welfare to those big oil companies that need it the least. That is a good place to start.

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 for debate only until 5 p.m., 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 majority controlling the first 30 minutes and the Republicans controlling the next 30 minutes.

The Senator from Illinois.

OIL COMPANY SUBSIDIES

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise in support of the comments made by the majority leader. I was in Chicago over the weekend, and downstate as well in Illinois, and saw these gasoline prices and understand the hardship they cause. At a BP filling station in Chicago near Lawrence and Lake Shore Drive, I ran into a man who is a plumber who has a van and goes from job to job. He said it is not unusual now for him to spend over $100 a week on gasoline. Of course, that is taking away money he could have brought home for his family. It is a real hardship on him.

He kind of smiled and chuckled and said: They do it to us every year, don't they.

That is true, Madam President. Whether we are talking about the situation in New Hampshire or Illinois, we can predict the rights of spring in America: the opening of the baseball season, Easter egg hunts, Seder dinners for Passover, and skyrocketing gasoline prices.

Then there are the excuses. There is always an excuse: Oh, we had to switch from winter to summer. We didn't see that coming. Oh, there is a problem in the Middle East. Whatever it is, any excuse will do, and the gasoline prices go up.

We can do something about it, and we should. The majority leader is right. We accept the challenge of Speaker JOHN BOEHNER who said in New York: Let's make a serious effort to deal with this deficit. Well, we have a great downpayment: $21 billion we can take off the deficit. We can take it away from a group that does not need it. We are talking about the oil companies that are registering record profits—$36 billion. If we decide to take away the subsidies that are now being given to these extremely profitable companies, it will save taxpayers $21 billion over 10 years.

Let's get started there. That ought to be the easy part because right now we know what is going on. We are paying for these high gasoline prices three times: First, when we fill up our tanks. Oh, they hit us hard there—$60, $80, $100 just to fill up the tank. Second, because we are giving $4 billion a year in subsidies to the oil companies, taxpayers are being hit again. It is not just what we pay at the gas pump, it is what we pay on April 15. Part of that is going to the oil companies.

But there is a third hit. Do you know where we get the money to pay the subsidies to the oil companies? We borrow it from China—the largest creditor of the United States. We are borrowing 40 cents for every $1 we spend. So out of the $4 billion we are talking about that is going annually to these oil companies, 40 percent of it—about $1.6 billion—is being borrowed every single year from countries such as China. So the third way we pay is, ultimately, on the debt to China and the interest on that debt.

Can we afford that? At a time when Americans are sacrificing, can't we ask the oil companies, with record profits, to sacrifice their Federal subsidies? That is all we are trying to do. I know Senator SCHUMER from New York is going to take the floor momentarily and talk about this issue. We will have a bill on the Senate floor. For those Members on both sides of the aisle who have given impassioned speeches about reducing the deficit, here is their chance. It is a put-up-or-shut-up moment. If we believe in reducing the deficit, here is $21 billion of low-hanging fruit. Let's pick it. Let's pick it for the taxpayers. Let's take these savings and put it right on deficit reduction. I hope that is something on which both sides of the aisle can agree.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, let me say a word very quickly about the President's speech today in El Paso.

I have said on the Senate floor many times, because it is a source of pride to me, I am a first generation American. One hundred years ago, my mother was brought to this country as an infant, 2 years of age. My grandmother brought her over from Lithuania, and they landed in Baltimore in 1911—100 years ago. How they made it—the four of them, at that point: my aunt, uncle, grandmother, and mother—how they made it from Baltimore to East St. Louis, IL, I do not have a clue because I am sure they did not speak but a handful of words in English.

They made it like other immigrants made it: because they were determined to come to this country. They were prepared to leave everything behind in their lives—their homes, their churches, their relatives, their friends, their languages, their cultures—and come to this great Nation and take the risk, the risk of opportunity. Think about that story and multiply it millions of times, and that is the story of America.

The people who hate immigration are turning their back on the heart and essence of this great Nation. We are an immigrant nation of people of extraordinary courage who picked up and moved and said: We are going to try our best in a new place with a new language. When most of them arrived—I am sure it was the case with many who were on the boat with my mom—there were folks standing on the shoreline saying: No, not more of those people. Don't we have enough of them? They don't speak our language. They don't look like us. They don't dress like us. They eat funny food. They hang out with one another. We don't need more of those people.

For as long as immigrants have been coming to these shores, there have been people standing on the shores saying: Please, pull up the ladder. We don't need any more of those folks. But we do. We need them not only because they work hard, we need them because they have a spirit and a determination which makes us a different nation.

The DNA each of us shares from those immigrant parents and grandparents gives us a drive and a determination to make this a better nation. When we close the doors to immigration—orderly, legal immigration—we are closing the doors of opportunity in this country.

The President will speak to immigration today. He has been a loyal friend of mine for a long time. He was a cosponsor of the DREAM Act, which I introduced 10 years ago, and I would not be surprised if he brought it up today in El Paso. He did last week in the White House. I know he is committed, as I am, to make sure children who were brought to the United States as infants and youngsters, who had no voice in the decision to come here, who have lived a good life here, worked hard and went to school, said the Pledge of Allegiance every morning in the classroom and know no other flag but the U.S. flag, children who want to become tomorrow's adults and tomorrow's leaders deserve a chance. The DREAM Act will give them that chance. They can choose to enlist in our military and become citizens of the United States, or they can choose to complete college, at least 2 years of it, and find a path to citizenship. That is reasonable, it is compassionate, and it is fair. I hope as part of immigration reform we include it.

I plead with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Do not turn your back on America's heritage. Do not turn your back on fairness and compassion. Join us in real immigration reform. Join us in passing the DREAM Act.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, I commend my colleague and friend from Illinois for his outstanding remarks on both subjects, the deficit and on immigration. I am here to talk about the deficit, but I will just touch on immigration.

People are saying, well, why is the President going to El Paso when we

have not made enough progress on immigration? They bring up a point, but the President's point is the right one. He is bringing the message to the country on why we need real immigration reform.

I think there is one point on which 100 Members of this Chamber would agree: our present immigration system is broken, badly broken. We turn away lots of people who should be here. We also do not have a rational system for who should come here, and America is the lesser for it. As the Senator from Illinois pointed out, immigration is part of our proud heritage, and immigrants help America.

One of the reasons we are doing a lot better than Europe is we have welcomed new people into this country, and we integrate them and say: As quickly as you can, become Americans. We all came from somewhere else originally.

Now, I am still very hopeful that as the President sets the table and let's America know how important this is, we can get bipartisan immigration reform done in this Chamber, on the floor of the Senate, and even over in the House. It is hard, no question, but I believe, first, to get comprehensive reform we need bipartisan support. That is obvious. But, secondly, that people see enough need to do it that we can actually get it done, particularly if the President goes around the country, as he is beginning to do today in El Paso and as he has done in the past, and talks about the need for immigration reform, setting the table so we can actually get something real done.

THE DEFICIT

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, let me speak to the issue I came here to speak about, which is the deficit.

Speaker BOEHNER was in my hometown of New York City last night, and he talked about how important it is to get a handle on this deficit. On that issue, my colleagues on this side of the aisle and I certainly have no problem. Neither does President Obama. The President has proposed $4 trillion in cuts—a huge amount of cutting, $4 trillion—to close the deficit both on the spending side and the tax side. So anyone who thinks one side wants to cut the deficit and the other does not has not looked at the facts. But, obviously, we have to come together.

If each side sticks to its own position, nothing will happen. There should be one obvious place where Speaker BOEHNER and his colleagues can show some goodwill; that is, on these subsidies to big oil. No one can defend them—no one. Oil companies are making record profits. Gas prices are at an all-time or close to an all-time high, and we, the taxpayers, are continuing to subsidize the five big oil companies.

You could not write a more ridiculous scenario. Senator MENENDEZ, along with Senators BROWN and MCCASKILL, later today will introduce legislation that our side agrees with, which will say take all that money and put it to deficit reduction. There are some who would have preferred to put the money into encouraging independence from particularly foreign oil. But because the deficit is such a huge problem and because we might have a dispute with our friends on the other side as to where the money ought to go, everybody can agree it would be worthwhile to take a little bit of the burden off of the taxpayers, have the oil companies pay their fair share, and stop these ridiculous tax breaks and subsidies to the five big oil companies.

So I ask Speaker BOEHNER to show some good faith. Some on his side have already said these subsidies don't belong. They were created at a time when oil was $17 a barrel, when we worried about production here. Oil was hovering at just over $100 a barrel again yesterday. You don't have to worry about their desire to explore. They are looking every place they can. They don't have to have a subsidy to do it.

Some might argue: What about the small and middle-size companies? Many of us believe they too should not get the tax breaks. But this bill Senator MENENDEZ will be introducing shortly doesn't even touch them—just the five big oil companies and just the tax breaks they now get. Why not? It is a perfect way to start this debate and show some good will.

Democrats have agreed to cuts—lots of cuts. People on the other side of the aisle can show some agreement on revenues. This area of revenues, which almost nobody can dispute, should not be there. So the time to repeal these giveaways is now. We would most prefer to do it in a bipartisan way. Speaker BOEHNER, and those on his side of the aisle, can show some good faith that they are not dug in and saying that only my way will lead to the kind of scenario that many tremble at, which is the debt ceiling not being approved.

We on this side of the aisle don't believe that should happen. Many on the other side have said they don't. The first good step that could be taken on the other side to show little give is to eliminate these big tax subsidies to big oil. I urge my colleagues to support it. I urge Speaker BOEHNER to pivot on his speech from yesterday and support this proposal. It would create a great deal of good will and put us in the direction of reducing the deficit that we all so much want to do.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, it has been called to my attention that there are some people who are trying to respond to the fact that we have such high prices of gasoline at the pumps in a totally unrealistic way, in a way that is class warfare, in a way that doesn't make any sense to anyone, when we have a solution to this problem we have been talking about for a long period of time.

There are some who are trying to say we are going to have to do something about the subsidies that are given to oil companies, about what they have been doing over the years, and all of a sudden they are the ones who are responsible for the high price of gas at the pumps.

A CRS report was requested by my colleague, LISA MURKOWSKI, that grew out of frustration with the Democrats' refrain that "America has only 3 percent of the global oil reserves." Therefore, under this view, more drilling and production at home is futile. As President Obama has said many times, "with 3 percent of the world's oil reserves, the U.S. cannot drill its way to energy security."

Well, it can, because it is not 3 percent. A CRS report came out later and showed—and this is something people don't want to believe, but it is out there and it is a fact—the United States of America has the largest recoverable reserves of oil, gas, and coal of any country in the world—more than China, Saudi Arabia, or anyone else. Our problem is a political one—this administration. It goes down Democratic and Republican lines. The Democrats put 83 percent of America's Federal lands off limits to drilling. Of course, that is fine for the administration, because they have made some statements, which I will read in a minute, to demonstrate clearly that they want to increase the price of gas at the pumps.

On the idea that you can do this through regulation and through trying to further tax the oil industry, CRS stated that tax changes outlined in the President's budget proposal—I am quoting from CRS, which everyone knows is completely nonpartisan—"would make oil and natural gas more expensive for U.S. consumers and likely increase foreign dependence."

I was very proud of a couple of Democrats—the only two who were outspoken. Senator LANDRIEU, from Louisiana, said:

> The administration has put forward draconian taxes on the oil and gas industry. . . . It seems very contrary to our stated goal of being more energy sufficient in the United States. Taxing this domestic industry will instead cut jobs and increase our dependence on foreign oil. So I want you to deliver that message again to the administration. We have bipartisan opposition to increasing taxes on this industry.

Senator MARK BEGICH from Alaska said:

[The President's proposal] would cost thousands of jobs in Alaska and across the country. Energy companies are among the businesses investing and creating jobs at a time when our country needs both. I will fight any measure to end these incentives.

It should be obvious that without these two Democrats coming in—I appreciate the fact they did. We are not going to be able to reduce the price of oil at the pumps by further taxing the oil and gas industry. It is ludicrous to even think that anyone would suggest we could increase taxes on the oil industry and gas industry and somehow we are going to have energy more available and are going to reduce the cost of gas at the pump.

There is a way of doing this that I think is so simple. There is not a person in this country—certainly no one who serves in this body—who, back during his or her elementary education, did not learn about supply and demand. Here we are in the United States of America sitting on more gas and oil than any other country in the world, and we are the only country that does not exploit its own natural resources. We are the only country. If we did, we would be completely independent from the Middle East. We would not have to go outside this continent to supply our needs.

People say: If you do that, you start developing. Then it is going to take a long time. It is going to be maybe 8 or 10 years. That would be fine. They were saying that 8 or 10 years ago, and we could have done it then. That is not quite true because the economists have said that if we announce we are going to areas where we are not exploiting our resources—I am talking about the gulf, the east coast, the west coast, the North Slope in ANWR, Alaska. I am talking about the public lands where 83 percent of our public lands are off limits for drilling. If we were to announce today that we were going to open drilling and exploration and production in the United States of America, that price would drop tomorrow. It would drop immediately because people would know we are going to use our own resources.

I hate to say this, but somebody has to say it. We have an administration that is so wrapped up in saying that one of these days, we are going to have to have all this green energy, and they themselves are on record saying they want to increase the price of oil and gas.

Let's look at what happened.

Alan Krueger with the Department of Treasury said:

The administration believes that it is no longer sufficient to address our nation's energy needs by finding more fossil fuels.

The Obama Treasury Department said:

To the extent the lower tax rate encourages overproduction of oil and gas, it is detrimental to long-term energy security.

Therefore, we want to do away with oil and gas.

Here is the best one. President Obama's Energy Secretary, Steven Chu, said:

Somehow we have to figure out how to boost the price of gasoline to the levels in Europe.

We have an administration that wants to increase the price of gasoline at the pumps to be comparable to Europe, which is between $7.50 and $8 a gallon. Obviously, people know this is true. It was not long ago that President Obama gave his energy speech. In his energy speech, he said there is all this abundance of clean gas we can use. Then at the end of the speech he said: But we have some problems in getting the gas out of the ground. He is talking about natural gas in this case, not about oil. I happened to give a response on one of the TV stations. He said he wants natural gas. At the same time, he says he wants to end hydraulic fracturing.

Let me tell my colleagues about hydraulic fracturing. Hydraulic fracturing started in the State of Oklahoma, my State, in 1948. It is a way of pumping fluids and water primarily into these tight formations. These tight formations mostly are down about 1 mile to 2 to 3 miles under the surface. That will allow them to go in and get the gas. We have enough natural gas to take care of our needs for the next 100 years; we just need to use these systems. If we do away with hydraulic fracturing, then that means we are not going to be able to get any of the natural gas. We cannot produce 1 cubic foot of natural gas without using hydraulic fracturing. What did we find out last week? Secretary Chu is going to be in charge of a study to see how dangerous hydraulic fracturing is. This is the same guy who said that somehow we have to figure out how to boost the price of gasoline to the levels in Europe.

I will only say this. We actually have three problems. We have the problem of, we have this abundance of resources we are not going after, and hydraulic fracturing. Then keep in mind that what we get, we have to refine. That is where the EPA comes in.

I have stood at this podium for 9 years talking about the problems we have with cap and trade, the fact that we can't have a cap-and-trade system that is going to have the effect of costing the American people—the estimates are between $300 billion and $400 billion a year. That is supposedly for greenhouse gases.

We had the Kyoto treaty back in the nineties, and then they tried seven different times on the Senate floor to pass legislation that would have the same type of cap and trade we would have had if we had become a party to and ratified the Kyoto treaty. The problem with that is, even if there are people out there—and there are. A very large percentage of the people in America, some 40 percent, believe that somehow greenhouse gases are causing catastrophic global warming. Even if that were true, which it is not, but if it were true, it does not make any difference what we do in the United States of America.

I admire the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Lisa Jackson, who was appointed by President Obama. Yes, she is way off in the leftwing. She is liberal and all of that. When you ask her a direct question, she gives an honest answer. She gave honest answers. I asked a question—I think at that time it was the Markey bill. It was one of the cap-and-trade bills. I said: In the event we were to pass a cap-and-trade bill in the United States, would that reduce emissions? Her response was, no, it will not, because that would only affect the United States of America.

That is not where the problem is. The problem is in India, Mexico, and China. Right now, China is cranking out two coal-fired generating plants every week. It is going to continue there. In fact, one could argue that it would even be more expensive or more polluting—if one calls CO_2 a pollution—because our jobs would go to places such as China where they do have this problem. They do not have any emissions control.

We have the problem of refining the gas once we get it. I see my good friend is on the floor and is going to be speaking perhaps to the same issue. I only want to mention one thing. With regard to the cap-and-trade agenda, since they are not able to get it passed, they are trying to do it through the Environmental Protection Agency through regulations.

Lion Oil, based in El Dorado, AR, recently testified before the House Energy and Commerce Committee that it commenced a $2 million expansion of its El Dorado refinery in 2007, with 2,000 construction jobs, but its completion has since been stalled. As Lion Oil vice president Steve Cousins explained:

The uncertainty and the potentiality of prohibitive costs associated with possible cap-and-trade legislation and EPA's greenhouse gas regulations were a critical factor leading us to delay the completion of the expansion.

What I am saying is, if we are—and I believe we are—going to break down this barrier and overcome this mentality that we should not be developing our own resources, then we also have to have a way of refining it. We can do it. It is within our reach. We can bring down the price of oil and gas and certainly gasoline at the pump by tomorrow. If we were to announce we were going to stop being the only country in the world that does not exploit its own resources, if we go after the oil and gas that is available in the gulf, the east coast, west coast, our public lands, as well as the North Slope of Alaska, we could be independent from any dependency on the Middle East. I believe the American people understand that point. It goes right back to our elementary school education. It is supply and demand. We have the supply in the United States of America. We have to open up that supply so we can use it, and obviously that would lower the price of gas at the pumps.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Oklahoma for his leadership on the Environment and Public Works Committee. I am pleased to be back on that committee with him. I share very much the substance of his views about the need to produce more oil and gas. It keeps money in the United States, creates jobs in the United States, and creates tax revenues for the United States. Offshore oil and gas in our gulf produces billions of dollars for States and the Federal Government. Why we would want to produce oil and gas off Brazil and not produce it off our shore I do not know. I thank my colleague.

THE BUDGET

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I wish to make a few remarks about the budget circumstances in which we find ourselves.

Yesterday, we learned that the President has scheduled two summit meetings on the budget this week. The President will meet with Senate Democrats on Wednesday and Republicans on Thursday. By calling this summit, it would seem the President has effectively canceled this week's planned unveiling of a Democratic Senate budget in the Senate Budget Committee that was planned earlier. First it was going to be Monday, then Tuesday, then Wednesday. It looks as if maybe it will not be held this week at all. It might be that Senator CONRAD could do that, but somehow, with this event occurring, he may not.

Regardless of this new discussion period, it is my expectation and belief that the American people should be given a Senate budget plan so it can be examined and we can know what is in it and see what it is about. The American public deserves to know where our elected leaders stand.

I hate to say that we have gone 700-plus days without a budget for the United States of America during a time of the greatest debt increase we have ever faced. We will have doubled the debt of the United States, I believe, by next year in 4 years. We will add $13 trillion to the debt over the 10 years presented by President Obama's budget that he sent to us in February.

There have been all kinds of discussions and talks and a lot of speeches. The President created a fiscal commission. They came forward with a serious proposal that was worthy of real insight and study. They spent a lot of time on it. It did not go far enough, in my opinion, to reduce our surging growth in spending, but it was intellectually honest, and it offered us some very real suggestions about how we could do better.

Then we started hearing that after the President's budget was submitted and it was received very badly—in fact, it was not helpful at all but actually made the debt trajectory we are on worse. We had a gang of six Senators who tried to work together to establish a budget plan that might work for us. They met in secret and had ideas. I was interested in what they had to say, but somehow that seems to have gone on the back burner.

Then we had Vice President BIDEN. He is going to lead a discussion with House and Senate Republicans and Democrats, and he is going to work out something.

Now, just yesterday, we heard that the President is going to have another meeting at the White House and talk to us. I hope it is not like the one to which he invited the House Budget Committee chairman, PAUL RYAN, and criticized him, sitting right there in front of him, for producing what I think is a historic budget that would put us on a sound path if followed.

Here we are. We have not gotten a plan or a commitment as to what this administration intends to advocate for. They submitted their budget. It was alleged to have reduced the deficit by $2 trillion, but when the Congressional Budget Office, our objective analyst, took the document they submitted and studied it in detail, they concluded it would add $2.7 trillion. In other words, it would create more debt over the next 10 years by $2.7 trillion than was projected to accrue without the budget. That is not what financial experts are telling us, that is not what economists and professors are telling us we need to do. It is unacceptable.

That budget was criticized, and we hadn't heard much about it since. Well, the President, for a week or so, tried to propose that it would have us live within our means and help pay down the debt. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the lowest deficit in 10 years would be over $700 billion, and the President said this was going to have us living within our means? Apparently, desiring to back off that, the President made a speech and he said he is now going to save $4 trillion.

Well, the budget staff—I am ranking Republican on the Budget Committee—looked at what he said in the speech and noticed a couple of things. We noticed the President had moved the budget period from 10 years to 12 years, and that made the numbers look a lot better compared to a 10-year savings plan. If we save a little each year and we go 12 years, it looks better than 10, when everybody was talking about 10. It is kind of a little gimmick, you see, to make the numbers look better. Then they incorrectly took credit for every dollar that was saved when the Republicans in the House negotiated with the Senate on the CR and reduced spending about $75 billion a year below what the President had asked for. They took credit for that. That was about $800 billion of the savings.

The net result is, it was not any different than the budget plan he had proposed, except it took credit for the House reduction in spending.

I have to say, the House Republicans—PAUL RYAN—stood and faced the American people and revealed in advance the core of their plan. I attended one press conference in which PAUL RYAN announced the budget he was moving forward with. He had a series of press briefings. He basically said: This is my plan and I am ready to hear any exceptions you have to it, I am prepared to answer your questions, and I am prepared to defend what it is we have done. It was an honest, direct, and responsible approach.

The Ryan budget dealt with the long-term financial threats to America as well as the immediate. The numbers he proposed get us to the point where we can certainly say we are not on the same debt trajectory that put us in such great risk. I believe it is probably the most serious effort I have seen, in the 14 years I have been in the Senate, to address the significant fiscal challenges we face.

We face not only a short-term problem, but we face a long-term, systemic problem. We have an aging population—people drawing more Social Security for longer periods and Medicare for longer periods. We have other entitlement programs. We have been spending extraordinarily. So all that has to be a part of our discussion about how to put this country on a sound path. Senator CONRAD, our Democratic chairman, has done a good job in calling good witnesses. Every expert who has testified before the Budget Committee has told us the truth about the grim circumstances we find ourselves in. They have told us: If you don't act, we could have a debt crisis. They have told us the debt we have already accrued, and which continues to increase, is right now pulling down our economy; that our growth is not what it would be had we not incurred this much debt.

It is uncontroversial that this much debt slows down the economy. When I asked Treasury Secretary Geithner, he agreed with the Rogoff-Reinhart study that says when debt reaches 90 percent of GDP it pulls down economic growth 1 percent. Secretary Geithner said: Yes, that is an excellent study, and I would add one more thing. He said: When we get that much debt, we run the risk of having a debt crisis that could throw us back into some sort of recession or financial problem such as we have had. That was President Obama's Secretary of the Treasury. We know we have a serious problem. We need to do something about it.

The President submitted a budget that has basically been rejected. I can't imagine the Senate would bring it forward as the Senate Democratic budget. The House of Representatives, in accordance with the law and the timeframes of the Budget Act, has produced a budget, showed it publicly before they voted on it, and has defended it since. We haven't had one in the Senate. The Senate, by law, should have produced its budget and started its markup 6 weeks ago. The law says we

are supposed to have passed a budget by April 15—tax day. We haven't even begun to mark it up.

People are attempting, politically, to explain. The Democratic spinmasters are attempting to explain what it is all about. Why are we doing these things? Why hasn't a real budget been produced? They say Republicans are divided. They say: Oh, tea party people and Republicans are all divided. The Republican House has passed a budget. Where is the Democratic Senate? Who is divided? Why can't they produce a document? Why do we have to have the Vice President and the President having meetings and the President giving speeches? Why don't we see a real budget that the American people can see in advance and be able to evaluate and Senators standing, as we are paid to do, and casting votes for or against it? That is what we need to be doing.

I don't agree with the fact that the President is leading. I wish I could say that. Maybe he will surprise us on Thursday with something. I hope so. But I don't sense any leadership at all, because the budget he produced will not do the job. That is the only one we have in the Senate at this point. Indeed, Mr. Erskine Bowles, the man the President chose to head his fiscal commission, said the President's budget came nowhere near doing what is necessary. Actually, what he said was the President's budget goes nowhere near where they will have to go to resolve our fiscal nightmare.

I am wondering what is happening. The American people get it. They sent a message in the elections last November. They sent 64 new Members to the House of Representatives, and every single one of them promised to do something about reckless spending in Washington.

What about this budget the President has submitted to us? It is the only one we have in the Senate. The Senate Democratic leadership hasn't presented one. The President's budget called for a 10.5-percent increase in education, a 9.5-percent increase in energy, a 10.5-percent in the State Department's budget, and a 62-percent increase in the transportation budget. Well, we don't have the money. Forty cents of every $1 we spend is borrowed. That cannot be continued. We are on an unsustainable path. The American people know it. Every expert has told us. We know it. Where are our leaders in the Senate?

Senator CONRAD, apparently, made a presentation of his budget, and the Republicans have asked Senator CONRAD to present it to us 72 hours before the committee meets. He said he is not going to do that. He made a presentation to the Democratic conference and, apparently, it didn't go well. Senator CONRAD apparently proposed reducing spending more than they liked to hear. The Democratic leader, Senator REID, was sort of critical, actually. He said it was a nice bunch of charts. Obviously, he wasn't happy.

When are we going to see a budget? Are we going to go another 700 days? Are we not going to have a budget this year? The way things should work is like this: The Senate should come forward—the Democratic Senate, because they have the majority and we can pass a budget with a simple majority—and propose a budget that hopefully will get bipartisan support. If not, they stand and say what they believe in and how this budget reflects their vision for America. The House has done that. Then we go to conference committee. After it comes to the floor and is voted on, it goes to the conference committee and differences are worked out. Then it comes back and we have to vote on final passage of an agreed-upon budget.

We have to have a budget. It is time for this country to begin to reverse the reckless trend we are on because we are placing our Nation at risk. Mr. Bowles and Senator Alan Simpson, when they testified before the Budget Committee, warned us we have to do something significant. In the written statement they both signed, they said we are facing the most predictable economic crisis in our history. When asked when that could occur, Mr. Bowles said 2 years, maybe. Alan Simpson said: I think maybe 1. We are not talking about our grandchildren. I am talking about now.

What I would just say is, I think it is time for us to go back to regular order. We have tried a lot of different approaches to confront this crisis we face. It seems to me our leadership in the Senate is desperately seeking to avoid having to do what is responsible; that is, to stand and produce a budget. If they aren't prepared to stand before the American people and tell them how they think the country ought to be run and where the money ought to be spent and how much ought to be collected, then they are not leading, it seems to me.

I am very disappointed in the President's leadership. He has been roundly criticized because the only proposal he has sent to us is irresponsible. It in no way comes close, as Mr. Bowles said, to doing what is necessary to avoid our fiscal nightmare, and that is the path we are headed toward. It is not a matter of dispute. We will not reach 10, 15 years down the road spending like we are because we will have a catastrophe before then.

Alan Greenspan, the former head of the Federal Reserve, said he thought maybe some sort of compromise would be reached that would be good for the country. The only question, he said, was whether it would be before or after a debt crisis occurs. This was a few weeks ago that Alan Greenspan was saying this.

It is a challenge for us and a challenge for the leadership in this Senate to come before the American people and produce their plan and seek support on the floor of the Senate. Let's debate it. Let's have amendments offered. Let's go to conference, and somehow, some way hammer out a budget that will put this country on a better path. We have no other choice. It is the defining moment for this Congress. We have no higher duty than to confront the dangerous fiscal path we are on.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 today the Senate proceed to executive session and begin consideration of Executive Calendar No. 61, the nomination of Edward Chen of California to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of California under the previous order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, there will be 3 hours of debate on the Chen nomination beginning at 2:15 p.m. today. Senators can expect a rollcall vote on the Chen nomination at approximately 5:15 p.m. today.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas.

FLOODING AND FEMA

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I will speak in morning business for 10 minutes or less. Let me talk about a couple things this morning. First, I wish to talk about something my State has been going through since mid-March and has continued to the present day. We have been battered by tornadoes and high winds and now flooding. We see this in a photo that was taken a few days ago, late last week, of one of the areas in our State underwater. We have had many towns that have been evacuated, many counties have been declared disaster areas. In fact, the Corps of Engineers showed me a map on Friday when I met with them. They have a map that is a large overview that starts down near Dallas, TX, pretty much through all the State of Arkansas, then a little bit of Missouri and Tennessee and Illinois and even, I think, a little bit into Kentucky.

The folks in those areas in that oval have received six times the normal rainfall. When we have six times the normal rainfall, this is what we get. This is a photo where we can see the water is in the house and up on the front porch. These folks are underwater, similar to a lot of people in our State.

I will say this. The Governor of our State is doing all any Governor can do. He is doing a great job. Even though we have Interstate 40 underwater right now in one area where the White River goes under Interstate 40, they are trying very hard to get that open, maybe even today if the water will cooperate. We are seeing a lot of emergency response in our State, seeing neighbor helping neighbor, churches are rolling out, we have seen folks doing everything they can to make this work.

Also, I thank the Corps of Engineers. It is easy for us to beat up on the Corps

of Engineers sometimes, but the truth is probably 95 or more percent of the time they do things right. They do things the right way. If it weren't for the Corps of Engineers, a lot of east Arkansas would be underwater and maybe a lot more. The system they designed and built has worked. Even though this is a 100-year flood or even worse, it is working and it is saving billions of dollars in damages and hardship. I thank the Corps and I also thank FEMA. FEMA has been on the ground in Arkansas for 3 or 4 weeks now, probably, with different teams going around the State helping in different ways and they have been very helpful.

I wish to go to my second topic, and I wish to emphasize what we are seeing happening in the State right now is not impacted by what I am about to talk about. But I think this FEMA administration is still cleaning up some of the mess from the previous FEMA administration. A few years ago, we had another series of floods in our State. Now we are seeing FEMA trying to recoup that money against people in our State. Let me give a little background.

Three years ago, in an area around Mountain View, AR, the White River flooded. FEMA came and they actually went to a woman's house—I wish to talk about her and her husband. They went to this couple's house. They are on Social Security. They retired. FEMA assured them they would be eligible for assistance. FEMA took pictures. They verified the damage. They gave them the paperwork—even kind of coaxed them through some of the paperwork. They assured them repeatedly that they would qualify for some assistance from FEMA.

They did end up getting $27,000 for home repairs and that is exactly what they spent it for. They played by the rules. They filled out all the paperwork. FEMA was physically on their premises. They got the check, plowed it right back into the house, exactly like they said they would, and it helped them stay in their house.

Fast forward 3 years. We see FEMA writes them a letter, what I would call a demand letter, where they are requesting that they repay all this money, that they have 30 days to repay the balance of the debt they owe FEMA. This, of course, is a big shock to them because they were assured, repeatedly, that they had a legitimate claim. FEMA encouraged them to file this claim, they got the money, and they thought everything was great.

What has happened is, this couple, similar to many others in our State, built their home down on the river. They knew it could possibly flood one day. When they built it, they bought flood insurance. After years of paying the flood insurance, it never flooded. But after years of paying the flood insurance, the flood insurance company said they would not cover flood insurance anymore. They actually went to Lloyd's of London and paid for that for a number of years. Eventually, Lloyd's of London said: We are not doing flood insurance anymore. They desperately tried to find flood insurance and could never find it.

FEMA has a rule that in order for anyone to get flood insurance through the National Flood Insurance Program, the county or the city has to pass an ordinance. That is necessary in order for them, the people in the community, to get flood insurance. FEMA knew this particular county, Stone County, had not passed this ordnance. Nonetheless, they assured this couple, repeatedly, they were entitled to this money. So in a very real sense, these people and many others in our State are twice the victim. They are the victim of the storm and the flood, but then they are a victim of their government because their own government has injured them by the way they have handled all this—giving out the money and then demanding recoupment for the money 3 years after the fact, when they get the notice of debt.

FEMA, by the way, did not just send it out to this one couple; they sent it out to 35 families around the State. Three years later, when they get this notice of debt, they have no means to pay it back. These folks are on Social Security. In fact, they would not have qualified for the payment had they had substantial resources. So one of the ironies is, what we are doing is we are telling the poorer people they need to pay FEMA back. The poorer folks owe FEMA the most money. That is the way the program works.

I think if we had Director Fugate, who again I think is doing a good job running FEMA—if we had him here today, I don't know exactly what he would say about the situation, but I think he would say the statute ties his hands, and he doesn't have much flexibility under the statute. Whether he agrees with the hardship of the situation or the equity of the situation, he doesn't have a lot of leeway in trying to deal with this. I am offering a solution. I am offering it in the Homeland Security Committee this week. I hope Members of the Senate will look at my legislation. It is only four pages long. We are asking Congress to give FEMA some flexibility when it comes to the recoupment process and to allow leniency for some individuals under certain circumstances. I think our couple in Arkansas fits those circumstances exactly. Basically, they have played by the rules, they have done all they can do and they continue to play by the rules and do all they can do.

I filed a bill that is going to be in the Homeland Security Committee this week. I would love to have my colleagues look at it and support it, if they see fit. It does three things. No. 1, it says FEMA may waive a debt owed to the United States in cases where funds were distributed purely by FEMA error, which is the case here, because FEMA knew this particular county had not passed this ordinance. FEMA knew no one in this county was entitled to any assistance under this particular provision of the disaster relief law because the county had not passed the ordinance. FEMA knew that for the entire county. In fact, they have a list of every county—every ZIP Code in the country where people do not qualify. This woman of the couple from Arkansas was very clear about her location as she went through this process.

FEMA, whether they admit it—we can produce the documentation—FEMA was clearly in error in giving out this check, in assuring her she was entitled to it, and assisting her through this process. They were clearly in error. I think it is a case of the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing.

Again, I think this FEMA administration has cleaned up this problem. My guess is we will not see this type of problem in the future, especially not out of this FEMA administration.

The second thing it does is it says they have to waive a debt owed to the United States in cases where the rationale for recoupment was failure to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program. Again, what this will do is acknowledge that FEMA made some mistakes 3 years ago. It is kind of competence 101 that they would know which counties and which residents would be entitled to this particular relief, but somehow, some way, they dropped the ball. This would make it very clear, from 2005 to 2010—again, this is the limited duration of this bill, this is a relief bill to help a specific group of people—that because of FEMA's mistake and because the folks here could not participate in the flood insurance program, no matter how much they wanted to—and this particular couple did want to participate in the FEMA flood insurance program, they could not do it—this would basically say we cannot now punish them and come back on them for that money.

The third thing it does, it makes clear that Congress is not giving any waivers in cases of fraud or misrepresentation or false claims or anything of that nature. This is purely for mistakes and errors made by the Federal Government when the Federal Government is trying to come back in and recoup moneys they wrongly paid.

Let me run through a couple other things, and I will be glad to yield the floor in just a few minutes. These communities that have not passed this ordinance and, therefore, are not entitled to participate in the flood insurance program, they are called sanctioned communities. That is what FEMA calls them. They are called sanctioned communities. There was a lawsuit a few years ago that basically challenged FEMA's ability to do certain things. It is too long and involved to talk about, but the court found there are 168,000 cases. Mostly these go back to the hurricanes of Katrina, Rita, et cetera—the biggest bulk of them. Of the 168,000 cases that FEMA has to revisit and

maybe recoup some money from people, so far they have only done 5,000 of these cases. Out of the 5,000 cases they have reviewed, only 18 cases, 18 total out of 5,000—out of 5,500 cases—would be impacted by my bill.

So we are talking a very small percentage. We are talking three-tenths of 1 percent is what we are talking about here. This is a very tiny, very narrow exception. I am for recoupment as much as anybody. I think it is very important that the government do it right and do it right the first time. If there is some sort of fraud or some sort of misrepresentation, then the government absolutely should go after that money and try to recoup as much of that as possible.

What we are talking about here is in 99.7 percent of the cases they can pursue recoupment. But based on the numbers we have today, it is three-tenths of 1 percent of the time where the mistake is completely on FEMA's side of the equation, and we would say no, as a matter of fairness and as a matter of equity, then they cannot seek recoupment in these cases.

To me this is a matter of equity. This is a situation where this particular couple in Arkansas—and we have other couples, we have other families too—we know of a total of four in our State who fall into this category. So we only have four out of how ever many thousands have received FEMA payments over the years. But nonetheless, this is a matter of equity because if you look at this couple I am talking about here in Arkansas near Mountain View, they basically would never have done this. They would have made other arrangements 3 years ago.

I do not know if they would have gone to the bank. I do not know if they would have gotten a second mortgage. I do not know if they would have sold the property and moved out. I do not know. They do not want to think about it. Because this FEMA check actually allowed them to stay in their house.

Now they are coming back in a worse condition than they were before because FEMA says, you have 30 days to pay this back. The fact they have not paid it back yet and that they filed an appeal with FEMA to try to work this process to get some relief, which FEMA, apparently, very seldom if ever grants—the fact that they filed this paperwork means that they have a little extension on the principle load. But it is very clear from the correspondence from FEMA that now interest is accruing. So interest is accruing on these folks.

Again, I think they are in a worse situation today than they would been had FEMA said no 3 years ago as they should have done. To me this is a matter of equity. I think if we were in a court, you might use the word estoppel. I think the Federal Government should be estopped in this situation from pursuing this money, because there was detrimental reliance on the part of the family.

They did not ask for this. FEMA showed up at their house. FEMA took pictures. FEMA helped them fill out the paperwork. FEMA walked them through the process. They do exactly what they are supposed to do. They put it in the house. It saves their house and gives them the ability to stay there. And now 3 years later, they get a letter basically saying, notice of debt, you owe FEMA $27,000. Well, you can imagine, this is devastating for a family on Social Security who has very few other means. Again, if they qualified for this in the first place, you know they are not high-income folks. And $27,000 at this stage of life for them is a lot of money. It is a mountain that is too tall to climb.

What I would love for my colleagues to do is look at what we are going to offer in the committee. I hope you can support it. We will be glad to answer any questions if any of my colleagues want to talk about it today or in the hallways here in the Senate over the next couple of days as we are working through this.

I certainly want to thank Senator LIEBERMAN for allowing us to put it on the markup. I think folks around here rightly are in a recoupment mode. They want to recoup money that has been wrongly paid out. And, again, I am for that 100 percent. In fact, we had a hearing in one of the Homeland Security subcommittees the other day about recoupment. We have talked about this. This is very important that we stop the bleeding and the government not pay out more money than they should. But in this particular case, I think the principle of equity and fairness is certainly on the side of these folks who again, as I said, are twice the victims. They were first victimized by the storm, and second they are victimized by their own government.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL ENERGY POLICIES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced two bills on a subject of great importance—two different subjects—related to our national energy policy. The two bills were the Oil and Gas Facilitation Act of 2011. The second was the Outer Continental Shelf Reform Act of 2011.

Both of these bills are based on bipartisan, largely consensus work, that was done in the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources during the last Congress. I should note that these important issues are being addressed in separate bills very consciously and for a reason. In the past we have crafted comprehensive energy bills that attempted to address all of the energy policy issues of the day in a single piece of legislation. There are obvious advantages to that. But there are well-documented disadvantages as well. I wish to avoid those disadvantages this year in furtherance of completing our important work.

There is no disagreement in the Senate about the need to have robust and responsible domestic production of oil and gas. At the same time, there is probably considerable disagreement about how best to address that issue. We need to begin work on that. However, ensuring the safety and viability of our operations on the Outer Continental Shelf is a separate matter which deserves attention on its own. The question of how we undertake oil and gas exploration and production on the Outer Continental Shelf appropriately, in my view, stands apart from the question of where we undertake those activities.

I do not believe it would make sense to try to trade off safety or environmental protections against the issue of access, for example. I believe the Congress should set an appropriate level of safety and environmental compliance, regardless of where the oil and gas exploration and production is occurring.

I will also observe that there was much greater consensus on the need to reform the rules governing Outer Continental Shelf production in the last Congress than on other issues such as those related to access to particular areas. So conflating these separate issues in the one bill is not likely to be the best path to success in enacting a bill into public law. Accordingly, we have introduced two bills.

That is not to say we don't have a responsibility to address both issues. We do. I believe they should be addressed on parallel tracks and not in combination. I hope to be able to move forward in the committee with consideration of both of these bills later this month.

The first of the bills, the Oil and Gas Facilitation Act, is intended to enhance sufficient and appropriate domestic production of oil and gas and to limit the dependence of the United States on foreign sources of oil.

The last 2 years have been a time of real success in increasing our domestic production of both oil and gas and in reducing our reliance on imported oil. We are currently the third largest producer of oil in the world. The percentage of the oil we use that is imported has declined from 60 percent in 2008 to about 51.5 percent in 2009 and to about 49 percent in 2010. We want to be sure we continue this progress while protecting our other natural resources and our communities' health and safety.

This bill, the Oil and Gas Facilitation Act, addresses production issues in

a variety of ways. It requires a comprehensive inventory of the oil and natural gas under the waters of the Outer Continental Shelf to inform decisions about where leasing is likely to be most productive. To improve the efficiency of the permitting process for development on Federal lands and waters, permit coordination offices are reauthorized, and a new coordination office is established for the Alaska region of the Outer Continental Shelf.

Two provisions facilitate the transportation of Alaska's abundant oil and gas resources. The amount of Federal guarantee instruments is increased to support the construction of an Alaska natural gas pipeline and the Trans-Alaska oil pipeline system is exempted from certain requirements that unnecessarily slow the permitting process.

Coproduction of geothermal energy by existing oil and gas leaseholders is encouraged by making leases available for that purpose on a noncompetitive basis.

Finally, the bill will potentially contribute millions to the Federal Treasury by repealing the current law that requires the Secretary of the Interior to give relief from royalty payments to certain offshore oil and gas production. This bill would allow the Secretary to provide such relief in appropriate circumstances, but it would not require such relief. This avoids inappropriate giveaways of taxpayer-owned oil and gas resources to industry when it is unnecessary for us to maintain robust domestic production.

These provisions are drawn almost verbatim from S. 1462 which was reported by our committee on a bipartisan basis in the last Congress. The one significant change is that certain funding for the offshore oil and gas inventory provided by S. 1462 is redirected by the committee in subsequent legislation to be used for research on safety issues related to offshore oil and gas drilling. To avoid spending the same money twice, we have eliminated that funding here so it could be included in offshore safety legislation. At the same time, the bill retains the authorization of significant appropriations to be used for this oil and gas inventory.

The Outer Continental Shelf Reform Act is the other bill I am introducing. It is a verbatim reproduction of S. 3516 which was reported unanimously by our Energy Committee in the last Congress. Because of the widespread support for this bill, I have reintroduced it exactly as reported, since I believe it is a good place to begin our work this year. It will need a bit of updating as we move forward. A few of the provisions have largely been overtaken by events and we have learned from the President's Oil Spill Commission and others about some refinements we should make in this legislation.

I have been having discussions with Senator MURKOWSKI and others who supported last year's bill and I will continue those discussions as we move forward. I hope we will have the same strong bipartisan support for these efforts as we did last year when we reported this bill during the midst of the worst oilspill in our Nation's history. Our commitment to responsible operations in the gulf and protection of our citizens and communities should be well understood by all.

This bill is intended to respect those who lost their lives in the Deepwater Horizon accident and respect the people of the gulf who have suffered serious economic and emotional harm by doing what we can to create a better future for them. It is the particular responsibility of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to look at the future of the regulatory agency and the industry it regulates. As I said last year when we introduced this bill, our goal must be, of course, to prevent future disasters, but we can and must do more than that. Congress should create organizational resources and a set of requirements that will have safety and environmental protection and innovation at their core. We should require that both industry and agency employees have the expertise, the experience, and the commitment to quality that is necessary to handle the complex issues involved, and we should set principles in place to create a culture of excellence for the regulatory agency and for the industry that will be a model for the entire world.

Thus, this bill reforms the structure of the offices of the Department of the Interior dealing with offshore oil and gas leasing and development to avoid organizational conflicts of interest. It clarifies the breadth of the Department's responsibilities in managing the resources of the Outer Continental Shelf.

It increases the safety requirements for exploration and well drilling and production. It mandates use of best available technology, an evidentiary safety case, and a risk management system that identifies and addresses hazards in advance and manages for change. It provides for third-party review by qualified parties outside the agency of key equipment and well design.

It addresses the essential need for the Department of the Interior to have in-house research capacity on both the safety and the marine environment issues necessary for the exercise of its regulatory authority. Research departments in these areas will no longer be optional, but are required, and funding is redirected from other areas of research to ensure this will happen.

In order to ensure that the rules are enforced, the bill requires the collection of fees from industry to fully fund the necessary teams of inspectors. It provides for independent investigations of accidents and the sharing of data so that all can learn from mistakes. It also provides the Department of the Interior with adequate time to carry out necessary reviews and it makes the input of other Federal agencies occur in a transparent way. And it increases the civil and criminal penalties applicable to violations of the law and regulations.

I believe these policies and resources can set us on a new and constructive path toward managing the incredible natural resources we have on the Outer Continental Shelf. We must commit ourselves to the goal of excellence in this important endeavor. The fact that oil is no longer gushing into the Gulf of Mexico in no way diminishes the importance of this work.

Both of these bills address issues of great national importance. We will shortly be scheduling the necessary hearings and preparing these bills for committee consideration. If at all possible, we will do so before the Memorial Day recess. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and in the rest of the Senate on a bipartisan basis as we have in the past to address the vital issues presented by both of these bills.

Mr. President, 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. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:36 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. WEBB).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF EDWARD MILTON CHEN TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward Milton Chen, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 3 hours of debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. We are on the nomination; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in opposition to Magistrate Judge Chen, the President's

nominee for the Northern District of California. Before I address Judge Chen's nomination, I wish to say a few words about our progress on judicial nominations.

At the beginning of this Congress, I told the chairman that I would work with him to process consensus nominees at a fair and reasonable pace. Thus far this Congress, I have worked very hard and in good faith to do just what I promised. We have confirmed consensus nominees with a particular focus on nominees in so-called judicial emergencies. I made that commitment to the chairman, and I have kept it.

The Senate has been in session for only 46 days this Congress. In that short period, we have confirmed 20 judges. We confirmed three judges last week. In fact, thus far we have taken positive action on 43 of 71 nominees who have been submitted to this Congress by the President—20 have been confirmed, 13 have been reported out of committee, and 10 have had hearings in the committee. All totaled, we have taken positive action, then, on 61 percent of the judicial nominees submitted by the President during this Congress.

Despite my good-faith efforts, my colleagues from the other side continue to accuse us of not moving quickly enough. And, I might add, the White House Counsel continues to state publicly that we are not moving fast enough. Recently, the President's top lawyers spoke to a group of ABA members and asked them to ''bring home the impact or the effects of gridlock.'' The President's lawyer neglected to tell the American Bar Association that the problem begins at the White House. In other words, the Senate cannot act on nominees for judicial appointments if the President has not processed them and sent them to the Senate. The President has failed to send to the Senate a nomination for 50 percent of the current judicial nominees. Yet we have his White House Counsel telling the American Bar Association: Get on top of the Senate and tell them to get their job done, when we have processed 61 percent of the ones who are up here and done it in the 46 days we have been in session. Somehow they expect us to process nominees who have not been submitted to the Congress. That is not possible. This statistic certainly does not indicate a sense of urgency on the part of the White House—in other words, the fact that the Senate has not even received 50 percent of the nominees for those vacancies.

Notwithstanding my efforts to work together, the majority insists on taking detours and throwing up roadblocks to this cooperative effort. For example, last week, after moving forward with two district court judges, the majority leader filed cloture on one of President Obama's most controversial nominees, Mr. Jack McConnell. This week, the majority leader has turned to two more of the President's controversial nominees. Last night, we defeated a cloture motion for Mr. Cole, the President's nominee for Deputy Attorney General, and today we turn to Judge Chen. Of course there are noncontroversial nominees the Senate could turn to. We could confirm additional district judges as we have been doing. But rather than continuing to move forward with the consensus nominees, the other side has chosen to turn to the President's most controversial nominees.

I must say this makes it extremely difficult to continue to work in a good-faith effort to move forward on noncontroversial nominees. From our perspective, it appears that the more we try to work with the majority, the more we are accused of not moving fast enough. The test, I guess, is in the pudding and the general counsel for the White House telling the American Bar Association lawyers to get on the Senate to get more nominees confirmed. The more we try to move consensus nominees, the more the other side insists on moving the President's most objectionable nominees.

Judge Chen is not a consensus nominee. His nomination was considered during the last Congress and was voted out of committee on a party-line vote. The nomination was returned to the President on more than one occasion. Despite our repeated and consistent opposition, the nomination was resubmitted this year. Again it was reported out on a 10-to-8 party-line vote. Yet, despite the unanimous Republican opposition to the nominee, we have agreed to a short time agreement rather than engage in extended debate on this nomination.

With that, I have some remarks regarding Judge Chen's nomination. At the outset, let me emphasize the basis of my opposition. It is based on Mr. Chen's judicial philosophy, on his own statements, and on his record. It is absolutely critical that our judges remain impartial. That is the independence of the judiciary. That is why it is independent. Their job is to interpret law, not to make law. Our system depends upon this independence and impartiality. For that reason, when judges put on a robe for the first time, they take a solemn oath that they will remain impartial. They swear that they will administer justice ''without respect to persons and do equal right to the poor and to the rich.'' That is why we want to make sure judges we confirm will set aside their personal opinions. We do not want their personal views to influence how they do their job. They are supposed to decide cases based on facts and on law and nothing else.

Unfortunately, there are some who believe that this notion of impartiality is somehow just plain old-fashioned and outdated. They believe judges should not be limited to the facts and the law. Instead, they believe judges should look at the litigants themselves. The President seems to take this view. This is the heart of the so-called empathy standard. The problem, of course, is that empathy for one litigant is a bias against the other. But Mr. Chen appears ready and willing to adopt and to apply the so-called empathy standard. He appears to be a member of the camp who believes that being completely impartial is just an old-fashioned view of judging.

In 2003, as a sitting Federal magistrate judge, he wrote an article that summed up his view, and I want to quote it. It is fairly long.

> Judges have to make determinations that draw not so much upon legal acumen, but on an understanding of people and of human experiences. Such experiences inform assumptions that affect legal decisions. . . . Simply put, a judge's life experiences affect the willingness to credit testimony or understand the human impact of legal rules upon which the judge must decide. These determinations require a judge to draw upon something that is not found in case reports that line the walls of our chambers. Rather, judges draw upon the breadth and the depth of their own life experience, upon the knowledge and understanding of people, and of human nature.

I am sure John Marshall would turn over in his grave if he heard that about modern 20th-century and 21st-century judges.

The problem with this approach is that it is the exact opposite of what judges are supposed to be. Judges are supposed to determine the facts and apply the law. That is what their oath demands, and that is what judges must do for our judicial system to remain independent and impartial.

In addition to allowing empathy to affect his decisionmaking, Judge Chen appears willing to inject his personal views into judging. Both his writing and public comments while as a magistrate judge suggest that Judge Chen believes judges should interpret the law according to their personal understandings and preferences. This is a classic definition of judicial activism.

For example, in discussing his work as a magistrate judge, he stated in a speech in 2007 before the American Constitution Society that he finds ''most rewarding . . . contributing to the development of the law via published opinion, especially if it comports with my view of justice.'' Again, the problem here is that a judge's view of justice is very irrelevant. Judges are not policymakers. That is what we are in the Congress of the United States. Judges are called on to decide the facts and to apply the law. Their own view of justice is simply not relevant.

Given that Judge Chen believes a judge's personal views and experiences impact their decisions, it becomes important for us to understand his views and how they were shaped. Prior to becoming a magistrate judge, Judge Chen worked as a staff attorney at the ACLU for over 15 years. He was a advocate for the ACLU. He took very liberal positions on a variety of issues. I would like to name just a few. He opposed private drug testing, he opposed antigang injunctions, he defended affirmative action, he harshly criticized English-

only measures, and he argued that Alabama should be forced to give driving tests in languages other than English.

Those who have defended Judge Chen's nomination have argued that we should not consider his work for the ACLU. As I said, we have confirmed other nominees with strongly held personal views. But when a nominee says that personal views and experiences should and will influence how they approach cases, it becomes difficult to overlook their work on behalf of an organization such as the ACLU.

Judge Chen's advocacy on behalf of the ACLU is not disqualifying in and of itself. But it is hard to imagine why Judge Chen would devote so much of his professional career to the ACLU causes if he did not believe in them deeply. More importantly, given that in Judge Chen's view, personal views and personal experiences should influence how a judge decides cases, we have no choice but to examine Judge Chen's personal views and experiences, including his work at that organization.

For these reasons and others, I oppose this nomination. If Judge Chen is confirmed today, I sincerely hope he will prove me wrong. I sincerely hope he will set aside his personal views and make decisions based solely on the facts and on the law. But based on the record before this Senator, I fear he will not be able to do so. Therefore, I will vote no on his confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

TENNESSEE FLOODING

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, on Friday, I visited Memphis to see the flooding along the Mississippi River myself, to meet with volunteers who were helping, and to see the tremendously well coordinated efforts of emergency workers who are meeting and working every day, long into the evenings, and have been doing so for the last few weeks and will continue to do so for the next several weeks.

I want to make sure that as the Federal Government's role for helping arrives, we are doing everything we should be doing. It is quite a sight in Memphis. The Mississippi River today is 14 feet above flood stage. It is at a level that nearly equals the level in 1937. The river is normally a half mile wide. Today it is 3 miles wide. A great many people in Tennessee and Arkansas have been evacuated because their homes are flooded with water.

As we saw a year ago in the Tennessee floods, which stretched from Nashville to Memphis, and as I saw last Monday in Hamilton County near Chattanooga, Tennesseans know how to respond to this kind of tragedy. They are doing it again by helping one another and helping to clean up rather than complaining and looting. It is an impressive sight. Bob Nations, who is the director of the Shelby County Emergency Management Agency, presides over daily meetings of maybe 50 or 60 people from a variety of volunteer and governmental organizations, who are carefully coordinated to deal with everything from watching the levees, to looking for sand boils, to helping people evacuate, to dealing with utilities that may be threatened by flooding. He is doing a tremendous job.

COL Vernie Reichling, commander of the Memphis District Corps of Engineers, was there on Friday. He has had a tough couple of weeks. He was the one who had to blow up a levee in Missouri which hurt families in that area but saved towns, whole towns that are down river along the Mississippi River from irreparable damage, in northwest Tennessee and also in Missouri. He was there providing us with the latest information. Overall the Corps' work has been exemplary. So far none of the levees around Memphis has been breached, and it appears none will be breached, despite the high water.

The National Weather Service, both State and local officials have been an important part of the efforts. The University of Memphis has contributed daily maps that will predict where the water will go, which have proved to be fairly accurate, which is enormously helpful to volunteers and others as they find a way to help people evacuate when they need to be evacuated, or before they need to be evacuated.

I visited with volunteers who were filling sandbags near the Pyramid. These included off-duty military personnel from the Navy base nearby. These included people from land that is going to stay dry in other parts of Shelby County. They knew someone needed to help. I traveled to Mud Island where the flood waters were continuing to rise. Officials predict as many as 3,000 properties and 6 schools may be affected by the flooding. One of the most impressive stories is that of Hope Presbyterian Church and its pastor, Dr. Craig Strickland. The church has organized up to 13 shelters, each of which could hold 150 to 200 individuals. Two of them were filled when I was there on Friday. More of them are filling up. All of this is being done without any cost to the government, without any cost to the individuals who are being sheltered there. It is all being provided by the churches and synagogues of Memphis. Reverend Strickland and Hope Presbyterian Church deserve enormous credit for the role they are playing, along with others, in Shelby County.

The Federal Government, through the efforts of the Corps, is leading the fight. This is the largest flood in the history of the Mississippi River and Tributaries project. The Mississippi is the third largest watershed. The problem is it received 600 percent more rainfall than it normally does in a span of 2 weeks. The Corps says it came in all the wrong places. Over 4 million people are protected by the comprehensive Mississippi River and Tributaries Project. It is being tested in ways that it never has before. But the system so far is performing as designed. The Corps has made some tough choices that I talked about earlier. It is going to continue to need to make tough choices as the water moves south.

The Memphis District has been fighting the flood since the 24th day of April, relying on 500 people working 24 hours a day around the clock. The Federal Government, through FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, is also helping State and local officials evacuate those in harm's way in advance of the floodwaters.

Governor Haslam of Tennessee requested, and our entire delegation has supported, our State's request for emergency evacuation assistance to help move residents in Dyer, Lake, Shelby, and Stewart Counties to higher ground.

The President responded quickly, and we thank him for that. Over the weekend, the congressional delegation also supported Governor Haslam's request for Federal assistance to help victims in 15 counties recover from the flood and severe storms that began impacting our State on April 19.

Actually this is a different sort of request. The first was evacuations; this is to help those recover. The record rainfall and flooding has only added to the devastation caused by the storms. Last night I learned the President has approved Tennessee's request to make individual and public assistance available to families in the hardest hit areas.

I would say to the Tennesseans who are affected by this, now that the President has approved opportunities for individual assistance, I hope they will take advantage of this. There is a telephone number to call. It is 1–800–621–FEMA. That is 1–800–621–3362. Unfortunately, we have had some experience with this telephone number in Tennessee in the last year. The floods that came exactly a year ago, which hit counties from Nashville to Memphis, produced enormous devastation, $2 billion alone in Davidson County. What we found with FEMA, once the President had granted the assistance, that Tennesseans who called that telephone number got a quick response, usually had an inspector there within a few days, and in most cases where there was damage, received a check of up to $30,000 within a few days. We hope that happens again, although we understand there is terrible devastation in hundreds of counties right now around the country, especially in Alabama and the eastern part of Tennessee. But I want to make sure that residents and neighbors in Tennessee know that the FEMA number, 1–800–621–FEMA, is available now to be called.

The first thing they will do is ask for your ZIP code. After that, they will have a chance to provide help. The most important thing that Tennesseans can do in preparation for that is to document the loss.

This flood will impact our State for weeks. The river only crested last night, the second highest flood stage

ever recorded. It will take days for the waters to recede. Only then will we know the true extent of the damage. The volunteers and the emergency crews and the church shelters will be open for a long time after today.

I am proud of the Tennesseans who are responding, from the Corps of Engineers' personnel, to the Hope Presbyterian Church shelters, to the professionals with Mr. Nations. It is an admirable sight.

Senator CORKER and I and our entire delegation are working together to make sure that we do all we can to expedite Federal help in response to this historic disaster that has occurred in the western part of our State.

I ask unanimous consent that two letters I am passing to the desk be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks. They are the two letters our delegation has sent to the President making a request for a declaration for disaster assistance.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 7, 2011.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of the State of Tennessee, we urge you to approve Governor Bill Haslam's request to declare a major disaster due to severe storms, straight-line winds, tornadoes, flash flooding and river flooding that began on April 19, 2011.

Residents all across our State are faced with devastation from multiple disasters, and Governor Haslam has determined that this incident has caused so much damage that federal assistance is necessary. Flooding along the Mississippi River has compounded the impact of the storms that swept across the Southeast, and will continue to impact our State for weeks. Thousands of our constituents are now dealing with the challenge of rebuilding their homes, while many in West Tennessee are still under the threat of catastrophic flooding.

The Governor's request specifically seeks Public Assistance for all categories, under the provisions of Section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, for Benton, Carroll, Crockett, Dyer, Gibson, Henderson, Henry, Houston, Lake, Lauderdale, Madison, Montgomery, Obion, Shelby and Stewart Counties, as well as state-wide assistance through the Hazard Mitigation Grant program. This assistance is critical to help local governments begin debris removal and start putting their communities back together.

In addition, the State is seeking Individual Assistance for Dyer, Lake, Obion, Shelby and Stewart Counties, making residents of these counties eligible for the Individuals and Households Program, Disaster Unemployment Assistance, Crisis Counseling, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Disaster Legal Services and Small Business Administration disaster loans. Without this federal assistance, many families will simply not be able to recover.

Officials with the Federal Emergency Management Agency have been working with State and local officials since the beginning of this incident, and we are grateful for their efforts to respond to Tennessee's needs. We ask that you consider our State's request as soon as possible, and our offices can provide you with any additional information should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Lamar Alexander, U.S. Senator; Bob Corker, U.S. Senator; Steve Cohen, Congressman; Marsha Blackburn, Congresswoman; Jim Cooper, Congressman; Chuck Fleischmann, Congressman; Phil Roe, Congressman; Stephen L. Fincher, Congressman; Diane Black, Congresswoman; Scott DesJarlais, Congressman; John J. Duncan, Jr., Congressman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2011.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of the State of Tennessee, we urge you to approve Governor Bill Haslam's request for emergency funding to help state and local authorities in Dyer, Lake, Shelby and Stewart counties to begin evacuation preparedness activities in advance of the flooding along the Mississippi, Tennessee, and Cumberland Rivers.

The flooding along the Mississippi River and its tributaries is historic. Heavy rainfall across the region has also caused major flooding along the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers, In Tiptonville, which has been under a voluntary evacuation order since last week, the Mississippi River is forecast to reach the highest flood stage ever recorded. In the City of Memphis, the forecasted crest has been increased to 48 feet, and residents are being told to prepare for the worst. Those living along the Cumberland River in Stewart County, many of whom are still recovering from last year's floods, are also beginning to evacuate.

Governor Bill Haslam and the Tennessee Emergency Management Agency are working in cooperation with local officials to meet the needs of our citizens, but they need federal help. The requested funds are critical to support our state's evacuation efforts, which may be extensive, and we cannot afford to delay.

In light of the need to begin evacuations quickly, we urge you to consider our State's request as soon as possible, and we will provide you with any additional information about our State's needs should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Lamar Alexander, U.S. Senator; Bob Corker, U.S. Senator; Steve Cohen, Congressman; Marsha Blackburn, Congresswoman; Jim Cooper, Congressman; Chuck Fleischmann, Congressman; Phil Roe, Congressman; Stephen L. Fincher, Congressman; Diane Black, Congresswoman; Scott DesJarlais, Congressman; John J. Duncan, Jr., Congressman.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it is my honor to be here to support the nomination of Judge Edward Chen to the Northern District of California. I congratulate Judge Chen and I congratulate his family on this momentous day that is long overdue. I wish to thank Senator FEINSTEIN for her hard work and her leadership in support of Judge Chen's nomination.

I think the way we do our judge recommendations in California is exemplary. What we do is, we each have a committee that advises us, and they come up with the names of a few people who they think are the top choices. Then, each of us makes that recommendation to the President. Judge Chen was her nominee.

Judge Chen has had a distinguished career. He enjoys broad support and respect in California's legal community. When I heard the remarks of my colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, it broke my heart because it doesn't sound to me as though he knows Judge Chen. He seems to be criticizing someone else—someone who sets aside the law. That is not Judge Chen. Judge Chen will make an outstanding addition to the Federal bench.

Since 2001, Judge Chen has served as a magistrate judge in the Northern District of California, where he has issued over 350 published legal opinions. Before coming to the bench, Judge Chen was a respected civil rights lawyer and part of the trial team that successfully overturned the wartime conviction of Fred Korematsu. He made history when he became the first Asian-American magistrate judge to serve in the Northern District. Today, Judge Chen takes another history-making step if he is confirmed—and I surely hope he will be—because when he is confirmed, he will be only the second Asian American in the 150-year history of the Northern District to be confirmed as a judge.

In our great Nation, we are a melting pot. I don't believe we can have the kind of justice our Founders envisioned unless we have juries of our peers and we have judges who also represent the broad quilt that is America. I think this is something to talk about, not to ignore.

While I am proud we are finally going to vote on the confirmation of Judge Chen, I have to again express frustration that it took so long to reach this point. Judge Chen was nominated over 21 months ago. I ask everyone to think about this—the family, everybody waiting for this moment, years and years on the bench with an outstanding record. I remember attending Judge Chen's confirmation hearing in September 2009. He was nominated for a judicial emergency seat, one that has been vacant since April 2008. That is a judicial emergency. We don't have enough judges. So one would think we would move quickly on this. Following his hearing, his nomination was held up by an unprecedented campaign of obstruction, unfortunately, by my friends in the Republican Party. They refused to allow an up-or-down vote, and they forced the White House to renominate Judge Chen, not once, not twice, not three times but four times—

four times. I tell my colleagues, I have read their objections, and they boil down to this: They object because once he worked as a staff attorney for the ACLU handling civil rights cases.

This is a man who received the highest rating from the American Bar Association. They gave him the ''well qualified'' rating. So I have to ask my colleagues why they would object to someone who did a good job defending the Constitution. By the way, I don't agree with the ACLU all the time, believe me. I am surprised at this objection. For example, the ACLU and the tea party in my State right now—in northern California—are working together to oppose free speech restrictions in front of the Redding Library. In fact, the ACLU and the tea party filed parallel lawsuits to strike down the restrictions.

So my friends on the other side who give the tea party a tremendous amount of support, I am a little surprised they would go after the ACLU, which is partnering with the tea party in defending the Constitution. It is hard for me to believe that because Ed Chen was once a staff attorney for the ACLU, he would come under this kind of fire.

They never objected to anything from his 9 years as a magistrate judge, not one complaint about any of the opinions he has written. Judge Chen's record as a fair and impartial judge since 2001 demonstrates clearly that he understands the difference between being an advocate and being a judge.

So I don't think we should say anyone who was ever the staff attorney for this organization or that organization is barred from getting promoted. That is a sad thing. I don't think people should be voted down or voted against because they stand for equal rights and civil rights. If anything, we ought to say: That is great, because we all want our civil rights protected. We all want our rights that are guaranteed to us in the Constitution protected.

Judge Roberts, the Chief Justice, has called on Senators to stop playing politics with judicial nominees. I have to say, to me, this sounds like politics. You don't like an organization, so then you say someone who has been a judge for 9 years—you have no complaints about him—go back 10 years and now say because you don't like that organization, they can't be promoted.

Chief Justice Roberts has warned that delays in filling vacancies has created acute difficulties in some judicial districts. That is a quote. Let me read it. The delays in filling vacancies ''has created acute difficulties in some judicial districts.'' Certainly, we know in this district we have been in an emergency situation.

It is time to get Judge Chen seated so he can continue serving the people of northern California as a district court judge. I commend Judge Chen for his strength and his perseverance over the past 21 months. This has not been an easy process. I commend his family for standing by him. I again commend Senator FEINSTEIN for fighting for him, and I commend everybody here who was able to somehow hammer out an agreement to have an up-or-down vote on this very talented man.

I close with great hopes that we are going to get this nominee confirmed. In advance of that—and I hope I am right in doing this—I wish to congratulate Judge Chen and his family.

I urge my colleagues to cast their votes to confirm this highly qualified and respected nominee to the Northern District and make history in doing so and be proud in doing so and know that when we put qualified people on the court who bring a different background to the court, we are doing something very positive for America. That is what America is. I am a first-generation American on my mother's side, and I can tell my colleagues what I learned from her: that we should kiss the ground in this country. As I grew up, I realized that one of the great things about our country is we are such an experiment in democracy. People from every background, every religion, differences, but we believe in one thing; that is, protection of our rights and the belief in freedoms we get from this Nation and we vow to protect those freedoms. Part of protecting those freedoms is putting people on the bench who understand that. As Benjamin Franklin once said: You have a Republic if you can keep it. The way to keep it is not to bar people from getting these up-or-down votes. Put good people on this bench. You can vote no. You can vote yes. Yes, there are times when we say we want a supermajority, but for Ed Chen, I can tell my colleagues right now, this isn't one of those times. I look forward to his positive vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time that is unused during the quorum calls be charged to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EGYPT'S POLITICAL FUTURE

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, more than 2 months ago, a popular uprising in Egypt swept President Hosni Mubarak from power after 30 years in office. The Egyptian military is now charged with reforming that country's political system in preparation for parliamentary and Presidential elections.

History teaches us this sort of transition happens in three phases, not two. First, the dictator falls. Next follows a weak interim government. Only then does a final permanent government enter the scene.

We remember the French Revolution with the fall of Louis XVI, then the hopefulness of the French First Republic, and then finally the rise of Napoleon.

We remember the October Revolution—first the fall of the czar, then the hopefulness of the interim Kerensky government, and finally the rise of the Soviet Union. Most recently we remember Iran—first the fall of the shah, then the hopefulness of the interim Bakhtiar government, and finally the rise of Khomeini.

Today we are watching this sequence play out in Egypt. First Mubarak fell, then came the jubilation of Tahrir Square and the hopefulness of an interim military government, and now we are left to wonder what act 3 will bring.

Will Egypt remain a strong U.S. ally in the region; will it uphold the Camp David peace treaty with Israel; will it commit to the rule of law and human rights at home; or will Egypt fall into the hands of the radical Muslim Brotherhood; will it drift toward Iran and embrace the enemies of Israel?

Unfortunately, recent developments indicate Egypt is moving in the wrong direction. The Muslim Brotherhood is gaining additional influence and may soon gain significant legislative power.

According to a poll released on April 25 by the Pew Research Center, 78 percent of Egyptians hold a favorable view of the Muslim Brotherhood—and that is better than the youth-led ''April 6 Movement'' that removed Mubarak from power. In September's planned elections, the Muslim Brotherhood plans to contest anywhere between 30 to 50 percent of all parliamentary seats.

Meanwhile, Egypt's foreign policy is shifting away from the United States and our allies and toward the Islamic Republic of Iran and its terrorist proxies. On April 18, Iran announced the appointment of the country's first ambassador to Egypt in 30 years. On April 27, Egyptian Foreign Minister Nabil Elaraby said he will meet with the Iranian Foreign Minister, Ali Akbar Salehi, in Indonesia on the sidelines of the Non-Aligned Movement Summit. The two officials will discuss next steps for the Iranian-Egyptian relationship. On May 3, Iran's Foreign Minister announced he would send his deputy to visit Egypt in the coming days.

Egyptian authorities helped negotiate the recent reconciliation agreement between the terrorist movement Hamas and Fatah—a major setback to Israeli-Palestinian peace. When asked to comment on Hamas being a terrorist organization, Egypt's Foreign Minister said:

> [We must] allow someone who is fighting for a cause to see the light of day at the end of the tunnel and enter into peace.

On March 28, Hamas submitted a request to the Egyptian Government to

reopen its Embassy in the Gaza Strip. On April 28, Egypt's Foreign Minister announced plans to reopen the Rafah border with Hamas on a permanent basis—a potential boon to the Hamas terrorist organization. On April 30, Al Hayat reported that Hamas would be relocating its offices from Damascus—sending the terrorist group's No. 2 man, Musa Abu Marzouk, to Egypt.

Meanwhile, Egypt's commitment to democracy and human rights has suffered a serious setback following recent attacks on the country's Coptic Christian community that left scores dead and hundreds more injured. This follows the interim government's move to dismiss the Coptic governor of the city of Quena only days after his appointment—caving to mass demonstrations organized by the Muslim Brotherhood.

As one Coptic bishop told AFP:

> They are led by Salafis and the Muslim Brotherhood, and they are chanting: ''We won't leave until the Christians leave.''

Finally, on March 28, Dr. Maikel Nabil Sanad, a 25-year-old blogger, was arrested for ''insulting the military,'' and ''disturbing public security'' after posting comments on his blog that were critical of the military's role in the protests. This arrest clearly violated the International Covenant on International and Political Rights and the new government's commitment to the fundamental freedoms of its people. If Egyptians could freely express their views in Tahrir Square, they should have the freedom to express their views online.

Mr. President, the trajectory of Egypt's revolution now faces two distinct scenarios: It could become a secular American ally that respects the rule of law, diversity, and a peace treaty with Israel; or it could become a Muslim Brotherhood-controlled ally of Iran that embraces terrorist groups such as Hamas, persecutes its own religious minorities, and rejects peace with Israel.

We must do everything in our power to support the secular forces of Egypt or face the prospect of a strategic setback on the scale of Iran in 1979, laying the foundation for potentially yet another war in the Middle East.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, am I correct that we are now on the nomination of Ed Chen to the District Court for the Northern District of California?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, today the Senate will finally consider the nomination of Judge Edward Chen to fill a judicial emergency vacancy on the District Court for the Northern District of California. Since 2001, Judge Chen has been a well-respected Federal Magistrate Judge on the court to which he is now nominated to serve as a Federal District Judge. His nomination has received the strong and consistent support of his home state Senators, Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator BOXER, since he was first nominated over 21 months ago. When he is confirmed, Judge Chen will be only the second Asian Pacific American to serve on the district court bench in the 150-year history of the Northern District of California. The debate and vote we have today are long overdue.

We are finally able to consider Judge Chen's nomination because of the vote the Senate took last week toward restoring a longstanding tradition of deference to home state Senators with regard to Federal District Court nominations. The Senate turned away from a precipice when 11 Republican Senators joined in voting to end a filibuster of the nomination of Jack McConnell to the District Court for the District of Rhode Island. In doing so, a super majority of the Senate came together to reject a new standard, which I believe is being unfairly applied to President Obama's district court nominees. Now, nearly 20 months after his confirmation hearing, and after having had his nomination reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee four times, Judge Chen's nomination will at last have an up-or-down vote in the Senate.

We should have taken up and confirmed his nomination when it was first reported favorably by the committee nearly 19 months ago. The supposed ''controversy'' that has delayed and obstructed this nomination is in my view entirely misplaced, the result of applying a partisan litmus test. This should be an easy nomination to confirm. It is no surprise that Judge Chen's nomination received the highest possible rating from the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary, unanimously ''well qualified,'' since he has had a distinguished legal career and has issued over 350 judicial opinions in his decade as a Federal magistrate judge.

Judge Chen's nomination has received broad, bipartisan support from the judicial and legal community in California and from numerous bar associations, including the National Asian Pacific Bar Association, which has been a vocal proponent of this nomination. Judge Chen's nomination also has significant support from local law enforcement in the district he currently serves and would continue to serve if confirmed. Michael Hennessey, sheriff for the city and county of San Francisco, wrote: ''Judge Chen's solid record as a U.S. Magistrate Judge speaks for itself. He has published over three-hundred judicial opinions which are indicative of his work ethic and his thoughtful intellect as a respected magistrate judge.'' This praise is representative of the scores of letters of support we have received.

I thank Senator FEINSTEIN for her strong advocacy for Judge Chen's nomination the four times it has been considered and favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee. Any fair minded person who listened to the impassioned speeches Senator FEINSTEIN has made about Ed Chen in the committee would have to be impressed. Senator FEINSTEIN is right to be proud of her recommendation of Ed Chen to President Obama. As Senator FEINSTEIN has explained, Judge Chen was the recommendation of her bipartisan Judicial Advisory Committee in California, putting the lie to the caricature from the far right that this was a partisan nomination. This is a fine man with sterling legal credentials and all the qualifications needed to be an outstanding Federal judge.

The approach taken by opponents of Judge Chen's nomination threatens to take the Senate down a dangerous path of imposing partisan litmus tests in place of our constitutional duty to offer advice and consent on nominations. The debate in our committee on Judge Chen's nomination was ugly. One Republican Senator in explaining his opposition said that Judge Chen has the ''ACLU gene.'' I hope that we do not hear such a preposterous notion repeated today on the floor of the Senate. This is a distinguished Federal magistrate judge who has demonstrated that he knows how to be a fair and impartial judge.

Our legal system is an adversary system, predicated upon legal advocacy for both sides. Certainly defending civil liberties is no vice. The other side appears to be suggesting that Judge Chen's work as a staff attorney at the ACLU many years ago, primarily representing individuals in discrimination and civil rights matters, somehow renders him unfit to be a judge. Since when do we impose a litmus test for nominees that they can never have been legal advocates? If we were to do that, we would have no judges. Almost every nominee who had been a practicing lawyer would be disqualified by one side or the other.

Surely Judge Chen's work while in private practice as a member of the legal team that represented Fred Korematsu in a lawsuit that successfully overturned his prior conviction for violating the Japanese Internment Order during World War II does not render Judge Chen unfit to be a judge. In my view, that important advocacy to right a wrong from one of the dark chapters in our history serves as proof that President Obama made a wise choice in nominating Judge Chen for the Federal bench. Indeed, just a few years ago this Senate passed a resolution acknowledging that wrong and seeking to help right it.

The question for me about this nominee is the same question I have asked about every judicial nominee, whether

nominated by a Democratic or a Republican president whether he or she will have judicial independence. Does the nominee understand the role of a judge, and how it differs from the role of an advocate?

With this nominee, Judge Chen, that is not a hard question to answer. We know that he understands the role of a judge because he has been doing it for 10 years on the court to which he has now been nominated. As Judge Chen said in response to a question from Senator SESSIONS: ''The role of a judge is to be fair, neutral, and evenhanded in applying the law and finding facts . . . without regard to personal preferences.'' His 10 years as a Federal magistrate judge resoundingly have answered any concerns about bias or partisanship on his part. His testimony before the Judiciary Committee reflects his understanding of the proper role of a judge.

There was no need for the delays that plagued this nomination. There were no ''extraordinary circumstances'' that held up this nomination for nearly 2 years. With judicial vacancies at crisis levels, affecting the ability of courts to provide justice to Americans around the country, we should be debating and voting on each of the 12 judicial nominations reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee and pending on the Senate's Executive Calendar, in addition to Judge Chen. No one should be playing partisan games and obstructing while vacancies remain above 90 in the Federal courts around the country.

Judge Chen, born and raised in Oakland, CA, as the son of two Chinese immigrants, spent much of his childhood helping his mother and siblings support a small family business after his father passed away. After earning his A.B. from the University of California, Berkeley, in 1975, and his law degree from Boalt Hall School of Law in 1979, Judge Chen clerked for Judge Charles Renfrew on the court to which he has now been nominated, the Northern District of California, and then for Judge James Browning on the Ninth Circuit. After a distinguished career in private practice and as a staff attorney for the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Northern California, Judge Chen was selected to serve as a Federal Magistrate Judge for the Northern District of California, having since been reappointed upon the recommendation of the nonpartisan Merit Selection Review Panel. His story is a moving reminder of what it is possible to achieve in this great Nation through hard work.

I congratulate Judge Edward Chen and his family on his confirmation today. I commend Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator BOXER for their steadfast support of his nomination.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. Is time being divided?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, it is.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided during the quorum call.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Senate Daily Digest proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I see the distinguished senior Senator from California on the floor. I will yield, of course, to her. She has been indefatigable in her support of Judge Chen in the committee, in the Halls of the Senate, and in her steadfast work with the leadership to get this nominee before us. I can brag about all the work she has done easier than she might, but I hope Judge Chen and his family know they had as strong and as stalwart a supporter on the Senate Judiciary Committee as they could possibly have with Senator FEINSTEIN.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Senate Daily Digest proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I wish to thank Chairman LEAHY for his leadership on this particular judgeship. I believe he is accurate in everything he said, and I very much appreciate his stalwart support.

I rise to add my support to the nomination of U.S. Magistrate Judge Edward Chen to become a U.S. district judge in the Northern District of California. I recommended Judge Chen to the President, so obviously he has my strong support.

I wish to tell my colleagues a little bit about him. He was born and raised in Oakland, and he is the son of Chinese immigrants. His father immigrated to the United States in the 1920s, and that was followed by his mother in the 1930s. He attended public schools in Oakland and then went on to the University of California at Berkeley, where he received his undergraduate degree with great distinction, and then on to Boalt Hall School of Law, where he graduated in the top 10 percent of his class.

He was a law clerk to District Judge Charles Renfrew on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, as well as to Circuit Judge James Browning on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. He then began his legal career as a litigator, first at the private law firm of Coblentz, Patch, Duffy, and Bass and later as a staff attorney at the American Civil Liberties Union.

In 2001, he was appointed to be a U.S. magistrate judge for the Northern District of California, and he has served in that capacity for the past 10 years.

So today Judge Chen is a solid, tested, and respected judge with over a decade of experience on the Federal bench. In these 10 years as a judge, he has written more than 350 published opinions. I would point out that not one of those opinions has been criticized by anyone in the 20 months this nomination has been awaiting action in the Senate. Nor has there been any criticism of any of his published opinions.

In fact, there is a broad consensus among those who have reviewed his judicial record that he is indeed a very good judge.

He was recommended to me by a bipartisan judicial advisory committee. That committee reviewed his record, and spoke with judges, attorneys, and litigants who knew his work as a judge. The committee unanimously recommended that I forward his name to the President, and I did.

The San Francisco Bar Association has rated him ''exceptionally well qualified.'' The American Bar Association has rated him ''well qualified''—their highest rating. And in 2009, a merit selection review panel, appointed by the U.S. District Court, thoroughly reviewed his record and recommended him for reappointment as a magistrate judge. That panel consisted of seven lawyers appointed by the district court. They solicited public comments on Chen's work as a judge. Only positive information was forthcoming.

They talked to Federal prosecutors in the U.S. Attorney's Office. Again, the reports were uniformly favorable. Prosecutors called Chen's analytical skills ''exemplary'' and said his rulings were ''balanced and well reasoned.''

Defense attorneys were similarly positive. They described Chen as ''respectful'' and ''considered'' in his judgments.

Partners with large law firms called Chen ''prompt,'' ''well-prepared,'' ''very intelligent'' and ''decisive.''

Overall, the panel recommended unequivocally that Chen be reappointed for a second 8-year term as a magistrate judge. Obviously, he has served 2 years of that second term.

I have the panel's full report here and would be pleased to share it with any Senator who wishes to review it.

Since Chen's nomination for the district court, the reports we have received in the Senate from those who know Chen's work as a judge have been similarly positive.

We have received letters urging Chen's confirmation from Republicans and Democrats, public officials and law enforcement, judges, civil rights groups, business leaders, and private lawyers. Let me share a few with you.

Judge Lowell Jensen, whom I have followed for decades, was appointed to the U.S. District Court by President

Reagan. He also served as second in charge of the Department of Justice during the Reagan administration. He has worked closely with Chen on the Federal bench and had this to say about him, and this is a direct quote:

I have found Judge Chen to be both an excellent jurist and a person of high character. He brings a conscientious, careful, and impartial approach to every issue and every party. The decisions he makes reflect not only good judgment but a complete commitment to the principles of fair trial and the application of the rule of law. I support his confirmation without reservation.

I can say that Judge Jensen is one of the most distinguished judges in California.

Former U.S. District Judge Fern Smith was also appointed by President Reagan to the Federal court. She writes:

Both in my own dealings with [Judge Chen] and based on his reputation among my former colleagues, I can attest to his intellectual competence, his respect for the law, his judicial temperament, and his integrity. I have no doubt that Ed Chen would do honor to any of our 94 United States District Courts.

We have a letter from the president of the San Francisco Police Commission, a lifelong Republican, Thomas Mazzucco. He published an op-ed in the Roll Call urging the Senate to confirm Chen and calling him ''an experienced judge who understands the distinction between personal preference and judicial obligation, and who has always based his rulings—more than 300 decisions over eight years—solely on the law and the merits of a case.''

The San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs Association said this:

Chen has earned a reputation as an evenhanded jurist who is constantly mindful of the role that judges such as himself fulfill in our society: as keepers of the rule of law and public trust in our system of justice.

I have over 50 more letters, if anyone wishes to read them. They come from the mayors of San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose; the sheriff, city attorney, former chief of police, and former U.S. Marshal of San Francisco; the last 10 presidents of the bar association of San Francisco; the congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus; the National Asian Pacific American Bar; and many others.

The judgment is clear: Ed Chen is fair. He is impartial. He is an excellent jurist, and has been for 10 years, and he deserves to be confirmed.

You come back to Washington and what happens? Here is the story. Despite this long judicial track record and broad bipartisan support, this nomination has been sitting in the Senate for more than 600 days.

The President first nominated Chen on August 6, 2009. That was 643 days ago. Since that time, the minority has required the nomination to be sent back to the President three different times. The Senate Judiciary Committee has had to consider the nomination four different times.

This is extraordinary—but then the Republicans have an extraordinary search engine. I will talk about that in a minute.

This is a district court nominee with 10 years of judicial experience, with not a blemish on it. When other judicial nominees have come before the Senate, they have been criticized because they didn't have judicial experience or because there was no judicial track record to review. Well, here is a nominee who has both. Ten years on the bench; bipartisan support and uniformly positive reviews; more than 350 published opinions, and there has not been a single criticism of a single one. But his nomination has been sitting in the Senate for 600 days and sent back to the President 3 separate times.

I find this to be a deeply disappointing testament to the situation we face in the Senate today. Let me pose the question that Police Commissioner Mazzucco—a Republican—asked in his op-ed:

If Judge Chen—an experienced judge whose judicial record proves he is committed to the rule of law, without bias or favor, and who is widely respected by the bar that has practiced before him—isn't qualified for the Federal bench, then who is?

I echo that.

So what happened here? Well, let me take a few moments to address a couple of the attacks that have been made on Judge Chen.

First, Judge Chen has been criticized because he worked as a staff attorney for the ACLU long before becoming a judge. No one disputes that. Chen was once an advocate, and that is a fact. But he also has a 10-year record to prove that he has made the transition. He was once an advocate. He is now a judge—and a darn good judge.

As a coalition of Northern California Asian American Bar Associations wrote:

Chen has made a successful transition from a zealous advocate to a balanced and conscientious adjudicator who is committed to the impartial and active administration of justice.

Former Federal prosecutors from the Northern District of California made the same point. They wrote:

Judge Chen consistently treats all sides evenly and impartially, and conducts himself with the utmost propriety, as is fitting for a judge. . . . While we are aware of his previous position as a staff attorney at the ACLU of northern California, Judge Chen does not show favoritism toward the parties or issues before him.

The record is available. The evidence is in. Chen understands the unique role of the impartial adjudicator. He knows what it means to decide cases evenhandedly. He has been doing it for more than 10 years.

Let me turn then to some speeches that the ''search engine'' turned up. Since 2009, the Washington Times and others have used a handful of quotes from speeches Chen has given to try to paint him as someone he is not. As happens far too often, those quotes have been cut, spliced, and taken out of context. Let me give you an example.

The effort to label Chen as a ''radical'' is based on a speech he gave to students following the funeral of a man by the name of Fred Korematsu. I want to take a moment to explain Korematsu and the case. Some of you may be too young to remember Mr. Korematsu and his fight against Japanese internment during World War II, but I am not.

One of the singular experiences of my lifetime was when my father took me, as a small child, to the Tanforan Racetrack. That racetrack was a few miles south of San Francisco. During World War II, it was taken out of action as a racetrack and turned into an internment camp. It was fenced with barbed wire. Small buildings lined the center portion of the track. This is a photo of it. Here is the racetrack and here are the buildings. This is where Japanese Americans were essentially incarcerated for the remainder of World War II.

Let me show you this. This is the order, which is from the Western Defense Command and Fourth Army Wartime Civil Control Administration—instructions to all Americans of Japanese ancestry living in the following area, which is the city and county of San Francisco, lying generally west of the north-south line, and it describes that. It says:

All Japanese persons, both alien and nonalien, will be evacuated from the designated area by twelve o'clock on Tuesday, April 7, 1942. No Japanese person will be permitted to enter or leave the above-described area after 8 a.m. Thursday, April 7—

That is over half of the city of San Francisco.

without obtaining special permission from the provost marshal at the Civil Control Administration.

Then they are told where they are to report—to the Civil Control Station—to receive further instructions. This must be done between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Thursday, April 2, or between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Friday, April 3.

That is their notice. They turn up, get in a bus, and then this is where they go, and where they remained until the end of the war.

One young Californian, Fred Korematsu, challenged the internment. He took his case all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, and he argued that the U.S. Constitution did not permit loyal American citizens to be forced into these camps solely because of their Japanese-American heritage, which was the case here. The Supreme Court heard his case, but he lost in a decision that is considered by many to be a black stain on the jurisprudence of our Supreme Court.

Decades later, in 1983, Korematsu challenged his conviction again. This time, he was represented by a team of volunteer lawyers, including Edward Chen. This team put forward newly discovered evidence that demonstrated that prosecutors in Korematsu's original case had withheld evidence, specifically, U.S. Government intelligence at the time indicating the internment was not justified.

This time they won. So four decades after the original internment order,

Fred Korematsu's conviction was overturned by the district court, and, four years later in 1987, President Ronald Reagan signed into law the Civil Liberties Act, issuing a formal, national apology for the Japanese internment.

So this was the context of the speech in which Chen was speaking to a group of students and reflecting on the funeral of Fred Korematsu. He said in the speech that, at times, he had experienced ''feelings of ambivalence and cynicism when confronted by appeals to patriotism.'' He was referring to the internment of Japanese-American citizens for no cause other than they happened to be of Japanese heritage. I would think you could get a bit cynical about that. People who did not see this do not believe it ever happened. But it did happen, and it happened here. This was the condition in which people were kept. It is not right.

But critics have picked out this line—''feelings of ambivalence and cynicism when confronted by appeals to patriotism''—and tried to use to paint Chen as unpatriotic. But they did not know the context. Sometimes things that have monumental importance at the time, such as the internment of Japanese-American citizens without due process, fade too quickly from our historical memory. I thought I would bring it back so this body could understand the total context.

This was a very big deal. It was not a proud moment for our country. Congress and President Reagan rightfully issued a formal apology for the injustice that was done years later.

To take a quote from a speech after Fred Korematsu's funeral and to use it to try to imply that Edward Chen does not love his country—it is shameful. It is also flatly inconsistent with the rest of the speech. Chen went on to say that when the congregation sang ''America the Beautiful'' at Korematsu's funeral, he was moved to tears because ''the song described the America that Fred envisioned, the America whose promised beauty he sought to fulfill, an America true to its founding principles.''

Fred Korematsu is no longer with us, but his daughter Karen sent me a letter about Edward Chen. Here are some of her words:

> My father's belief in our Constitution was unwavering, even when he was treated unfairly. Like my father, Judge Chen is adamant about upholding the Constitution, without bias or prejudice.

In my view, Edward Chen is a judicial nominee who has been treated extraordinarily unfairly. But he remains steadfast in his commitment to serving our country as a Federal judge, and he has a 10-year unblemished judicial track record to show that he will serve us exceedingly well.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the nomination of Judge Edward Chen to be a district judge for the Northern District of California.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time has expired. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Edward Milton Chen, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California?

Mr. LEE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 68 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Akaka	Gillibrand	Murray
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Inouye	Pryor
Bingaman	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Blumenthal	Kerry	Reid
Boxer	Klobuchar	Sanders
Brown (MA)	Kohl	Schumer
Brown (OH)	Landrieu	Shaheen
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Snowe
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Levin	Tester
Casey	Lieberman	Udall (CO)
Collins	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Conrad	McCaskill	Warner
Coons	Menendez	Webb
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Murkowski	

NAYS—42

Alexander	Enzi	Lugar
Ayotte	Graham	McCain
Barrasso	Grassley	McConnell
Blunt	Hatch	Moran
Boozman	Heller	Paul
Burr	Hoeven	Portman
Chambliss	Hutchison	Risch
Coats	Inhofe	Roberts
Coburn	Isakson	Rubio
Cochran	Johanns	Sessions
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Kyl	Toomey
DeMint	Lee	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Rockefeller	Vitter

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for debate only until 7 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2 p.m. tomorrow, May 11, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 44; that there be 1 hour of debate, equally divided, in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on Calendar No. 44; 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 related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; 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.

Mr. REID. 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. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BIG OIL

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise in support of legislation I am proud to cosponsor—to finally end the taxpayer handouts to the world's largest oil companies—as they rake in record profits. This measure is about accountability. It is about responsibility. It is about fairness.

When I got off the tractor from planting last weekend and went to fill my tank, it was $3.69 in Big Sandy, MT—almost a dollar higher than just a few months ago. But while I am paying close to $4 gallon at the pump, like other working Americans, oil company executives are padding their stock options and bonuses. They are diminishing their investment here in America, choosing instead to use tax loopholes to offshore their production.

I would like to make just three quick points today about the over $4 billion in tax earmarks that the biggest oil companies in America are receiving today.

First, they never asked for them.

Second, they don't need them.

And finally, they are not good for America—or our economy.

These taxpayer handouts are running up our national debt, taking our jobs overseas, and they expose us to higher gas prices.

In 2005, the CEOs of the five largest oil companies testified in the Senate about these subsidies. When asked directly about these oil and gas tax breaks, all five executives said they did not ask for them.

They agreed with President Bush—that with the price of oil over $55 per barrel, they didn't need tax incentives. And today, oil is $109 per barrel.

The CEO of Chevron told the committee that ending these breaks ''will have a minimal impact on our company, minimal.''

Let me be as clear as those executives were then: This bill has nothing to do with Chevron's or Conoco's or Exxon's ability to operate refineries or put folks to work here at home.

It has everything to do with holding their top-level executives accountable to all American taxpayers as they rake in billions of dollars in profits every year. Right now Big Oil executives are writing off the royalties they pay to foreign countries as taxes, and until we fix it, all of us are paying for it.

That means you and I are footing the bill every time one of these big companies writes a check to the government of Saudi Arabia or Nigeria. And they are telling us they don't want it or need it. We should do the fiscally responsible thing and close these loopholes.

Instead, we should use that $8.5 billion to pay down our deficit. And that is what this bill does.

Special tax breaks are supposed to make companies more competitive and get new technologies into the market. But for major oil companies we have written a privileged tax code just for them.

Some of these provisions have been on the books since 1913. I don't know what companies after 98 years still need a subsidy, but if it does, either it isn't very effective or the system is being abused.

As you will hear again and again this week—because it is just an astonishing number—as gas surpasses $4 per gallon, oil companies are getting $4 billion annually in tax breaks.

The big five oil companies have made nearly $1 trillion in profits in the last decade. Nearly $32 billion of that came in the first 3 months of this year alone.

But what is happening to gas prices?

Rather than bringing down prices at the pump, these giveaways merely line the executives' pockets and run up the deficit. All the while, gas prices have gone up.

For example, Exxon, the biggest of the oil companies in the U.S. made more than $9 billion dollars in profit last year—just their U.S. operations. And how much did they pay in taxes? Just $39 million.

That is 0.4 percent.

But this is more fair than in 2009, when Exxon received a $156 million tax refund from the IRS.

That means we as taxpayers are paying them. The Tax Code is broken and this bill will help fix it.

Right now, we are making tough choices about how to get a handle on our Nation's debt. We have tough debates ahead about heating homes in rural America, and investing in crumbling highways, and strengthening the future of Medicare.

All the while, we are still literally writing checks to our biggest oil companies who don't need them.

After causing the largest offshore oil spill in American history, BP still managed to rake in more than $7 billion in profits, up 17 percent from the year before.

But most of these big companies are not developing their onshore resources here at home.

How do I look the oil worker in Montana's Bakken Field in the face and say: We are giving the largest oil companies a billion dollars a year to go drill overseas, taking your opportunities offshore.

Dual Capacity, the most egregious of these tax provisions, subsidizes $1 billion each year in royalty payments to foreign governments that don't like us very much. We don't let companies producing in America credit royalty payments to their taxes, so why would we do that for companies that produce outside of the U.S.?

And does this make us safer? Does it bring stability to the market? Absolutely not.

As we have all watched in the last few months, turmoil in the Middle East has driven up speculation and driven up prices.

Oil prices fell about 10 percent last week—though not enough to relieve hardworking Montanans with any changes in prices at the pump.

Prices didn't fall because of the discovery of a new oil field or a new technology. It happened because some folks on Wall Street moved some numbers around on paper.

There is no accountability in that. And that is why we're trying to change it.

But unlike on Wall Street, there are places where folks are doing the hard work of oil discovery and developing the technology to lower the cost of oil.

A lot of that has to do with the ''small guys'' in the oil business. And they are successful. In fact, domestic production is going strong—at its highest level in almost a decade.

They are making risks and getting new technology into the field, like in eastern Montana.

My State is home to likely the most productive domestic onshore oilfield in the United States. And small oil companies are doing good, responsible in securing America's energy future.

The Bakken Field is estimated to hold nearly 4 billion barrels of oil. They are leading the way in developing new technology for oil field development.

Where is Exxon? They aren't reinvesting the last quarter's $11 billion back in U.S. exploration.

In fact, in 2009, they paid their shareholders 90 percent of the profits to shareholders, leaving just 10 percent to invest in their workforce, research and development, exploration, safety and the expanding energy frontier.

Contrary to what some of my colleagues are saying, eliminating these wasteful subsidies won't raise gas prices. I want to repeat that:

Eliminating wasteful subsidies will not raise gas prices.

Many of these handouts have been on the books for decades as prices have continued to rise.

It is time to close these loopholes for big oil in order to strengthen our national security—and our energy future. It is time to end the taxpayer handouts to Big Oil.

This bill returns us to a responsible path toward energy development that benefits taxpayers and consumers. And it starts addressing the debt and deficit. It is the right thing to do.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF INTELLECTUAL & DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am pleased today to join the Illinois chapter of the American Association of Intellectual & Developmental Disabilities, AAIDD, in recognizing the recipients of the Illinois Direct Support Professional Award 2011. These individuals are being honored for their outstanding efforts to enrich the lives of people with developmental disabilities in Illinois.

These recipients have displayed a strong sense of humanity and professionalism in their work with persons with disabilities. Their efforts have inspired the lives of those for whom they care, and they are an inspiration to me as well. They have set a fine example of community service for all Americans to follow.

These honorees spend more than 50 percent of their time at work in direct, personal involvement with their clients. They are not primarily managers or supervisors. They are direct service workers at the forefront of America's effort to care for people with special needs. They do their work every day with little public recognition, providing valued care and assistance that is unknown except to those with whom they work.

It is my honor and privilege to recognize the Illinois recipients of AAIDD's Illinois Direct Support Professional Award 2011: Brenda Walker, Sandy DeArmond, Rosie Pippens, Crystal Alvey, Patience Blair, Diana Christofalos, Nick White, and Erica Carter.

I know my fellow Senators will join me in congratulating the winners of the Illinois Direct Support Professional Award 2011. I applaud their dedication and thank them for their service.

REMEMBERING VERNARD WEBB

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a Kentuckian who for much of his life was

content to remain an unsung hero. But let there be no doubt now that Mr. Vernard Hughes Webb, who passed away last year, leaves behind a legacy of great accomplishment and service to his Nation. You see, for many years, Mr. Webb was a pioneer in secret reconnaissance and satellite technology that was crucial to America's efforts in the Cold War. He was one of the developers on the top secret CORONA project, a spy satellite effort, and was awarded a medal of achievement for his life's work by the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Webb was born and raised in Letcher County, KY, and became the first in his family to go to college, graduating from Berea College in 1940. The day after the Pearl Harbor attack, he joined the Army Air Corps. Becoming a bombardier on a B–17, he flew 30 combat missions over Europe during World War II.

Later in the war, Mr. Webb developed the crucial idea that would change the course of not only his career, but perhaps his country as well. Assigned to a combat mapping squadron that was tasked with taking reconnaissance pictures over the Philippines, he came up with an idea to greatly increase the accuracy and efficiency of the cameras.

Mr. Webb ran his idea past his Air Force superiors, and in their infinite wisdom, they said no. So Mr. Webb did it anyway. He spent his own money to create a new camera. And when Vernard's superiors finally realized the worth of his invention, they asked him to implement it across the Air Force.

Vernard Webb eventually rose to the rank of major and became one of this country's leading developers of cameras and aircraft for surveillance purposes. He and his colleagues were in a race with the Soviets. By the 1950s, Vernard realized that his technology could be used not just in airplanes, but in satellites.

In 1958, Mr. Webb was assigned to the CORONA project, America's first efforts to develop a spy satellite. In 1960 the project accomplished its first success, gaining valuable intelligence on the Soviet Union and China. But for all those years Mr. Webb could only tell his friends and even his wife that he was an unimportant bureaucrat or engineer.

In 1995 the CIA declassified many documents pertaining to the CORONA project, and only then were Mr. Webb's accomplishments made clear. Around that same time, Vice President Al Gore declared that ''the CORONA project represents a crucial development in aiding the national security efforts of the United States.''

Vernard Webb passed away last Veterans Day. I extend my greatest condolences to his wife Katie Louis Webb, their children and grandchildren, other members of the Webb family and friends for their loss.

It is only fitting that after a lifetime of service to his country, most of it under a cloak of secrecy that preventing him from receiving the gratitude that he so richly deserved, that Mr. Vernard Webb will be interred at Arlington National Cemetery later this month with full military honors.

And I know my colleagues will join me in extending to the Webb family this Senate's thanks and appreciation for Vernard Webb's sacrifice and service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article illustrating Mr. Webb's heroic life and career be printed in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Berea College Magazine, Summer 1996]

THE SECRET'S OUT: WEBB WAS A SPACE PIONEER

A year ago, Vernard Webb could have gone to prison for telling you about his coffee table.

The piece of furniture, which resembles a kettle drum with a glass top, is made of gold-plated titanium.

Thirty years ago, during the height of the Cold War, the table was the shell for a spy satellite used by the Air Force and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to peek behind the Iron Curtain. It is one of four such satellite ''buckets'' still in existence. The other three are in the Smithsonian institution.

For decades, Webb, a member of Berea's Class of 1940, could only pass himself off as a pencil-pusher for the Air Force, or an engineer with the Environmental Protection Agency. But by no means was Webb telling the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

Webb's wife, Katie Lou Chambers Webb, class of 1942, had her suspicions. After three decades of relocation from one Air Force Base to another and her husband's extended official trips to places he wouldn't identify, she was certain that whatever the government had him working on was very important.

Then, in late 1995, the CIA declassified tens of thousands of documents and it was evident. Webb was a major player in the top secret CORONA project, America's first spy satellite program, from 1957 until 1972. Webb, in fact, is a pioneer in reconnaissance and satellite technology.

Before the CIA's declassification of CORONA documents in August 1995, Webb and other members of the CORONA team were called to the Pentagon for a medal presentation ceremony which itself was classified. He was awarded a medal of achievement by Vice President Al Gore and CIA officials. However, no citation accompanies the medal, since the mission for which he was being honored was still top secret at the time.

''We were not allowed to even speak with our spouses about the classified projects,'' Webb said. ''It was for their own protection, if anything else.''

Joining the Army the day after Pearl Harbor (Dec. 8, 1941), Webb went into what was then the Army Air Corps. Because he had been a photographer for the Berea College student newspaper and listed ''photography'' as one of his skills on a military questionnaire, it was assumed that Webb would be capable with any sort of optical instrument, such as bomb sights and some navigational equipment. He was assigned as a bombardier on a B–17 and flew 30 combat missions over Europe, bombing Axis petroleum sites, mostly in Germany, and dropping supplies to the French Resistance.

Late in the war, Webb was assigned to a combat mapping squadron flying reconnaissance missions from the Philippines. While stationed there, he came up with an innovation that would help shape the remainder of his career.

''We used large cameras mounted in planes that were once used as bombers,'' he said. ''On a typical mission, somewhere between 30 and 40 percent of the film that was used on these cameras would be useless, because we had failed to photograph the target correctly.

''It occurred to me that if one of our cameras were mounted to a Norden bomb sight, it would greatly increase the accuracy of the camera and the efficiency of the equipment. There was a great similarity between the bomb sight and the control of aerial cameras. They both operated on the same principles. The variable on the operation of both was the ratio between the velocity of the airplane and its height above the ground. I thought it would be convenient to combine the two.''

Webb's proposal was found unorthodox by Air Force officials and permission to make the camera-bomb sight combination was denied. Still, Webb was convinced it was a good idea.

''I circumvented the red tape by buying a Norden bombsight with my own money,'' he said. ''The U.S. government had given the Philippine government some Norden sights, and I was able to purchase one of them from the Philippine Air Force. I then mounted the camera on the sight, and we started flying missions with this device. The combination proved to be a 'natural.' ''

While the average reconnaissance mission had an accuracy of photographing a specific site ''on target'' only 60 to 70 percent at that time, an inspector general took notice of the consistent 100 percent success rate of the flights using Webb's camera-bomb sight combination.

''The Air Force officials were always looking at air crew effectiveness,'' he recalled. ''When they saw that we had no rejected aerial photography for a period of months, they began to look into the reasons why. I showed them how we had used the camera and they earmarked me to introduce that technology to the rest of the Air Force.

''I was then transferred to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio, where a team of engineers had been working for almost a year to come up with something like the camera-bomb sight combination I had put together. They ended up scrapping their entire project as a result.''

The official testing of Webb's invention was conducted at Rainey Air Force Base near Wichita, Kan. The Air Force's top test pilot, Chuck Yeager, was assigned to try out the camera system in an RB–50 observation plane and the results were, according to Webb, outstanding. And the die was cast for his career.

''For the next 40 years or so of my career, I would be associated with the reconnaissance efforts of the U.S. Air Force and the Central Intelligence Agency,'' he said.

The following years saw Webb on various projects surrounding the development of cameras and aircraft for surveillance purposes. The RB–36, U–2 and SR–171 spy planes used by the Air Force were fitted with cameras designed by Webb and his team, who were headquartered at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base until the late 1950s.

''The U.S. Air Force continued to develop faster, higher-flying aircraft, which was in response to the development of faster and more accurate anti-aircraft weapons and fighter aircraft developed by the Soviets. It was in the early 1950s that we began to consider certain theories on using orbiting satellites as a platform for reconnaissance work,'' Webb said.

''But we had some big hurdles to jump before we got that far.''

''There were four Air Force officers, Lt. Col. Charles Hoy, Capt. Bernard Quinn, Capt. Louis E. Watson and I [Webb was a major], stationed at Wright-Patterson, who met to analyze what would be the future of our efforts. I had been flying the high-altitude tests on the RB–36, up to 55,000 feet, and we knew that we would have to fly higher and higher altitudes due to the increased capability of Soviet lighter aircraft.

''We knew the answer to our problem would be the altitude of the aircraft or source of observation. We analyzed what problems would result if we could attain an observation point above the atmosphere. These, we narrowed down to three key areas.

''First, we knew that we needed to build better cameras. Our ground resolution couldn't be accurate if we took the cameras we were using then to a much higher altitude. Next, we needed better film with a much higher resolution. Third, we needed a better means to process the film. The administration at Wright-Pat in those days was dominated by civilian engineers, who didn't take kindly to such suggestions from Air Force officers.''

In a historic move, Webb and the three officers maneuvered themselves toward reassignment at the Air Force's Air Research Development Command in Baltimore. The office was administered by Gen. Marvin Dent, who supervised contracted development of reconnaissance systems for the Air Force and was a much more sympathetic listener to Webb and his associates.

''We were able to write the specifications for photographic systems the Air Force required of the industrial contractors then managing the projects at Wright-Pat,'' Webb recalled. ''A meeting was called by the Air Force to speak with industry representatives in Cincinnati regarding the Air Force's needs. Gen. Dent gave the keynote speech. He basically told industry representatives that the current technology being used for reconnaissance was becoming quickly outmoded and he strongly suggested that they work with our group of officers in developing future reconnaissance projects.''

The speech by Dent, made in 1955, led to the development by Air Force-contracted private industry of the first spacecraft-based cameras.

''Within a week of the General's speech, we were visited by representatives of three different contractors,'' Webb said. ''One was a representative of Fairchild Camera and Instrument Corporation, another was from Eastman Kodak and the third was one of the most brilliant optical designers this country has ever produced, Dr. James Baker. Fairchild said they could build the camera, Kodak would handle the processing and Baker would design the lenses required.

''These individuals had done their homework and told us they were confident that they could build a photographic system that could meet our specifications. We had the camera system from them in a year.''

The photographic equipment, which was originally designed for the U–2 spy plane, was meant to operate at an altitude of approximately 84,000 feet. The camera system designed by the Fairchild-Kodak-Baker partnership had a 24-inch lens and a better resolution than any other visual reconnaissance system used at that time. However, the Soviet development of satellite technology would change the nature of Webb's work forever.

''When we originally had the Fairchild camera developed, we were still thinking airplanes,'' Webb recalled. ''But, the development of Sputnik forced us to take the resulting technology into space. When the Soviets successfully orbited Sputnik, the first satellite in 1957, most of America was horrified that we no longer had a technological edge in the Cold War. With my team, we were exhilarated that it had been proven a satellite could be successfully orbited. It gave us an additional step toward our research goals.''

Webb and his co-workers already had an interest in utilizing a space-based camera system for observation. Using some foresight, Webb was able to get transferred to a unit dedicated to guided missile research and incorporated what he learned there into the great body of reconnaissance knowledge he already possessed.

''I was no longer influenced by people who knew only airplanes,'' he said. ''We were now looking at using a camera system that needed to produce high-quality photos from an orbit of 100 miles, instead of 85,000 feet. But the development of the Fairchild camera laid the groundwork for what we would be using later on. The lens we used with the CORONA system was a slight variation of Dr. Baker's 24-inch lens used on the U–2.''

The CORONA program began in 1955 with numerous experiments at a classified site near Palo Alto, California. Webb was assigned to the program, the United States' first efforts at using a spy satellite, in the fall of 1958. ''Our program's cover name, which was operated under scientific pretenses, was Discoverer,'' Webb said. ''We already had a lot of ballistic information that had been done by the guided missile people at Lockheed, the primary contractor of the program.''

The early months of the CORONA program were frustrating for Webb and the Lockheed team. Rocket failures, camera problems and film difficulties all combined to serve as an expensive tutor for the group. The CORONA system consisted of a large orbiting camera, which would be linked to a ''bucket'' containing approximately 4,000 feet of film. After receiving radio commands from Webb and his associates, the satellite was designed to photograph designated areas with the film spooling back into the bucket. The bucket would then detach from the camera and plunge back through Earth's atmosphere where it would be recovered by aircraft upon a parachute reentry.

On August 18, 1960, the first fully successful CORONA mission was accomplished, with the satellite photographing areas in the Soviet Union and China. An American flag, stowed in the satellite's bucket, was presented to President Dwight D. Eisenhower in a secret White House ceremony later that month.

The White House, however, was even more pleased with the photographs obtained by CORONA. ''That single mission obtained more photos from behind the Iron Curtain than all the combined U–2 missions flown up to that time,'' Webb said. ''It was considered an outstanding success, and we were in business.''

The CORONA project was utilized successfully during the Cuban Missile Crisis, most of the Vietnam War and an important period of the Cold War. Portions of the project's development and results are still classified, but many of the spy photos have been made available to the public on the Internet by the CIA and Air Force.

''The CORONA project represents a crucial development in aiding the national security efforts of the United States,'' said Vice President Gore in a ceremony held at the Pentagon last year.

Originally from Letcher County, Ky., Webb credits Berea for getting him on track for what he considers a fascinating career. ''At Berea they taught me to work. They gave me the discipline I needed to do well,'' Webb said.

Oh, and just how did Webb get his ''coffee table,'' anyway? ''When they changed the design of the satellite and no longer needed these, a crate arrived at my office,'' Webb remembered.

''When I saw what was in it, I called my supervisor and asked why it had been sent to me. He said, 'We have been given an order from the highest possible authority that the bucket is yours to keep. Your efforts have been appreciated. Now, don't ask any more questions.' And he hung up.''

REMEMBERING HARRY HOE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is with sadness that I rise today to note the passing of one of southeastern Kentucky's most notable citizens, Mr. Harry Morgan Hoe. Mr. Hoe was a decorated World War II veteran who fought in the Battle of the Bulge under the command of GEN George Patton. He recalled once what General Patton said to his men then:

''Half of you guys are not going home, you know that, don't you? You're over here to take that hill, and if you don't take it, I want to see the truckload of dog tags that show me that you proved yourself.''

Well, Harry Hoe did return home, after fighting in five major European campaigns, and he certainly did prove himself. He received the Silver Star for gallantry in action, the Bronze Star, the Oak Leaf Cluster for heroic action and the French Liberation Appreciation Medal.

But Mr. Hoe's heroic service in World War II is just the beginning of his incredible life story. He would go on to meet the love of his life, his wife Mary, in college and return to his hometown of Middlesboro to work in the family foundry business. He would be elected to the State legislature, invest countless hours in volunteer work and community service, and become a role model for me and many others for his leadership, his humility and his dedication to the people of the Bluegrass State.

With his wife Mary, who passed away some time ago, Harry had three children and several grandchildren. I wish to offer my greatest condolences to the Hoe family and all of Harry's many friends who are mourning his loss.

Mr. President, a wonderful article that appeared today in the Middlesboro Daily News tells the story of Mr. Harry Hoe's life and career. It is a fitting tribute to a fine man and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Middlesboro Daily News, May 10, 2011]

MIDDLESBORO LOSES 'CROWN JEWEL'

(By Lorie Settles/Staff Writer)

MIDDLESBORO.—Many in Middlesboro are mourning the passing of one of the city's most influential people—Harry Morgan Hoe.

''The city has lost one of its crowned jewels,'' lamented longtime friend and businessman, Dewey Morgan. ''He and Mary Bob (his

wife) were always generous and welcoming to everyone. They were people people.''

Hoe spent his life serving his community and his nation. A World War II veteran, Hoe fought in five major European campaigns including the Battle of the Bulge, and served under the infamous General George Patton.

Hoe spoke of his experience under Patton in a Daily News interview in 2010.

''He said: Half of you guys are not going home, you know that don't you? You're over here to take that hill and if you don't take it, I want to see the truckload of dog tags that show me that you proved yourself.' So we fought. We were his soldiers—that was all we knew to do,'' he remembered.

Dewey Morgan also remarked on Hoe's service to the nation.

''The thing a lot of people might not know about Harry is that he was a hero in the Battle of the Bulge. He was a member of the American force that pushed Hitler back into Germany. And for the rest of his life, he suffered with his feet that had been frozen during the battle,'' Morgan reported.

Hoe was decorated with the Silver Star for gallantry in action, the Bronze Star, the Oak Leaf Cluster for heroic action and the French Liberation Appreciation Medal—all before reaching the age of 19.

Hoe's achievements only increased from there. In 1953, Harry Morgan Hoe was honored as one of the three Outstanding Young Men of Kentucky. Hoe worked as the Director of the Kentucky Utilities company for 19 years, and was honored by the company with a $100,000 donation that was awarded to Clear Creek Baptist Bible College. He served as a board member of the college for 20 years and as Chairman for two terms.

In 1953, Hoe became the founder of the first racially integrated Little League Baseball organization south of the Ohio River. He served as the Middlesboro League's president for seven years.

Hoe worked as General Chairman for the dedication of the Cumberland Gap National Park in 1959. He was the Director of Kentucky Mountain Laurel Festival Board for more than 50 years and served twice as President.

Harry also acted as Chairman of the Board of Directors of Kentuckians for Better Transportation and Associated Industries in Kentucky. He spent two three-year terms as Director of the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce.

In 1964, Harry Hoe decided to try his hand at politics. He was elected to the Kentucky House of Representatives, where he served for six years. The passage of the drunk driving bill that he authored in 1968 was the highlight of his political career.

Harry was the Minority Whip and the Assistant Minority Floor Leader. He spent twelve years serving on the Kentucky Republican State Central Committee and was inducted into the Republican 5th Congressional District Hall of Fame by Congressman Hal Rogers.

As an eyewitness to paramount moments in the history of the U.S., the state of Kentucky, and the city of Middlesboro, Hoe served as a reference guide to many who knew him.

''He was a walking history book,'' said friend Lawrence Tuck. ''He was a very special friend to my wife Barbara and myself. He helped so many people and we will miss him so much.''

Tuck said that Hoe had attended last Wednesday's Kiwanis meeting, a club he was a member of since 1949. He also attended Sunday services at First Baptist Church where he had served as a Deacon, Sunday School teacher, and choir member.

Hoe was additionally a lifetime member of the Salvation Army Advisory Board and was awarded the Salvation Army William Booth Award, the highest honor given by the charity, after serving as Chairman.

Many also know Hoe for his work with the family business, the J.R. Hoe and Sons foundry.

Hoe was preceded in death by his beloved wife, Mary, whom he met while the two were students at the University of Tennessee. He referred to her as his ''secret weapon'' in the Daily News interview. The couple had three children together and several grandchildren.

RECOGNIZING LOGIC SUPPLY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I wish to share a business success story from my home State of Vermont.

For years Vermont has been branded as the State of milk, apples, and maple syrup. But along the ridgelines of the Green Mountains and in the valleys along the many rivers that find their way to Lake Champlain, a new high-tech and green-tech sector is quickly emerging as an economic driver for both Vermont and the entire country. The Burlington Free Press recently highlighted one such company—Logic Supply in South Burlington, VT.

I have heard many great things about Logic Supply's work and their commitment to Vermont. Company owners Lisa and Roland Groeneveld have kept Logic Supply extremely active in our State's high-tech business networking community both as members of the Vermont Software Developers Alliance and as regular participants in the Vermont 3.0 Creative Tech Jam. In 2010, KeyBank and Vermont Business Magazine recognized Logic Supply as one of Vermont's fastest growing companies.

As Logic Supply has grown, they have helped brand Vermont as a place where businesses can succeed, and where people looking to work in the economy of tomorrow can find a job today. I commend them for their hard work and success.

I ask unanimous consent that the May 9, 2011, Burlington Free Press article entitled ''Logic Dictates, Couple Prove Tech Has Place On Vt. Buz Scene'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press, May 9, 2011]

LOGIC DICTATES, COUPLE PROVE TECH HAS PLACE ON VT. BIZ SCENE

(By Dan D'Ambrosio)

In 2002, Lisa and Roland Groeneveld left behind their corporate telecommunications jobs in the Netherlands, where they had met, and moved to Vermont without work. Roland is Dutch. Lisa is a native of Barre and wanted to live close to family after her father died.

The company she worked for, WorldCom, was imploding spectacularly, filing the biggest bankruptcy in U.S. history at the time. The company he worked for, an Anglo-Dutch consultancy called CMG with about 14,000 employees, was about to be swallowed up by an even bigger company, Logica, based in Reading, England, now with almost 40,000 employees.

So, they went their own way. In less than a decade, the Groenevelds have built a high-tech business in South Burlington, Logic Supply, Inc., that has made a profit from day one.

After launching with $40,000 the couple had saved, the company is on track to reach $16 million in sales in 2011—up nearly 40 percent from 2010 sales of $11.5 million. It is debt free, recently moved into a $2.3 million building with room for expansion and, in theory, will reach $350 million in sales by 2020 if it meets the BHAG (Big Hairy Audacious Goal) set by its management and employees. That acronym, by the way, is proudly displayed on a bulletin board in the break room.

HOW'S THAT FOR LANDING ON YOUR FEET?

After moving to Vermont, Lisa and Roland's first order of business was to build a house on property Lisa's parents owned where they had a small vacation cabin. Roland bought a book on how to build your own house, hired a carpenter, and got to work, with Lisa's help.

''It literally was nine months of pounding nails, which was a lot of fun, very different than IT,'' Roland said. ''Once you start doing it, it's pretty straightforward.''

While their house was being built, Lisa landed a job in Boston at a business some of her former colleagues from WorldCom had started, called Fiberlink. After the house was finished in 2003, the couple decided to move to Boston for Lisa's job.

''We found an apartment there,'' Roland said. ''What am I to do next? Together we sat down and wrote some business plans.''

Years earlier, Roland had started a company in the Netherlands, and sold it a year and a half later to an Internet company during the dot.com boom. So he knew the feeling of being an entrepreneur.

''Running your own business is nice, it gives you a lot of freedom and independence,'' Roland said. ''I wanted to get back to that sort of feeling and idea.''

The couple complemented each other when it came to launching a high-tech business. Roland had a degree in electrical engineering and computer science. Lisa had an extensive business background, having worked for what was the highest flyer in telecom before it crashed to earth.

But before they got to the plan that would lead to Logic Supply, the couple took a couple of detours.

''One was importing high-end coffee makers from Europe,'' Roland said. ''You're drinking a cup of coffee and you think, Boy wouldn't it be nice to get a good cup of coffee!'''

Of course, there were already companies out there importing nice coffee pots from Europe. But there weren't so many doing what Logic Supply would end up doing, an idea that came from the development of smaller and smaller, and more and more rugged computers.

''We make very high-end computer systems for industrial embedded applications,'' Roland said, summarizing the company he and Lisa launched in their Boston apartment eight and a half years ago. ''We never really sell to end users. Typically we sell to a company that has their own product, their own sales force and their own marketing. We're basically the engineering department for the company.''

Logic Supply makes the computers, for example, for Project 54, a system for police cruisers and ambulances developed at the University of New Hampshire that integrates the functions of the vehicle into a single interface that can be operated by voice or a touch screen, simplifying life for a police officer or EMT in an emergency situation.

''It's a computer that runs the police car,'' Roland said. ''When they're driving, cops can

interact with the computer by voice: 'Sirens on, lights on.' They can request initial information on a license plate, operate video cameras. The computer is not taking over the functions, but controlling the functions.''

Logic Supply also makes custom computers for industrial automation—in slaughterhouses, where they can be sprayed with blood; or tire manufacturing, where they're subject to a lot of moisture and particles flying around, along with shock and vibration.

''Our computers are designed to withstand all that,'' Roland said. ''A typical PC will fail. They can't handle that sort of environment.''

Logic Supply is in the medical market as well.

''One of our customers converts analog X-ray machines to make them digital,'' Roland said. ''Our computers will capture the images from those older machines and convert them and make those images available online for doctors.''

INTERNET SAVVY

Remarkably, the company has experienced its explosive growth almost exclusively through its website, making search engine optimization a top priority.

''Our primary customers are engineers, and engineers don't like to talk to sales people, they like to do their own research,'' Roland said. ''I can say this stuff because I'm an engineer myself.''

The website gives engineers all the information they need to place their orders. The Logic Supply sales team does follow up with human contact, just to make sure their customers are satisfied and have everything they need, Roland says, but if they want to be left alone to place their orders in peace and not talk to anybody, Logic Supply obliges.

The Groenevelds' plan for the next 10 years is to grow at a sustained rate of 30 percent to 40 percent a year, which presumably would get them to the BHAG posted on the lunch room bulletin board. If anything slows them down, Roland says, it's likely to be the difficulty of finding qualified employees in Vermont.

''Vermont is not well known as a tech state, or even a great state for employment,'' Roland said. ''People think there's not a future for them here and they leave. We need to stop that as a community. We need to make sure people are aware there are opportunities here and that there are great businesses here.''

Mark Heyman is Logic Supply's director of human resources, and recently joined the board of directors of Vermont Software Developers' Alliance. He said the alliance is planning to broaden into a representative group for the entire tech industry in the state, highlighting companies in the state like his own, and many others.

''There's a reason not only to stay in Vermont, but for other people to come here,'' Heyman said. ''We see ourselves along with other companies as leading a resurgence. Get the word out, let's attract people. Like geeking out on a computer? I've got a sandbox for you. As people come walking through here applying for a job, they often say they never even realized something like this existed in Vermont.''

TRIBUTE TO DR. MATTHEW FRIEDMAN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to congratulate Dr. Matthew Friedman, a finalist for the 2011 Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medals. Dr. Friedman is the executive director of the National Center for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, PTSD, headquartered in White River Junction, VT. He was a finalist for the Career Achievement Medal given annually to a federal employee for significant accomplishments over a lifetime of achievement in public service.

Dr. Friedman is a pioneer in the field of traumatic stress disorders. For nearly 40 years now he has been working to identify the causes of and treatments for PTSD and advocating for those afflicted with the disorder. It is the cause of his career.

While PTSD is now recognized as a serious affliction associated with the stresses and violence of war, this was not always the case. In the early days of his work, Dr. Friedman had to convince skeptics both inside and outside of the Veterans Administration that many returning troops were suffering from PTSD. His efforts eventually persuaded veterans to accept the disease within their own communities. He was among the first Veterans Administration clinicians to recognize the depth and breadth of the disorder among returning Vietnam veterans. In 1973, he established one of the earliest groups to provide mental health assistance to former soldiers.

In 1989, after years of distinguished work in the field, Dr. Friedman was named as the first executive director of the then-new National Center for PTSD based in Vermont, in White River Junction. Since then, the center has grown into a group of seven centers located at VA medical centers and in connection with university medical research programs around the country. These seven centers have conducted unprecedented research, leading to critical advancements in the understanding, treatment, and prevention of traumatic disorders.

The Service to America Medals are some of the most prestigious awards given to celebrate America's civil servants. The medals will be presented on September 15 in Washington, DC.

Dr. Friedman has spent years studying, treating and advocated for our brave veterans who have been psychologically affected by war or other tragedies. Whether or not he is ultimately selected for it, Dr. Friedman is certainly deserving of the Samuel J. Heyman Career Achievement Medal, I commend him on his selection as a finalist, and I thank him for a lifetime of public service to America's veterans.

Dr. Friedman was mentioned in an article entitled Finalists for government's ''Oscars,'' recently published in the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that a copy be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 2011]

FINALISTS FOR GOVERNMENT'S ''OSCARS''

SERVICE MEDALS WILL BE AWARDED TO NINE OUTSTANDING EMPLOYEES

(By Lisa Rein)

One is leading the effort to reduce tobacco-related disease by regulating what goes into cigarettes. Another helped disrupt drug traffickers from laundering billions of dollars through Mexican banks. Another developed a strategy to make sure every American has access to high-speed Internet service.

These are among 34 federal workers nominated for the 2011 Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medal awards. The service medals—or ''Sammies,'' as they are known—are the Academy Awards of the federal world and honor distinguished public servants in a variety of fields, including transportation safety and data systems. With civil servants a key focal point in the debate over the size of government, the nonprofit Partnership for Public Service hopes its annual Service to America medals will act as a reminder of federal workers' commitment to their jobs.

Nine employees will receive awards this fall for their work on a variety of issues, both in the headlines and under the radar. One among them will be honored as federal employee of the year.

The 34 finalists, selected from more than 400 nominations by their bosses and colleagues, will be honored Thursday at a breakfast on Capitol Hill as part of Public Service Recognition Week, May 1–7, intended to recognize the efforts of federal, state and local government workers.

The nominees hail from Menlo Park, Calif., to White River Junction, Vt., with 23 working in the Washington area. Some are approaching the end of a long career in government, while others are in their 20s.

The Washington Post chose a random sample of finalists to ask about their work:

When the Food and Drug Administration gained new authority over tobacco products in 2009, it turned to doctor and public health expert Lawrence Deyton to launch the Center for Tobacco Products. Deyton's 30-year career in government has focused on fighting hepatitis, AIDS among veterans and other public health threats.

With a $450 million budget, Deyton, 58, led a successful effort to prohibit tobacco manufacturers from displaying the labels ''light,'' ''low'' and ''mild.'' In June, the center will issue regulations requiting graphic new health warnings on cigarette packages and billboards. Next up: Establishing which ingredients in cigarettes could be removed or changed to make them safer.

''We have a fundamental authority now that no other country has,'' Deyton said.

The Defense Department's inspector general has long had a system for protecting service members who report wrongdoing. But until Dan Meyer and his team were hired in 2004, civilian whisleblowers who suffered from retaliation had no advocate.

Meyer, 46, created a program that protects employees who report national security and procurement fraud. These whistleblowers often lose their security clearances as punishment. Meyer once blew the whistle himself when he was a Navy line officer who disclosed flaws in the investigation of a 1989 explosion that killed 47 American sailors.

''We needed to approach this as protection of our sources,'' he said.

When the Environmental Protection Agency came out late last year with a new plan to restore the Chesapeake Bay, 31-year-old Katherine Antos cajoled sometime-warring state governments, advocacy groups and industry to cooperate to increase their accountability. ''If we are going to be successful, we needed the right buy-in,'' said Antos,

leader of the bay program's Water Quality Team. The biggest problem was conveying what might seem simple: ''What needs to be done, who is going to do it and how,'' she said.

Three years ago, the National Institutes of Health attempted to pick up where the country's prestigious medical centers had left off, cracking the code of diseases that cannot be diagnosed.

William Gahl, a pediatrician specializing in clinical and biochemical genetics, took on the challenge as the first director of the Undiagnosed Diseases Program. Interest was so strong that Gahl's $280,000 budget quickly grew to $3.5 million. Of 5,000 applicants, 400 have been accepted, though a medical diagnosis has been found for just 60.

''We admit failure in the majority of our cases,'' Gahl said. ''But these are people who have been everywhere else.''

Analysts at the Treasury Department's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network have long suspected that Mexican drug traffickers were smuggling cash from their narcotics sales back into Mexico for deposit in local banks. Senior intelligence research analyst Ann Martin, 29, analyzed tens of thousands of bank transactions and discovered last year that billions of dollars in illegal drug profits were entering the Mexican banking system from the United States. Her work led the Mexican government to issue new regulations capping the amount of American dollars that can flow to Mexican banks.

Post-traumatic stress disorder is a well-known mental health issue facing service members, but when Matthew Friedman began his career working with veterans 40 years ago, the term did not exist.

Today, the psychiatrist and pharmacologist is executive director of the Veterans Affairs Department's National Center for PTSD, based in White River Junction, Vt. Since the center was created in 1989, Friedman has expanded it to seven VA medical centers across the country. He overcame many skeptics along the way, who believed the affliction was not a serious disorder. At 71, Friedman now wants to understand how to prevent the disorder and why some soldiers suffer from it while others don't.

''What is the difference between resilient and vulnerable people?'' he asked.

STAMP OUT HUNGER FOOD DRIVE

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, today I honor the National Association of Letter Carriers' Stamp Out Hunger Food Drive. Every year, on the second Saturday in May, letter carriers across the country collect nonperishable food as part of the Nation's largest one-day food drive, distributing the donations to local food banks. In these difficult economic times—as families continue to make ends meet and food banks deal with tightening budgets—these efforts are especially important.

The Stamp Out Hunger Food Drive is just one example of how letter carriers work to make a difference in the lives of those they serve. Since the food drive was launched 19 years ago, they have collected a billion pounds of food, including 77.3 million pounds last year alone. They do all of this in service of the communities in which the live and work. And the work they do remains essential. Even in today's electronic society, millions of us depend on letter carriers to deliver everything from birthday cards to life-saving prescription medications.

In recognition of all letter carriers, their hard work and their commitment to their communities, I ask that all of us join with them in support of their one-day food drive and make a donation of nonperishable food items this Saturday, May 14, 2011, the National Association of Letter Carriers' Stamp Out Hunger Food Drive Day.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NEW HAMPSHIRE TIMBERLAND OWNERS ASSOCIATION

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I recognize and congratulate the New Hampshire Timberland Owners Association on achieving a commendable feat—100 years of successful forest management, conservation, and awareness efforts.

The New Hampshire Timberland Owners Association will hold its centennial annual meeting this year in Whitefield, NH, at the Mountain View Grand Resort from Friday, May 20 through Sunday, May 22, where the association will gather at Weeks State Park—the former summer home of Senator John Wingate Weeks, the author of the 1911 Weeks Act, a landmark piece of conservation legislation which paved the way for the formation of the White Mountain National Forest.

The New Hampshire Timberland Owners Association was established as a nonprofit organization in 1911, with William R. Brown serving as president. By 1912, the association had 32 members. Today, the association celebrates 100 years of hard work and its more than 1,400 members representing land ownership of over 1 million acres.

The association's initial objectives were the protection and improvement of timberland and property rights. The members' efforts focused on planning and acting on matters relating to forest management, legislation, and taxes. Today, the association is a statewide coalition of landowners, forest industry professionals, government officials, and supporters who work together to promote forest management and conservation of New Hampshire's working forests and to ensure a vibrant forest products industry.

Since its inception, the association has continuously grown and expanded its efforts. Working with the State of New Hampshire, the Federal Government, and local governments, the association has ensured that New Hampshire's timberlands are managed for the benefit of timberland owners and, ultimately, the best interests of the timber economy of our great State. Together, landowners and forest industry professionals share the understanding that a well-managed forest is essential to New Hampshire's economy and our identity. The New Hampshire Timberland Owners Association represents some of the most treasured characteristics of the Granite State—teamwork, foresight in innovation, vision, and initiative.

As the New Hampshire Timberland Owners Association celebrates its first 100 years, I commend their efforts and congratulate them on a job well done. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the New Hampshire Timberland Owners Association's centennial celebration.•

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 940. A bill to reduce the Federal budget deficit by closing big oil tax loopholes, 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–1564. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (70); Amdt. No. 30779'' (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1565. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (116); Amdt. No. 3418'' (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1566. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (33); Amdt. No. 3419'' (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1567. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Amdt. No. 3420'' (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1568. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Amdt. No. 3421'' (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1569. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (12); Amdt. No. 3423'' (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2011; to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1570. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Kahului, HI'' ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2010–1233)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1571. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Creighton, NE'' ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2010–1170)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1572. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; West Yellowstone, MT'' ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2010–1209)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1573. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Pueblo, CO'' ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2010–1246)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1574. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Taylor, AZ'' ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2010–1189)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1575. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Terre Haute, IN'' ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2010–1034)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1576. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Kenton, OH'' ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2010–1054)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1577. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Indianapolis Executive Airport, IN'' ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2010–1027)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1578. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Class E Airspace; Kutztown, PA'' ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2010–0869)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 927. A bill to require congressional approval before implementation of certain agency actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURR:

S. 928. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to limit the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use bid savings on major medical facility projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs to expand or change the scope of a major medical facility project of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 929. A bill to establish a comprehensive literacy program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 930. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the same capital gains treatment for art and collectibles as for other investment property and to provide that a deduction equal to fair market value shall be allowed for charitable contributions of literary, musical, artistic, or scholarly compositions created by the donor; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 931. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the rules relating to fractional charitable donations of tangible personal property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 932. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a $1,000 refundable credit for individuals who are bona fide volunteer members of volunteer firefighting and emergency medical service organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 933. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and increase the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 934. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to make a technical correction relating to stainless steel single-piece exhaust gas manifolds; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

S. 935. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a program of outreach to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 936. A bill to establish the American Infrastructure Investment Fund and other activities to facilitate investments in infrastructure projects that significantly enhance the economic competitiveness of the United States by improving economic output, productivity, or competitive commercial advantage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. COATS):

S. 937. A bill to repeal certain barriers to domestic fuel production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. KOHL):

S. 938. A bill to establish a research, development, demonstration, and commercial application program to promote research of appropriate technologies for heavy duty plug-in hybrid vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 939. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the volume cap for private activity bonds shall not apply to bonds for facilities for the furnishing of water and sewage facilities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. REID, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REED, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. COONS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 940. A bill to reduce the Federal budget deficit by closing big oil tax loopholes, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 941. A bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 942. A bill to provide for improved investment in national transportation infrastructure; 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 Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. Res. 175. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to ongoing violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Georgia and the importance of a peaceful and just resolution to the conflict within Georgia's internationally recognized borders; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

S. Res. 176. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States Postal Service should issue a semipostal stamp to support medical research relating to Alzheimer's disease; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. Res. 177. A resolution designating the week of May 15 through May 21, 2011, as ''National Public Works Week''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. Res. 178. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 1, 2011, as ''Silver Star Service Banner Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself and Mr. INOUYE):

S. Con. Res. 16. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 164

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 164, a bill to repeal the imposition of withholding on certain payments made to vendors by government entities.

S. 222

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 222, a bill to limit investor and homeowner losses in foreclosures, and for other purposes.

S. 245

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 245, a bill to reduce Federal spending in a responsible manner.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 362, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a Pancreatic Cancer Initiative, and for other purposes.

S. 385

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 385, a bill to include nonprofit and volunteer ground and air ambulance crew members and first responders for certain benefits.

S. 411

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 411, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into agreements with States and nonprofit organizations to collaborate in the provision of case management services associated with certain supported housing programs for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 414

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 414, a bill to protect girls in developing countries through the prevention of child marriage, and for other purposes.

S. 418

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 418, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

S. 427

At the request of Mr. HELLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 427, a bill 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. 456

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 456, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to require monthly reporting to the Secretary of Agriculture of items contained in the cold storage survey and the dairy products survey of the National Agriculture Statistics.

S. 457

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 457, a bill to allow modified bloc voting by cooperative associations of milk producers in connection with a referendum on Federal milk marketing order reform.

S. 458

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 458, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish and enforce a maximum somatic cell count requirement for fluid milk.

S. 459

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 459, a bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to preserve certain rates for the milk income loss contract program.

S. 463

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 463, a bill to amend part B of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to promote effective STEM teaching and learning.

S. 468

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) 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. 489

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 489, a bill to require certain mortgagees to evaluate loans for modifications, to establish a grant program for State and local government mediation programs, and for other purposes.

S. 547

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 547, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish an award program recognizing excellence exhibited by public school system employees providing services to students in pre-kindergarten through higher education.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 567, a bill to amend the small, rural school achievement program and the rural and low-income school program under part B of title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

S. 584

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 584, a bill to establish the Social Work Reinvestment Commission to provide independent counsel to Congress and the Secretary of Health and Human Services on policy issues associated with recruitment, retention, research, and reinvestment in the profession of social work, and for other purposes.

S. 587

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 587, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to repeal a certain exemption for hydraulic fracturing, and for other purposes.

S. 634

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) 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. 668

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 668, a bill to remove unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats from seniors' personal health decisions by repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

S. 701

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) 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. 718

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 718, a bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to improve the use of certain registered pesticides.

S. 800

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 800, a bill to amend the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to reauthorize and improve the safe routes to school program.

S. 844

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) 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 names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 868, a bill to restore the longstanding partnership between the States and the Federal Government in managing the Medicaid program.

S. 891

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 906

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of S. 906, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions and to provide for conscience protections, and for other purposes.

S. 926

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 926, a bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to permanently prohibit the conduct of offshore drilling on the outer Continental Shelf in the Mid-Atlantic and North Atlantic planning areas.

S.J. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 10, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the budget.

S. RES. 80

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 80, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 174

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 174, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that effective sharing of passenger information from inbound international flight manifests is a crucial component of our national security and that the Department of Homeland Security must maintain the information sharing standards required under the 2007 Passenger Name Record Agreement between the United States and the European Union.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. KOHL):

S. 938. A bill to establish a research, development, demonstration, and commercial application program to promote research of appropriate technologies for heavy duty plug-in hybrid vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Heavy Duty Hybrid Vehicle Research, Development, and Demonstration Act, along with my colleagues Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator KOHL. This bill will accelerate research of plug-in hybrid technologies for heavy duty trucks.

The Federal Government, through the 21st Century Truck Partnership, has for some years provided funding to conduct research and development for the modernization of this industry, in association with private industry partners. Despite the significant potential benefits of hybrid trucks, however, research in this area was eliminated recently to focus on passenger vehicles. This decision was shortsighted.

Truck operators in Maine and around the country are again being hard hit by increases in the price of diesel fuel. Given that our nation relies upon the trucking industry to keep our economy running by providing timely delivery of food, industrial products, and raw materials, we must develop alternatives that make the industry less susceptible to dramatic changes in oil prices. Hybrid power technologies offer tremendous promise of reducing this critical industry's dependence on oil.

Trucks consume large amounts of imported fuels. Successfully transitioning trucks to hybrid power technology will reduce our Nation's oil consumption and improve our energy security. The Heavy Duty Hybrid Vehicle Research, Development, and Demonstration Act directs the Department of Energy to expand its research in advanced energy storage technologies to include hybrid trucks as well as passenger vehicles. Current hybrid technology works well for cars that can be made with lightweight materials and travel short distances. Trucks need to be constructed with heavy materials commensurate with the heavy loads they carry and, if they are going to be plug-in hybrids, travel relatively long distances between charges. Thus advances in battery and other technologies are needed to make plug-in trucks commercially viable and will require more advanced technology than is required for passenger cars.

Grant recipients will be required to complete two phases. In phase one, recipients must build one plug-in hybrid truck, collect data, and make performance comparisons with traditional trucks. Recipients who show promise in phase one will be invited to enter into phase two where they must produce 50 plug-in hybrid trucks and report on the technological and market obstacles to widespread production. The bill will also sponsor two smaller programs to deal with drive-train issues and the impact of the wide use of plug-in hybrid technology on the electrical grid. In total, the bill authorizes the expenditure of $16 million for each of fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014.

We need a comprehensive approach to modernize commercial transportation in the 21st century. The Heavy Duty Hybrid Vehicle Research, Development, and Demonstration Act is one vital piece of that approach.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 941. A bill to strengthen families engagement in the education of their children; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I introduce the Family Engagement in Education Act with my colleagues Senator COONS and Senator WHITEHOUSE. I thank Representative PLATTS for introducing the House companion of this bipartisan bill.

Our legislation will strengthen family engagement in education at the local, State, and national levels. It will empower parents by increasing school district resources dedicated to family engagement activities from 1 percent to 2 percent of the district Title I allocation. It will also improve quality of family engagement practices at the school level by requiring school districts to develop and implement standards-based policies and practices for family-school partnerships. It will build State and local capacity for effective family engagement in education by setting aside 1 percent of the State Title I allocation for local family engagement in education centers to provide innovative programming and services, such as leadership training and family literacy, to local families and to remove barriers to family engagement, and for supporting state-level activities. Finally, our bill will restructure the Parent Information Resource Centers so that they can provide statewide technical assistance in line with the quality framework developed by the U.S. Department of Education, Harvard Family Research Project, and Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. At the national level, our legislation will require the Secretary of Education to convene practitioners, researchers, and other experts in the field of family engagement in education to develop recommended metrics for measuring the quality and outcomes of family engagement in a child's education.

Research demonstrates that family engagement in a child's education increases student achievement, improves attendance, and reduces dropout rates. A recent study by Anne Seitsinger and Steven Brand at the University of Rhode Island's Center for School Improvement and Educational Policy found that students whose parents support their education through learning activities at home and discuss the importance of education perform better in school. Yet too often, family engagement is not built into our school improvement efforts in a systematic way. The Family Engagement in Education Act will promote meaningful family engagement policies and programs at the national, State, and local levels to ensure that all students are on track to be career and college-ready.

The bill builds on my successful efforts in the last reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act, to incorporate provisions throughout the law to strengthen and boost parental involvement. It is also in line with the Administration's blueprint for reauthorization, which calls for doubling the amount that school districts are required to set aside for parental involvement and encouraging States to use some of their Title I funding to support local family engagement centers in education.

Developed with the National Family, School, and Community Engagement Working Group, which includes organizations such as National PTA, United Way Worldwide, Harvard Family Research Project, and National Council of La Raza, and endorsed by hundreds of local, State, and national organizations, this legislation represents the broad consensus that we must do a better job of engaging families in all aspects of their children's education.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Family Engagement in Education Act, and to work for its inclusion in the forthcoming debate to reauthorize and renew the Elementary and Secondary Education 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. 941

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 ''Family Engagement in Education Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
Sec. 3. Findings; purpose.
Sec. 4. Amendment references.
Sec. 5. Family engagement in education.
Sec. 6. State plans.
Sec. 7. Local educational agency plans.
Sec. 8. Family engagement in education policy.
Sec. 9. Prevention and intervention programs for children and youth who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk.
Sec. 10. High-quality teachers and principals.
Sec. 11. Family engagement in education programs.
Sec. 12. Definitions.
Sec. 13. Conforming amendments.
Sec. 14. Government Accountability Office study and report.
Sec. 15. Federal coordination of family engagement in education programming.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Family engagement in a child's education raises student achievement, improves behavior and attendance, decreases drop-out rates, and improves the emotional and physical well-being of children.

(2) Families are critical determinants of children's school readiness as well as of students' decision to pursue higher education.

(3) Effective family engagement is a great equalizer for students, contributing to their increased academic achievement, regardless of parents' education level, ethnicity, or socioeconomic background.

(4) Family engagement can raise student academic achievement so substantially that schools would need to increase spending by more than $1,000 per pupil to gain the same results.

(5) Positive benefits for children, youth, families, and schools are maximized through effective family engagement that—

(A) is a shared responsibility in which schools and other community agencies and organizations are committed to reaching out to engage families in meaningful ways and families are committed to actively supporting their children's learning and development;

(B) is continuous across a child's life from birth to young adulthood; and

(C) reinforces learning that takes place in all settings.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENT REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.).

SEC. 5. FAMILY ENGAGEMENT IN EDUCATION.

(a) FAMILY ENGAGEMENT AND RESPONSIBILITY FUND.—Title I (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) is amended by adding after section 1004 the following:

''SEC. 1005. FAMILY ENGAGEMENT AND RESPONSIBILITY FUND.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each State educational agency may reserve not more than 1 percent of such agency's allocated funds under section 1122 for each fiscal year for use as provided in subsection (b).

''(b) USE OF RESERVED FUNDS.—From the amounts reserved for each fiscal year under subsection (a), each State educational agency shall—

''(1) reserve not less than 85 percent for Local Family Engagement Centers under section 1006; and

''(2) reserve not more than 15 percent for State educational agency capacity for family engagement activities under section 1007.''.

(b) LOCAL FAMILY ENGAGEMENT CENTERS PROGRAM.—Title I (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) is amended by adding after section 1005, as added by subsection (a), the following:

''SEC. 1006. LOCAL FAMILY ENGAGEMENT CENTERS PROGRAM.

''(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to establish and operate Local Family Engagement Centers and to evaluate the usefulness and effectiveness of innovative approaches demonstrated by these centers in engaging families in their children's education by providing training, services, supports, and opportunities that meet families' needs and remove barriers to their engagement in their children's education to improve student achievement.

''(b) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From the funds reserved to carry out this section under section 1005(b)(1), a State educational agency shall award grants or enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with eligible entities to establish and operate Local Family Engagement Centers.

''(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—In this section, the term 'eligible entity' means a private, nonprofit organization that—

''(1) has a demonstrated record of working with low-income parents and families in the community;

''(2) is located in a community with elementary schools and secondary schools that receive funds under part A and is accessible to families of students in those schools; and

''(3) is partnering with 1 or more local educational agencies or 1 or more schools that receive funds under part A.

''(d) APPLICATION FOR GRANTS.—To receive a grant under this section, an eligible entity

shall submit an application to the State educational agency at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the State educational agency may require, including—

''(1) a description of the entity's approach on family engagement in education, including its use of strength-based strategies;

''(2) information demonstrating that the applicant meets the definition of an eligible entity;

''(3) information that the applicant has the capacity to operate a center capable of conducting the training, services, and support activities to fulfill the purposes of a Local Family Engagement Center;

''(4) information that the applicant will structure and operate a center of sufficient scope and quality adequate to serve the needs of the local area in which it is located;

''(5) a description of the entity's experience in providing training, services, and support to low-income parents and families, English language learners, minorities, parents of students with disabilities, parents of homeless students, foster parents, and parents of migrant students;

''(6) a description of the collaboration with the local educational agency or school personnel in the geographic area to be served by the center;

''(7) a description of the steering committee, a majority of whose members are parents of students in schools that receive funds under part A, that will direct and implement the activities of the Local Family Engagement Center;

''(8) a description of how the entity will coordinate its efforts with the Statewide Family Engagement Centers under subpart 16 of part D of title V in the State;

''(9) information that the applicant is capable of meeting milestones or deadlines as the State educational agency may prescribe; and

''(10) such other information as the State educational agency determines necessary.

''(e) USES OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall establish and operate a Local Family Engagement Center and use the grant funds to provide training, services, and supports to engage families in their children's education and to build the school-family partnerships necessary to ensure that all children are on track to graduate from high school ready for college and careers, such as through—

''(1) assisting parents and families in understanding how they can improve student achievement, including how to access ongoing student performance data and related information to support learning in the classroom with activities at home, and in after-school and extracurricular activities;

''(2) training parents and families on effective ongoing communication with their children, teachers, principals, counselors, administrators, and other school personnel;

''(3) providing direct services to families, such as home visitation, family literacy programs, and health and behavioral health services to meet the needs of families and remove barriers for engaging in the education of their children;

''(4) providing advocacy services to ensure that families can fully participate in their children's education;

''(5) providing supports such as transportation, childcare, and meals to facilitate families' engagement in programs implemented or assisted by the Center;

''(6) assisting parents and families in understanding how they can prepare their children academically, socially, and financially for postsecondary education, including early awareness of the availability of student financial assistance; and

''(7) improving the coordination, availability, and effectiveness of integrated services and comprehensive supports for children and families.

''(f) EVALUATION AND ANNUAL REPORT.—A State educational agency shall—

''(1) evaluate the effectiveness of the grants funded under this section; and

''(2) issue an annual report on the implementation of such grants, describing any practices the State determines to be most effective or innovative for fulfilling the purposes of the Local Family Engagement Centers.''.

(c) STATE FAMILY ENGAGEMENT COORDINATING COUNCILS.—Title I (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) is amended by adding after section 1006, as added by subsection (b), the following:

''SEC. 1007. STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY CAPACITY FOR FAMILY ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each State educational agency shall administer and expend funds reserved under section 1005(b)(2) to—

''(1) provide for the establishment of a statewide family engagement coordinating council; and

''(2) support the development and implementation of a statewide family engagement in education plan.

''(b) STATE FAMILY ENGAGEMENT COORDINATING COUNCILS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State educational agency that receives funds under part A shall establish a State Family Engagement Coordinating Council (referred to in this section as a 'Council') to ensure coordination and integration of family engagement in education activities across the education spectrum.

''(2) REPORTING RESPONSIBILITY.—Each Council shall report to the Governor and the Chief State School Officer of the State on the Council's findings and recommendations regarding family engagement in education and such other information as the Governor may request.

''(3) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Governor of the State, in consultation with the State educational agency, shall determine the number of members to serve on the Council and their term of office, and shall appoint such members, initially, for a full term or for a period of less than a full term, as the Governor determines appropriate. Such members shall include representatives of—

''(i) State educational agency programs, Statewide Family Engagement Centers under subpart 16 of part D of title V, and Local Family Engagement Centers under section 1006 operating in the State;

''(ii) parent training and information centers and community parent resource centers assisted under sections 671 and 672 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, operating in the State;

''(iii) the State parent teacher association and other parent groups;

''(iv) family members, students, teachers, and school administrators;

''(v) the State's advisory council on early childhood education and care;

''(vi) colleges and universities; and

''(vii) nonprofit organizations and State governmental agencies serving children and families.

''(B) RESTRICTION ON GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Not more than 50 percent of the Council members shall be employees of a State or local unit of government.

''(4) DUTIES OF THE COUNCIL.—Duties of the Council shall include any duties the Governor may specify and the following duties:

''(A) Establish a statewide vision of family engagement in education that is consistent with, and leverages, Federal family engagement in education resources and initiatives.

''(B) Encourage consistency in family engagement in education policies and practices across learning settings along the child and youth life span.

''(C) Coordinate Federal, State, and local family engagement in education programs and activities.

''(D) Coordinate family engagement in education programs and activities across early childhood, school-age, vocational and technical, and higher education programs.

''(E) Identify opportunities for family engagement in education collaboration and resource sharing among State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and organizations that support family-school partnerships.

''(F) Review the family engagement in education component of the State plan prepared under section 1111(d) and submit to the State educational agency and to the Governor any recommendations of the Council for modifications to the plan.

''(G) Visit local educational agencies, schools, and other learning settings to support the implementation and monitoring of family engagement in education policies, practices, and uses of funds.

''(c) USES OF FUNDS.—Each State may use funds reserved under section 1005(b)(2) to support the development and implementation of the statewide family engagement in education plan described in section 1111(d) through activities such as—

''(1) supporting an office or staff positions within the agency dedicated to family engagement;

''(2) carrying out the State's responsibilities under the Local Family Engagement Centers Program under section 1006;

''(3) developing and implementing a statewide data collection and evaluation system on family engagement metrics to identify schools that would benefit from training and support related to family engagement in education;

''(4) reviewing local educational agencies' family engagement policies and practices as provided by sections 1112(b)(1)(P) and 1118(i), and evaluating the use of funds under this subsection;

''(5) coordinating technical assistance and support to local educational agencies with schools that would benefit from training and support related to family engagement in education with the Statewide Family Engagement Centers;

''(6) developing curricula for professional development for teachers, principals, school librarians, and other school leaders on improving family engagement in education;

''(7) developing standards and curricula for family engagement in education for teacher and principal preparation programs; and

''(8) coordinating statewide services related to early education, higher education, child health and welfare, after-school programs, community service-learning programs, and other programs to develop coordinated family engagement in education policies, practices, and services.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1004 the following:

''Sec. 1005. Family engagement and responsibility fund.
''Sec. 1006. Local Family Engagement Centers Program.
''Sec. 1007. State educational agency capacity for family engagement activities.''.

SEC. 6. STATE PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1111(d) (20 U.S.C. 6311(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) FAMILY ENGAGEMENT.—Each State plan shall include a plan for strengthening family engagement in education. Each such plan shall, at a minimum, include—

''(1) a description of the State's criteria and schedule for review and approval of local educational agency engagement policies and practices pursuant to sections 1112(e)(3) and 1118(i);

''(2) a description of the State's system and process for assessing local educational agency implementation of section 1118 responsibilities;

''(3) a description of the State's criteria for identifying local educational agencies that would benefit from training and support related to family engagement in education;

''(4) a description of the State's statewide system of technical assistance and support for local educational agencies and schools on family engagement in education;

''(5) an assurance that the State will refer to Statewide Family Engagement Centers those local educational agencies that would benefit from training and support related to family engagement in education;

''(6) a plan for using funds received under section 1005;

''(7) a description of the relationship between the State educational agency and Statewide and Local Family Engagement Centers, parent training and information centers, and community parent resource centers in the State established under sections 671 and 672 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; and

''(8) a plan for establishing a State Family Engagement Coordinating Council or, if a similar entity exists, a description of the composition and activities of such similar entity.''.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) ANNUAL STATE REPORT.—Section 1111(h)(4) (20 U.S.C. 6311(h)(4)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(H) the number of schools and the name of each school that would benefit from training and support related to family engagement in education, the reason why such school was so identified, and the measures taken to address the need for training and support; and

''(I) information on the State educational agency's family engagement in education programs and activities.''.

(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 1111(j) (20 U.S.C. 6311(j)) is amended by inserting ''the development and implementation of policies and procedures for family engagement in education,'' after ''reliable,''.

SEC. 7. LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1112(b)(1)(P) (20 U.S.C. 6312(b)(1)(P)) is amended to read as follows:

''(P) a description of the strategy the local educational agency will use to implement and assess family engagement in education under section 1118;''.

(b) ENGAGEMENT IN DEVELOPING PLANS.—Section 1112(b)(1) (20 U.S.C. 6312(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (Q) as subparagraph (S);

(2) in subparagraph (P), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (P) the following:

''(Q) a description of how the local educational agency will engage families in the development, implementation, and assessment of local educational agency plans;

''(R) a description of how the local education agency will improve teacher and principal knowledge and skills in effectively engaging parents in their children's education; and''.

SEC. 8. FAMILY ENGAGEMENT IN EDUCATION POLICY.

(a) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY DEVELOPMENT OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES.—Section 1118 (20 U.S.C. 6318) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a) through (h) as subsections (b) through (i), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before subsection (b), as redesignated by paragraph (1), the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each local educational agency and each school receiving funds under this part shall develop policies and practices for family engagement in education that meet the following principles and standards for family-school partnerships:

''(1) Welcome all families to be active participants in the life of the school, so that they feel valued, connected to each other and to school staff and to what students are learning in class.

''(2) Communicate effectively by ensuring regular two-way, meaningful communication between family members and local educational agency and school staff in a manner, language, and with technology that family members can understand and access.

''(3) Support student success by fostering continuous collaboration between family members and local educational agency and school staff to support student learning and healthy development at school and at home.

''(4) Speak up for every child and empower family members to be advocates for all students within the school.

''(5) Ensure that family members, local educational agencies, and school staff are equal partners in family engagement in education decisionmaking.

''(6) Collaborate with community organizations and groups to turn the school into a hub of community life.

''(7) Create a continuum of family engagement in education in student learning and development from birth to young adulthood.

''(8) Train and support superintendents, principals, and teachers to fully engage families in the education of their children.''.

(b) WRITTEN POLICY.—Section 1118(b)(2), as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''(e)'' and inserting ''(f)'';

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(3) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(G) participate in evaluations of the effectiveness of family engagement in education strategies and policies; and

''(H) participate in developing recommendations for creating a positive school climate and safe and healthy schools.''.

(c) RESERVATION.—Section 1118(b)(3)(A), as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended to read as follows:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each local educational agency shall reserve not less than 2 percent of its allocation under subpart 2 to carry out this section.''.

(d) RESERVED FUNDS.—Section 1118(b)(3), as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds reserved under subparagraph (A) may be used for purposes including the following:

''(i) Increasing capacity through establishment of a dedicated office or dedicated personnel within the local educational agency or at the school level for family engagement in education.

''(ii) Supporting schools and nonprofit organizations in providing professional development on family engagement in education for school staff, parent leadership training, family literacy and numeracy programs, home visitation programs, family volunteerism programs, and other innovative programs that meaningfully engage families.

''(iii) Developing and implementing local educational agency family engagement in education data-collection systems and indicators.

''(iv) Assessing and providing recommendations on school family engagement in education policies, practices, and use of funds.

''(v) Providing technical assistance and training to schools on the implementation and assessment of family engagement in education policies and practices.

''(vi) Providing additional support to schools that have been identified for improvement under section 1116(b) to assist in their implementation of family engagement in education, including the hiring and maintenance of family engagement coordinators.

''(vii) Partnering with Local Family Engagement Centers or community-based organizations to identify community resources, services, and supports to remove economic obstacles to family engagement in education by meeting families' needs.

''(viii) Supporting schools and eligible entities in the development of early childhood programs that promote family engagement in education and school readiness.

''(ix) Establishing and supporting an advisory group comprised of families, educators, and nonprofit organizations to develop recommendations to strengthen family engagement in education from birth to young adulthood.

''(x) Assisting schools in the development, implementation, and assessment of family engagement in education plans.

''(xi) Monitoring and evaluating the family engagement in education policies and practices funded under this section.

''(xii) Partnering with Local Family Engagement Centers or Statewide Family Engagement Centers to assist the local educational agency and participating schools in the implementation of this section.

''(xiii) Supporting other activities approved in the local education agency's plan for improving family engagement.''.

(e) SCHOOL PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT POLICY.—Section 1118(c)(1), as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended in the first sentence by striking ''(c) through (f)'' and inserting ''(d) through (g)''.

(f) SHARED RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIGH STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT.—Section 1118(e), as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''subsection (b)'' and inserting ''subsection (c)''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) describe the school's responsibility to—

''(A) provide high-quality curriculum and instruction in a supportive and effective learning environment that enables the children served under this part to meet the State's student academic achievement standards, and the ways in which each parent will support their children's learning, such as—

''(i) monitoring attendance and homework completion;

''(ii) volunteering in their child's classroom or school; and

''(iii) participating, as appropriate, in decisions relating to the education of their children and positive use of extracurricular time; and

''(B) engage family members in the development of recommendations for student attendance, expectations, behavior, and school

safety, including the development of reasonable disciplinary policies and behavioral interventions, such as the implementation of school-wide positive behavior interventions and supports and the phase-out of out-of-school suspension and expulsion; and''.

SEC. 9. PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK.

(a) STATE PLAN AND STATE AGENCY APPLICATIONS.—Section 1414 (20 U.S.C. 6434) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) that contains an assurance that each child or youth serviced by the program will have a transition plan developed in partnership with families and aftercare providers that will place the child or youth on a path to career and college readiness; and''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (15) through (19) as paragraphs (17) through (21), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (14) the following:

''(15) describes how the State agency will implement family engagement in education policies and practices that align with section 1118;

''(16) includes an assurance that the State agency will establish, for each child or youth served under this subpart, an educational services and transition plan that is developed in consultation with the child or youth, family members of the child or youth, and the local educational agency or alternative education program that will receive the child or youth following their period of service under this subpart;''.

(b) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY APPLICATIONS.—Section 1423 (20 U.S.C. 6453) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (9) through (13) as paragraphs (11) through (15), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

''(9) a description of how schools will implement family engagement in education policies and practices that align with the provisions of section 1118;

''(10) an assurance that the local educational agency will establish for each child or youth served under this subpart an educational services plan that is developed in consultation with the child or youth, family members of the child or youth, and the local educational agency or alternative education program receiving the child or youth following their period of service under this subpart;''.

(c) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS FOR CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES RECEIVING FUNDS UNDER THIS SECTION.—Section 1425 (20 U.S.C. 6455) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (10), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(12) prepare an educational services and transition plan for each child or youth served by the program, in partnership with families and aftercare providers, consistent with section 1414(a)(1)(C); and

''(13) establish for each child or youth residing in the facility and serviced by this subpart an educational services and transition plan that is developed in consultation with the child or youth, family members of the child or youth, and the local educational agency or alternative education program receiving the child or youth following their period of service under this subpart.''.

SEC. 10. HIGH-QUALITY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS.

(a) STATE APPLICATION CONTENTS.—Section 2112(b) (20 U.S.C. 6612(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(13) A description of how the State educational agency will improve teacher and principal knowledge and skill in effectively engaging families in their children's education.''.

(b) STATE ACTIVITIES.—Section 2113(c) (20 U.S.C. 6613(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (12) through (18) as paragraphs (13) through (19), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following:

''(12) Training of teachers and principals on how to effectively engage families in their children's education.''.

SEC. 11. FAMILY ENGAGEMENT IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

(a) HEADING.—The heading for subpart 16 of part D of title V is amended to read as follows:

"Subpart 16—Family Engagement in Education Programs".

(b) FAMILY ENGAGEMENT.—Section 5561 (20 U.S.C. 7273) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5561. PURPOSES.

''The purposes of this subpart are the following:

''(1) To provide financial support to nonprofit organizations to build the capacity of and provide technical assistance and training to States and local educational agencies in the implementation and enhancement of successful systemic and effective family engagement policies, programs, and activities that lead to improvements in student development and academic achievement.

''(2) To assist State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and community-based organizations in strengthening partnerships among parents (including parents of children under the age of 6), teachers, principals, administrators, and other school personnel in meeting the educational needs of children.

''(3) To support State educational agencies and local educational agencies in developing and strengthening the relationship between parents and their children's school in order to further the developmental progress of children.

''(4) To coordinate activities funded under this subpart with engagement in education initiatives funded under section 1118 and other provisions of this Act.

''(5) To assist the Secretary, State educational agencies, and local educational agencies in the coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs to engage families in education.''.

(c) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—Section 5562 (20 U.S.C. 7273a) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5562. GRANTS AUTHORIZED.

''(a) STATEWIDE FAMILY ENGAGEMENT CENTERS.—The Secretary is authorized to award grants for each fiscal year to statewide nonprofit organizations (and consortia of such organizations and State educational agencies), to establish Statewide Family Engagement Centers that provide comprehensive training, technical assistance, and capacity building to State educational agencies, local educational agencies, schools identified by State educational agencies and local educational agencies, organizations that support family-school partnerships (such as parent-teacher associations and Parents as Teachers organizations), and other organizations that carry out parent education and family engagement in education programs.

''(b) GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, ensure that a grant is—

''(1) awarded for a Statewide Family Engagement Center in each State and outlying area; and

''(2) in an amount of not less than $500,000.''.

(d) APPLICATIONS.—Section 5563 (20 U.S.C. 7273b) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5563. APPLICATIONS.

''(a) SUBMISSIONS.—Each statewide nonprofit organization, or a consortium of such an organization and a State educational agency, that desires a grant under section 5562 shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require.

''(b) CONTENTS.—Each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

''(1) A description of the applicant's approach to family engagement in education, including the use of strength-based strategies.

''(2) A description of the applicant's plan for building a statewide infrastructure for family engagement in education, that includes—

''(A) management capacity and governance;

''(B) statewide leadership;

''(C) systemic services for family engagement in education;

''(D) capacity building for State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools;

''(E) alignment with title I; and

''(F) learning and improvement.

''(3) A description of the applicant's experience in providing training, information, and support to State educational agencies, local educational agencies, schools, and nonprofit organizations on family engagement in education polices and practices that are effective for low-income parents and families, English language learners, minorities, parents of students with disabilities, parents of homeless students, foster parents and students, and parents of migrant students.

''(4) An assurance that the applicant will—

''(A) be—

''(i) governed by a board of directors, the membership of which includes parents of school-aged children; or

''(ii) an organization or consortium that represents the interests of parents;

''(B) establish a special advisory committee, the membership of which includes—

''(i) parents of children from birth through young adulthood, who shall constitute a majority of the members of the special advisory committee;

''(ii) representatives of the State parent teacher association;

''(iii) representatives of education professionals with expertise in improving services for disadvantaged children;

''(iv) representatives of local elementary schools and secondary schools, including students, disadvantaged youth, and representatives from local youth organizations; and

''(v) representatives of State educational agencies and local educational agencies;

''(C) use not less than 65 percent of the funds received under this subpart in each fiscal year to serve local educational agencies, schools, and community-based organizations that serve high concentrations of low-income families and disadvantaged children and youth, including English language learners, minorities, parents of students with disabilities, parents of homeless students, foster parents and students, and parents of migrant students;

''(D) operate a center of sufficient size, scope, and quality to ensure that the center is adequate to serve the State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and community-based organizations;

''(E) serve urban, suburban, and rural local educational agencies and schools;

''(F) work with—

''(i) State educational agencies and local educational agencies and schools;

''(ii) other Statewide Family Engagement Centers assisted under this subpart;

''(iii) Local Family Engagement Centers assisted under section 1006;

''(iv) parent training and information centers and community parent resource centers assisted under sections 671 and 672 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;

''(v) clearinghouses; and

''(vi) other organizations and agencies;

''(G) use not less than 30 percent of the funds received under this section in each fiscal year to establish or expand technical assistance for evidence-based early childhood parent education programs;

''(H) provide assistance to State educational agencies and local educational agencies and community-based organizations that support family members in areas such as assistance in understanding State and local standards and measures of student and school academic achievement and strategies for supporting school academic achievement; and

''(I) work with State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools to determine parental needs and the best means for delivery of services to address such needs.''.

(e) USES OF FUNDS.—Section 5564 (20 U.S.C. 7273c) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 5564. USES OF FUNDS.

''Grantees shall use grant funds received under section 5562 to provide training, technical assistance, and capacity building to State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and organizations that support family-school partnerships, to enable those agencies and organizations—

''(1) to assist parents in participating effectively in their children's education and to help their children meet State and local standards, such as assisting parents—

''(A) to engage in activities that will improve student academic achievement, including understanding how they can support learning in the classroom with activities at home and in afterschool and extracurricular programs;

''(B) to communicate effectively with their children, teachers, principals, counselors, administrators, and other school personnel;

''(C) to become active participants in the development, implementation, and review of school-parent compacts, family engagement in education policies, and school planning and improvement;

''(D) to participate in the design and provision of assistance to students who are not making adequate academic progress;

''(E) to participate in State and local decisionmaking;

''(F) to train other parents; and

''(G) to help the parents learn and use technology applied in their children's education;

''(2) to develop and implement, in partnership with the State educational agency, a statewide family engagement in education policy and systemic initiatives that will provide for a continuum of services to remove barriers for family engagement in education and support school reform efforts; and

''(3) to develop, implement, and assess family engagement in education policies and plans under sections 1112 and 1118.''.

(f) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—Section 5565 (20 U.S.C. 7273d) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 5565. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

''(a) MATCHING FUNDS FOR GRANT RENEWAL.—For each fiscal year after the first fiscal year for which an organization or consortium receives assistance under this subpart, the organization or consortium shall demonstrate in the application that a portion of the services provided by the organization or consortium is supported through non-Federal contributions, which may be in cash or in-kind.

''(b) SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION.—Each organization or consortium receiving assistance under this subpart shall submit to the Secretary, on an annual basis, information on the activities it has carried out using grant funds received under section 5562, including reporting on metrics developed under section 5567.

''(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall reserve not more than 5 percent of the funds appropriated to carry out this subpart to provide technical assistance, by grant or contract, for the establishment, development, and coordination of Statewide Family Engagement Centers, including their establishment of statewide infrastructures for family engagement in education.

''(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subpart shall be construed to prohibit a Statewide Family Engagement Center from—

''(1) having its employees or agents meet with a parent at a site that is not on school grounds; or

''(2) working with another agency that serves children.

''(e) PARENTAL RIGHTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subpart—

''(1) no person (including a parent who educates a child at home, a public school parent, or a private school parent) shall be required to participate in any program of parent education or developmental screening under this subpart; and

''(2) no program or center assisted under this subpart shall take any action that infringes in any manner on the right of a parent to direct the education of their children.''.

(g) FAMILY ENGAGEMENT IN INDIAN SCHOOLS.—Section 5566 (20 U.S.C. 7273e) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 5566. FAMILY ENGAGEMENT IN INDIAN SCHOOL.

''The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall establish, or enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with local Indian nonprofit parent organizations to establish and operate, Local Family Engagement Centers and shall establish a national Indian Family Engagement Coordinating Council modeled on the State Family Engagement Coordinating Council as described in section 1007.''.

(h) RESEARCH AND EVALUATION FOR EFFECTIVE FAMILY ENGAGEMENT IN EDUCATION.—Subpart 16 of part D of title V (20 U.S.C. 7273 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 5567. RESEARCH AND EVALUATION FOR FAMILY ENGAGEMENT IN EDUCATION.

''(a) DEVELOPMENT OF METRICS FOR FAMILY ENGAGEMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Family Engagement in Education Act of 2011, the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, after consultation with the advisory committee established under subsection (b), shall develop recommended metrics on family engagement in education for State educational agencies and local educational agencies that receive funds under section 1118 and provide recommendations on the integration of metrics into State accountability and longitudinal data systems.

''(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Secretary shall appoint an advisory committee, including researchers and representatives from national nonprofit organizations with expertise in family engagement in education, to make data-driven recommendations regarding metrics required under subsection (a).

''(c) RESEARCH FOR EFFECTIVE FAMILY ENGAGEMENT IN EDUCATION.—The Secretary shall reserve not more than 5 percent of funds appropriated to carry out this subpart to conduct research on effective family engagement in education, including through awarding grants and entering into contracts with eligible entities. Such research may include—

''(1) exploratory research to discover the underlying processes or components of family engagement programs that are associated with improved education outcomes for students;

''(2) research to—

''(A) develop culturally sensitive strategies or programs for improving family engagement in education; and

''(B) rigorously evaluate the impact of such strategies or programs on students' education outcomes; and

''(3) research to—

''(A) develop professional development programs intended to enable school personnel to support parental involvement in education; and

''(B) rigorously evaluate the impact of such programs on students' education outcomes.''.

SEC. 12. DEFINITIONS.

Section 9101 (20 U.S.C. 7801) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (32);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (20) through (31) as paragraphs (21) through (32), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (19) the following:

''(20) FAMILY ENGAGEMENT IN EDUCATION.—The term 'family engagement in education' means a shared responsibility—

''(A) of families and schools for student success, in which schools and community-based organizations are committed to reaching out to engage families in meaningful ways and families are committed to actively supporting their children's learning and development; and

''(B) that is continuous from birth through young adulthood and reinforces learning that takes place in the home, school, and community.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(44) TRIBALLY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS.—The term 'tribally controlled schools' means schools administered by Indian tribes or their delegates pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.).''.

SEC. 13. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

The Act (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) is amended by striking—

(1) ''parental involvement'' and ''parent involvement'' each place the terms appear and inserting ''family engagement'';

(2) ''involvement of parents'' each place the term appears and inserting ''engagement of families'';

(3) ''parental information and resource center'' each place the term appears and inserting ''Statewide Family Engagement Center'';

(4) ''parental information and resource centers'' each place the term appears and inserting ''Statewide Family Engagement Centers''; and

(5) ''involve parents'' each place the term appears and inserting ''engage families''.

SEC. 14. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY AND REPORT.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study, and make findings and recommendations relating to compliance with, and use of funds made available for, section 1118 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6318), including matters specified in paragraph (2).

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The study shall include a review and analysis of—

(A) the use of funds reserved by local educational agencies for family engagement under such section 1118;

(B) the innovative, effective, replicable, or model family engagement in education policies, practices, and uses of funds of State educational agencies and local educational agencies determined by the Secretary of Education to be in alignment with section 1118;

(C) any barriers to State educational agencies and local educational agencies in implementing section 1118;

(D) any barriers to Indian tribes and organizations, Native Hawaiian organizations, and Alaska Native organizations in developing, implementing, and assessing family engagement in education policies and practices; and

(E) the use of data collection and reporting and outcome and assessment systems of State educational agencies and local educational agencies to determine the extent to which family engagement in education is implemented as described in section 1118.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives a report containing the findings and recommendations resulting from the study conducted under this section.

SEC. 15. FEDERAL COORDINATION OF FAMILY ENGAGEMENT IN EDUCATION PROGRAMMING.

(a) STAFFING.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, there shall be established in the Department of Education dedicated staff, including a Director, for family and community engagement.

(b) DUTIES.—The duties of the Director shall include the following:

(1) Articulating a national vision of family engagement in education.

(2) Coordinating and integrating activities related to family engagement strategies, services, and programs within the Department and across Federal agencies.

(3) Providing guidance to Department offices and units on the administration of family engagement in education programs, community school programs, and other related initiatives, such as Promise Neighborhoods.

(4) Ensuring consistency in family engagement in education policies and programs within the Department.

(5) Ensuring consistency in family engagement in education policies and programs with family engagement policies and practices of the programs and activities of other Federal agencies.

(6) Administering the Statewide Family Engagement Centers under subpart 16 of part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Full Service Community Schools program.

(7) Developing, in consultation with the public through an invitation for public comment in the Federal Register, a plan for innovation, research, and evaluation of family engagement in education, including impact, implementation, and replication studies.

(8) Conducting, by arrangement with the Department's Institute of Education Sciences, by contract, or by competition, innovation, research and evaluation on family engagement in education consistent with the requirement of section 5567(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(9) Disseminating effective and innovative practices on family engagement to State educational agencies, Statewide Family Engagement Centers and Local Family Engagement Centers, parent training and information centers and community parent resource centers assisted under sections 671 and 672 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, administrators of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), and others.

(10) Coordinating innovation, research, training, and technical assistance activities among Statewide Family Engagement Centers, Local Family Engagement Centers, and regional educational laboratories.

(11) Identifying opportunities for family engagement in education collaboration and resource sharing among State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and organizations that support family-school partnerships.

(12) Preparing a biennial report to Congress on family engagement in education, including a summary of activities, performance, and outcomes under sections 1006, 1008, 1112, and 1118, and subpart 16 of part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(13) Publishing State educational agency family engagement in education plans and reports prepared as required by section 1111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 on the website of the Department.

(14) Carrying out such other duties as may be designated by the Secretary.

(c) FEDERAL DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY COOPERATION.—Each department or agency of the Federal Government providing programs related to family and community engagement in education shall—

(1) cooperate with the efforts of the Director described in subsection (a);

(2) provide such assistance, statistics, studies, reports, information, and advice as the Director may request, to the extent permitted by law;

(3) adjust department or agency staff job descriptions to support collaboration and implementation of the vision and strategy; and

(4) assign department or agency liaisons to the office to oversee and implement interagency coordination.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 175—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE WITH RESPECT TO ONGOING VIOLATIONS OF THE TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY AND SOVEREIGNTY OF GEORGIA AND THE IMPORTANCE OF A PEACEFUL AND JUST RESOLUTION TO THE CONFLICT WITHIN GEORGIA'S INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED BORDERS

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES 175

Whereas, since 1993, the territorial integrity of Georgia has been reaffirmed by the international community and 36 United Nations Security Council resolutions;

Whereas the United States-Georgia Strategic Charter, signed on January 9, 2009, underscores that ''support for each other's sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and inviolability of borders constitutes the foundation of our bilateral relations'';

Whereas, in October 2010, at the meeting of the United States-Georgia Charter on Strategic Partnership, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton stated, ''The United States will not waiver in its support for Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity.'';

Whereas the White House released a fact sheet on July 24, 2010, calling for ''Russia to end its occupation of the Georgian territories of Abkhazia and South Ossetia'' and for ''a return of international observers to the two occupied regions of Georgia'';

Whereas Vice President Joseph Biden stated in Tbilisi in July 2009 that the United States ''will not recognize Abkhazia and South Ossetia as independent states'';

Whereas, according to the Government of Georgia's ''State Strategy on Occupied Territories,'' the Government of Georgia has committed itself to a policy of peaceful engagement, the protection of economic and human rights, freedom of movement, and the preservation of cultural heritage, language, and identity for the people of Abkhazia and South Ossetia;

Whereas the August 2008 conflict between the Governments of Russia and Georgia resulted in civilian and military causalities, the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Georgia, and large numbers of internally-displaced persons;

Whereas large numbers of persons remain displaced as a result of the August 2008 conflict as well as the earlier conflicts of the 1990s;

Whereas the August 12, 2008, ceasefire agreement, agreed to by the Governments of Russia and Georgia provides that all troops of the Russian Federation shall be withdrawn to pre-conflict positions;

Whereas the August 12, 2008, ceasefire agreement provides that free access shall be granted to organizations providing humanitarian assistance in regions affected by violence in August 2008;

Whereas the recognition by the Government of Russia of Abkhazia and South Ossetia on August 26, 2008, was in violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Georgia;

Whereas Human Rights Watch concluded in its World Report 2011 that ''Russia continued to occupy Georgia's breakaway regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia and strengthened its military presence in the region by establishing a military base and placing an advanced surface-to-air missile system in Abkhazia'';

Whereas the parties have taken some constructive steps in recent months, including the resumption of direct flights between Russia and Georgia, Russian troop withdrawal from the Georgian village of Perevi, and regular participation in the Incident Prevention and Response Mechanism;

Whereas these positive steps neither adequately address the humanitarian situation on the ground nor constitute full compliance with the terms of the August 2008 ceasefire agreement;

Whereas, on November 23, 2010, before the European Parliament, Georgian President Saakashvili declared that ''Georgia will never use force to restore its territorial integrity and sovereignty'';

Whereas Secretary of State Clinton stated in Tbilisi on July 5, 2010, ''We continue to call for Russia to abide by the August 2008 cease-fire commitment . . . including ending the occupation and withdrawing Russian troops from South Ossetia and Abkhazia to their pre-conflict positions.'';

Whereas the Russian Federation blocked the extension of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) Mission to Georgia and the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia, forcing the missions to withdraw from South Ossetia and Abkhazia;

Whereas troops of the Russian Federation stationed in Abkhazia and South Ossetia continue to be present without the consent of the Government of Georgia or a mandate from the United Nations or other multilateral organizations;

Whereas, at the April 15, 2011, meeting in Berlin between the foreign ministers of Georgia and NATO, Secretary of State Clinton stated, ''U.S. support for Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity remains steadfast. . . . We share Georgian concerns regarding recent Russian activities that can negatively affect regional stability.'';

Whereas, on April 25–26, 2011, Foreign Minister of Russia Sergei Lavrov made a high-profile visit to Abkhazia and South Ossetia, which was immediately criticized by the Department of State as ''inconsistent with the principle of territorial integrity and Georgia's internationally recognized borders'';

Whereas the Senate supports United States efforts to develop a productive relationship with the Russian Federation in areas of mutual interest, including non-proliferation and arms control, cooperation concerning the failure of the Government of Iran to meet its international obligations with regard to its nuclear programs, counter-terrorism, Afghanistan, anti-piracy, and economics and trade; and

Whereas the Senate agrees that these efforts must not compromise longstanding United States policy or United States support for its allies and partners worldwide: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms that it is the policy of the United States to support the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Georgia and the inviolability of its borders, and to recognize Abkhazia and South Ossetia as regions of Georgia occupied by the Russian Federation;

(2) calls upon the Government of Russia to take steps to fulfill all the terms and conditions of the 2008 ceasefire agreements between Georgia and Russia, including returning military forces to pre-war positions and ensuring access to international humanitarian aid to all those affected by the conflict;

(3) urges the Government of Russia and the authorities in control in the regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia to allow for the full and dignified return of internally-displaced persons and international missions to the territories of Abkhazia and South Ossetia;

(4) supports peaceful, constructive engagement and confidence-building measures between the Government of Georgia and the authorities in control in South Ossetia and Abkhazia and encourages additional people-to-people contacts; and

(5) affirms that finding a peaceful resolution to the conflict is a key priority for the United States in the Caucasus region and that lasting regional stability can only be achieved through peaceful means and long-term diplomatic and political dialogue between all parties.

SENATE RESOLUTION 176—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE SHOULD ISSUE A SEMIPOSTAL STAMP TO SUPPORT MEDICAL RESEARCH RELATING TO ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE

Ms. MIKULSKI submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 176

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States Postal Service should, in accordance with section 416 of title 39, United States Code—

(1) issue a semipostal stamp to support medical research relating to Alzheimer's disease; and

(2) transfer to the National Institutes of Health for that purpose any amounts becoming available from the sale of such stamp.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I rise today to submit a resolution urging the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal stamp to help raise money for Alzheimer's research. A semipostal stamp will fund new research while also raising public awareness about this devastating disease.

Finding new ways to treat Alzheimer's should be a national priority. The disease not only harms patients and their families, it strains our health care system as well. Every 70 seconds, someone in America develops Alzheimer's. An estimated 5.4 million Americans have Alzheimer's disease, including one in eight people over 65. The direct and indirect costs of Alzheimer's and other dementias to Medicare, Medicaid and businesses amount to more than $183 billion each year. By 2050, this disease is likely to affect more than 11 to 16 million people 65 and older—unless we can find a medical breakthrough.

As Alzheimer's Disease is so prevalent, almost every American knows someone with this condition. My father was diagnosed with Alzheimer's. This was after many physicians said it was just ''old age'' stress or depression. Like all family members with a loved one with Alzheimer's, I felt powerless over my father's situation as he got worse.

There are 14.9 million unpaid caregivers taking care of loved ones with Alzheimer's. They are depending on us to help find the cure for this terrible disease. No treatment is available to slow or stop the deterioration of brain cells in Alzheimer's disease. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration has approved five drugs that temporarily slow the worsening of symptoms for about six to 12 months. They are effective for only about half of the individuals who take them.

However, researchers around the world are studying numerous treatment strategies that may have the potential to change the course of the disease. Approximately 75 to 100 experimental therapies aimed at slowing or stopping the progression of Alzheimer's are in clinical testing in human volunteers. We need to keep the fight for a cure strong and funded.

A semipostal stamp is one way each of us can help in the fight against Alzheimer's. Proceeds from the stamp's sales would help fund Alzheimer's research at the National Institutes of Health. By paying more than the normal postage rate for this stamp, the public can contribute directly to the search for a new treatment or even a cure. I also want to thank Senator CARDIN for his cosponsorship of the Alzheimer's research semipostal stamp and Representative MARKEY for working on this important legislation in the House. I ask my colleagues today to join me in the fight against Alzheimer's and support this resolution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 177—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 15 THROUGH MAY 21, 2011, AS ''NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK''

Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 177

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services are of vital importance to the health, safety, and well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas the public works infrastructure, facilities, and services could not be provided without the dedicated efforts of public works professionals, including engineers and administrators, who represent State and local governments throughout the United States;

Whereas public works professionals design, build, operate, and maintain the transportation systems, water infrastructure, sewage and refuse disposal systems, public buildings, and other structures and facilities that are vital to the people and communities of the United States; and

Whereas understanding the role that public infrastructure plays in protecting the environment, improving public health and safety, contributing to economic vitality, and enhancing the quality of life of every community of the United States is in the interest of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of May 15 through May 21, 2011, as ''National Public Works Week'';

(2) recognizes and celebrates the important contributions that public works professionals make every day to improve—

(A) the public infrastructure of the United States; and

(B) the communities that public works professionals serve; and

(3) urges individuals and communities throughout the United States to join with representatives of the Federal Government and the American Public Works Association in activities and ceremonies that are designed—

(A) to pay tribute to the public works professionals of the United States; and

(B) to recognize the substantial contributions that public works professionals make to the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 178—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 1, 2011, AS ''SILVER STAR SERVICE BANNER DAY''

Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 178

Whereas the Senate has always honored the sacrifices made by the wounded and ill members of the Armed Forces;

Whereas the Silver Star Service Banner has come to represent the members of the Armed Forces and veterans who were wounded or became ill in combat in the wars fought by the United States;

Whereas the Silver Star Families of America was formed to help the American people remember the sacrifices made by the wounded and ill members of the Armed Forces by designing and manufacturing Silver Star Service Banners and Silver Star Flags for that purpose;

Whereas the sole mission of the Silver Star Families of America is to evoke memories of the sacrifices of members and veterans of the Armed Forces on behalf of the United States through the presence of a Silver Star Service Banner in a window or a Silver Star Flag flying;

Whereas the sacrifices of members and veterans of the Armed Forces on behalf of the United States should never be forgotten; and

Whereas May 1, 2011, is an appropriate date to designate as ''Silver Star Service Banner Day'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports the designation of May 1, 2011, as ''Silver Star Service Banner Day'' and calls upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16—AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR AN EVENT TO CELEBRATE THE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA

Mr. AKAKA (for himself and Mr. INOUYE) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S CON. RES. 16

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENT TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for an event on June 5, 2011, to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

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 the hearing scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources for Thursday, May 12, 2011, will now begin at 9 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on carbon capture and sequestration legislation, including S. 699 and S. 757.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150, or by e-mail to Abigail Campbell@energy .senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Allyson Anderson or Abigail Campbell.

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 Water and Power. The hearing will be held on Thursday, May 19, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing will be to hear testimony on seven items:

S. 201, a bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the C.C. Cragin Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes.

S. 333, a bill to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Little Wood River Ranch.

S. 334, a bill to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir.

S. 419, the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System Act of 2011.

S. 499, the Bonneville Unit Clean Hydropower Facilitation Act.

S. 519, the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2011.

S. 808, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow for prepayment of repayment contracts between the United States and the Uintah Water Conservancy District, 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 may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150, or by e-mail to Meagan_Gins@energy .senate.gov

For further information, please contact Tanya Trujillo or Meagan Gins.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. REID. 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 10, 2011, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Reviewing the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission's Final Report.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. REID. 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 10, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 10, 2011, at 10 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Perspectives on Deficit Reduction: Social Security.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 10, 2011, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled, ''Steps Needed for a Successful 2014 Transition in Afghanistan.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 10, 2011 at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

Mr. REID. 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 10, 2011, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, GOVERNMENT INFORMATION, FEDERAL SERVICES, AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia and Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate

on Tuesday, May 10, 2011, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a joint hearing entitled ''Roadmap for a More Efficient and Accountable Federal Government: Implementing the GPRA Modernization Act.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVACY, TECHNOLOGY AND THE LAW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology and the Law, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on May 10, 2011, at 10 a.m. in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Protecting Mobile Privacy: Your Smartphones, Tablets, Cell Phones and Your Privacy.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 16, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event celebrating the birthday of King Kamehameha.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the measure be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 16

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENT TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for an event on June 5, 2011, to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

SILVER STAR SERVICE BANNER DAY

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 178, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 178) expressing support for the designation of May 1, 2011, as ''Silver Star Service Banner Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the matter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 178) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 178

Whereas the Senate has always honored the sacrifices made by the wounded and ill members of the Armed Forces;

Whereas the Silver Star Service Banner has come to represent the members of the Armed Forces and veterans who were wounded or became ill in combat in the wars fought by the United States;

Whereas the Silver Star Families of America was formed to help the American people remember the sacrifices made by the wounded and ill members of the Armed Forces by designing and manufacturing Silver Star Service Banners and Silver Star Flags for that purpose;

Whereas the sole mission of the Silver Star Families of America is to evoke memories of the sacrifices of members and veterans of the Armed Forces on behalf of the United States through the presence of a Silver Star Service Banner in a window or a Silver Star Flag flying;

Whereas the sacrifices of members and veterans of the Armed Forces on behalf of the United States should never be forgotten; and

Whereas May 1, 2011, is an appropriate date to designate as ''Silver Star Service Banner Day'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports the designation of May 1, 2011, as ''Silver Star Service Banner Day'' and calls upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 940

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I understand that S. 940, introduced earlier today by Senator MENENDEZ, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 940) to reduce the Federal budget deficit by closing big oil tax loopholes, and for other purposes.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, appoints the following Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 112th Congress: the Honorable KELLY AYOTTE of New Hampshire, the Honorable SAXBY CHAMBLISS of Georgia, the Honorable MARCO RUBIO of Florida, and the Honorable ROGER WICKER of Mississippi.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 2011

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 11; 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 for the transaction of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the first hour equally divided and controlled by the leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the next 30 minutes; that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, there will be a rollcall vote around 3 p.m. tomorrow on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 44, the nomination of Arenda Wright Allen to be a U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BENNET. 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 6:07 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 11, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 10, 2011:

THE JUDICIARY

EDWARD MILTON CHEN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RESTARTING AMERICAN OFFSHORE LEASING NOW ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union 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:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1230.

Gas prices continue to rise. The instability in the Middle East is threatening our supply, and we already import much of our oil from countries that are hostile to our interests. We need to safely and responsibly produce our domestic resources offshore in order to reduce this reliance on foreign imports and in turn, increase our economic growth.

We cannot forget that just one production rig equals 500 jobs—100 workers on the rig, plus 400 workers supporting drilling operations onshore. This industry comprises not only oil and gas companies, but also a network of suppliers and contractors that purchase goods as diverse as forgings, valves, computers, chemicals and helicopters from suppliers in all 50 states.

That is why I support H.R. 1230, which would force lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico and offshore Virginia that were delayed or cancelled following the Macondo spill.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO CHANGE THE STRUCTURE OF THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS AUTHORITY BOARD

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I have been one of the strongest supporters of Washington Dulles International Airport and Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport as well as the Dulles Corridor Metrorail Extension project. I was one of the original sponsors of the 1986 legislation that transferred from the federal government the operations of Dulles and Reagan. I worked with former Senators John Warner and Paul Trible, former Governor Linwood Holton, and former Secretary of Transportation Elizabeth Dole to enact that important law that created the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, MWAA. For nearly 25 years MWAA has operated effectively, governed by board members who were pillars of the community and understood the importance of the success of both Dulles and Reagan.

After the airports authority was created, both Reagan and Dulles prospered. In the past 25 years, Dulles has become the economic engine for not only northern Virginia, but the entire Commonwealth. Without a successful international airport drawing global traffic and myriad businesses, the region would not be nearly as successful as it is today. Metrorail access to the airport and fast-growing Loudoun County will attract more businesses, create new jobs and ease congestion on area roadways. Dulles Rail being completed on time and at or under original cost estimates is key to many more decades of success.

While I have been extremely pleased observing MWAA's achievements over the past two decades, I believe continued success is now threatened by a board of directors that has lost sight of its primary mission of serving airport passengers and residents of the surrounding communities. For many years MWAA was run by competent and dedicated professionals such as Jim Wilding and Jim Bennett. As current CEO Lynn Hampton prepares to retire, the search process for her replacement conducted by the current board of directors has been a study in poor management and political horse trading. When the board voted to advance the nomination of Nathaniel Ford, the deciding vote was cast by proxy by a then board member who was under house arrest in the Ivory Coast.

This problem arose because under the current law, board members serve until their replacement is confirmed. While this may have worked in the past, in my opinion the law is being abused to keep political favorites in office, even if their service is suspect. The leadership void at MWAA also is reflected in the planning for Phase 2 of Dulles Rail. Under the current board, costs have greatly exceeded original estimates, with more likely to come with the board's April 6 decision to build an underground station at Dulles Airport.

Because of these concerns about the direction of MWAA today, I am introducing legislation to make changes to the 1986 law that established the regional operating authority for Dulles and Reagan National airports. This legislation will amend the original statute to give Virginia a majority on the MWAA Board of Directors by increasing the number of Commonwealth appointees from five to nine. With both airports located in Virginia and with northern Virginia residents and local governments providing the lion's share of the revenue for the Dulles Rail project, it is only fair that the majority of the board be Virginians. The bill will also prevent board members from serving past the end of their appointment, and will establish that board members can be replaced at any time by the respective executives who appoint the board: the governors of Virginia and Maryland, the mayor of the District of Columbia or the president of the United States. I believe these changes are critical if we are to ensure that MWAA will once again function as originally intended and in the best interests of northern Virginia. Phase 2 will require nothing less than the most qualified board possible to be a success.

It is imperative that these changes to the original law be enacted quickly, and I hope that the committee of jurisdiction will expedite review of the legislation. If the current leadership is allowed to stay in place, it will very likely continue to make decisions that add to the cost of Phase 2 and further jeopardize not only MWAA's bond rating, but the success of both airports under their control. The respective executives simply must have the ability to appoint new board members as soon as possible to prevent the current board from turning Dulles Rail into a failed project.

My primary interest is to see the project completed on time and at or under budget and I believe the board's decision to opt for an underground station at Dulles Airport could be disastrous. Since the announcement, Fairfax and Loudoun counties have indicated that they will not assume the extra costs of the underground station. If the local governments withdraw Phase 2 funding, the project will be in serious jeopardy.

The underground station also is opposed by nearly every elected official representing northern Virginia residents, including the Fairfax and Loudoun boards of supervisors, the Herndon Town Council, Virginia Secretary of Transportation Sean Connaughton and Governor Bob McDonnell. Independent groups such as the Washington Airports Task Force, Dulles Corridor Rail Association, the Northern Virginia Regional Commission, the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce, the Virginia Chamber of Commerce and AAA Mid-Atlantic have all spoken out against the underground station. For a board member to recently state, "I think the board is committed to the underground station as best for the community at large" shows astonishing hubris and a willful avoidance of reality.

Recent Phase 2 cost estimates are extremely troubling. While original projections put the cost of Phase 2 at $2.5 billion, the cost spikes to at least $3.5 billion under the plan approved by the MWAA board. With such dramatic cost increases before a contract is even awarded, some have expressed concerns about the creditworthiness of the bonds that will be issued to pay for Phase 2. Airport authorities nationwide have been placed on notice that bond ratings could be lowered in the future. An additional $300 million or more for Dulles Rail could be a troublesome sign for the bond markets. I fear an increase in borrowing costs could effectively kill the project in the design phase.

Considering all this information, I do not believe that the current board of directors is acting in the best interests of the northern Virginia residents who will be forced to underwrite costs for Phase 2 through increased tolls on the DTR and increased revenue from county coffers. The underground station will add at least $300 million to the overall cost of Phase 2. When long-term financing costs are included, the underground station could end up

adding closer to $500 million to the project. It is my understanding that tolls on the Dulles Toll Road could reach $10.25 in 2020, eight-and-a-half years from now. The initial toll projection issued by MWAA had tolls reaching $11.25 by 2047. As the cost of Phase 2 goes up, so will the tolls.

A recent Washington Post editorial indicated that commuters could be forced to pay as much as $4,000 a year to use the toll road by 2020. Add in the tolls on the Dulles Greenway and my constituents' transportation costs could be higher than their monthly car payments. It will be the parents taking their children to school and soccer practice, the business owner that uses the DTR on a daily basis to make deliveries, the realtor who will see home sales decrease due to the higher transportation costs and the commuters to Tysons Corner who will shoulder the heavy burden of the MWAA board's recent decisions.

I want both MWAA and Dulles Rail to be successful. Because of that, Representative TOM LATHAM, chairman of the House Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, and I have asked the U.S. Department of Transportation Inspector General, IG, to conduct an audit of the operations of the MWAA board. I am pleased that the IG's office will begin this audit in the near future. Outside of the actual composition of the board, it is my hope that the audit will examine the governance structure of MWAA and determine if it operates with the transparency necessary for an organization tasked with such important responsibilities.

In the meantime, I urge support for my legislation to update the board's composition and appointment structure to reflect today's realities.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF GEORGE FRANCIS SCARBOROUGH

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, George Francis Scarborough, 77, of Pensacola, FL passed away peacefully Wednesday, May 4, 2011 surrounded by his family.

George Francis Scarborough was born on Good Friday, March 30, 1934 in Lexington, KY. The son of George Buskie and Ada Wheat Buskie, George spent his early years in Miami, FL and San Diego, CA. He moved to Milton, FL in 1946 when his family was transferred to Whiting Field.

George graduated from Milton High School and remained close to many of his classmates, hosting Milton High reunion events over the past 20 years. After graduating from Milton, he returned to Lexington where he attended the University of Kentucky from 1952–1956. There he fell in love with Kentucky basketball and his future wife, Mary Joanna Clark. George and Mary Jo were married on August 14, 1955 at Second Avenue Baptist Church in Rome, Georgia. George graduated from the University of Kentucky the next year with a B.S. degree in Business.

George Scarborough served in the U.S. Army from 1955–1957, and was stationed at Ft. Benning, GA and Ft. Polk, LA. Carolyn Elizabeth Scarborough was born to George and Mary Jo in 1957 while they were stationed at Ft. Benning. They went on to have two more children, George Clark Scarborough was born in Rome, GA in 1960 and Charles Joseph Scarborough was born in Atlanta, GA in 1963.

While in Atlanta, George worked as a manufacturing engineer for Lockheed. He was proud to work on the C–5A, the C–130, and the L–1011 projects. He often said his work at Lockheed was the favorite of all his jobs. George was transferred to Lockheed's Meridian, MS plant in 1969 after the L–1011 assembly line was moved to Meridian. In 1973, he began work at National Homes as a purchasing agent and was soon transferred to Elmira, NY. During his time in Upstate New York, he took a job at American LaFrance as an Industrial Engineer.

In 1978, George and his family had the opportunity to move to Pensacola, FL where he began working with Mary Jo, who at that time was a director for the Miss National Teenage pageant. In 1983, the Scarboroughs and Carolyn Hawkins founded the Miss American Coed Pageant. George was named the national director. George Scarborough took great pride in the fact that the organization consistently promoted patriotism, community service and a strong academic record. Through extraordinary focus and hard work, George and Mary Jo Scarborough's pageant organization became the largest in the United States within a few years. He enjoyed meeting families across America throughout the year and going to the national pageant each summer in Hawaii.

Faith has always played a great role in George's life. In 1978, he and his family joined First Baptist Church in Pensacola where George was a deacon, taught Sunday School and sang in the choir. His greatest joy came from his volunteer work at Samaritan Hands.

George was the proud grandfather of nine grandchildren, Ian, Ginger and Julie Ward, Emily and Benjamin Scarborough, and Joey, Andrew, Kate and Jack Scarborough. His love of baseball and other sports kept him engaged as a coach throughout his adult life and in his final years he enjoyed keeping score at his grandsons' baseball games. He was also an avid fan of the Atlanta Braves and Kentucky Wildcats and for many years attended the Breeder's Cup.

Survivors include wife, Mary Jo Scarborough, Pensacola, FL; daughter, Carol Ward (John) and their children, Julie and Ginger Ward of Jacksonville, FL and Ian Ward of Orlando, FL; son, George Scarborough (Sara) of Gulf Breeze, FL and their children Emily and Benjamin Scarborough of Gulf Breeze, FL; son, Joe Scarborough (Susan) of New York, NY and their children Joey Scarborough of New York, NY and Andrew Scarborough of Pensacola, FL and Kate and Jack Scarborough of New York, NY; he is also survived by his brothers, Chuck Scarborough of California, Scott Scarborough of Nevada and sister, Margaret Scarborough of Oregon.

Visitation will be held from 3:00–5:00 pm Sunday, May 8, 2011 at First Baptist Church with Funeral services beginning at 5:00 pm with Dr. Barry Howard officiating. Private Family Entombment will follow at Bayview Memorial Park.

The family would like to thank the doctors and nurses at Sacred Heart Hospital, Dr. John Bray, Pippa Nicholson-Kuenn, Don Gaetz and TLC Caregivers, Lou Donaldson, Jan Bowersox, Alan Waren, Aunt Caroline, Stephanie Smart, and all the family and friends who showed an outpouring of love and support over the last year and a half. We could not have survived without you. The family also asks that donations be made to Samaritan Hands in lieu of flowers.

Harper-Morris Memorial Chapel is in charge of arrangements.

IN TRIBUTE OF DENNIS POPP

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dennis Popp, who is stepping down after 12 years of distinguished service as Mayor of the city of Groton, Connecticut.

Dennis began his career at the submarine maker Electric Boat, where he worked as a pipe welder for 3 years before being promoted to supervisor for another 20 years. Dennis capped his career at EB by serving as a draftsman for his final 3 years.

Dennis took his breadth of experience at building and supervising the production of some of the world's most advanced machines and translated his skill set to the world of politics and governance. Just as I fell short in my first effort in running for Congress, Dennis also just missed in his first effort to win the Mayor's office in Groton. But with determination honed like the steel of Electric Boat, Dennis went back at it again and won the election for Mayor of the city of Groton in 1999.

Immediately upon taking the reins of city government, Mayor Popp worked to repair city relations with neighboring towns, which had frayed in recent years. Elevating the city's leadership in regional issues, Dennis held positions of Chair, Treasurer, and Secretary of the Southeastern Council of Governments throughout his tenure.

Mayor Popp will be remembered most of all by his constituents for his tireless efforts to improve the quality of life for the city he loves. Dennis kept taxes level for 12 years and decreased the mill rate while improving city services. Mayor Popp led Groton Utilities' expansion into telecommunications, television, and internet service while strengthening the local community with responsive, neighborhood customer service.

Dennis went on to win reelection five times, running unopposed on several occasions as a testament to his support from residents across the city and from both political parties. His record of leadership for his city will be remembered years after he leaves office and includes expanding regional water sales and revenue for the city; resuscitating the summer recreation program at West Side; leading an expansion of the Pequot Health Center; improving public safety through increased firefighter positions; acquiring additional watershed land to protect the water supply; installing barriers on 1–95 over the reservoir to protect water quality; and supporting the installation of three flagpoles at Fort Griswold Battlefield Park.

Dennis has advocated tirelessly for the needs of Groton, and I have valued his counsel as I prioritized the city's requests in my work in Congress. I have been proud to collaborate with Mayor Popp in delivering Federal

support for fire department equipment, Justice Department support for police hiring and crime prevention, and new, critical investments to strengthen the position of the subase for the future.

Even outside of his elected office, Dennis has served as a pillar in the Groton community. Dennis will continue to be active with the local Eagle Scout program, at the Bill Library, in helping U.S. Subvets Groton Base, and in his local church.

Groton will not be the same after Mayor Popp's exit, but the city can look fondly back on the leadership of its favorite ''Popp Daddy.'' I know that his wife Karen will welcome this retirement as an opportunity to spend more time together and open up a new chapter in their lives. I also know that our friendship will endure even after Dennis leaves office. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting a true man of Groton and for Groton—Dennis Popp.

URGING TAIWAN'S PARTICIPATION IN THE UNFCCC

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the leaders of the United Nation's Framework Convention on Climate Change, UNFCCC, to allow for Taiwan's meaningful participation.

As climate change continues to impact our world and as we face the prospect of dwindling oil reserves, Taiwan's renewable-energy section is growing rapidly. Taiwan has invested heavily in turbines generating electricity, use of alternatives to fossil fuels and possibilities of harnessing energy from the ocean. Taiwan is also the fourth largest producer of solar cells in the world.

Moreover, Taiwan's Environmental Protection Administration, EPA, is doing everything possible to promote environmental sustainability. For instance, Taiwan has made significant strides in waste management, with the nation's overall recycling rate reaching almost 42 percent in 2008.

Improving air quality, reducing noise pollution and vehicular emissions and protecting wildlife are also top priorities for the government and people of Taiwan. Taiwan is totally committed to protecting the environment and reducing pollution. But due to political factors, Taiwan is not a UNFCCC contracting party. Instead, they are considered a non-governmental organization observer under the name Industrial Technology Research Institute and are not permitted to participate in either the discussions over the post-Kyoto mechanism or the international carbon market.

I hope that the UNFCCC leaders will see the wisdom of Taiwan's need to participate in the UNFCCC and the post-Kyoto mechanism, especially considering that Taiwan and its environment are vulnerable to climate change and need to avoid the negative impacts on its economy and trade. Taiwan is an important part of the world economy and should be able to provide direct input to the UNFCCC, and I would ask the UNFCCC leaders to allow meaningful participation from Taiwan.

RECOGNIZING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 6TH RANGER TRAINING BATTALION'S RANGER CAMP AT EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to recognize the 60th anniversary of the 6th Ranger Training Battalion located on Eglin Air Force Base, Florida.

On November 15, 1951, the U.S. Army Amphibious/Jungle Training Committee was established to conduct the final phase of the U.S. Army Ranger School. Now known as the Florida Ranger Camp, the 6th Ranger Training Battalion emphasizes platoon training in a humid coastal and swamp environment. This final phase of the Army Ranger School places students under severe mental and physical stress in an attempt to replicate the rigors of combat.

The first Ranger class arrived at Eglin Air Force Base on January 24, 1952. This first class learned survival techniques for amphibious environments and leadership in combat situations. Today, students in the Army Ranger School experience training very similar to that received by the first Ranger class. The initial six days are focused on technique training, which is then followed by a ten-day field training exercise. Leadership skills are tested vigorously through small unit operations in a simulated combat environment. Students in the Florida Ranger Camp learn to overcome severe weather, difficult littoral and swamp terrain, and sleep and food deprivation while combating mental and physical exhaustion. Through their rigorous training, students at the Florida Ranger Camp learn the techniques necessary to undertake demanding and difficult assignments in protection of our nation. These techniques are then put to the test in a simulated combat environment to create adaptive and effective combat leaders for our Armed Forces.

During its time on Eglin Air Force Base, the Florida Ranger Camp has trained over 100,000 students of the United States Armed Forces and over 60 allied countries worldwide. The 6th Ranger Battalion trains over 2,500 students annually, conducting its 18 day program 11 times per year. The 6th Ranger Training Battalion has 225 officer and enlisted personnel complemented by 30 civilian support personnel who work together to run the Florida Ranger Camp.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is my honor to thank the men and women who make up the 6th Ranger Training Battalion, as well as the Army Rangers they train, for their professionalism and commitment. Their indefatigable service and dedication to our nation protects our inalienable liberties and freedoms, allowing the United States of America to prosper as the world's greatest nation. My wife Vicki and I congratulate the 6th Ranger Battalion, and each of the more than 100,000 graduates of the Florida Ranger Camp, for 60 exceptionally successful years of service to our country.

HONORING THE CAREER OF ERWIN JONAS

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work Erwin D. Jonas has done on Long Island on the occasion of his retirement from Northrop Grumman after 42 years of service.

Erwin has been employed by Northrop Grumman since 1969 in multiple radar engineering capacities, from Development Engineering to Manager of Engineering and Programs. The major focus of Mr. Jonas' work at Northrop Grumman has been the development of shipboard radar programs and automatic detection and tracking systems.

Erwin has been the manager of the Northrop Grumman Ship Self Defense Systems Department since January 1992 and is responsible for all engineering and research operations associated with naval radar and automatic tracking systems.

The contributions Erwin has made to naval research as well as to the research industry on Long Island are significant. I wish him all the best in this next stage of life and, again, thank him for the work he has done.

IN HONOR OF MR. FRANK L. KOWALSKI

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. Frank L. Kowalski, Jr., a gentleman whose dedication to the Polish-American community of Cleveland has led the Cleveland Society of Poles Foundation to name him the 2011 recipient of the ''Good Joe'' Award.

Mr. Kowalski was born and raised in the Tremont area of Cleveland. After graduating from Lincoln High School, he joined the Navy Reserve. He was soon called into active duty and served on the USS *Navarro* as a machinist's mate during the Korean War. Upon his discharge in 1954, Mr. Kowalski joined the Polish Legion of American Veterans and he remains an active member of the organization to this day.

Mr. Kowalski attended Fenn College (now Cleveland State University) under the GI Bill and graduated in 1965. He worked at the Thompson Products Plant until 1972, when he pursued a second career in property management and maintenance.

Many organizations within the Polish-American community in Cleveland have benefitted from Mr. Kowalski's leadership. He has served as Post Commander, Financial Director, and National Financial Director for the Polish Legion of American Veterans; Director, Treasurer, and Vice President of the Polonia Foundation of Ohio; Financial Secretary of the Cleveland Society; Financial Director of the Polish National Alliance Group #171; and Treasurer of the Tremont Residence Service Corporation. He has been named a Knight of Pulaski by the Polonia Foundation of Ohio and

was awarded the Miecze Hallerowskie Medal by the Polish Army Veterans Kosciuszko Post 152. He is also an active parishioner at St. John Cantius Catholic Church.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of Mr. Frank L. Kowalski, Jr., whose tireless devotion to the Polish-American community has been an inspiration to many. I offer Mr. Kowalski my sincerest congratulations.

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. HELEN GOTTLIEB

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Helen Gottlieb, Chairwoman of the Middlesex County Democratic Organization in New Jersey. Chairwoman Gottlieb is a strong Democratic leader in Middlesex County who has made immeasurable contributions to her community and the Democratic Party. As a result of her actions, Chairwoman Gottlieb will be presented with the 2011 New Jersey Federation of Democratic Women's Peg Roberts Award. Ms. Gottlieb's service is undoubtedly deserving of this body's recognition.

In addition to her public service, Chairwoman Gottlieb has amassed an impressive professional resume. Helen served as a dedicated teacher of English as a Second Language with the South Plainfield school district from 1970 through 1994. Beginning in 1980, as a member of the Edison Township Board of Adjustments, Helen faithfully served the local residents. She later served as President of Edison Menlo Oaks Democratic Club and was a member of the Edison Township Planning Board. Her outstanding mentoring and leadership lead to her appointment as Assistant Principal of South Plainfield High School in 1994, where she served for 10 years. Helen also served as co-chair of the Middlesex County Clinton/Gore Presidential Campaign and Edison, New Jersey Democratic Vice-Chair. She currently serves as New Jersey State Committee Member and Middlesex County Democratic Chair, having previously serving as Vice Chair. I commend Helen for her continued service on behalf of the residents of Middlesex County.

As a result of her exceptional work, Helen has received countless awards and honors for her achievements. She was awarded the "Woman of Achievement" Award and Commendation from the New Jersey General Assembly, 18th District, in 1999 and 1997, respectively. Helen was also the recipient of the Middlesex County Woman of Excellence Award in Education in 1993. She was featured in The News Tribune "Applause" Section in 1991 and was the New Jersey ESL Teacher of the Year in 1990. Helen currently resides in Edison, New Jersey with her husband, Judge Joel Gottlieb. They have two children and two grandsons.

Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to extend my congratulations to Chairwoman Helen Gottlieb for her exceptional contributions to the residents of my district and congratulate her for the honor she received from the New Jersey Federation of Democratic Women.

THE HUI PANALAAU

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the story of 130 young men from Hawaii, who were asked by the U.S. Federal Government to occupy a trio of deserted islands in the remote Pacific Ocean from 1935 to 1942.

These young men were asked to live on the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis for three-month shifts of four-men per island. The men earned $3 a day, a good wage during the Great Depression.

The majority of the colonists were Native Hawaiians because the government planners felt that the colonizing task was so daunting that only young Hawaiians would be able to survive. Kamehameha Schools, a school for Native Hawaiian children, was asked to recruit recent male graduates who could swim, fish, and handle a boat. Collectively, the group came to be known as the Hui Panalaau (group of colonizers).

The islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis are about halfway between Hawaii and Australia. The colonists traveled by boat and it typically took five days to reach Jarvis and another three to reach Howland and Baker.

The Hui Panalaau were supplied only with canned goods, water, and a few tents. The colonists were asked to keep logbooks about the weather and to gather natural specimens. Their lives on the islands meant enduring rats, beetles, sharks, and the blazing sun.

Why were the Hui Panalaau recruited by the United States to live on these islands? The U.S. Department of Defense considered these islands to be of strategic importance. After the first year of colonization, the United States claimed territorial jurisdiction of the islands and air supremacy. So while the public mission of the colonists was to take weather readings for potential commercial flight routes, the colonist program also served secret military objectives.

In 1941, as World War II intensified, Japanese planes attacked Howland Island likely because of the landing field the colonists were directed to construct. Two colonists, Richard "Dickey" Kanani Whaley and Joseph Kealoha Keliihananui lost their lives during the attack. Their deaths ended the Hui Panalaau program.

Bishop Museum, the Hawaii State museum for natural and cultural history, developed a documentary on the story of the Hui Panalaau, entitled, Under a Jarvis Moon. The film combines historical interviews of the colonists, still photographs, government documents, and newsreel footage. The film is titled after a song co-written by one of the four surviving colonists, George Kahanu, Sr. The film was directed by Heather Giugni and Noelle Kahanu, the granddaughter of George.

Under a Jarvis Moon premiered at the 2011 Hawaii International Film Festival and was nominated for the Halekulani Golden Orchid Award. On March 12, 2011, the U.S. Department of the Interior will be hosting a screening of the film and I encourage my colleagues to see it and hear the story of the Hui Panalaau from the men who lived it.

Mahalo nui loa (thank you very much).

IN HONOR OF SRI KARUNAMAYI AMMA

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Sri Karunamayi Amma, a Hindu spiritual leader who has devoted her life to peace, unity, compassion, and respect for all life forms. Sri Karunamayi will be visiting Cleveland during her 17th World Tour at the end of May.

Sri Karunamayi, known as "Amma," the Telugu word for "mother" by her followers, was born in South India in 1958. From an early age, her compassion for the less fortunate and her insights into ancient Sanskrit spiritual teachings and prayers were noted by her family and learned spiritual scholars alike. At the age of 21, Sri Karunamayi travelled to the sacred Penusila Forest, where she lived a life of strict asceticism, meditation, and study of ancient Vedic texts for ten years. At this time, she decided it was time to share her knowledge with the rest of the world.

Since emerging from the Penusila Forest, Sri Karunamayi Amma has devoted her life to charity works and teaching. She has founded two free elementary schools, a free college, a free hospital, mobile medical clinics, emergency relief programs, food and clothing donation programs, and free housing programs, all to allow the impoverished people of her native India to live better lives. She has also travelled the world, sharing her blessings, teachings, and quest for peace, hope, and emotional healing with thousands of people. Sri Karunamayi Amma teaches that "we should realize the great opportunity we have as human beings to cultivate inner beauty, offer ourselves in service to the entire universe, and ultimately attain spiritual liberation."

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of Sri Karunamayi Amma, whose charitable works and spiritual guidance have inspired countless people around the world. I extend my personal thanks to Sri Karunamayi for sharing her message with the people of northeast Ohio.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO LT MATTHEW LOWE AND LT NATHAN WILLIAMS OF NAVAL STATION, LEMOORE

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to two heroic officers from Naval Air Station (NAS), Lemoore who tragically lost their lives on Apr. 6, 2011. LT Matthew Ira Lowe, 33, and LT Nathan Hollingsworth Williams, 28, were killed last Wednesday during a training mission when the F/A–18F Super Hornet they were flying crashed into an agricultural field near NAS Lemoore.

California's 20th Congressional District is home to many individuals who serve and have served in our Armed Forces. NAS Lemoore is a proud and honored naval community. The

crash that took the lives of Lieutenant Lowe and Lieutenant Williams is a tragic reminder that the men and women of our Armed Forces put their lives at risk every single day in defense of our beloved country.

LT Matthew Ira Lowe was from Plantation, Florida. He received his commission through Officer Candidate School on Feb. 21, 2003, and reported to Strike Fighter Squadron, VFA, 122 on July 9, 2009. He was designated a pilot following naval aviation training from Nov. 2002 until July 2006. Following his training, Lieutenant Lowe was assigned to VFA–94 based at NAS Lemoore. During his career, Lieutenant Lowe earned the Navy/Marine Corps Achievement Medal and the National Defense Service Medal. Lieutenant Lowe was most recently training to become a pilot for the elite Blue Angels exhibition team. LT Matthew Lowe is survived by his parents Ira and Pamela Lowe of Fort Lauderdale, Florida and two siblings.

LT Nathan Hollingsworth Williams, of Oswego, New York, received his commission through the Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps at the University of Rochester in New York on May 28, 2004. He reported to VFA–122 on Jan. 25, 2010, and was designated a Naval Flight Officer following training from Aug. 2004 through Feb. 2007. Lieutenant William's first squadron assignment was with VFA–213 based in Norfolk, Virginia. In Afghanistan, Lieutenant Williams served aboard the USS *Theodore Roosevelt*, providing air support for U.S. ground troops. After returning from Afghanistan, Lieutenant Williams was chosen to be a flight instructor at Lemoore Naval Air Station, training other flight officers on the Super Hornet, and was also selected for the West Coast Super Hornet Demonstration Team. During his career, Lieutenant Williams earned the Air Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Sea Service Deployment Ribbon and Pistol Marksmanship Medal.

LT Nathan Williams is survived by his wife, Meredith; his parents, Alan and Gay Williams, of Oswego; and his brothers, Jeffrey and Seth, of New York City.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask you and my colleagues to join me today for a moment of silence to remember both of these heroic men. May the families and friends of LT Matthew Ira Lowe and LT Nathan Hollingsworth Williams know our thoughts and prayers are with them during this most trying time, and may they know we are extremely proud of their distinguished service to our country.

RECOGNIZING THE VICTIMS OF OMARSKA

HON. RUSS CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the victims of a notorious concentration camp in Omarska, located in northwestern Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In the summer of 1992, Omarska was the site of mass human rights violations in an attempt to drive non-Serbs from this part of the country.

When the world learned of these mass atrocities, U.N. prosecutors brought cases against many of the perpetrators of these crimes.

The ICTY found several guilty of crimes against humanity.

Remembering the victims of Omarska allows the survivors and families of the victims to mark this tragic chapter.

This is critical to reconciliation, and to the future of Bosnia.

I strongly urge all companies, municipalities, and others to allow anniversary events to take place in Omarska.

It is critical that all involved allow a memorial to be built, and for all parties to respect the commemoration of Omarska and the right of remembrance so that the horrors of Omarska are never repeated again.

IN HONOR OF FRANK H. GAUTHAN

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. Frank H. Gauthan of Cleveland, Ohio, who will be celebrating his 90th birthday on May 14. Mr. Gauthan bravely served his country and the citizens of Cleveland with honor and distinction.

Mr. Gauthan began his life of public service as a member of the 5th Division of the Marine Corps during World War II. Stationed in the South Pacific, he fought in the battles of Iwo Jima and Guam.

Following the war, Mr. Gauthan served with the Cleveland Police Department for 31 years. He was promoted to the rank of detective, and served in the narcotics division of the Cleveland Police Department. As an experienced narcotics officer, he was crucial in the establishment of the narcotics department of the Cuyahoga County Sherriff's Department. Mr. Gauthan played a crucial role in the development of a new county-wide office to aid in the fight against narcotics.

Mr. Gauthan is an active member of the Retired Irish Police Society (RIPS), Westside Irish American Club, and Veterans of Foreign Wars Chapter 1079. He also volunteers with Meals on Wheels and has been an active volunteer with the Democratic Party. In addition, Mr. Gauthan is an avid golfer and bowler, and has garnered many awards and trophies throughout the years.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in wishing Mr. Frank H. Gauthan a very happy 90th birthday.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF CHARLES SEYMOUR

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask Congress to pay tribute to a community leader and activist, Charles Seymour. Charlie passed away on April 1, 2011 and a memorial service was held on April 13, 2011 at the Feldham Library in the Bing Wong Auditorium.

Charlie grew up in a segregated neighborhood in Detroit. Although his opportunities were limited, he made the most of them. He became heavyweight champion Joe Louis' golf caddy. Charlie often said he learned everything he needed to know about life on the golf course. He emphasized the honor and integrity as well the self-reliance, self-control, and self-discipline golf taught him.

Moving to Los Angeles as a young man, Charlie relied on all these characteristics to succeed. He worked odd jobs and supplemented his income with the money he earned at golf matches. Charlie worked for The Tribune Newspaper on Mount Vernon Avenue and later started a bulk mailing business.

Throughout his professional success, Charlie remained an activist at heart. In San Bernardino, he was known for his compassion—especially for children and animals. Charlie has been described as a ''force-multiplier.'' Dr. Amos Issac explains, ''He was a kind of exceptional person at seeing the needs out there, and involving others in helping to respond to those needs.''

Notably, Charlie served as CEO of the Adopt-A-Bike Program. In 1991, there was a local bike rodeo that gave away four bikes but had 165 children participate. After witnessing the event, Charlie called everyone he knew to ask them for a bike; he received 85 bikes. He was able to present 51 fixed bikes at the next raffle. The event evolved into the Adopt-A-Bike Program and later the Adopt-A-Computer program. The San Bernardino community will always remember these two programs and the compassionate advocate who started the operations.

Charlie passed away less than three months after his wife, Madeline. He is survived by his children Charlotte Bruce Hall, Donna LeRoy Baker, Pat Walton, and Larry Lacy. He leaves with cherished memories a loving, large family of grandchildren and great-grandchildren. My thoughts and prayers, along with those of my wife, Barbara, and my children, Mayor Pro Tem Joe Baca Jr., Jeremy, Natalie, and Jennifer are with Charlie's family at this time. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring a beloved community member and tireless advocate, Charlie Seymour.

HONORING DR. GERALD TIROZZI ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize the outstanding leadership, vision, and innumerable contributions of Dr. Gerald Tirozzi as he prepares to retire from his position as Executive Director of the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Gerry has dedicated a lifetime to ensuring that our children have access to an education of the highest possible quality. Through his efforts we, as a nation and a society, have changed the way we look at public education and how the policies we create impact our young people and their success.

A Connecticut native, I have had the privilege of knowing Gerry for many years. In fact, I did some substitute teaching when he was the Superintendent of New Haven Public

Schools. I have rarely encountered an individual with the passion and enthusiasm that Gerry possesses—particularly as he is advocating for policies he believes will make a difference in educating our young people.

Gerry began his career as an educator—a science teacher—and soon moved into several administrative positions, including Superintendent of New Haven Public Schools. In 1983 he was tapped by then Governor Bill O'Neill to lead Connecticut's Department of Education. In fact, on the same day that Gerry was named Commissioner, the National Commission on Excellence in Education released its famous report, ''A Nation at Risk,'' calling for the reform of the American public school system. With the release of the report Gerry saw a unique opportunity and soon implemented reforms that have changed the face of public education in Connecticut. He reformed curriculum and advocated for raising teacher salaries and attracting more qualified candidates to the profession. Perhaps most significantly, it was under his direction that Connecticut established a statewide, systematic test that would more accurately assess student progress. This testing resulted in identifying the academic problems afflicting racial minorities and low-income students nearly two decades before it was taken up at the federal level. The Connecticut Mastery Test celebrated its 25th Anniversary last year and continues to be the single biggest influence in shaping curriculum and has become a national model for student testing.

After his tenure as Commissioner at the Connecticut Department of Education, Gerry went on to serve as President of Wheelock College, Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of Connecticut, and was later appointed by President Clinton as the Assistant Secretary of Elementary and Secondary Education at the U.S. Department of Education. For the last decade, Gerry has led the National Association of Secondary School Principals, an organization which acts as the national voice for middle and high school principals, assistant principals, and aspiring school leaders. In each of the many positions he has held, his commitment and unique vision have led to invaluable improvements in our system of public education.

Dr. Gerald Tirozzi has enjoyed a remarkable career and has earned a distinguished reputation as a leader in education reform. As he prepares to leave his professional life, I am honored to have this opportunity to extend my sincere thanks for his invaluable contributions to our Nation and our children. His work has improved the quality of public education for millions of young people across our Nation and helped to better prepare them for their future success. Today, as he celebrates his retirement with family, friends, and colleagues, I wish him, his wife Sharman, his son Jeff, and his grandchildren, Jason and Kayla, the very best for many more years of health and happiness.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, and 298, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a natural disaster in Southern Missouri. Had I been present the week of May 2nd, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall Nos. 278, 279, 280, 285, 286, 290, 292, 293, 294, and 298. I would have voted ''nay'' on rollcall Nos. 281, 282, 283, 284, 287, 288, 289, 291, 295, 296, and 297.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF NORRIS GREGORY, JR.

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask Congress to pay tribute to Norris Gregory, Jr., a respected community member and San Bernardino's first black city councilman. Norris passed away at this home on April 21, 2011, at the age of 85.

Born on the Fort Riley military base, Norris was raised and began his education in Kansas. He received his Bachelor of Arts from Washburn University. He later completed his Master of Education at the University of Kansas. He also completed classes at University of California, Riverside and California State University at Los Angeles.

Norris was a prominent member of the San Bernardino community and he will be remembered for all that he gave to the local residents. He served as a member of many important civil organizations including the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion. He was also a founding member of the San Bernardino Alumni chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi fraternity and a member of the Phi Delta Kappa national honorary educational fraternity. Kappa Alpha Psi fraternity honored Norris as Man of the Year.

Norris was perhaps best known for being San Bernardino's first black city councilman. He served two four-year terms in the Sixth Ward from 1967 to 1975, breaking San Bernardino's color barrier. Norris told the Black Voice News that ''Schools were segregated, and most blacks were relegated to menial jobs. Blacks had no power and no voice in government . . . but you can make a difference. You can change the law.''

San Bernardino has lost a trailblazer and a role model. Norris has been credited for paving the way for others like John Hobbs, Valerie Pope-Ludlam, Betty Dean Anderson, and Rikke Van Johnson. His wife, Salena Gregory, reflects, ''He was a very good man. He did a lot for San Bernardino.''

Salena and Gregory were married for 64 years. They had one son, the late Norris P. Gregory III, one granddaughter Jessica L.G. Tucker, and two great-grandsons, Jason and Justin Tucker. My thoughts and prayers, along with those of my wife, Barbara, and my children, Mayor Pro Tem Joe Baca Jr., Jeremy, Natalie, and Jennifer are with Norris' family at this time. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring a local hero, Norris Gregory, Jr.

ALEXIS SCHOONMAKER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alexis Schoonmaker for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alexis Schoonmaker is a 12th grader at Arvada West High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alexis Schoonmaker is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Alexis Schoonmaker for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ANNE MANFREDI MACK

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my dear friend Anne Manfredi Mack, who passed away April 22, 2011. I ask all my colleagues to join me in recognizing the many outstanding achievements of Anne during her lifetime.

Anne Mack touched the lives of many with grace and generosity. Anne's driven and compassionate nature laid the foundation for a legacy of inspiration to all who knew her.

With great compassion and a heart for service, Anne was a well known and dedicated public servant and longtime advocate for seniors and senior issues. After retiring from Lockheed, she dedicated her time to serving her community and the State of California. In 1998 she was elected to the California State Legislature. Because of her long standing commitment to the Senior Legislature, she was elected chair and had served in this position since 2006. In addition to her service on the Senior Legislature, Anne was a member of various state boards including the Senior Care Commission, Congress of California Seniors, and was Chair of the Advisory Council on Aging.

As an impressive 25-gallon blood donor and CPR instructor for over 20 years, Anne had a strong passion and dedication to helping those in her community. Anne's greatest source of pride and happiness, though, was her family—her six children, 12 grandchildren, and seven great-grandchildren that survive her today. Anne always put family first, and will be remembered most for her smile, generosity, and passion for those who were less fortunate.

Mr. Speaker, while it is with great sadness, I am truly honored to recognize a woman who has had a profound impact on my wife Patti

and me, my family, and on the lives of so many. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in recognizing Anne Manfredi Mack's lifetime of achievements.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JESS JACKSON

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with both pride and sadness today with my colleague MIKE THOMPSON to honor one of Sonoma County's pioneering leaders. Jess Stonestreet Jackson passed away April 12, 2011, at his home in Geyserville, California. From the wine industry to local philanthropy, Jess Jackson touched lives across the North Bay, and he was admired and respected for his devotion to our region.

Born on February 18, 1930, and raised in San Francisco, Jess Jackson worked numerous jobs as a child to support his parents. As a young adult, he worked as a long shoreman and police officer to put himself through the University of California, Berkeley. He embodied the American ideal that a dedicated and hardworking person can build a successful life.

With a unique drive and an entrepreneurial spirit, Jess Jackson established himself as a leader in the American wine industry. With a successful law career in San Francisco, he began growing grapes in the 1970s. He produced his first wine in the 1980s at the age of 52, quickly putting Sonoma County on the map as one of the premier wine-growing regions of the world. Jackson's work redefined the use of ''California'' as an appellation of quality for Chardonnay. His family company, Jackson Family Wines, now operates over 30 wineries around the globe.

Jackson was also known for devoting much of his energy, intellect and financial resources to help others. He donated millions of dollars to charities locally and across the country. In Sonoma County, for example, he supported the Family Justice Center, the Redwood Empire Food Bank, and the Boys and Girls Clubs. He and his wife, Barbara R. Banke, spearheaded a wine auction, Sonoma Paradiso, raising millions of dollars for a host of local causes for the benefit of children.

Jackson and Banke also embarked on a pioneering venture to promote the study and practice of sustainable viticulture. Their multimillion-dollar commitment to the University of California, Davis, which will fund the construction of a wine center geared toward education, testifies to the forward-thinking approach Jackson always took to business and agriculture in the Wine Country. I will create an opportunity for future generations to practice sustainable viticulture.

In addition to his wife, Jackson is survived by his five children and their families who will continue his legacy in the North Bay.

AIMEE LANGE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Aimee Lange for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Aimee Lange is a 12th grader at Faith Christian Academy and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Aimee Lange is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Aimee Lange for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JESS STONESTREET JACKSON

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise with both pride and sadness today with my colleague, LYNN WOOLSEY, to honor one of Sonoma County's pioneering leaders. Jess Stonestreet Jackson passed away April 12, 2011, at his home in Geyserville, California. From the wine industry to local philanthropy, Jess Jackson touched lives across the North Bay, and he was admired and respected for his devotion to our region.

Born on February 18, 1930, and raised in San Francisco, Jess Jackson worked numerous jobs as a child to support his parents. As a young adult, he worked as a long shoreman and police officer to put himself through the University of California, Berkeley. He embodied the American ideal that a dedicated and hardworking person can build a successful life.

With a unique drive and an entrepreneurial spirit, Jess Jackson established himself as a leader in the American wine industry. With a successful law career in San Francisco, he began growing grapes in the 1970s. He produced his first wine in the 1980s at the age of 52, quickly putting Sonoma County on the map as one of the premier wine-growing regions of the world. Jackson's work redefined the use of ''California'' as an appellation of quality for Chardonnay. His family company, Jackson Family Wines, now operates over 30 wineries around the globe.

Jackson was also known for devoting much of his energy, intellect and financial resources to help others. He donated millions of dollars to charities locally and across the country. In Sonoma County, for example, he supported the Family Justice Center, the Redwood Empire Food Bank, and the Boys and Girls Clubs. He and his wife, Barbara R. Banke, spearheaded a wine auction, Sonoma Paradiso, raising millions of dollars for a host of local causes for the benefit of children.

Jackson and Banke also embarked on a pioneering venture to promote the study and practice of sustainable viticulture. Their multimillion-dollar commitment to the University of California, Davis, which will fund the construction of a wine center geared toward education, testifies to the forward-thinking approach Jackson always took to business and agriculture in the Wine Country. It will create an opportunity for future generations to practice sustainable viticulture.

In addition to his wife, Jackson is survived by his five children and their families who will continue his legacy in the North Bay.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in honoring the life of Jess Stonestreet Jackson. His fine wines earned him friends worldwide. His entrepreneurial leadership and compassionate heart earned admirers throughout the North Bay. He has enriched our lives, and he will be dearly missed.

AUBREY WADLEIGH

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Aubrey Wadleigh for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Aubrey Wadleigh is a 12th grader at Pomona High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Aubrey Wadleigh is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Aubrey Wadleigh for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 296 regarding the Connolly of Virginia Part B Amendment No. 2 for H.R. 1230. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

ANDREA PIERCE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Andrea Pierce

for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Andrea Pierce is a 8th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Andrea Pierce is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Andrea Pierce for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING LOCAL SCHOOL'S ROBOTICS TEAMS

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize three local schools that have excelled in robotic competitions. These three teams participated in the Robotics for Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology (FIRST), regional tournament in Richmond on April 8–9, where 64 teams competed.

The local schools represented—Highland High School in Warrenton, RoboHawk-Team 3373; Fresta Valley Christian School in Marshall, Team 1731; and Battlefield High School in Haymarket, Team 1885 ILITE squad—are all local schools and teams that participated in the regional tournament.

The FIRST robotics program offers students a chance to design a robot from scratch. Their mission is to ''inspire young people to be science and technology leaders, by engaging them in exciting mentor-based programs that build science, engineering and technology skills, that inspire innovation, and that foster well-rounded life capabilities including self-confidence, communication, and leadership.'' The students receive a box of parts with no instructions, just a specific goal that their robot must reach. Then, the students have to design the robot to complete certain tasks for the competitions. The students are allotted a six-week period to build their robots and must bag and tag them before the tournament.

The students are responsible for obtaining mentors and sponsors to raise the $5,000 that is needed to receive a starter kit from FIRST. Their mentors are usually parents who work in the field of engineering and are role models and an inspiration to the students.

At the regional tournament in Richmond, there were three different competition rounds. The first round was autonomous, where the pre-programmed six-wheel robot had to act independently of its operators and place rings on pegs in order to gain points. The second round consisted of the operators having the robot place tubes on the scoring racks. The final and most difficult round, according to the Battlefield team, was having a minibot climb up the rack and place tubes at a faster and higher rate than the original robot.

I congratulate all the teams for participating in such a hands-on engineering and scientific educational experience, with special mention to the Fresta Valley Christian School for making it to the quarterfinals of the competition. I also congratulate Battlefield High School for placing second in the regional tournament. I congratulate and commend the two teams for their participation in the National Championship, which was held in St. Louis April 27–30.

AARON CISNEROS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Aaron Cisneros for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Aaron Cisneros is a 10th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Aaron Cisneros is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Aaron Cisneros for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all his future accomplishments.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today our national debt is $14,325,784,545,788.31.

On January 6, 2009, the start of the 111th Congress, the national debt was $10,638,425,746,293.80.

This means the national debt has increased by $3,687,358,799,494.50 since then.

This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

ALMA FRANCO-TORRES

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alma Franco-Torres for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alma Franco-Torres is a 8th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alma Franco-Torres is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Alma Franco-Torres for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

63RD ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF ISRAEL

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, today, Israel celebrates 63 years of independence as a Jewish-state. I am proud to say that it was on this same day 63 years ago that the United States became the first country in the world to recognize the State of Israel. For decades, our two nations have shared an unyielding bond based on trust, common values and a great respect for one another. I look forward to celebrating this bond for years to come.

As the Middle East and North Africa continue on their paths to self-governance it is my sincere hope that this progress will continue in the most peaceful way possible. I believe that once the people of these growing nations are able to achieve their ambitions that the bonds between Israel, the United States and the region will prosper. The United States will continue our efforts with Israel and others in the region to achieve widespread peace and work together toward this end.

I offer my best wishes to President Peres, Prime Minister Netanyahu, and the people of Israel as they celebrate their 63rd Independence Day. I remain committed to ensuring that the next 63 years of U.S.-Israel relations are marked by cooperation and mutual respect.

ASHLEIGH SANTISTEVAN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ashleigh Santistevan for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Ashleigh Santistevan is a 12th grader at Warren Tech North and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ashleigh Santistevan is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ashleigh Santistevan for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

HONORING KALERVO RUUSKANEN OF CANTERBURY, CONNECTICUT FOR 50 YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE IN THE CANTERBURY VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kalervo "Kavi" Ruuskanen of Canterbury, Connecticut in recognition of his 50 years of dedicated service with the Canterbury Volunteer Fire Department.

In 1960, a young Kalervo Ruuskanen helped friends and neighbors extinguish a brush fire. He impressed the local emergency officials so much that they asked him to join the department. Now 50 years later, Mr. Ruuskanen is the first non-charter member of the Canterbury Volunteer Fire Department to have reached the 50-year milestone. This accomplishment is a testament both to his skill as a first responder and his commitment to serving his fellow man.

Not only has he been with the Canterbury Volunteer Fire Department for 50 years, he has also worked as an emergency medical technician, and currently serves as a Constable of Canterbury and volunteers as a fire policeman. In small towns across eastern Connecticut where we rely on volunteers to protect our homes, our businesses and our way of life, men and women like Kalervo Ruuskanen provide a vital service by ensuring our safety.

As the duly elected Representative of the Second Congressional District of Connecticut, I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in extending hearty congratulations and warm thanks to Mr. Ruuskanen for his dedication and selfless service to the people of Canterbury, Connecticut.

IMPORTANCE OF INFORMATION AND REFERRAL PROGRAMS

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the dedicated professionals working each day in the field of Information and Referral or I&R. These people perform the essential task of bringing people and services together, assistance that has proven to be more important than ever in these difficult economic times.

In particular, I wish to acknowledge the important work of the Alliance of Information and Referral Systems or AIRS which has been serving for more than 30 years as the national organization which developed the professional standards that are a part of thousands of quality Information and Referral programs in this Nation.

In 2010, Information and Referral professionals responded to more than 20 million calls across our Nation from people seeking assistance. This includes people that accessed services through the hundreds of 2–1–1 organizations. AIRS in partnership with United Way Worldwide were the architects of the 2–1–1 system which has served to transform access to human services in America and Canada.

The United States is currently served by Information and Referral professionals through 2–1–1 programs, aging I&R services, Aging and Disability Resource Centers, child care resource and referral services, military family centers, and other specialty Information and Referral services. In addition, the Aging Network consists of 56 State agencies on aging, 629 area agencies on aging, 244 Tribal organizations, and 2 Native Hawaiian organizations. These entities also provide Information and Referral and are important to moving Information and Referral forward.

The importance of the Information and Referral service is that it links consumers with the most appropriate service that they may need whether it be for housing, nutrition, job training, transportation services or long-term care options counseling. Information and Referral and 2–1–1s have proven to be especially invaluable in times of natural disasters in our Nation working in conjunction with first responders to provide help to persons in need.

Information and Referral services have been recognized in Federal legislation for more than 35 years, including in the 1973 reauthorization of the Older Americans Act and including the establishment of the National Eldercare Locator and the development of Aging and Disability Resource Centers.

Comprehensive and specialized Information and Referral programs help people in every community and operate as a critical component of the health and human services delivery system. Information and Referral organizations have databases of programs and services, and disseminate information through a variety of channels to individuals, professionals and communities.

Let me conclude by commending all those professionals who work in the Information and Referral field and with 2–1–1s. We are especially fortunate in my District and State to have one of the most effective of these professionals, my friend Jamie Moore who serves as Vice President of Volunteer & Community Services at the United Way of the Midlands.

I urge my colleagues to become more familiar with the Information and Referral and 2–1–1 programs in their districts help their constituents learn about who to call for information about local resources.

ALEXANDRA BURTON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alexandra Burton for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alexandra Burton is a 12th grader at Warren Tech North and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alexandra Burton is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Alexandra Burton for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO GROUND ZERO FOLLOWING THE KILLING OF OSAMA BIN LADEN

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my fellow New Yorkers in expressing my gratitude to President Obama for visiting our city today and for a job very well done. Under the President's extraordinary leadership and with an heroic effort by our military and our intelligence community, at long last, a mass murderer has been brought to justice.

President Obama's visit to Ground Zero will hopefully bring comfort to the families who lost loved ones, and bring the attention of the world back to the courage that so many showed on 9/11: the firefighters, police officers, and first responders who answered the call of duty and went into burning towers, never to return; the construction workers and volunteers who came to Ground Zero to help our nation recover; the office workers who risked their lives to lead others to safety.

I hope the President's visit will also remind Americans how we came together after the attacks, a unity that impressed itself on the heart of the world and delivered us from some of the most difficult times our nation has ever faced. As the President himself said, when we come together, there's nothing that we can't do.

HONORING MURIEL SCOTT

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Muriel Scott, the President and CEO of the Central Maine Area Agency on Aging, better known as Spectrum Generations. For more than three decades, Muriel has been dedicated to building a strong agency to serve central Maine's elderly population.

Muriel has always believed in the importance of seniors' exercising their own independence. For decades, Muriel has worked to support policies and initiatives that make it easier for seniors to live in their own homes and lead their own lives.

Muriel's hard work and dedication expanded Spectrum Generations to seven community center locations in central Maine. She first joined Spectrum in 1976 as the Director for the Retired Senior Volunteer Program, and Muriel would serve as Nutrition Director before rising to the position of Associate Director in 1979.

Under Muriel's leadership, Spectrum became a leader in ensuring community access

to these services in multiple, convenient locations. Her achievements in Maine led her to national success, serving as a delegate to the 1995 White House Conference on Aging and a Board member of the National Association of Area Agencies.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Muriel Scott on her retirement after 34 years of dedication to Maine's elderly.

ADRIAN ESTRADA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Adrian Estrada for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Adrian Estrada is a 12th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Adrian Estrada is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Adrian Estrada for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all his future accomplishments.

THE NATIONAL GUARD EMPLOYMENT PROTECTION ACT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand before you today to reintroduce the National Guard Employment Protection Act.

I created this legislation in order to extend the same reemployment rights for all of our National Guard personnel, regardless of whether they are assigned to a homeland security mission or deployed overseas to Iraq or Afghanistan. Under current law, the members of the National Guard who are called up for active duty in support of homeland security missions inside the United States are not provided the same reemployment rights to their civilian occupations that other members of the National Guard and Reserve have when they are called to active duty for overseas military assignments.

There is no doubt that the soldiers and the airmen serving in the National Guard must have the same reemployment rights irrespective of where they are ordered to serve. The bill recognizes that those who are called up for homeland security missions can face the same hardships and challenges in trying to return to their civilian employment as someone who has been away from their civilian occupation due to an overseas military assignment.

With the passage of this law, National Guard members will no longer have to worry about being put into a position where they are forced to choose between retaining their civilian employment or serving our Nation in a critical homeland security mission.

I would like to thank Delegate MADELEINE BORDALLO, Representative HARPER and Representative ROE for co-sponsoring again. I urge the passage of this legislation.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. KIRAN DESAI

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Kiran Desai, former Chairman of the Old Bridge Township Zoning Board of Adjustment and member of the Township Planning Board. Kiran is being recognized by the New Jersey State Planning Officials Organization as a recipient of the 2011 Achievement in Planning Award for his continued service to the residents of Old Bridge, New Jersey. Kiran continues to demonstrate significant contributions to the planning and development of Old Bridge and is therefore deserving of this body's recognition.

Kiran served as the Chairman of the Township's Zoning Board of Adjustment from 2000 to 2010. A humble, thirty year resident of Old Bridge, Kiran excels in his professional endeavors as a result of his personal relationship with the local residents and neighbors. During his tenure, Kiran has evaluated hundreds of applications and has most notably opposed larger residential developments and retail complexes not suited for the area. Kiran's steadfast determination and clear mission has assisted in balancing the rights of developers with the needs of Old Bridge's large, diverse and growing community. He also proudly continues to place particular emphasis on protecting local environmentally sensitive areas. In January 2011, Kiran transitioned from the Zoning Board of Adjustment to the Old Bridge's Township Planning Board where he spearheads the initiative to review the Township's master plan.

In addition to his professional experience, Kiran has also been active in several other civic organizations. He has served on the Economic Development Corporation and is the former Treasurer of the New Jersey Democratic State Committee. He currently serves as a Commissioner and Secretary of the Old Bridge Municipal Utilities Authority.

Kiran is also very active in the Indian community and various organizations dedicated to preserving cultural roots and further Indian strides within the American community. Kiran is a founding member of the India Cultural Association of Central Jersey and has served as President of Vraj of North America. He is also founding President of the Chh Gaam Patidar Samaj of North America and continues his involvement with countless other cultural organizations. As a result of his outstanding efforts, Kiran was recently awarded the Ellis Island Medal of Honor, an annual award presented to an individual for their contributions by immigrants to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, once again please join me in congratulating Mr. Kiran Desai, the 2011 recipient of the New Jersey State Planning Officials Organization's Achievement in Planning Award. Mr. Desai's professional accomplishments and community and cultural involvement should be an inspiration to us all.

ARISAI GURROLA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Arisai Gurrola for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Arisai Gurrola is an 11th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Arisai Gurrola is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Arisai Gurrola for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

COMMENDING THE MASON SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend The Mason Small Business Development Center for being named the 2011 Small Business Development Center of Excellence and Innovation by the Small Business Administration Washington Metro Area District Office. This award recognizes and honors centers that use innovation to provide quality and effective services to small businesses to help them improve program management and delivery.

For more than ten years, The Mason SBDC has helped small businesses throughout Northern Virginia support and business counseling services. It is a successful partnership between the federal government, Commonwealth of Virginia and George Mason University, and it assisted more than 480 small businesses in 2010. The hard work and dedication of the team members from The Mason SBDC has resulted in the retention of more than 1,200 local jobs. The Washington Metropolitan region has greatly benefited from the vitality of the small business sector, and The Mason SBDC is an important part of that success.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in commending The Mason Small Business Development Center and its team members for their efforts on behalf of our nation's small businesses.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 2011

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

House Republicans are waging a war against women and they have made their extreme and dangerous agenda clear—to undermine women's access to reproductive health care.

H.R. 3 is a radical attack on women and their reproductive rights. It extends unprecedented limitation on access to abortions, and it singles out and punishes women who want access to this legal service.

Do not be confused. H.R. 3 goes far beyond current law—which is already highly restrictive, and which I oppose. The Hyde Amendment already prohibits women enrolled in Medicaid and Medicare, federal employees, women serving in the military, women in federal prisons, Peace Corps volunteers, and women seeking care under the Indian Health Services Act from getting the care they need. Its very narrow exceptions do not even give women facing severe health conditions like cancer access to medically necessary abortion care so they can receive chemotherapy treatment.

One of the original goals of this legislation was to narrow the already harmful Hyde exceptions even further. The bill's sponsors tried to redefine rape and incest—to take us back to a time when saying "no" wasn't enough. Public outcry at this mean-spirited and hurtful attempt to make it harder for survivors of rape and incest to access coverage for abortion services forced its removal. Unfortunately, based on the House Judiciary Committee Report accompanying H.R. 3, some members of this chamber are still intent on narrowing the rape exception.

This bill is both hurtful and offensive. H.R. 3 expands an unfair, punitive policy that is dangerous to women's health and applies it to millions of women and men in the private insurance market. No one should be limited in terms of their access to safe and legal abortion.

This legislation redefines the concept of "government funding" far beyond the current common understanding. It prohibits even private and nonfederal government funds from being spent on any activity remotely related to the provision of abortion—any time federal money is involved in funding or subsidizing other, nonabortion-related care.

This legislation increases taxes on small businesses with abortion coverage in their private insurance plans. For decades, small businesses have been fighting insurance company premium demands and struggling to maintain health insurance coverage for their employees. Many of those small businesses—1 in 3—are owned by women, but this bill affects both men and women.

The Affordable Care Act provides small businesses with tax credits to help make health insurance both accessible and affordable. Those tax credits are available now. Today, they are worth up to 35 percent of health insurance premium costs. By 2014, they will be worth up to 50 percent.

The Republicans have already passed legislation to repeal the Affordable Care Act—taking away tax credits from small business owners and employees who need help. Repeal is bound to fail. But H.R. 3 takes another course—it would repeal this benefit for any small business insurance policy that includes coverage of abortions.

Small business owners will face an unfair and discriminatory choice. If they need the tax credit to make coverage for themselves and their employees affordable, they will need to drop the abortion benefit. If they want to keep the benefit, they will have to go without the tax credit—raising their costs and taking away money that could be used to expand their business and maybe hire another employee. H.R. 3 will raise taxes on millions of small businesses.

Nearly 90 percent of private health insurance policies offer abortion coverage and this is a blatant attempt to force employers to drop abortion coverage from their private health insurance plans.

Now is the time to work on the issues that are most important to Americans—creating jobs and improving the economy—rather than punishing small businesses and workers through legislation that takes health care away from women.

American women will suffer if this bill becomes law.

RECOGNIZING HELEN SPIVEY

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Helen Spivey who today is receiving the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's 2010 Regional Director's Conservation Award.

I had the distinct pleasure and honor to serve and sit next to Helen in the Florida House of Representatives, and I am proud that her many years of service yielded such tremendous benefits to the people of Florida and our state's unique ecosystem. Her recognition today is warranted and well deserved.

For several decades, Helen Spivey has been an iconic leader in the protection of Florida's special ecosystems and in particular, the endangered Florida manatee. For that work, she holds a very special title to those of us that know her well—"The Manatee Lady."

For decades, Helen has fought to preserve the more pristine and natural Florida she knew in her youth. Since moving to Crystal River in the 1970s, she has built a long resume volunteering in efforts to fight uncontrolled urban growth, pollution from wastewater facilities, and of course to protect Florida manatees.

From serving on the Crystal River City Council to being elected to the Florida Legislature, Helen's life exemplifies the best a citizen has to offer as an active and effective community and public servant.

While she has worked in collaboration with many conservation organizations over her lifetime, her connection to the Save the Manatee Club is special.

Since 2000, she has served as co-chair of the Save the Manatee Club's Board of Directors. In this role, she works tirelessly for the gentle creature of our Florida waterways. The Club could not have a better advocate for their efforts.

Today, the Fish and Wildlife Service is honoring Helen for her work on expanding the Crystal River National Wildlife Refuge to include the critically important Three Sisters Springs property.

This project is a microcosm of Helen's long fight to protect Florida's incredible natural wonders and to protect much needed habitat for the Florida Manatee.

Three Sisters is an urban spring that has been under threat of development for many years. But through Helen's leadership, this 57-acre property was acquired by the Service to forever preserve this ecologically important habitat.

Each year, more than 150 manatees winter in and around this spring, and it draws tourists from across the state and beyond to behold this gentle giant of our waterways. If you have ever experienced a Florida manatee up close, you understand how special this creature is, and how important it is that we protect this impressive species for future generations.

The Three Sisters project took many years to realize and required the collaboration of many public and private partners. I was honored to work with Helen and with Congresswoman Ginny Brown-Waite of Brooksville, Florida, and Florida's senior Senator BILL NELSON to help secure federal funding for a portion of this important project.

But it was Helen that was the driving force that made the Three Sisters Springs Project a reality. She worked tirelessly to coordinate state, local and federal agencies, and the private partners needed to line up all the funding required to protect this precious resource. She has never been someone to take "no" for an answer, and with her bright spirit and intellect, she constantly wins over new allies for her cause.

Now that the spring's site is under federal management, I look forward to its full restoration and the inclusion of an interpretive platform and station that will enhance visitors' appreciation for this special ecosystem.

Once again, Helen should be very proud, as we are, of her hard fought victory for Florida's ecosystem and for the Florida manatee.

But I know what Helen will actually do . . . which is to smile, give us all a small nod, and then get right back to work on her next endeavor.

In a 2004 article in the St. Petersburg Times, Helen was quoted as saying, "I guess I wouldn't want people to remember me . . . but I would be really pleased if they could see an ecosystem that functions and a world that is not asphalt and concrete."

Well, Helen, we will most certainly remember you and the work you continue to do each day to make your vision a reality.

And with your work regarding saving Three Sisters Spring, you have added one more special ecosystem to the list of protected places in our beloved Florida. I am thrilled that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is honoring you today—because no one is more deserving of this recognition.

So today, as you receive this award while also celebrating your eighty-third birthday, Florida thanks you for all that you do. I am so proud of you and simply can't wait to see what you accomplish in your next eighty-three years.

HONORING MOTT MIDDLE COLLEGE

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, on May 12th Mott Middle College in Flint Michigan will celebrate its 20th year of preparing at-risk high school students for further education and the workforce. Through collaboration between Genesee Intermediate School District and Mott Community College, students from 21 school districts and 10 public academies in Genesee County are able to integrate high school, community college and the world of work as part of their educational experience.

Mott Middle College opened in 1991 funded by a grant from The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, to specialize in dropout prevention. Working with students that may not succeed in a traditional high school setting, Mott Middle College offers students the opportunity to earn college credits and a high school diploma simultaneously. The student body currently averages 400 students, and over its 20 year history the school has graduated over 650 students.

The teachers are trained to function as focus group leaders to small groups of students. The teachers and support staff work very hard to develop an education system that meets the needs of all learning styles and foster one-on-one relationships with students. The school also utilizes community resources to assist students with their academic, career and personal development. In 2002 the school began to shift from a middle college to an early college to increase the emphasis on student dual enrollment. During the 2009–2010 school year, 375 students earned 1,562 college credits.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the administrators, educators, staff, graduates, and community partners for working diligently to help accomplish the educational goals of students; and for creating a program that has gained a national reputation for excellence. As a role model for other middle and early colleges, Mott Middle College has set the bar very high for success and I wish them the best in the coming years.

HONORING DR. GEORGE DAVISON TENNISON

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Dr. George Davison Tennison born on July 5, 1918.

Dr. George Tennison was known as "Dr. George" to everyone in Silsbee, Texas. Dr. George, a veteran of World War II served his country proudly as a U.S. Navy physician in the war. He served as part of the Navy Medical Corp on board a troop transport. He received an honorable discharge from the Navy in 1946. After leaving the Navy, he returned to Silsbee where he practiced medicine for 52 years. It is widely speculated that Dr. George delivered over 5,000 babies over his distinguished career.

Dr. George was a rare breed of rural physician who traveled country dirt roads in the evenings after office hours to provide care for patients who had no transportation into town.

In 1940, Dr. George married Elise Nelson of Zachary, Louisiana, and they had five children over 70 years of marriage.

Dr. George was long active in the community. He was a former school board President and member of the Kiwanis Club, bank board, and the hospital board.

Dr. George was known around Silsbee for his love of duck hunting. He loved hunting so much that he frequently got up at 3 A.M. to go out on the duck marshes before daylight. After a couple hours of hunting, he returned to his clinic for a full day of treating patients.

He was also known for his award winning roses. For as long as he was able, he grew hundreds of rose bushes in his yard and won many rose competitions.

Dr. George was instrumental in starting the first Episcopal Church in Hardin County, St. John's, where he served on the church vestry.

Dr. George is survived by his loving wife of 70 years, Elise Nelson Tennison.

HONORING MISS ABBY KEENE

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Miss Abby Keene.

She is freshman at Southern Wayne High School in Dudley, NC. Abby is currently an active member of the Southern Wayne High School FFA and is currently working with training a goat for the goat exhibition and show. She is preparing for a land judging contest in which she will be a judge. Prior to her diagnosis she was a cheerleader, softball player and dancer.

In the fall of 2009 after a routine exam by their family doctor, Abby was found to have an enlarged spleen. Further test revealed that she suffers from a rare liver disease named Primary Sclerosing Cholangitit (PSC). PSC is a liver disease of the bile ducts and is very rare in children and even more rare to be diagnosed in a female. The only known treatment is a transplant and she is currently on a waiting list for a transplant at Children's Hospital in Pittsburgh, PA.

Abby's mother Deon has teamed up with COTA (Children's Organ Transplant Association) along with friends, neighbors, local churches, fire department/rescue units, Grantham Grange, Southern Wayne High School FFA, and other local civic groups to raise $50,000 for Abby to receive a transplant. On May 14, 2011, Eureka Christian Church is hosting a BBQ lunch and dinner, followed by an auction of donated items. Abby is hoping to return to her active roles upon completion of her liver transplant.

Mr. Speaker, today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Miss Abby Keene and wish her the best in her upcoming future.

RECOGNIZING TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Teacher Appreciation week and the extraordinary work done by America's teachers to provide students with the knowledge and skills they will need to compete and thrive in the 21st century.

Every day, hard working men and women go into the classroom to prepare our children for a successful future. For this, they deserve not just our utmost gratitude and respect but fair and adequate compensation. Instead, teachers and other public workers across the nation are under attack. Earlier this year, I went to Wisconsin to lend support for teachers and other state workers who are not only fighting cutbacks in salaries and benefits but the loss of long-standing collective bargaining rights. Fortunately, in Wisconsin and other states, people are turning out in large numbers to show opposition to those attacks and demonstrate support for teachers and public employees.

Rather than demonize teachers, it is imperative that we recognize the essential role they play in our society not only this week but throughout the year. President Obama has spoken at length about America's need to "Win the Future." As our nation looks to achieve that objective, we must not lose sight of the fact that nothing has a more direct impact on student achievement than having a great teacher in the classroom.

As a former elementary school teacher, I know just the teaching profession is both rewarding and challenging. I encourage every American to take a moment this week to thank a teacher for the incredible work they are doing to make our nation a better place.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF INOVA FAIRFAX HOSPITAL

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Inova Fairfax Hospital, which is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year.

Fairfax Hospital was first proposed by a group of concerned citizens who embraced the concept of a not-for-profit hospital. With the strong support of the community, Fairfax County and the federal government, The Fairfax Hospital was built and opened its doors on February 6th, 1961. With a visionary and dedicated group of physicians, nurses, allied health care professionals, management, board members and auxillians, The Fairfax Hospital has become a premier health care institution in the Washington, D.C. area.

During the past 50 years, Fairfax Hospital, renamed Inova Fairfax Hospital in 1997, has significantly expanded to 833 acute-care beds and is now the busiest hospital in the Commonwealth of Virginia. It serves as the flagship facility of Inova Health System, which now includes hospitals in Alexandria, Mount Vernon, Fair Oaks, and Loudoun.

As the premier hospital serving the Northern Virginia community, Inova Fairfax Hospital includes the Inova Heart and Vascular Institute and the Inova Fairfax Hospital for Children, both of which are internationally recognized facilities, and the Inova Fairfax Hospital for Women.

Since its opening, Inova Fairfax Hospital has served as a teaching institution for future health professionals. Currently it partners with the medical schools of Georgetown, George Washington, the University of Virginia and Howard University as well as the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. It also serves as the Northern Virginia campus for the medical school of Virginia Commonwealth University. In addition it is affiliated with numerous nursing, pharmacy and other allied health profession programs and with numerous institutions of higher learning, including George Mason University. Inova Fairfax Hospital continues to expand with construction underway for a new 11-story tower to provide better access and flexibility to meet patient needs.

Among its many accolades, Inova Fairfax Hospital has been designated as the Level 1 Trauma Center for Northern Virginia by the Commonwealth of Virginia, awarded Magnet Recognition in Nursing Excellence, and consistently named among the 50 Best Hospitals in the United States by both U.S. News & World Report and HealthGrades. Inova Fairfax and Inova Health System are ranked among the nation's top 100 Military Friendly Employers, Top 100 Companies for Working Mothers, Best Employers for Workers Over 50, and are commonly named among the nation's 100 Most Wired hospitals and health systems.

While serving the health needs of an extensive community, Inova Fairfax also is actively involved in the community, partnering with community based programs and Fairfax County Public Schools. Inova also provides more than $200 million in charity care within a single year. I was proud to represent Inova Fairfax Hospital during my 14 years as the chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, and I am pleased to continue that partnership today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating the 50th Anniversary of Inova Fairfax Hospital, which the community will mark in a May 11 celebration. For 50 years, Inova Fairfax Hospital has carried out its mission as engraved on its dedication plaque that it is ''dedicated to the relief of human suffering and to the protection and preservation of the health of all who enter its doors.'' I extend my congratulations to the entire Inova Fairfax Hospital family and to Inova Health System and thank them for their continued commitment to our community.

THE REPUBLIC OF TEXAS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as I walked onto the battlefield in the hot Texas sun, I journeyed through a sea of buckskin uniforms, Bowie knives and long muskets. I felt like I had died and gone to Heaven.

The men who portrayed Sam's Boys had a certain swagger, a certain something that made them real members of the Texas Army. I even got my picture taken with Captain Juan Seguin, who led the Tejanos, Mexicans loyal for independence. So as not to confuse these Tejanos with Santa Anna's army, General Sam had Seguin put a playing card in the head band of each Tejano so they could easily be recognized.

Seguin and his men were roaming around the battlefield. Cannons, battle cries and the sound of hooves surrounded me. I was like a little boy again.

Thousands of people came from far and wide to celebrate 175 years of Texas independence at the San Jacinto Day Festival and Battle Reenactment. Children and senior citizens alike all gathered to travel back in time and see the reenactment of one of the most decisive battles in all history—and certainly the most decisive battle in Texas history.

Folks lined the battlefield with lawn chairs, umbrellas and water bottles to watch the reenactment of events that led to the Texas victory over the larger Mexican Army on April 21, 1836. I was reminded of how good it feels to be an American—particularly a Texan-American. As the wind blew, history unfolded right in front of our eyes. I felt like I stepped back in time to 1836.

It was 175 years ago that Texas became an independent nation. Like many folks, sometimes I wish that we still were. General Sam and his boys took on Santa Anna and an army of about 1,600 along the marshy banks of the San Jacinto River in the battle that resulted in one of the largest land transfers in world history and gave way to a new independent nation—the Republic of Texas.

After Mexican dictator Santa Anna stormed the walls of the Alamo, and ordered the massacre at Goliad, he felt the Texans had all but been defeated, and he set his sights on finishing the war with the Texans heading southeast in the ''Runaway Scrape.''

During this time, panic spread across Texas and doubt loomed that General Sam Houston could stop the Mexican Army. But, General Sam was not the quitting type and he would not give up his fight for freedom so easily.

The battle for Texas took place on the marshes of the San Jacinto River. On the afternoon of April 21, General Sam's battle plan called for a charge the next day at dawn, but after discussions with his troops he decided not to wait any longer.

Scout Deaf Smith was ordered to burn the only bridge and trapped both armies between the river and the marshes. In broad daylight, General Sam and the boys, 700 Texas freedom fighters, marched double-time in a single line to independence—taking on a professional army more than twice their size.

The Texans charged yelling, ''Remember the Alamo! Remember Goliad!'' They carried a flag of partially nude Miss Liberty, and the fife played a bawdy house song called ''Come to the Bower.'' Santa Anna's army, caught napping, was routed.

Tradition says Santa Anna was having a rendezvous in his tent with a lady that turned out to be a spy for Texas, Emily Morgan, who is sometimes referred to as the ''Yellow Rose of Texas.'' Most of the enemy was killed or wounded; the rest were captured or disappeared. The victory was stunning. The rest, as they say, is Texas history.

General Santa Anna's life was spared to the dismay of many that had lost loved ones at the Alamo and Goliad. But General Sam, noting that Texas was now a free and independent nation, held Santa Anna as a prisoner of war until negotiations between the two countries could be made.

While Texas had declared her independence from Mexico a month earlier on March 2, it was at this moment that she actually became a Republic all unto herself and remained so for nine glorious years.

Texas claimed land as far north as the Canadian border and as far west as Colorado. These historic battlegrounds remain an important part of Texas history, and in 1936, the state of Texas honored the Texas War of Independence and General Sam's victory by erecting a monument modeled after the Washington Monument, but naturally bigger.

I am proud to be a Texan-American. And that weekend, as I saw thousands of people celebrating the 175th anniversary of Texas Independence, I was reminded of how proudly we Texans hail. Because of men like Sam Houston, Texas is the great state that it is today. We must always remember that Texas was once a nation. Texas forever!

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE CHINA OCEAN SHIPPING COMPANY ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the China Ocean Shipping Company (COSCO) on its 50th anniversary.

Throughout the past fifty years, China Ocean Shipping Company has evolved from a small coastal carrier to a global maritime leader and a diversified multinational ''Fortune Global 500'' company that is the 2nd largest shipping company worldwide. My congratulations go to all the employees of COSCO. This company, with its American headquarters located in Secaucus, New Jersey, continues to be a leader in maritime commerce between the U.S. and China; providing jobs and economic growth here at home, and supporting safety, environmental and security efforts.

International maritime trade is vital to New Jersey and has helped support U.S. consumers, companies and products. COSCO Americas Inc. was recognized for promoting office social responsibility and received the 2010 New Jersey Department of Transportation New Jersey Smart Workplaces (NJSW) gold award. This award recognizes the efforts of COSCO to help reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality by providing commuter benefits to their employees in New Jersey. These important contributions to our state deserve the highest recognition.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to congratulate COSCO on its 50th anniversary and honor its employees for their role in COSCO's continued global business success and conscientious work in the State of New Jersey.

INTRODUCING THE LENA HORNE RECOGNITION ACT

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Lena Horne Recognition Act, a bill to posthumously honor Lena Horne with a Congressional Gold Medal in recognition of her many achievements and contributions to American culture and the Civil Rights Movement. A symbol of elegance and grace, the legendary Lena Horne entertained America and broke racial barriers as a singer, dancer, and actress for over 60 years. Ms. Horne passed away a year ago yesterday, in New York City on May 9, 2010 at the age of 92.

Lena Mary Calhoun Horne was born on June 30, 1917, in Brooklyn, New York. Her path to international stardom would take her from Harlem's famous Cotton Club, where she was hired as a chorus dancer at the age of 16, to Charlie Barnet's jazz band, where she became one of the first African American women to tour with an all-white band, to Hollywood and Broadway.

In the 1940s, Ms. Horne was discovered by a Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (MGM) talent scout and moved to Hollywood to be an actress, becoming the first black artist to sign a long-term contract with a major studio. Despite her extraordinary beauty and talent, however, she was often limited to minor acting roles because of her race. Among many lost opportunities, studio executives cast fellow actress Ava Gardner as Julie in the film adaptation of Show Boat instead of Ms. Horne because they did not want it to star a black actress. However, she dazzled audiences and critics in a number of films, including Cabin in the Sky and Stormy Weather.

The struggle for equal and fair treatment was an inseparable and increasingly political part of Ms. Home's life. During World War II, Ms. Horne toured extensively with the United Service Organizations, USO on the West Coast and in the South in support of the troops. She was out-spoken in her criticism of the way black soldiers were treated, refusing to sing for segregated audiences or to groups in which German prisoners of war were seated in front of African American servicemen.

During the period of McCarthyism in the 1950s, Ms. Horne was blacklisted as a communist for seven years because of her civil rights activism and friendship with Paul Robeson and W.E.B. Du Bois. Although she continued to face discrimination, Ms. Horne's career flourished in television and on nightclub stages across the country. It was during this time that she also established herself as a major recording artist. In 1957, she recorded Lena Horne at the Waldorf-Astoria, which reached the Top 10 and became the best-selling album by a female singer in RCA Victor's history.

Ms. Horne used her talent and fame to become a powerful voice for civil rights and equality. In 1963, she participated in the historic March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, at which Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. delivered his immortal "I Have a Dream" speech. She also performed at rallies throughout the country for the National Council for Negro Women and worked with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), of which she was the cover girl for their monthly bulletin at the age of 2, in addition to being a member of the Delta Sigma Theta sorority.

In 1981, Ms. Horne finally received the big break she had waited for her whole life—a one-woman Broadway show. Lena Horne: The Lady and Her Music, was the culmination of her triumphs and struggles. It enjoyed a 14-month run before going on tour and earned her a special Tony award for distinguished achievement in theater and two Grammys. Ms. Horne was also the recipient of the Kennedy Center honor for lifetime contribution to the arts in 1984 and in 1989 received a lifetime achievement Grammy Award. She received two stars on the Hollywood Walk of Fame—for her work in both motion pictures and recording—in addition to a footprint on the International Civil Rights Walk of Fame at the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site.

Mr. Speaker, Lena Horne was an extraordinary woman who refused to give up her dreams and used her beauty, talent, and intelligence to fight racial discrimination. I urge my colleagues to support the Lena Horne Recognition Act to honor the life and legacy of Ms. Lena Horne with a Congressional Gold Medal.

RECOGNIZING JIM MANDICH

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the passing of Miami Dolphins legend Jim Mandich.

Jim "Mad Dog" Mandich died on April 26th at the age of 62, after a valiant battle with bile duct cancer for more than a year.

He was a beloved and respected member of the South Florida community known for his warmth and generosity to those in need.

To longtime Dolphins fans, Mandich is remembered as the hard-nosed tight end on the two Super Bowl championship teams in the early 1970s.

Over eight seasons in the National Football League, all but one with the Miami Dolphins, he caught 121 passes, for 1,406 yards and 23 touchdowns.

But on the field he will best be remembered for always giving it his all on every play.

Earning the nickname "Mad Dog" for his all-out efforts on special teams, his teammates point out that he was the heart and soul of the undefeated team in 1972—the only undefeated season by an NFL team in the Super Bowl era. He then helped them repeat as Super Bowl champions the following season.

To younger Dolphins fans, he was the "voice" of the Dolphins. In 1992, the "Mad Dog" became the Dolphins radio color commentator, but to thousands of "Dol-fans" he simply became their voice. For nearly 20 years, Mandich grew a massive following for his all-out support of the team and his signature call, "Awwww-right Miami!"

Friends described how tough Jim was in his battle with cancer. Despite receiving chemotherapy and radiation, Mandich called every Dolphins game last season.

Fittingly, the Dolphins opened up Sun Life Stadium last Wednesday so that thousands of fans could pay their respects. He is survived by his wife Bonnie and their three sons.

May we rejoice in the profound joy Jim brought to those privileged to know him. He will be missed by the thousands of fans who cheered him on the football field and later, listened to him on the radio. He will be sorely missed and never replaced.

CELEBRATING ISRAEL'S 63RD ANNIVERSARY

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Yom Ha'atzmaut, Israel's Independence Day, and to mark the 6314 anniversary of the founding of the state of Israel.

Despite enduring decades of war and terror, Israel has emerged as a strong and vibrant democracy, a close U.S. friend and ally, and a global leader in technology, energy, and scientific innovation.

For me, as a Jew, ties to Israel are very personal. Growing up, I saved my money to buy tree certificates to help make the Israeli desert bloom. As a member of Congress, I continue to be a strong supporter of the State of Israel, of a vibrant U.S.-Israel relationship, and of a peaceful and secure future for Israel and the entire region.

The U.S.-Israel relationship, begun a mere minutes after Israel's founding, remains critically important to both our nations. Based on shared values and interests, this deep and abiding friendship is as important now as ever, in the face of international threats and a growing tide of delegitimization.

In February, I traveled to Israel with the Jewish United Fund of Metropolitan Chicago. In addition to discussions about regional developments and critical security issues, I also had the opportunity to learn more about Israel's excellent social programs as well as cutting edge research into green technology. As with previous trips to Israel, I left with both great pride and a renewed hope for a lasting peace solution.

Today, we mark the 63rd anniversary of the founding of the state of Israel, our steadfast friend, ally, and partner, and we reaffirm the unbreakable bonds between our two countries.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2815–S2850

Measures Introduced: Sixteen bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 927–942, S. Res. 175–178, and S. Con. Res. 16. **Pages S2839–40**

Measures Passed:

Authorizing the Use of Emancipation Hall: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 16, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha. **Page S2850**

Silver Star Service Banner Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 178, expressing support for the designation of May 1, 2011, as ''Silver Star Service Banner Day''. **Page S2850**

Appointments:

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki): The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, appointed the following Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 112th Congress: Senator Ayotte, Senator Chambliss, Senator Rubio, and Senator Wicker. **Page S2850**

Allen Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 2 p.m., on Wednesday, May 11, 2011, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Arenda L. Wright Allen, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia; that there be one hour for debate, equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote without intervening action or debate on confirmation of the nomination; that no further motions be in order to the nomination. **Page S2832**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 56 yeas and 42 nays (Vote No. EX. 68), Edward Milton Chen, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California. **Pages S2824–32, S2850**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S2838, S2850**

Executive Communications: **Pages S2838–39**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2840–41**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2841–49**

Additional Statements: **Page S2838**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S2849**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S2849–50**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—68) **Page S2832**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:07 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 11, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2850.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: COAST GUARD

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Coast Guard, focusing on an examination of operational and recapitalization requirements, after receiving testimony from Admiral Robert J. Papp, Jr., Commandant, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities concluded open and 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, after receiving testimony from Joseph R. DeTrani, Director, National

Counterproliferation Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence; Edward B. Held, Director, Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence, Michael McKeon, Chief Scientist, Anne M. Herrington, Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, National Nuclear Security Administration, and John Gerrard, Assistant Deputy Administrator, International Material Protection and Cooperation, all of the Department of Energy; and Brian Keith Lessenberry, Acting National Intelligence Officer for Weapons of Mass Destruction, Kenneth A. Meyers III, Director, Defense Threat Reduction Agency, Kenneth B. Handelman, Acting Assistant Secretary for Global Strategic Affairs, and Jed Royal, Director, Cooperative Threat Reduction Policy, all of the Department of Defense.

FINANCIAL CRISIS INQUIRY COMMISSION'S FINAL REPORT

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission's final report, after receiving testimony from Phil Angelides, Chairman, Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission.

TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIAL PROGRAM

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Transportation Worker Identification Credential Program, focusing on if internal control weaknesses need to be corrected to help achieve security objectives, after receiving testimony from Representative Mica; John Pistole, Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, and Rear Admiral Kevin S. Cook, Director, Prevention Policy, United States Coast Guard, both of the Department of Homeland Security; and Stephen M. Lord, Director, Homeland Security and Justice Issues, Government Accountability Office.

UPSTREAM OIL AND GAS TECHNOLOGIES

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine new developments in upstream oil and gas technologies, after receiving testimony from Kevin R. Banks, Alaska Department of Natural Resources Division of Oil and Gas Director, and Lois N. Epstein, Wilderness Society, both of Anchorage; Thomas Davis, Colorado School of Mines, Golden; Andy Hendricks, Schlumberger, Sugarland, Texas; and L. Stephen Melzer, Melzer Consulting, Midland, Texas.

DEFICIT REDUCTION

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine perspectives on deficit reduction, focusing on Social Security, after receiving testimony from James Roosevelt, Jr., Tufts Associated Health Plans, Inc., Watertown, Massachusetts; and Charles P. Blahous, Hoover Institution, Nancy J. Altman, Social Security Works, and Alex M. Brill, American Enterprise Institute (AEI), all of Washington, D.C.

SUCCESSFUL 2014 AFGHANISTAN TRANSITION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine steps needed for a successful 2014 transition in Afghanistan, after receiving testimony from David J. Kilcullen, Caerus Associates, Seth G. Jones, RAND Corporation, and Stephen Biddle, Council on Foreign Relations, all of Washington, D.C.

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS MODERNIZATION ACT

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: 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 concluded a joint hearing to examine a roadmap for a more efficient and accountable Federal government, focusing on implementing the Government Performance and Results (GPRA) Modernization Act, after receiving testimony from Jeffrey D. Zients, Administrator, Federal Procurement Policy, Office of Management and Budget; Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office; Robert Shea, Grant Thornton LLP, Alexandria, Virginia; Paul L. Posner, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia; and Jonathan D. Breul, IBM Center for The Business of Government, Washington, D.C.

PROTECTING MOBILE PRIVACY

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology and the Law concluded a hearing to examine protecting mobile privacy, focusing on smartphones, tablets, cell phones and privacy, after receiving testimony from Jessica Rich, Deputy Director, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission; Jason Weinstein, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Department of Justice; Justin Brookman, Center for Democracy and Technology (CDT), Alan Davidson, Google Inc., Jonathan Zuck, The Association for Competitive Technology, and Ashkan Soltani, all of Washington, D.C.; and Guy Tribble, Apple Inc., Cupertino, California.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 24 public bills, H.R. 1801–1824; and 8 resolutions, H.J. Res. 57; and H. Res. 255–256, 258–262 were introduced. **Pages H3159–61**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3161–62**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 257, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 112–74). **Page H3159**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Graves (GA) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3117**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:06 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H3118**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Jane Wood, Jerusalem-Mt. Pleasant United Methodist Church, Rockville, Maryland. **Page H3118**

Whole Number of the House: The Speaker announced to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Nevada, Mr. Heller, the whole number of the House is adjusted to 432. **Page H3118**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:14 p.m. and reconvened at 4 p.m. **Page H3119**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Assessing Progress in Haiti Act: H.R. 1016, amended, to measure the progress of relief, recovery, reconstruction, and development efforts in Haiti following the earthquake of January 12, 2010. **Page H3126**

Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act: The House began consideration of 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. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, May 11th. **Pages H3120–26 H3131–47**

Pursuant to the 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. **Page H3131**

Rejected:

Polis amendment (No. 1 printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–73) that sought to require safety review of permits to take into consideration all applicable safety, environmental and fisheries laws (by a recorded vote of 167 ayes to 245 noes, Roll No. 299); **Pages H3132–34, H3141**

Garamendi amendment (No. 2 printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–73) that sought to implement the Commission's recommendation by requiring that in reviewing a drilling permit, the Secretary consult with an independent drilling safety organization not affiliated with the oil industry trade association (by a recorded vote of 169 ayes to 240 noes, Roll No. 300); **Pages H3134–35, H3141–42**

Markey amendment (No. 3 printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–73) that sought to implement basic offshore drilling safety reforms recommended by the independent BP spill commission. The Commission found that the root causes of the BP spill were "systematic" and could have been prevented. The amendment would set specific new minimum standards for blow-out preventers, cementing and well design (by a recorded vote of 176 ayes to 237 noes, Roll No. 301); and **Pages H3135–37, H3142–43**

Hastings (FL) amendment (No. 10 printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–73) that sought to amend the bill to emphasize quality of court decisions instead of speed of court decisions. **Pages H3145–46**

Proceedings Postponed:

Hanabusa amendment (No. 4 printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–73) that seeks to state that the Secretary shall not issue an offshore drilling permit

without certifying that the applicant has calculated a worst-case discharge scenario for the proposed drilling operations; and has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the applicant possesses the capability and technology to respond immediately and effectively to such worst-case discharge scenario; **Pages H3137–38**

Holt amendment (No. 6 printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–73) that seeks to strike a provision in the underlying bill that would ''deem'' drilling permits approved after 60 days even if the necessary safety and environmental reviews have not be completed. The amendment leaves in place a timeline for approving drilling permits, but prevents permits from being ''deemed'' approved before the safety review has been completed; **Pages H3138–40**

Polis amendment (No. 7 printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–73) that seeks to lift timeline requirements if the agency lacks an adequate budget or lacks staff expertise to properly review permits; **Pages H3140–41**

Hastings (FL) amendment (No. 8 printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–73) that seeks to require a detailed description of the extent to which and by when any oil found on the leased property will decrease the price of crude oil and at the pump for hardworking Americans; **Pages H3143–44**

Deutch amendment (No. 9 printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–73) that seeks to strike section 202 of H.R. 1229, so that states outside of the 5th Circuit can have their courts hear civil actions relating to energy projects in the Gulf of Mexico; and **Pages H3144–45**

Hastings (FL) amendment (No. 11 printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–73) that seeks to strike section 207 of the bill which pertains to limitations on attorneys' fees. **Pages H3146–47**

H. Res. 245, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to on May 5th.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H3118.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3141, H3141–42 and H3142–43. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 9:39 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee began markup of the following: H.R. 5, the Help Efficient, Accessible, Low-cost, Timely Healthcare (HEALTH) Act of 2011; and H.R. 908, the Full Implementation of the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards (CFATS) Act.

GOVERNANCE, DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION IN AFRICA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights held a hearing on Governance, Democracy, Human Rights, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation in Africa: The FY 2012 Proposed Budget. Testimony was heard from Johnnie Carson, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of African Affairs, Department of State; Sharon Cromer, Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Africa, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Patrick Fine, Vice President for Compact Implementation, Department of Compact Operations, Millennium Challenge Corporation.

FUTURE OF CAPITAL FORMATION

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Future of Capital Formation.'' Testimony was heard from the following Securities and Exchange Commission officials: Mary Schapiro, Chairman; Meredith Cross, Director, Division of Corporation Finance; Roel C. Campos, Former Commissioner; and public witnesses.

REVERSING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S OFFSHORE MORATORIUM ACT

Committee on Rules: The Committee granted, by a record vote of 7 to 3, a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1231, Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources shall be considered as adopted and that the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. Provides that 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. The rule waives all points

of order against the amendments printed in the report. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.Testimony was heard from Rep. Bishop of Utah; Rep. Holt; Rep. Pallone: Rep. Garamendi; and Rep. Hastings of Florida.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: 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.

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.

Committee on Armed Services: 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.

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 p.m., SD–106.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine manufacturing our way to a stronger economy, 2 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: 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.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: 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: Subcommittee on Primary Health and Aging, 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.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 772, to protect Federal employees and visitors, improve the security of Federal facilities and authorize and modernize the Federal Protective Service, S. 550, to improve the provision of assistance to fire departments, S. 792, to authorize the waiver of certain debts relating to assistance provided to individuals and households since 2005, S. Res. 174, expressing the sense of the Senate that effective sharing of passenger information from inbound international flight manifests is a crucial component of our national security and that the

Department of Homeland Security must maintain the information sharing standards required under the 2007 Passenger Name Record Agreement between the United States and the European Union, H.R. 793, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12781 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard in Inverness, California, as the ''Specialist Jake Robert Velloza Post Office'', S. 349, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4865 Tallmadge Road in Rootstown, Ohio, as the ''Marine Sgt. Jeremy E. Murray Post Office'', and S. 655, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 95 Dogwood Street in Cary, Mississippi, as the ''Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr. Post Office'', 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: 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.

Committee on Rules and Administration: 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.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing on the National Endowment for the Arts FY12 Budget, 9:30 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on Defense Health Program, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, hearing on the Government Printing Office, Congressional Budget Office, Members and Public Witnesses, 10 a.m., HT–2, Capitol.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing on National Endowment for the Humanities FY12 Budget Oversight, 11 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, 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. 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training, hearing on Removing Inefficiencies in the Nation's Job Training Programs, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee continued markup of the following: H.R. 5, the Help Efficient, Accessible, Low-cost, Timely Healthcare (HEALTH) Act of 2011; and H.R. 908, the Full Implementation of the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards (CFATS) Act, as reported by the Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy. On May 10 at 4 p.m., 2123 Rayburn. 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health, begin markup of H.R. 1683, the State Flexibility Act of 2011, the Subcommittee will convene immediately after the completion of the Full Committee markup, 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, 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.

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, Full Committee, hearing on the Peace Corps at 50, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Full Committee, markup on H. Res. 209, Directing the Secretary of State to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any document, record, memo, correspondence, or other communication of the Department of State, 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, 4:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, 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.

Committee on House Administration, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing on GPO—Issues and Challenges: How will GPO Transition to the Future? 1:30 p.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, hearing on the USA PATRIOT Act: Dispelling the Myths, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement, hearing on H.R. 1741, the Secure Visas Act, 1:30 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security, Homeland Defense and Foreign Operations, hearing entitled ''USAID: Following the Money.'' 1:30 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

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.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 754, Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing on Review of Hydraulic Fracturing Technology and Practices, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1425, Creating Jobs Through Small Business Innovation Act of 2011, 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Reboot: Examining VA's IT Strategy for the 21st Century, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1745, Jobs, Opportunity, Benefits, and Services Act of 2011, 10:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings to examine Central Asia and the Arab spring, focusing on growing pressure for human rights and whether the factors that drove the uprisings in North Africa and the Middle East exist in any of the Central Asian States, 2 p.m., 2322, Rayburn Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 2 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Arenda L. Wright Allen, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, and after a period of debate, vote on confirmation of the nomination at approximately 3 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, May 11

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Complete consideration of H.R. 1229—Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act. Consideration of H.R. 1231—Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baca, Joe, Calif., E843, E844
Brady, Kevin, Tex., E850
Carnahan, Russ, Mo., E843
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E846, E848
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E848, E850
Costa, Jim, Calif., E842
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E840, E847
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E843, E845
Emerson, Jo Ann, Mo., E844
Garamendi, John, Calif., E844
Green, Gene, Tex., E839
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E852
Hirono, Mazie K., Hawaii, E842
Israel, Steve, N.Y., E841
Jones, Walter B., N.C., E850
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E850
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E841, E842, E843
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E847
Michaud, Michael H., Me., E841, E847
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E840, E841
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E842, E846, E848
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E844, E845, E845, E845, E846, E846, E846, E847, E848, E848
Poe, Ted, Tex., E851
Rothman, Steven R., N.J., E851
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E849, E850, E852
Terry, Lee, Nebr., E847
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E845
Wasserman Schultz, Debbie, Fla., E849, E852
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E839, E846
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E845

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.