United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 2011 No. 89

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 21, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL K. SIMPSON 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.

MEDICAID

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, while it is imperative that we reduce the Federal deficit, balancing the budget on the backs of our Nation's disadvantaged children and senior citizens is neither responsible nor equitable. I believe in an America that protects the young and the elderly.

But the Republican budget attacks the important safeguards for children and the disadvantaged, replacing Medicaid with vastly limited monetary grants to the States, forcing them to either reduce benefits to lower-income families or reduce the number of eligible families. Currently, 34 million children receive health care through Medicaid. From 1997 to 2009, the percentage of children without health insurance as a result dropped from 13.9 percent to 8.2. The Republican budget's attacks on Medicaid will imperil the health insurance for 24,100 children and reduce benefits for 6,100 seniors in my district, the 11th District of Virginia.

Unfortunately, the Republican attacks on our seniors don't end with Medicaid. Imagine a world where half of all seniors lack health insurance. Imagine a world where the rising costs of health care threaten retirees' ability to afford essential medicine their doctor prescribed. Imagine a world where more than one out of every three seniors lives in poverty and the choice for the day is between food and their drugs. This isn't a dystopian nightmare—it was the United States in 1965 before we passed Medicare. Seniors suffering from arthritis, hypertension, coronary disease, cancer, glaucoma, and any number of ailments lacked coverage and far too often fell into financial distress.

But thanks to Medicare, we changed all of that, providing guaranteed health insurance coverage to our Nation's seniors. As a result, the senior poverty rate decreased by 75 percent.

But our retirees once again face that nightmare scenario as the Republican budget plan for fiscal year 2012 seeks to eliminate Medicare for everyone 54 years and younger and force future retirees into finding insurance in the private market—the private market which could choose not to offer them coverage at all. Many seniors will be forced to pay more for health insurance; many seniors won't find any coverage.

Under the Republicans' plan for Medicare, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, retirees in 2022 will pay $6,400 more per year than they otherwise would under the traditional Medicare coverage.

In addition, the Republican budget reopens the Medicare part D prescription drug coverage gap, or the doughnut hole, which will cost seniors thousands of dollars each year for prescription medication. Prescription drugs can be expensive, and many of the medications seniors take are long term. People take medication daily to control their arthritis pain, lower their cholesterol, and reduce the risk of stroke. These lifesaving medications come at a price.

The implementation of Medicare part D in 2005 left many seniors with a gap in coverage, the doughnut hole. This gap, the initial coverage within it, and the catastrophic coverage amount cost many seniors thousands of dollars a year. I was proud to vote to eliminate that doughnut hole in 2009 with the health care reform bill. Unfortunately, just 2 years later, the Republican attack on Medicare reinstates the doughnut hole, once again threatening seniors with thousands of dollars in medication costs.

Mr. Speaker, I know our constituents want the Congress to get our fiscal house in order, and they're right. But Americans don't want us to eviscerate Medicare and attack retiree health insurance as part of that process.

I recently held a telephone town hall meeting and I conducted a poll. Seventeen hundred people participated in that poll. Seventy-three percent said do not gut Medicare.

True fiscal responsibility requires a firm commitment and shared sacrifice. It involves long-term focus to rein in and reduce spending in a responsible, sustained manner. Real fiscal discipline requires us to look at every area of the budget, including revenues, savings, efficiencies, and cuts where

Printed on recycled paper.

necessary. Ultimately, the budget represents our Nation's priorities. Reducing deficits is a significant priority, and as my constituents in the 11th District of Virginia have made clear, protecting seniors and their Medicare is equally significant.

WARNING: LIGHTBULBS DANGEROUS TO YOUR HEALTH

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it's turn out the lights; the party is almost over for the incandescent lightbulb.

Four years ago, a law went into place which mandated that every lightbulb across America must be 25 percent more efficient by 2014. What this meant was that the incandescent lightbulb, Thomas Edison's greatest invention, is being banned and Americans will be forced to buy the government-selected replacement, the compact fluorescent lightbulb.

There are health risk problems with the compact fluorescent lightbulb, or the CFL as it's called. The National Institutes of Health states that fluorescent bulbs contain mercury. Now, isn't that lovely? Further, another Federal agency, the EPA, warns that the broken bulb contains mercury and will ''continue to release mercury vapor until it is cleaned up and removed from the room.''

Mr. Speaker, I thought we were trying to get rid of mercury in our products in this country. So, in case we happen to break one of these new glass fragile lightbulbs—and I have one here and I'll be very careful not to drop it on the House floor because if I do, we'll have to evacuate the House floor. Here's what the EPA says and advises we're to do to clean up the poisonous debris in this lightbulb.

I am reading from the EPA's verbatim Web site:

Have people and pets leave the room.

Air out the room for 5 to 10 minutes by opening a window or a door to the outdoors. Now, how you do that in a high-rise, Mr. Speaker? You are to shut off the central heating and air conditioning system.

Collect materials needed to clean up the broken bulb. I guess we have to use gloves and duct tape, and place the cleanup materials in a sealable container.

Promptly place all bulb debris and cleanup materials outdoors in a trash container or protected area until materials can be disposed of properly.

Avoid leaving any bulb fragments or cleanup materials inside the room.

It goes on. Continue to air out the room where the bulb was broken and leave the heating and air conditioning system shut off for several hours.

I might note this is just a condensed instruction. The EPA has provided more detailed instructions on its Web site, and I submit this 3-page, single-spaced, typed document of over 1,000 words on how to clean up one of these lightbulbs if it's broken into the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

Recently, the French have noted that CFL bulbs can harm a child's vision because they contain arsenic, among other poisons, and the German scientists have found that these CFL bulbs can also cause cancer. Now, isn't that odd—that these bulbs mandated by the Federal Government actually are harmful to our health?

We should forget school lunches, Mr. Speaker. We now need to worry about our children's eyesight because of the lighting they sit under every day in a classroom, all thanks to the blind Federal Government. The Federal Government's anti-energy, anti-consumer choice regulation leaves Americans no other option but to purchase and use a harmful, poisonous product. If that's not reason enough to get rid of these bulbs, here's another one.

None of these bulbs are made in the U.S.A. You look very carefully on every one of these bulbs, they will say, ''Made in China.'' That's right. Our good buddies, the Chinese, make all of these bulbs. The last factory in the United States that made incandescent lightbulbs closed down September 14, 2010. This ended a manufacturing industry that began all the way back to Thomas Edison.

So these job-producing lightbulb factories have been shipped off to China and now to Mexico, leaving even more Americans out of work. In fact, the lightbulb that I just read off of says that it is made in China, and it's in several languages, of course.

So the Federal Government imposed a burdensome, harmful-to-your-health regulation. An American factory closed. Jobs moved overseas. We've sort of heard this story before.

□ 1210

But there's a bright spot to this sad tale. Just yesterday, the State of Texas passed a law that protects Texans from this absurd abuse of Federal power. The law will allow Texans to continue to buy incandescent bulbs that are made in the State of Texas, keeping the government out of people's lives and keeping jobs in America—even if it is in Texas.

And let's not forget that this regulation is unconstitutional. The Federal Government does not have the authority to force anybody to buy anything, from health care insurance to a box of doughnuts or even a light bulb, especially if the light bulb is hazardous to America's health. Nowhere in the Constitution does the Federal Government have such abuse of power.

So it's time we repeal the unconstitutional job-killing, bad-for-your-health light bulb mandate. Otherwise, it looks like we'll be singing ''the party's over'' for the incandescent light bulb. ''Because they say that all good things must end. Call it a night. The party's over. And tomorrow starts the same old thing again.''

And that's just the way it is.

WHAT TO DO IF A COMPACT FLUORESCENT LIGHT (CFL) BULB OR FLUORESCENT TUBE LIGHT BULB BREAKS IN YOUR HOME: DETAILED RECOMMENDATIONS

SOURCE: EPA.GOV

BEFORE CLEANUP

1. Have people and pets leave the room, and avoid the breakage area on the way out.

2. Open a window or door to the outdoors and leave the room for 5–10 minutes.

3. Shut off the central forced-air heating/air conditioning (H&AC) system, if you have one.

4. Collect materials you will need to clean up the broken bulb:

Stiff paper or cardboard; sticky tape (e.g., duct tape); damp paper towels or disposable wet wipes (for hard surfaces); glass jar with a metal lid (such as a canning jar) or a sealable plastic bag(s).

CLEANUP STEPS FOR HARD SURFACES

1. Carefully scoop up glass fragments and powder using stiff paper or cardboard and place debris and paper/cardboard in a glass jar with a metal lid. If a glass jar is not available, use a sealable plastic bag. (NOTE: Since a plastic bag will not prevent the mercury vapor from escaping, remove the plastic bag(s) from the home after cleanup.)

2. Use sticky tape, such as duct tape, to pick up any remaining small glass fragments and powder. Place the used tape in the glass jar or plastic bag.

3. Wipe the area clean with damp paper towels or disposable wet wipes. Place the towels in the glass jar or plastic bag.

4. Vacuuming of hard surfaces during cleanup is not recommended unless broken glass remains after all other cleanup steps have been taken. [NOTE: It is possible that vacuuming could spread mercury-containing powder or mercury vapor, although available information on this problem is limited.] If vacuuming is needed to ensure removal of all broken glass, keep the following tips in mind:

Keep a window or door to the outdoors open; vacuum the area where the bulb was broken using the vacuum hose, if available; and remove the vacuum bag (or empty and wipe the canister) and seal the bag/vacuum debris, and any materials used to clean the vacuum, in a plastic bag.

5. Promptly place all bulb debris and cleanup materials, including vacuum cleaner bags, outdoors in a trash container or protected area until materials can be disposed of properly.

Check with your local or state government about disposal requirements in your area. Some states and communities require fluorescent bulbs (broken or unbroken) be taken to a local recycling center.

6. Wash your hands with soap and water after disposing of the jars or plastic bags containing bulb debris and cleanup materials.

7. Continue to air out the room where the bulb was broken and leave the H&AC system shut off, as practical, for several hours.

CLEANUP STEPS FOR CARPETING OR RUGS

1. Carefully scoop up glass fragments and powder using stiff paper or cardboard and place debris and paper/cardboard in a glass jar with a metal lid. If a glass jar is not available, use a sealable plastic bag. (NOTE: Since a plastic bag will not prevent the mercury vapor from escaping, remove the plastic bag(s) from the home after cleanup.)

2. Use sticky tape, such as duct tape, to pick up any remaining small glass fragments and powder. Place the used tape in the glass jar or plastic bag.

3. Vacuuming of carpeting or rugs during cleanup is not recommended unless broken

glass remains after all other cleanup steps have been taken. [NOTE: It is possible that vacuuming could spread mercury-containing powder or mercury vapor, although available information on this problem is limited.] If vacuuming is needed to ensure removal of all broken glass, keep the following tips in mind: Keep a window or door to the outdoors open; vacuum the area where the bulb was broken using the vacuum hose, if available; and remove the vacuum bag (or empty and wipe the canister) and seal the bag/vacuum debris, and any materials used to clean the vacuum, in a plastic bag.

4. Promptly place all bulb debris and cleanup materials, including vacuum cleaner bags, outdoors in a trash container or protected area until materials can be disposed of properly.

Check with your local or state government about disposal requirements in your area. Some states and communities require fluorescent bulbs (broken or unbroken) be taken to a local recycling center.

5. Wash your hands with soap and water after disposing of the jars or plastic bags containing bulb debris and cleanup materials.

6. Continue to air out the room where the bulb was broken and leave the H&AC system shut off, as practical, for several hours.

FUTURE CLEANING OF CARPETING OR RUGS: AIR OUT THE ROOM DURING AND AFTER VACUUMING

1. The next several times you vacuum the rug or carpet, shut off the H&AC system if you have one, close the doors to other rooms, and open a window or door to the outside before vacuuming. Change the vacuum bag after each use in this area.

2. After vacuuming is completed, keep the H&AC system shut off and the window or door to the outside open, as practical, for several hours.

ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE TO PREVENT BROKEN COMPACT FLUORESCENT LIGHT BULBS

Fluorescent bulbs are made of glass and can break if dropped or roughly handled. To avoid breaking a bulb, follow these general practices:

Always switch off and allow a working CFL bulb to cool before handling.

Always handle CFI, bulbs carefully to avoid breakage.

If possible, screw/unscrew the CFL by holding the plastic or ceramic base, not the glass tubing.

Gently screw in the CFL until snug. Do not over-tighten.

Never forcefully twist the glass tubing.

Consider not using CFLs in lamps that can be easily knocked over, in unprotected light fixtures, or in lamps that are incompatible with the spiral or folded shape of many CFLs.

Do not use CFL bulbs in locations where they can easily be broken, such as play spaces.

Use CFL bulbs that have a glass or plastic cover over the spiral or folded glass tube, if available. These types of bulbs look more like incandescent bulbs and may be more durable if dropped.

Consider using a drop cloth (e.g., plastic sheet or beach towel) when changing a fluorescent light bulb in case a breakage should occur. The drop cloth will help prevent mercury contamination of nearby surfaces and can be bundled with the bulb debris for disposal.

INVEST IN THE FUTURE OF OUR NATION

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. We've seen some pretty miserable employment numbers recently, but the real unemployment rate is actually about twice what you read in the paper. It's closer to 18 percent, with discouraged workers and people who are underemployed.

Now, can we look to Washington for solutions? On the Republican side of the aisle, the answer is simple: more tax cuts. That will put people back to work. Let's see, for 10 years now, we've been living under the Bush tax cuts; and we've had the worst job creation for the last decade since World War II.

Now, it doesn't seem to be working too well, but it is all based on the theory of trickle-down. But I think at this point, the American people have been trickled on so much, particularly those who are unemployed and looking for work, that they'd like an umbrella and they'd like a little shelter from these nonsensical policies.

Can we look to the White House? Well, unfortunately, things aren't a lot better down at the White House. They went along with the Republicans on quite a bit of these tax cuts. Forty percent of the so-called stimulus was tax cuts. Seven percent—one-sixth of that—was invested in infrastructure. And guess what, that investment at one-sixth the cost of the tax cuts put a heck of a lot more people to work, investment in building things and in the future of our country, as opposed to debt-driven consumption-driven tax cuts.

Last December, the President caved, went along with extending the Bush tax cuts, and we've still got miserable job creation. Oh, wow, that's a surprise. Now they've floated a balloon. The White House has a great new idea. Let's continue the Social Security tax holiday. That was added to the Bush tax cuts in December. That's created a lot of jobs. Sure, working families can use an extra $15 a week. But what about the 20 million people who are unemployed? They don't get any of that. And how much of that $15 a week, how many jobs does that create? But the White House thinks we should extend that, and maybe we should give it on the employer side too.

So here's the way it will work: we don't have the money. We're going to cut the Social Security tax again. We have to make the trust fund whole. So we'll borrow $200 billion from China that we'll put into the Social Security trust fund, and that's going to put America back to work. What a great idea. Wait a minute, how about we take that $200 billion the White House wants to borrow to extend the Social Security tax holiday and we invest it into real things, the Nation's crumbling infrastructure?

We have 20 percent unemployment in the construction industry, and it isn't just construction workers who go to work when we rebuild our infrastructure. We have Buy America requirements. They're all American jobs, and everything that goes into every job is made in America. If it's a transit system, you've got engineers; you've got software; you've got high-tech manufacturing. If it's a bridge, you've got steel; you've got concrete; you've got engineering design; you've got construction workers. If it's a highway, the same thing.

Take that money, take that $200 billion they want to borrow and give a Social Security tax holiday. Instead, invest it in the future of this country and things that will serve our country for 100 years, make us more productive, more efficient, and you can look your grandkids in the eye 15, 20, 30 years from today and say, Yes, that's right, we borrowed that money; and you are still paying the bill.

If you give it for a Social Security tax holiday, he is going to say, Granddad, what did you spend that $17 on that week? Because I am paying the bill. But how about if Granddad can say, We built that bridge; we built that transit system; we rebuilt our national transportation system. We put millions to work and, guess what, that system will serve you for another 100 years.

That's an investment versus consumption. Everybody around here is just into consumption. We need to invest in the future of our country.

IN RECOGNITION OF TWO MEN FROM HOBBS, NEW MEXICO

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I had the opportunity in Hobbs, New Mexico, to attend two services, recognition ceremonies for people from Hobbs. First of all, we were able to attend the retirement for Dr. Dean Mathis, who pastored Taylor Memorial Baptist Church for 36 years, same preacher, same church. That is just not heard of these days in America.

All teachers are required to do two very difficult things. They are required to push our knowledge base to the extreme limits of what we are able to know; but simultaneously to that, they have to stay grounded in truth. In other words, you can't just teach out to the edge of the learning envelope. You also have to stay grounded in the timeless principles that cause things to be relevant and true. Dr. Mathis did this with extreme care and with a delicacy that I found always attractive. He was able to bring biblical lessons to life in our personal lives and bring relevance to these teachings.

I think that also he perfected community participation at all levels. From his one small congregation there in Hobbs, New Mexico, we have city counselors, county commissioners, judges, two State representatives, a State senator, and a U.S. Congressman.

Now, that says a lot, coming from one small corner of the State of New Mexico. But his life didn't end there. He also had two missionaries check in

from very difficult parts of the world. They were on Skype and checked in at the ceremony, saying that if it hadn't been for his teachings, that they would not have been there.

Dr. Mathis and his wife, Betty Sue, dedicated their lives to the spiritual calling. And without those spiritual teachings in our society today, we find our society is drifting towards moral chaos. We are dealing with those problems here in this Congress as we deal with teen pregnancies, with hunger, with people who are wasting their lives on drugs and taking extraordinary amounts of Medicaid.

So we deal with the problems of a society that is becoming all too secular and forgetting that no matter what we pass as laws here that there is a moral component to every nation and that if we ignore that, we ignore it at our peril. I would like to give my congratulations to Dr. Dean Mathis and his wife, Betty Sue, for their years of service.

But then on the same day, we were able to recognize Carl Mackey. Carl Mackey was a few years younger than me and passed away at too early an age last year. Carl Mackey was a community leader. He was one of the friends, one of the many people that my mom had in class. She used to talk about Carl and said, Carl is really mobile. That meant Carl was walking up and down all the time during classes. Carl was actually one of her favorite students.

Now, I know Mom and Carl both personally, and they probably did not agree on one philosophical issue: Carl was a hard-core Democrat, community activist, black leader. Mom just was conservative, raised a conservative family. But they identified each other across that chasm of philosophy to recognize that there aren't many differences in us accept the human nature that says that everyone should have access to justice, to mercy, and to kindness. So it was in that that this young junior high student and Mom formed a relationship that continued until he passed away.

I was able to visit with Mom about their relationship this last weekend, and she still remembers it with a smile. When I was elected and Carl Mackey was serving, Carl and I, again, overcame all the supposed difficulties, the things that we did not see eye to eye on in our philosophies. But we did see eye to eye in having him represent a piece of the community that is often forgotten. That was the community that I grew up in, the southern part of Hobbs, the part of Hobbs that did not get its fair share of funding, fair share of justice.

So Carl was a constant voice, reminding all of us that we need to stop, slow down just a bit, and pay attention to the small guys in society. He will be greatly missed, and Dr. Mathis and his wife will be greatly missed. But I thank the community of Hobbs, taking the time to honor two different people, completely different backgrounds, completely different lives who weren't so different after all.

In the end, we are all Americans, and we're here for a better America. I salute them both.

□ 1220

THE BARBER OF BIRMINGHAM

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

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great American, Mr. James Armstrong of Birmingham, Alabama, and the inspiring documentary of his life entitled ''The Barber of Birmingham: Foot Soldier of the Civil Rights Movement.'' This film had its world premiere in January at the Sundance Film Festival and later won Best Documentary Short at the Ashland Independent Film Festival.

In March, the city of Birmingham hosted a red carpet screening of this wonderful movie, and it was attended by over 2,000 Alabamians. It was featured at the Alabama Theater, a venue that once refused admission to African Americans.

Tonight we will celebrate ''The Barber of Birmingham'' with its Washington, D.C., premiere. Later this week, the documentary will be screened at the Silverdocs festival in Silver Spring, Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, the screening of this film and its historic accounts are deserving of tribute. I commend the independent filmmakers and codirectors, Robin Fryday and the late Gail Dolgin, for their collaborative vision in capturing the essence of Mr. James Armstrong's life, a Birmingham legend and civil rights activist.

This documentary celebrates the thousands of foot soldiers whose names are not written in the history books but on whose shoulders we all stand. I applaud the directors for their wonderful rendition of Mr. James Armstrong's life.

I applaud Gail Dolgin for her steadfast determination to battle breast cancer while codirecting and editing the film from her hospice bed in order to submit the film for the Sundance Film Festival. She died 2 weeks prior.

I pay homage to Ms. Amelia Boynton of Selma, who was interviewed and provided historical accounts for segments of the film. The film also visited and revisited the news footage of the beating of Ms. Amelia Boynton and others that endured beatings on Edmund Pettus Bridge on Bloody Sunday during their march for the Voting Rights Act.

Though she is ill, Ms. Boynton was determined to travel the distance to be a part of tonight's premiere. I am inspired by the courage and determination displayed by Ms. Boynton, who, at 99 years old, would not be deterred and will be here tonight at the premiere of ''The Barber of Birmingham'' right here at the Capitol Visitor's Center.

James Armstrong, who died at 81 in November 2009, lived to see the fulfillment of his dream when our Nation elected its first African American President. I recognize him for a symbol of everything that is good and right and great in this Nation.

For over 50 years, Mr. Armstrong ran a barber shop in Birmingham, Alabama. It served as a community hub for discussions of current events, like the Voting Rights Act, education, and other civil rights issues.

Mr. James Armstrong was a World War II Army veteran, and he made his mark on the civil rights movement as a foot soldier who carried the American flag at the head of the 1965 Selma to Montgomery march, Bloody Sunday, as it's known. When authorities turned on the marchers that day, Mr. Armstrong dropped to his knees, but he never let go of that flag. Proudly, James Armstrong carried that flag until the day he died in 2009 for every commemoration of the Bloody Sunday march.

As many in this august body will note, our colleague, the Honorable JOHN LEWIS of Georgia, was among the foot soldiers of this historic march.

I salute Mr. Armstrong and his sons, Dwight and Floyd, for fulfilling the destiny meant for them. He and his sons filed a discrimination lawsuit that encouraged Blacks to actually attend elementary schools in the Deep South, breaking barriers in public education in Birmingham and throughout the South. They filed a desegregation lawsuit in 1963.

The Armstrongs lived close to where civil rights activist the Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth's home was bombed, and where the four little Black girls were killed in the 16th Avenue Baptist Church just 5 days after they integrated Graymont Elementary School.

Dwight and Floyd needed a Federal escort to school for 2 years and were guarded at night with shotguns by members of the Alabama Christian Movement For Human Rights.

Now, these selfless acts by James, Floyd, and Dwight Armstrong added significantly to the quality of life of all citizens in Alabama and in Birmingham. That is why I stand before you today to recognize Mr. James Armstrong, a proud American, a proud Alabamian, for his unrelenting dedication to the civil rights movement.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a point of personal privilege. Growing up in Selma, Alabama, I take great pride in paying tribute to a film that not only shares our painful history, but also celebrates our time-tested resiliency through the life of James Armstrong and other unsung foot soldiers and heroes. This documentary, which people will be able to see in theaters in New York and Los Angeles in August and September, should motivate us all to protect the right to vote for every single American citizen. The film should also inspire all citizens of every age, race, or gender to cherish the right to vote and to use it to advance this great Nation for the benefit of all people.

I look forward to attending the Capitol Hill premiere tonight and urge all to see The Barber of Birmingham: Foot Soldier of the Civil Rights Movement.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

ECONOMIC DIFFICULTIES WE FACE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, as always, it's an honor to speak here in the House of Representatives.

I heard Democratic friends mention earlier that what we need to do to get the economy going is start spending on infrastructure because our grandchildren will really appreciate the dollars that they have to pay years from now that we spent on infrastructure.

The only thing is, that's exactly what our friends across the aisle were saying in January of 2009 when they wanted an $800 billion stimulus package that turned out to be maybe $900 billion or $1 trillion. It was going to be for infrastructure. And many in the American public said, yeah, that's a good idea. It turned out that only around 6 percent or so, 6 to 7 percent may have been for infrastructure.

Okay. Fooled us once, shame on you. Fool us twice, shame on us.

The thing is, some of us weren't fooled even back then. We had already seen things that were said that would be done that were not done. So I voted against that so-called ''porkulus'' stimulus, or whatever you want to call it, bill. I voted against TARP because in America we're not supposed to just give one man $700 billion and say, go do whatever you want with all this money; we don't care, just fix things. Because he certainly didn't fix things, although he did engorge his buddies at Goldman Sachs.

Nonetheless, we do face economic difficulties. And within the last 2 weeks there were six of us, a bipartisan group, in Turkey. Their economy seems to be going very well, and we were seeing things growing and doing well in Istanbul. And they don't understand sarcasm very well and so, but I, nonetheless, said to some of their economic leaders, business leaders, so you must have had many huge stimulus packages to get the economy going. They looked at me like I was crazy because they don't understand sarcasm very well in another language I guess. But they spoke good English.

Nonetheless, they didn't use stimulus packages. But they did say they had dropped their corporate tax rate that was much too high down to 20 percent, and now businesses have been coming in. That works. It works whenever it's been tried.

But let me get to another point. Credibility is always relevant. In my days as a judge and chief justice that was one of the rules of the court. Credibility is always an issue. It's always relevant. So when this country makes promises to people and doesn't keep them, or they're stupid promises to people we know will not keep their word to us, we lose credibility.

We found out now that this administration is negotiating with the Taliban; basically, you know, just let us out. We're negotiating with the Taliban? Did Hoover negotiate with Dillinger, and Bonnie and Clyde?

Did Robert Kennedy, as Attorney General, negotiate with the Mob?

When people are involved and they're criminals and they're murderers and they're engaged in criminal activity and they've never kept a promise, do you really want to be making that deal?

Now, I know it seems like we should have learned a lesson from the Clinton administration. When North Korea was trying to build nukes, the Clinton administration sends Madeleine Albright, and she comes in, hey, hey, how about dropping pursuing nuclear weapons? We'll build you a nuclear power plant if you'll just—you'll build us a nuclear power plant if we just tell you we won't pursue it? Sure, we'll tell you that all day long.

□ 1230

So they cut a deal. We built them a nuclear plant, and that has been used to develop nuclear weapons, just like anybody should have figured it would. When you deal with criminals, with lying thugs, you can't trust that agreement.

For us to be negotiating with the Taliban is a blight on those who have given their lives there. I attended a funeral this weekend of Brad Gaudet, who went down in a helicopter accident on June 5. We owe those people who have given their lives fighting against those who want to destroy our way of life better than cutting a deal.

Let's rearm the Northern Alliance, the people that originally defeated the Taliban—just give them the advisers, the trainers, all that they need, and let them whip the Taliban for us again. Let's not negotiate with Dillinger. It makes no sense and we lose credibility.

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 32 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 at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask today that You bless the Members of this assembly to be the best and most faithful servants of the people they serve. Purify their intentions, that they will say what they believe and act consistent with their words.

Help them, indeed help us all, to be honest with themselves, so that they will not only be concerned with how their words and deeds are weighed by others, but also with how their words and deeds affect the lives of those in need and those who look to them for support, help, strength, and leadership.

May all that is done this day in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN 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.

NLRB KILLING JOBS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, Congressman DARRELL ISSA conducted a field hearing in North Charleston, South Carolina. A witness who really brought home the consequences families will face as a result of the NLRB's job-killing complaint was Cynthia Ramaker, who is currently employed at Boeing.

Bringing a human face to the complaint, she explained how the NLRB is denying her right to work. She explained that Boeing's new 1.1 million square foot building is already completed. Manufacturing is to begin this summer, with over 1,000 jobs already, and up to 3,800 more jobs could come. With construction and suppliers, ultimately 9,000 jobs could be created.

Boeing was attracted to South Carolina because of the trained world-class workforce, a welcoming pro-business climate, right to work laws, and a pro-business government of Republicans and Democrats. The job-killing action

of the Obama administration is a threat to American workers.

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

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO SAVE $50 MILLION FOR TENNESSEE TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce my first piece of legislation since taking office, and I am proud that it saves the taxpayers of my home State of Tennessee an estimated $50 million.

The unfunded mandate put in place by the new standards of the Federal Highway Administration is an undue burden on States when they can least afford it. That is why I am joining Congressman DESJARLAIS and Senators ALEXANDER and CORKER to allow local governments to meet these new standards at the end of a road sign's natural lifecycle, and not on the accelerated timetable put forth by the Federal Highway Administration.

While this administration and their departments might have the mindset of tax, borrow, and spend, local governments cannot do the same. At a time when we are working to be fiscally responsible and balance our budgets, the Federal Government is telling them to spend money they don't have.

Washington politicians should take a clue from their local and State officials and get to work on balancing the budget instead of telling States how to spend their money.

REPUBLICAN PLAN FOR AMERICA'S JOB CREATORS

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, since President Obama was elected, 2½ million more of our fellow citizens have lost their jobs. Unemployment has now been above 8 percent for 28 straight months, the longest stretch since the Great Depression, and if you look at the underemployment numbers and those who have simply given up, the situation is far worse. The top three credit rating agencies have now all issued warnings about our spending-driven national debt. A recent report by the Bureau of Labor Statistics says that new business startups are at a 17-year low.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to get this Nation back to work. America is experiencing a deficit of jobs because job creators have a severe deficit of confidence in the President's economic policies. Washington cannot help the job seeker by punishing the job creator with massive debt and massive regulations.

House Republicans have a plan for America's job creators which will put the Nation on a fiscally sustainable path, make our Tax Code more competitive, help create more American-made energy, and take the burden of regulation off our job creators' backs so America can go back to work.

REAL RECOVERY AGENDA

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday marked 1 year since President Obama promised the American people a recovery summer. But looking at the latest grim economic reports, it is clear that recovery couldn't be further from the truth. Consumer confidence slid to a 6-month low; unemployment rose to 9.1 percent, the highest rate since December; the stagnant economy created only 54,000 jobs, less than half of the 125,000 many economists predicted; and housing prices fell to new depths in April.

Mr. Speaker, it is painfully clear that President Obama's policies of excessive spending, borrowing, and regulation are failing. The American people are paying the extremely high price, and they are demanding changes—an end to the spending and borrowing, and more pro-growth, pro-job policies. That is why we are working hard on a real recovery agenda that will create jobs, cut spending, and restore our Nation to fiscal health.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5:30 p.m.

□ 1731

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

SERGEANT CHRIS DAVIS POST OFFICE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1632) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5014 Gary Avenue in Lubbock, Texas, as the ''Sergeant Chris Davis Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1635

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5014 Gary Avenue in Lubbock, Texas, shall be known and designated as the ''Sergeant Chris Davis Post Office''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Sergeant Chris Davis Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1632, introduced by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5014 Gary Avenue in Lubbock, Texas, as the Sergeant Chris Davis Post Office. The bill is cosponsored by the entire Texas delegation; and, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an original cosponsor myself.

Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting and proper that we name this post office in Lubbock for Army Sergeant Davis to honor a true American hero and his service to our country.

Sergeant Davis was born on October 25, 1971, in Lubbock; and according to his sister Margaret, he was always helping people and serving, even from a young age. She recalled that ''he was always helping and serving and always thinking of someone else. That was Chris.''

With his passion for service, Chris joined the Army in 1999 and was eventually assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 69th Armor Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division, based out of Fort Benning, Georgia.

While deployed in Iraq, Sergeant Davis was tragically killed on June 23, 2007, when his unit was attacked by insurgents using an improvised explosive device and small arms fire in Baghdad. He was 35 years old and left behind his wife, Debbie, and two children.

As a Representative from Texas, it is my honor to stand in this Chamber and pay tribute to fellow Texans who have made the ultimate sacrifice courageously defending our country's freedom. I am truly grateful for the service of Sergeant Chris Davis and for all those who serve and protect us each day. I urge all Members to join me in strong support of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform minority, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 1632, which would rename the United States Postal Service facility at 5014 Gary Avenue in Lubbock, Texas, as the Sergeant Chris Davis Post Office.

The bill before us was introduced by my good friend and colleague Representative RANDY NEUGEBAUER of Texas on April 15, 2011. In accordance with the committee requirements, the bill is cosponsored by all 32 Members of the Texas delegation. Further, H.R. 1632 was unanimously reported out of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly highlight the achievements and the honorable service of Sergeant Davis. After graduating from Estacado High School in Lubbock, Texas, Sergeant Davis enlisted in the Army and was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 69th Armor Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division, stationed out of Fort Benning, Georgia. Sergeant Davis was killed while serving in Baghdad, Iraq, when insurgents attacked his unit with small arms fire and an improvised explosive device.

From his early childhood, Sergeant Davis was always described as being a server, whether it was helping out in his community or looking out for friends and family. His decision to enlist in the Army and serve his Nation would be the crowning achievement of his ability to give back to his community. Always described as a happy-go-lucky individual, Sergeant Davis will be forever remembered by his ultimate sacrifice to our Nation.

I ask that we pass the underlying bill without reservation and pay tribute to the honor and value this young man displayed and so others understand his commitment and sacrifice to protect our Nation.

I also join my good friend from south Texas, and I urge the passage of H.R. 1632.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Lubbock, Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER), the sponsor of this legislation, who represents Texas Tech University and a fine area of west Texas.

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

I rise today to honor a fallen soldier from the United States Army. Sergeant Chris Davis of Lubbock, Texas, was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 69th Armor Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division at Fort Benning, Georgia. He joined the Army in September of 1999 and proudly served four tours in Iraq, 2002, 2003, 2005 and 2007. On June 23, 2007, while deployed in Iraq, Sergeant Davis was killed in action when his unit was attacked by insurgents using improvised explosive devices and small arms. He was only 35 years old.

The bill currently under consideration, H.R. 1632, would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5014 Gary Avenue in Lubbock, Texas, as the Sergeant Chris Davis Post Office. I believe it is important for Congress to honor the sacrifice of this soldier and his family, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Chris was born October 25, 1971. He grew up in Lubbock, Texas, and graduated from Estacado High School. He later enlisted in the Army in 1999. Before enlisting, Chris was a welder in a machine shop.

Sergeant Davis wanted to serve his country from a very young age. According to his father, Ray Davis, he said that while Chris was in school, he expressed a desire to join the Army. His family remembers that he used to say, I want to fight for my country. I want to do something for my country and this is what I will do. And he said, So if something happens, don't be mad at anyone.

Chris earned quite a few awards during his honorable service to our country: one Army Commendation Medal, three Army Achievement Medals, one Presidential Unit Citation, one Good Conduct Medal, one National Defense Service Medal, one Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, one Southwest Asia Service Medal, one Iraqi Campaign Medal, one Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, and one Global War on Terrorism Service Medal.

Sergeant Davis will be remembered as a valiant soldier and a wonderful son, father, husband, and brother. He loved his family and was known to always place others before himself. His sister Margaret remembers that Chris loved to have barbecues just for the opportunity to give him time to spend time with his family. He was known to make people laugh. He had the knack for cheering up anyone around him who was having a bad day. Chris was proud to be an American, and he bravely served his Nation that he loved.

Chris is survived by his wife, Debbie; his daughter, Taylor; his son, Zachary; his parents, Raymond and Herminia; and nine siblings, who I am sure are watching today.

□ 1740

On behalf of the United States Congress, we thank you for your sacrifice. As I speak these words, I'm reminded of the words Abraham Lincoln used in his famous letter to Mrs. Bixby, the mother of five sons who were killed during the Civil War:

"I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom." Abraham Lincoln, November 21, 1864.

Mr. Speaker, with the 4-year anniversary of Sergeant Davis' death just a few days away, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1632, in honor of Sergeant Chris Davis, and designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5014 Gary Avenue in Lubbock, Texas, as the Sergeant Chris Davis Post Office.

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, along with my Texas colleagues, I would like to urge all Members to support passage of H.R. 1632.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1632.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MARINE SGT. JEREMY E. MURRAY POST OFFICE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (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".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 349

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

SECTION 1. MARINE SGT. JEREMY E. MURRAY POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4865 Tallmadge Road in Rootstown, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the "Marine Sgt. Jeremy E. Murray Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Marine Sgt. Jeremy E. Murray Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 349, introduced in the Senate by Senator SHERROD BROWN of Ohio, would 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.

From a young age, Marine Corps Sergeant Jeremy E. Murray had a strong desire to join the military and to serve his country. According to his mother, Pam, Sergeant Murray talked constantly about wanting to join the military. In fact, he prepared so well for boot camp that he was able to break down a rifle faster than his superiors—something that didn't please his drill instructor.

Sergeant Murray joined the Marines in 1996, after graduating from Waterloo High School in Atwater Township. He was later assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 1st Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, and served three tours of duty in Iraq.

Tragically, on November 16, 2005, Sergeant Murray was killed by a roadside bomb outside of Fallujah. Sergeant Murray was 27 years old and left behind his wife, Megan, and his son, Ian. He was awarded the Purple Heart, a Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, and a Gold Star for his heroism.

In closing, I would like to read a quote from Sergeant Murray, as recalled by his father, Harold. Sergeant Murray told his father, ''If I don't come home, Dad, you know I died proudly. I died for what I wanted to do. This is my lifetime dream.''

America and I are grateful for Sergeant Murray's service to our country and for all our brave men and women in uniform who sacrifice so much for us each and every day.

I urge all Members to join me in strong support of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

On behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform minority, I'm pleased to join my colleagues and my friend from Texas in consideration of S. 349, which asks that we designate a postal facility in Rootstown, Ohio, after Marine Sergeant Jeremy Murray, who faithfully served his country until his passing in November of 2005 after his third tour of duty abroad.

S. 349 was introduced by Ohio State Senator SHERROD BROWN on February 15, 2011, and was passed by the Senate without amendment by unanimous consent on May 16, 2011. Congressman TIM RYAN from the State of Ohio introduced H.R. 725 also on February 15, 2011, which serves as a companion bill to the measure being considered currently.

Marine Sergeant Murray was a man who bravely served his country and was awarded the Purple Heart, a Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, and a Gold Star for his heroic achievement in Iraq. His mother, Pam Murray, is a longtime employee of the same facility which S. 349 is naming in honor and memory of her son.

Mr. Speaker, with respect for his achievements and sacrifice for his country, I urge the swift passage of this measure, which will recognize Sergeant Murray's contribution to America by naming this postal facility after him.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I again urge all Members to support passage of S. 349.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 349.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SCHERTZ VETERANS POST OFFICE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 771) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1081 Elbel Road in Schertz, Texas, as the ''Schertz Veterans Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 771

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

SECTION 1. SCHERTZ VETERANS POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1081 Elbel Road in Schertz, Texas, shall be known and designated as the ''Schertz Veterans Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Schertz Veterans Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 771, introduced by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from south Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1081 Elbel Road in Schertz, Texas, as the Schertz Veterans Post Office.

This bill is cosponsored by the entire Texas delegation, and I'm a proud cosponsor myself, Mr. Speaker. It's altogether fitting and proper that we designate this post office in Schertz to honor those who have sacrificed so much for this Nation—our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend my colleague from Texas for introducing this legislation and also commend him for introducing H.R. 1318, the South Texas Veterans Health Care Expansion Act. I'm a proud original cosponsor of this legislation as well, which is vitally important to the veterans all over south Texas.

□ 1750

H.R. 1318 would expand health care for the more than 117,000 veterans who reside in far south Texas. Currently, without adequate medical facilities, many of these veterans are forced to drive over 6 hours to the nearest facility in order to receive needed medical care.

This is unacceptable and we can do better.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that this legislation passed the House last week as part of the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2012, and it is my hope that the Senate will act swiftly on this measure and that the President will soon sign this important bill into law.

The VA estimates nearly 49,000 veterans currently reside in the 27th Congressional District, which I am honored to represent. This makes up much of far south Texas, along with the district Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. HINOJOSA represent. According to the VA, Texas has an estimated 1.7 million veterans, and there are approximately 22.5 million veterans all across our Nation.

To the men and women who have served, thank you for all you have done and for the countless sacrifices that you have made. I am truly grateful for your service and for the hardships you and your families have endured. I am proud to stand in this Chamber and to

honor you here today with both bills, that of renaming the post office and our veterans' bill for south Texas. I urge all Members to join me in strong support of H.R. 771.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First of all, I want to thank my good friend and colleague from south Texas, along with Congressman RUBÉN HINOJOSA, and then on the Senate side, both Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON and Senator CORNYN. All of us have been working as a team, and have been working to improve the access to veterans in south Texas. I think my friend said it ably, that there is a need out there, and we are working together to make sure in a bipartisan way that we provide that health care to the veterans. And I certainly want to thank Mr. FARENTHOLD for all the leadership that he has provided. Thank you very much.

H.R. 771 will designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1081 Elbel Road in Schertz, Texas, as the Schertz Veterans Post Office to honor those who have served in our Nation's defense. Many of us know someone who has served in the military: a friend, a family member, a parent, or a neighbor. Nearly 2 million veterans, almost 10 percent nationwide, call Texas home, and I thank them for their service. Our veterans have given full measures of devotion, sacrificing their time, their youth, in some cases their health, and in all cases time with their families. The Schertz Veterans Post Office will be located in the city of Schertz in Guadalupe County, which is connected with the military presence of Randolph Air Force Base nearby, which I represent.

Guadalupe County, in which Schertz resides, has the second-highest concentration of veterans in my district. Thousands and thousands of them live there in Guadalupe County. This legislation will name a landmark to serve as both a reminder and as a sincere ''thank you'' to the veterans at home and abroad. I urge the passage of H.R. 771 for all the brave men and women who have fought for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, Congressman LLOYD DOGGETT.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank both of my colleagues from Texas for using this as an opportunity, not only to herald this important bill, but as well the importance of health care for our veterans in south Texas.

As a sponsor myself, through several sessions of this effort to strengthen health care in south Texas, I am pleased we are finally making some progress on it. We need to continue to redouble our efforts, whether it is there or at Audie Murphy, or at the burn center, or at Lackland, or, as with our success last Friday in Austin, Texas, where we broke ground on what will become the largest veterans' outreach clinic to provide outpatient care for our veterans of any place in the entire United States.

Of course, what brings us principally here today is the bill that Congressman CUELLAR introduced and that I am a sponsor of, the bill to salute the veterans of Schertz, Texas, by renaming this as the Schertz Veterans Post Office. With so many in the Schertz area who have contributed so much to our Nation's freedom, there just aren't enough public buildings in Schertz to name all of them for the individual sacrifice that has occurred, so this bill very practically approaches the heroism and the contribution of so many veterans and their families in Schertz by renaming this building the Veterans Post Office.

Schertz' connection to our Armed Forces is a proud and storied history. Most of the community's growth began going back to a general store in the last century, in the 20th century. It began in the twenties and thirties with the Army's construction of what was then called in Hollywood and elsewhere the West Point of the Air, then Randolph Field before the Air Force was even formed.

Today, Randolph Field may be called Randolph Air Force Base and Schertz, Texas, may have had since 1990 a tripling of its population, but some things have not changed. One of those, since World War II—1946 and the end of that war, as the veterans were returning—has been the chartering and the continuation of the Veterans of Foreign War Post, commanded by Mike Espinola, and it is still a thriving heartbeat of community activities. Families are also still coming to Schertz, Texas. They're coming in droves. Even CNN recognized it as one of the best places to live anywhere in America.

So often, rapid change will divide rather than unite, and that could be especially true when you have people coming from, literally, all over the world to a community practically adjacent to a military base and otherwise filled with many commuters. But unlike so many other parts of our country, where folks return to the same street without a sense of neighborhood, the people in Schertz have maintained a community spirit that is reflected at the Schertz Family YWCA, which recently got the Strong Community award; at the many events families attend at Pickrell Park; or at a football game at Samuel Clemens High School. This renamed Veterans Post Office will help maintain that community spirit and will serve as an anchor and as a reminder of where Schertz came from, how it has grown, and the road ahead.

A while back, I stood at this very microphone to speak up for the renaming of a post office in south Austin on South Congress, which is the street that once connected San Antonio and Austin, for Sergeant Henry Ybarra, III, who was killed in Iraq. I remember the dedication service that we had there, joined by the Catholic War Veterans, the American GI Forum, LULAC, and The Knights of Columbus Council, in addition to the family and friends of Sergeant Ybarra. It meant a great deal to them, and I believe that the same thing, the same kind of inspiration which they feel every time they go into that hub of community activity, will be realized as well in Schertz, Texas.

Our veterans, whether they wore uniforms last week or decades ago, understand a fundamental truth: That our military is the strongest in the world because of the spirit and the bravery of the men and women who put on that uniform. As a grateful Nation, we must continue to honor their service by meeting their health care needs and by taking steps like today in the renaming of the Schertz Veterans Post Office. I think it's a step in the right direction.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, my good friend and colleague, Mr. LLOYD DOGGETT, for his dedication, his passion, and his commitment to the veterans. For many years, he has been supporting the veterans, and has worked very hard. If there is anybody who works very hard for the veterans, it is my friend Mr. LLOYD DOGGETT, and I certainly want to thank you for cosponsoring this legislation.

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I too would like to thank the gentlemen from Texas for their ongoing and continuing support for the veterans.

There is not too much that we can do for the men and women who sacrifice time and again for our country. They sacrifice their time; they sacrifice their work; and sadly, in some cases, they are asked to sacrifice their lives. I stand in strong support of this bill, and urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 771, renaming the post office in Schertz, Texas, the Schertz Veterans Post Office.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 771.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1800

SPENCER BYRD POWERS, JR. POST OFFICE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (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''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 655

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

SECTION 1. SPENCER BYRD POWERS, JR. POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 95 Dogwood Street in Cary, Mississippi, shall be known and designated as the ''Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr. Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr. Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 655.

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

There was no objection.

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

S. 655, introduced in the Senate by Senator THAD COCHRAN of Mississippi, would 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.

Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr., was born on February 12, 1945, and grew up in Cary, Mississippi, a town that his family has called home for nearly a century. While growing up in Cary, Spencer Powers had a sense of duty and service ingrained in him by his father, uncle, and other relatives, all who bravely served our country during World War II.

During the mid-1960s, as the Vietnam War progressed, Spencer Powers decided it was time to step up and serve his country. He was commissioned in the U.S. Army as a second lieutenant and fought valiantly until his tragic death on February 8, 1968, during an offensive attack operation in South Vietnam. He was only 22 years old at the time and just a few days shy of his 23rd birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly grateful for each and every member of our armed services that has paid the ultimate price and given the ultimate sacrifice in the name of freedom and in defense of our Nation. Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr., and his family are a great example of the values that make this country a wonderful place, a country where sacrifice, duty, and a selfless desire to serve inspire and motivate people to a cause greater than themselves. To the Powers family and to all the others who have served, I say thank you.

I'd like to urge all Members to join me in strong support of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, minority, I also want to thank my colleague Mr. FARENTHOLD for the leadership that he's provided on managing this bill, and I am pleased to join my colleagues across the aisle in consideration of S. 655, which would name the United States Postal Service facility at 95 Dogwood Street in Cary, Mississippi, as the Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr. Post Office.

The underlying bill before us was introduced by Senator THAD COCHRAN of Mississippi on March 28, 2011, and passed by the Senate on May 16, 2011. Our colleague, Representative BENNIE THOMPSON from the State of Mississippi, also introduced a companion bill to this measure in the form of H.R. 1072. Both measures aim to acknowledge and recognize the heroic service of Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr., by renaming the local post office in Cary, Mississippi, in his honor.

With his father and other relatives serving in our Armed Forces, Spencer Byrd Powers would continue their legacy by joining the United States Army, where he would serve this Nation honorably up until the point of his death. In 1968, Spencer Byrd Powers unfortunately would become the first member of his family not to return home from serving in war abroad. Spencer Byrd Powers was killed in an offensive attack operation in the Vietnam War.

I ask that we come together as Americans to honor Mr. Powers' sacrifice so that those who continue to serve after Mr. Powers can understand his commitment and his courage to serve on behalf of this beautiful country that we call America.

I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this fallen soldier and vote in support of passing H.R. 1072 to rename the Dogwood Street postal facility in Cary, Mississippi, as the Spencer Byrd Powers Post Office.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this Senate bill.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I too urge all Members to support the passage of S. 655, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 655.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1632, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 771, by the yeas and nays;

S. 349, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

SERGEANT CHRIS DAVIS POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1632) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5014 Gary Avenue in Lubbock, Texas, as the ''Sergeant Chris Davis Post Office,'' on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 0, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 460]

YEAS—396

Ackerman	Baca	Becerra
Adams	Bachmann	Benishek
Aderholt	Baldwin	Berg
Akin	Barletta	Berman
Alexander	Barrow	Biggert
Altmire	Bartlett	Bilbray
Amash	Barton (TX)	Bilirakis
Andrews	Bass (CA)	Bishop (GA)
Austria	Bass (NH)	Bishop (UT)

Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—36

Bachus
Berkley
Bishop (NY)
Boustany
Burton (IN)
Cantor
Costa
Costello
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Engel
Fattah
Giffords
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Jordan
Kingston
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lummis
Markey
McHenry
Moran
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Rokita
Schock
Schrader
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Watt
Weiner
Young (AK)

□ 1854

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBSON). The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and in Afghanistan, and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

SCHERTZ VETERANS POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 771) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1081 Elbel Road in Schertz, Texas, as the ''Schertz Veterans Post Office,'' on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 0, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 461]

YEAS—398

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George

Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—34

Berkley
Bishop (NY)
Boustany
Burton (IN)
Costello
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Engel
Fattah
Giffords
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Lummis
Markey
Moran
Nugent
Pingree (ME)
Rokita
Schock
Schrader
Sewell
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Watt
Weiner
Westmoreland
Young (AK)

□ 1903

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARINE SGT. JEREMY E. MURRAY POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (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,'' on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 0, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 462]

YEAS—397

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—35

Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Boustany
Burton (IN)
Costello
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Dicks
Engel
Fattah
Giffords
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Jordan
Kingston
Lewis (CA)
Lummis
Markey
McMorris Rodgers
Moran
Pingree (ME)
Rokita
Schock
Schrader
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Watt
Weiner
Whitfield
Young (AK)

□ 1911

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for votes in the House Chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall votes 460, 461, and 462.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 tomorrow for morning-hour debate, thereafter to resume its session at 11:30 a.m.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRIMM). 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 later.

ELECTION SUPPORT CONSOLIDATION AND EFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 672) to terminate the Election Assistance Commission, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 672

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 ''Election Support Consolidation and Efficiency Act''.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.

(a) TERMINATION.—The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new title:

''TITLE X—TERMINATION OF COMMISSION

''Subtitle A—Termination

''SEC. 1001. TERMINATION.

''Effective on the Commission termination date, the Commission (including the Election Assistance Commission Standards Board and the Election Assistance Commission Board of Advisors under part 2 of subtitle A of title II) is terminated and may not carry out any programs or activities.

''SEC. 1002. TRANSFER OF OPERATIONS TO OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET DURING TRANSITION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall, effective upon the Commission termination date—

''(1) perform the functions of the Commission with respect to contracts and agreements described in subsection 1003(a) until the expiration of such contracts and agreements, but shall not renew any such contract or agreement; and

''(2) shall take the necessary steps to wind up the affairs of the Commission.

''(b) EXCEPTION FOR FUNCTIONS TRANSFERRED TO OTHER AGENCIES.—Subsection (a) does not apply with respect to any functions of the Commission that are transferred under subtitle B.

''SEC. 1003. SAVINGS PROVISIONS.

''(a) PRIOR CONTRACTS.—The termination of the Commission under this subtitle shall not affect any contract that has been entered into by the Commission before the Commission termination date. All such contracts shall continue in effect until modified, superseded, terminated, set aside, or revoked in accordance with law by an authorized Federal official, a court of competent jurisdiction, or operation of law.

''(b) OBLIGATIONS OF RECIPIENTS OF PAYMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The termination of the Commission under this subtitle shall not affect the authority of any recipient of a payment made by the Commission under this Act prior to the Commission termination date to use any portion of the payment that remains unobligated as of the Commission termination date, and the terms and conditions that applied to the use of the payment at the time the payment was made shall continue to apply.

''(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR STATES RECEIVING REQUIREMENTS PAYMENTS.—In the case of a requirements payment made to a State under part 1 of subtitle D of title II, the terms and conditions applicable to the use of the payment for purposes of the State's obligations under this subsection (as well as any obligations in effect prior to the termination of the Commission under this subtitle), and for purposes of any applicable requirements imposed by regulations promulgated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall be the general terms and conditions applicable under Federal law, rules, and regulations to payments made by the Federal government to a State, except that to the extent that such general terms and conditions are inconsistent with the terms and conditions that are specified under part 1 of subtitle D of title II or section 902, the terms and conditions specified under such part and such section shall apply.

''(c) PENDING PROCEEDINGS.—

''(1) NO EFFECT ON PENDING PROCEEDINGS.—The termination of the Commission under this subtitle shall not affect any proceeding to which the Commission is a party that is pending on such date, including any suit to which the Commission is a party that is commenced prior to such date, and the applicable official shall be substituted or added as a party to the proceeding.

''(2) TREATMENT OF ORDERS.—In the case of a proceeding described in paragraph (1), an order may be issued, an appeal may be taken, judgments may be rendered, and payments may be made as if the Commission had not been terminated. Any such order shall continue in effect until modified, terminated, superseded, or revoked by an authorized Federal official, a court of competent jurisdiction, or operation of law.

''(3) CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO DISCONTINUANCE OR MODIFICATION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to prohibit the discontinuance or modification of any proceeding described in paragraph (1) under the same terms and conditions and to the same extent that such proceeding could have been discontinued or modified if the Commission had not been terminated.

''(4) REGULATIONS FOR TRANSFER OF PROCEEDINGS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget may issue regulations providing for the orderly transfer of proceedings described in paragraph (1).

''(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Orders and actions of the applicable official in the exercise of functions of the Commission shall be subject to judicial review to the same extent and in the same manner as if such orders and actions had been issued or taken by the Commission. Any requirements relating to notice, hearings, action upon the record, or administrative review that apply to any function of the Commission shall apply to the exercise of such function by the applicable official.

''(e) APPLICABLE OFFICIAL DEFINED.—In this section, the 'applicable official' means, with respect to any proceeding, order, or action—

''(1) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, to the extent that the proceeding, order, or action relates to functions performed by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under section 1002; or

''(2) the Federal Election Commission, to the extent that the proceeding, order, or action relates to a function transferred under subtitle B.

''SEC. 1004. COMMISSION TERMINATION DATE.

''The 'Commission termination date' is the first date following the expiration of the 60-day period that begins on the date of the enactment of this subtitle.

''Subtitle B—Transfer of Certain Authorities

''SEC. 1011. TRANSFER OF ELECTION ADMINISTRATION FUNCTIONS TO FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

''There are transferred to the Federal Election Commission (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'FEC') the following functions of the Commission:

''(1) The adoption of voluntary voting system guidelines, in accordance with part 3 of subtitle A of title II.

''(2) The testing, certification, decertification, and recertification of voting system hardware and software by accredited laboratories, in accordance with subtitle B of title II.

''(3) The maintenance of a clearinghouse of information on the experiences of State and local governments in implementing voluntary voting system guidelines and in operating voting systems in general.

''(4) The development of a standardized format for reports submitted by States under section 102(c) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, and the making of such format available to States and units of local government submitting such reports, in accordance with section 703(b).

''(5) Any functions transferred to the Commission under section 801 (relating to functions of the former Office of Election Administration of the FEC).

''(6) Any functions transferred to the Commission under section 802 (relating to functions described in section 9(a) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993).

''(7) Any functions of the Commission under section 1604(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1277; 42 U.S.C. 1977ff note) (relating to establishing guidelines and providing technical assistance with respect to electronic voting demonstration projects of the Secretary of Defense).

''(8) Any functions of the Commission under section 589(e)(1) of the Military and Overseas Voter Empowerment Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–7(e)(1)) (relating to providing technical assistance with respect to technology pilot programs for the benefit of absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters).

''SEC. 1012. EFFECTIVE DATE.

''The transfers under this subtitle shall take effect on the Commission termination date described in section 1004.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''TITLE X—TERMINATION OF COMMISSION

''Subtitle A—Termination

''Sec. 1001. Termination.
''Sec. 1002. Transfer of operations to Office of Management and Budget during transition.
''Sec. 1003. Savings provisions.
''Sec. 1004. Commission termination date.

''Subtitle B—Transfer of Certain Authorities

''Sec. 1011. Transfer of election administration functions to Federal Election Commission.
''Sec. 1012. Effective date.''.

SEC. 3. REPLACEMENT OF STANDARDS BOARD AND BOARD OF ADVISORS WITH GUIDELINES REVIEW BOARD.

(a) REPLACEMENT.—Part 2 of subtitle A of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15341 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

''PART 2—GUIDELINES REVIEW BOARD

''SEC. 211. ESTABLISHMENT.

''There is established the Guidelines Review Board (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'Board').

''SEC. 212. DUTIES.

''The Board shall, in accordance with the procedures described in part 3, review the voluntary voting system guidelines under such part.

''SEC. 213. MEMBERSHIP.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall be composed of 82 members appointed as follows:

''(1) One State or local election official from each State, to be selected by the chief State election official of the State, who shall take into account the needs of both State and local election officials in making the selection.

''(2) 2 members appointed by the National Conference of State Legislatures.

''(3) 2 members appointed by the National Association of Secretaries of State.

''(4) 2 members appointed by the National Association of State Election Directors.

''(5) 2 members appointed by the National Association of County Recorders, Election Administrators, and Clerks.

''(6) 2 members appointed by the Election Center.

''(7) 2 members appointed by the International Association of County Recorders, Election Officials, and Treasurers.

''(8) 2 members appointed by the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

''(9) 2 members appointed by the Architectural and Transportation Barrier Compliance Board under section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 792).

''(10) The chief of the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice or the chief's designee.

''(11) The director of the Federal Voting Assistance Program of the Department of Defense.

''(12) The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology or the Director's designee.

''(13) 4 members representing professionals in the field of science and technology, of whom—

''(A) one each shall be appointed by the Speaker and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives; and

''(B) one each shall be appointed by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate.

''(14) 4 members representing voter interests, of whom—

''(A) one each shall be appointed by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives; and

''(B) one each shall be appointed by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

''(b) MANNER OF APPOINTMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Appointments shall be made to the Board under subsection (a) in a manner which ensures that the Board will be bipartisan in nature and will reflect the various geographic regions of the United States.

''(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS.—The 2 individuals who are appointed as members of the Board under each of the paragraphs (2) through (9) of subsection (a) may not be members of the same political party.

''(c) TERM OF SERVICE; VACANCY.—Members of the Board shall serve for a term of 2 years, and may be reappointed. Any vacancy in the Board shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

''(d) EXECUTIVE BOARD.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the day on which the appointment of its members is completed, the Board shall select 9 of its members to serve as the Executive Board of the Guidelines Review Board, of whom—

''(A) not more than 5 may be State election officials;

''(B) not more than 5 may be local election officials; and

''(C) not more than 5 may be members of the same political party.

''(2) TERMS.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), members of the Executive Board of the Board shall serve for a term of 2 years and may not serve for more than 3 consecutive terms.

''(3) STAGGERING OF INITIAL TERMS.—Of the members first selected to serve on the Executive Board of the Board—

''(A) 3 shall serve for 1 term;

''(B) 3 shall serve for 2 consecutive terms; and

''(C) 3 shall serve for 3 consecutive terms, as determined by lot at the time the members are first appointed.

''(4) DUTIES.—The Executive Board of the Board shall carry out such duties of the Board as the Board may delegate.

''(e) BYLAWS; DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The Board may promulgate such bylaws as it considers appropriate to provide for the operation of the Board, including bylaws that permit the Executive Board to grant to any of its members the authority to act on behalf of the Executive Board.

''SEC. 214. POWERS; NO COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE.

''(a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that funds are made available by the Federal Election Commission, the Board may hold such hearings for the purpose of carrying out this Act, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Board considers advisable to carry out this title, except that the Board may not issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses or the production of any evidence.

''(2) MEETINGS.—The Board shall hold a meeting of its members—

''(A) not less frequently than once every 2 years for purposes selecting the Executive Board and voting on the voluntary voting system guidelines referred to it under section 222; and

''(B) at such other times as it considers appropriate for purposes of conducting such other business as it considers appropriate consistent with this title.

''(b) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Board may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Board considers necessary to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Executive Board, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Board.

''(c) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Board may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as a department or agency of the Federal Government.

''(d) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.—Upon the request of the Executive Board, the Administrator of the General Services Administration shall provide to the Board, on a reimbursable basis, the administrative support services that are necessary to enable the Board to carry out its duties under this title.

''(e) NO COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE.—Members of the Board shall not receive any compensation for their service, but shall be paid travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Board.

''SEC. 215. STATUS OF BOARD AND MEMBERS FOR PURPOSES OF CLAIMS AGAINST BOARD.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The provisions of chapters 161 and 171 of title 28, United States Code, shall apply with respect to the liability of the Board and its members for acts or omissions performed pursuant to and in the course of the duties and responsibilities of the Board.

''(b) EXCEPTION FOR CRIMINAL ACTS AND OTHER WILLFUL CONDUCT.—Subsection (a) may not be construed to limit personal liability for criminal acts or omissions, willful or malicious misconduct, acts or omissions for private gain, or any other act or omission outside the scope of the service of a member of the Board.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) MEMBERSHIP ON TECHNICAL GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.—Section 221(c)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15361(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting the following:

''(i) Members of the Guidelines Review Board.'';

(B) by redesignating clause (iii) of subparagraph (A) as clause (ii); and

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''Standards Board or Board of Advisors'' and inserting ''Guidelines Review Board''.

(2) CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED GUIDELINES.—Section 222(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15362(b)) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''BOARD OF ADVISORS AND STANDARDS BOARD'' and inserting ''GUIDELINES REVIEW BOARD''; and

(B) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

''(2) GUIDELINES REVIEW BOARD.—The Executive Director of the Commission shall submit the guidelines proposed to be adopted under this part (or any modifications to such guidelines) to the Guidelines Review Board.''.

(3) REVIEW OF PROPOSED GUIDELINES.—Section 222(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15362(c)) is amended by striking ''the Board of Advisors and the Standards Board shall each review'' and inserting ''the Guidelines Review Board shall review''.

(4) FINAL ADOPTION OF PROPOSED GUIDELINES.—Section 222(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15362(d)) is amended by striking ''the Board of Advisors and the Standards Board'' each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting ''the Guidelines Review Board''.

(5) ASSISTANCE WITH NIST REVIEW OF TESTING LABORATORIES.—Section 231(c)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15371(c)(1)) is amended by striking ''the Standards Board and the Board of Advisors'' and inserting ''the Guidelines Review Board''.

(6) ASSISTING FEC WITH DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDIZED FORMAT FOR REPORTS ON ABSENTEE BALLOTS OF ABSENT UNIFORMED SERVICES AND OVERSEAS VOTERS.—Section 703(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–1 note) is amended by striking ''the Election Assistance Commission Board of Advisors and the Election Assistance Commission Standards Board'' and inserting ''the Guidelines Review Board''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by amending the item relating to part 2 of subtitle A of title II to read as follows:

''PART 2—GUIDELINES REVIEW BOARD

''Sec. 211. Establishment.
''Sec. 212. Duties.
''Sec. 213. Membership.
''Sec. 214. Powers; no compensation for service.
''Sec. 215. Status of Board and members for purposes of claims against Board.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the Commission termination date described in section 1004 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (as added by section 1(a)).

SEC. 4. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO TRANSFER OF CERTAIN AUTHORITIES TO FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

(a) DEVELOPMENT AND ADOPTION OF VOLUNTARY VOTING SYSTEM GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part 3 of subtitle A of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15361 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 223. TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY TO FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

''(a) TRANSFER.—Effective on the Commission termination date described in section 1004, the Federal Election Commission (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'FEC') shall be responsible for carrying out the duties and functions of the Commission under this part.

''(b) ROLE OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The FEC shall carry out the operation and management of its duties and functions under this part through the Office of the Executive Director of the FEC.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the item relating to part 3 of subtitle A of title II the following:

''Sec. 223. Transfer of authority to Federal Election Commission.''.

(b) TESTING, CERTIFICATION, DECERTIFICATION, AND RECERTIFICATION OF VOTING SYSTEM HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title II of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15371 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 232. TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY TO FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

''(a) TRANSFER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the Commission termination date described in section 1004, the Federal Election Commission (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'FEC') shall be responsible for carrying out the duties and functions of the Commission under this subtitle.

''(2) ROLE OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The FEC shall carry out the operation and management of its duties and functions under this subtitle through the Office of the Executive Director of the FEC.

''(b) TRANSFER OF OFFICE OF VOTING SYSTEM TESTING AND CERTIFICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There are transferred to the FEC all functions that the Office of Voting System Testing and Certification of the Commission (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Office') exercised under this subtitle before the Commission termination date.

''(2) TRANSFER OF PROPERTY, RECORDS, AND PERSONNEL.—

''(A) PROPERTY AND RECORDS.—The contracts, liabilities, records, property, appropriations, and other assets and interests of the Office, together with the unexpended balances of any appropriations or other funds available to the Office, are transferred and made available to the FEC.

''(B) PERSONNEL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The personnel of the Office are transferred to the FEC, except that the number of full-time equivalent personnel so transferred may not exceed the number of full-time equivalent personnel of the Office as of January 1, 2011.

''(ii) TREATMENT OF EMPLOYEES AT TIME OF TRANSFER.—An individual who is an employee of the Office who is transferred under this section shall not be separated or reduced in grade or compensation because of the transfer during the 1-year period that begins on the date of the transfer.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to subtitle B of title II the following:

''Sec. 232. Transfer of authority to Federal Election Commission.''.

(c) DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDIZED FORMAT FOR REPORTS ON ABSENTEE BALLOTING BY ABSENT UNIFORMED SERVICES VOTERS AND OVERSEAS VOTERS.—Section 703(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–1 note) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Effective on the Commission termination date described in section 1004, the Federal Election Commission shall be responsible for carrying out the duties and functions of the Commission under this subsection.''.

SEC. 5. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS.

(a) FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971.—

(1) DUTIES OF FEC.—Section 311(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 438(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (8);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(10) provide for the adoption of voluntary voting system guidelines, in accordance with part 3 of subtitle A of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15361 et seq.);

''(11) provide for the testing, certification, decertification, and recertification of voting system hardware and software by accredited laboratories, in accordance with subtitle B of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15371 et seq.);

''(12) maintain a clearinghouse of information on the experiences of State and local governments in implementing voluntary voting system guidelines and in operating voting systems in general;

''(13) carry out the duties described in section 9(a) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993;

''(14) develop a standardized format for reports submitted by States under section 102(c) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, make such format available to States and units of local government submitting such reports, and receive such reports in accordance with section 102(c) of such Act, in accordance with section 703(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002;

''(15) carry out the duties described in section 1604(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1277; 42 U.S.C. 1977ff note); and

''(16) carry out the duties described in section 589(e)(1) of the Military and Overseas Voter Empowerment Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–7(e)(1)).''.

(2) AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO PRIVATE CONTRACTS TO CARRY OUT FUNCTIONS.—Section 311 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 438) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) Subject to applicable laws, the Commission may enter into contracts with private entities to carry out any of the authorities that are the responsibility of the Commission under paragraphs (10) through (16) of subsection (a).''.

(3) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE REQUIREMENTS ON STATES AND UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—Section 311 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 438), as amended by paragraph (2), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) Nothing in paragraphs (10) through (16) of subsection (a) or any other provision of this Act shall be construed to grant the Commission the authority to issue any rule, promulgate any regulation, or take any other actions that imposes any requirement on any State or unit of local government, except to the extent that the Commission had such authority prior to the enactment of this subsection or to the extent permitted under section 9(a) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–7(a)).''.

(b) NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993.—Section 9(a) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–7(a)) is amended by striking ''Election Assistance Commission'' and inserting ''Federal Election Commission''.

(c) UNIFORMED AND OVERSEAS CITIZENS ABSENTEE VOTING ACT.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS FOR STATE REPORTS.—Section 101(b)(11) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff(b)(11)) is amended by striking ''the Election Assistance Commission'' and inserting ''the Federal Election Commission''.

(2) RECEIPT OF REPORTS ON NUMBER OF ABSENTEE BALLOTS TRANSMITTED AND RECEIVED.—Section 102(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–1(c)) is amended by striking ''the Election Assistance Commission (established under the Help America Vote Act of 2002)'' and inserting ''the Federal Election Commission''.

(d) ELECTRONIC VOTING DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS FOR SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—Section 1604(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1277; 42 U.S.C. 1977ff note) is amended by striking ''the Election Assistance Commission'' and inserting ''the Federal Election Commission''.

(e) TECHNOLOGY PILOT PROGRAM FOR ABSENT MILITARY AND OVERSEAS VOTERS.—Section 589(e)(1) of the Military and Overseas Voter Empowerment Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–7(e)(1)) is amended by striking ''Election Assistance Commission'' and inserting ''Federal Election Commission''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the Commission termination date described in section 1004 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (as added by section 1(a)).

SEC. 6. OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO TERMINATION.

(a) HATCH ACT.—Section 7323(b)(2)(B)(i)(I) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or the Election Assistance Commission''.

(b) SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.—Section 3132(a)(1)(C) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or the Election Assistance Commission''.

(c) INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1978.—Section 8G(a)(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking ''the Election Assistance Commission,''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the Commission termination date described in section 1004 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (as added by section 1(a)).

SEC. 7. STUDIES.

(a) PROCEDURES FOR ADOPTION AND MODIFICATION OF VOLUNTARY VOTING SYSTEM GUIDELINES.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General shall conduct a study of the procedures used to adopt and modify the voluntary voting system guidelines applicable to the administration of elections for Federal office, and shall develop recommendations on methods to improve such procedures, taking into account the needs of persons affected by such guidelines, including State and local election officials, voters with disabilities, absent military and overseas voters, and the manufacturers of voting systems.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to Congress on the study conducted under paragraph (1), and shall include in the report the recommendations developed under such paragraph.

(b) PROCEDURES FOR VOTING SYSTEM TESTING AND CERTIFICATION.—

(1) STUDY.—The Federal Election Commission shall conduct a study of the procedures for the testing, certification, decertification, and recertification of voting system hardware and software used in elections for Federal office, and shall develop a recommendation on the entity that is best suited to oversee and carry out such procedures, taking into consideration the needs of persons affected by such procedures, including State and local election officials, voters with disabilities, absent military and overseas voters, and the manufacturers of voting systems.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Election Commission shall submit a report to Congress on the study conducted under paragraph (1), and shall include in the report the recommendation developed under such paragraph.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

As we move forward on the difficult job of securing our Nation's financial future, the Congress will face many difficult decisions. Programs will have to be cut, and some even eliminated. All of those programs are there because someone wants them. We have to look carefully at each one and decide whether the benefit it creates is worth the cost of maintaining it.

After more than 2 years of hearings, investigations and oversight, the Committee on House Administration has identified not just a program but a Federal agency that we cannot justify to the taxpayers. That agency, the Election Assistance Commission, should be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, while the House is going to be making some very difficult spending decisions in the future, this is actually a clear and easy choice. The EAC was created in 2002 by the Help America Vote Act. HAVA passed the House with a large bipartisan majority. One hundred seventy-two Republicans voted for the bill that created the EAC. Its creation was a bipartisan choice, and so should be its termination. One of the primary reasons the EAC was created was to distribute money to States to update voting equipment and voter registration systems. The EAC has accomplished that, paying out over $3 billion to States for those purposes. With our deep debt and deficit, there almost certainly will be no more money for the EAC to distribute, meaning that that function is complete.

Another of the EAC's main functions, conducting research on election issues, is also complete. The agency has completed all of 19 planned election management guidelines as well as the 21 planned quick start guides. It has completed four of the five studies required under HAVA, and the fifth is tied up in an interagency controversy, making it unlikely that it will ever be finished.

The EAC also maintains a clearinghouse for election officials to share experiences working with voting systems, and it operates a program to develop voluntary guidelines for voting systems, test voting systems against those guidelines, and certify that systems comply with those guidelines. Thirty-five States and territories use the Federal testing and certification system in some way to decide what voting systems their election officials can purchase and use. Unlike the grants and research programs that are now obsolete, the clearinghouse and the testing and certification programs provide continuing value for State and local election officials.

Against that backdrop, we have to look at the reality of what has happened to the EAC. When it was created by HAVA, the EAC was a small agency authorized for 3 years to spend up to $10 million per year. That was 9 years ago. The agency is still there, and its last full-time, full-year appropriation was for almost $18 million. Since a staff ceiling was removed in 2007, the agency has doubled in size, and this doubling came despite the fact that many of the EAC's responsibilities were completed or diminished. The average salary at the EAC is over $100,000. It has an executive director, a chief operating officer, a chief financial officer, and an accounting director. In its budget request for 2012, the EAC proposed to spend 51.7 percent of its budget on management and administration costs. Mr. Speaker, that bears repeating. The EAC planned to spend more than half of its budget on overhead. An agency with that plan is an agency that should be eliminated.

The need to eliminate the EAC is so great that the National Association of Secretaries of State, a bipartisan group, whose members have received the more than $3 billion distributed by the EAC, has passed two resolutions calling for Congress to dissolve the agency. In 2005 and again in 2010, the Secretaries of State asked us to do what I am asking this House to support today.

Beyond simply being an agency with an increasing size and a dwindling purpose, the EAC has proven time and time again that what the agency knows how to do best is to be reckless and irresponsible with taxpayer dollars. In the short time I have served on the Committee on House Administration, we have learned of two different cases where legal claims were filed against the EAC for discrimination against candidates for the position of general counsel. The first case involved discrimination based on the candidate's political affiliation. The second involved discrimination based on the candidate's service in the military. Political neutrality and assistance to military and overseas voters are values the EAC should promote, not undermine.

□ 1920

On top of that, these cases are expensive for the taxpayers.

In the development of this bill, we have sought out and received a considerable amount of input from election officials and others, in hearings at the committee and other settings. That input has allowed us to improve this bill as we have moved forward. Perhaps most importantly, we added a Guidelines Review Board that gives election officials and others a formal seat at the table when voting system guidelines are developed. This board streamlines two existing boards into a single, smaller one but preserves the ability of States and local election officials to stay involved directly.

Before I close, I would like to thank Chairman HALL from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. He has worked closely with us as a partner in developing this bill. I appreciate his efforts to improve the bill and to bring it to the floor.

This bill is a careful and thoughtful measure to close down a Federal agency in a responsible way. To sustain an agency that has completed its assigned studies, dispersed its assigned grants, and fulfilled most of its mandates is the definition of irresponsibility. We haven't rushed through this process. We've held hearings. We've listened to numerous experts. We've kept and reassigned the programs that provide true value for election administrators. And now is simply the time to end the EAC and save American taxpayers at least $33 million in the next 5 years.

It doesn't get any easier to find an example of wasteful government spending. If we can't do this, we might as well pack up and go home because this is as obvious as it gets.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 672, and I yield myself 5 minutes.

Supporters of the bill once told us that this would save $14 million each year. I'm not sure how they came up with that number. What we do know is that when Ranking Member BRADY asked the FEC if they could handle the responsibilities of EAC, this is what they said: Sure, if you give us more money. So this bill would take money from an agency they don't like and give it to an agency that no one likes. It will take money from an agency that has met many challenges and has improved its operations in the past few years, and it will give it to one on the opposite path, one that has become only more dysfunctional in recent years.

But H.R. 672 doesn't move all of EAC's functions to the FEC. Some of the best ones simply go away. So let's say that H.R. 672 will save the Federal Government $6.6 million a year. That's great. Unless you happen to live in a State. This is just another example of shifting the costs to the States. Well, we lose the efficiencies of having a central clearinghouse for information, so maybe this isn't just cost shifting but cost increasing, because no matter what we do, our States have to run elections every year, often twice a year.

The EAC doesn't run elections. That's not its job. It assists the State and local election officials so that they can run elections better and for less. And local election officials have written in from across the country in praise of the EAC and opposition to this bill. H.R. 672 would eliminate the one Federal agency that's focused on finding best practices for elections. That will make it that much harder for the supervisor of elections in Palm Beach County, Florida, to learn that the registrar of voters in Fresno County, California, figured out a way to process paper ballots so they would run more smoothly, representing a 25 percent savings in election costs.

In my home, Bexar County, the elections administrator, Jacqui Callanen, learned from an EAC instructional video a new technique that will save

our county $100,000 per year. That's $100,000 in savings for one county, from one EAC instructional video, and we have more than 8,000 election jurisdictions in the United States.

But the savings don't stop there. The recount from Minnesota's 2008 Senate race was estimated to cost the State as much as $5 million and the candidates around $20 million. Worse, the people of Minnesota were deprived of one of their Senators for 6 of the most turbulent months in recent history. If the EAC can prevent the need for such recounts and reduce the costs and time involved in others, how much is that worth? EAC has taken tremendous steps to help our States ensure that our citizens, especially the disabled, are able to exercise their constitutional right and civic responsibility to participate in our electoral system. Now, how much is that worth?

Are the proponents of this bill willing to put a pricetag on that? Mr. Speaker, we spend millions of dollars and put our young men and women in harm's way, promoting and protecting our great democracy. Is it really too much to spend $6.6 million here at home?

When H.R. 672 was marked up in committee, I offered a very simple amendment. It would have had GAO look into whether the bill would actually save money, including whether savings at the Federal level would simply be the result of pushing costs onto the States, and whether voters would be disenfranchised, giving us the time to reconsider if the results were negative. I hadn't anticipated that the bill would reach the floor with no chance to offer an amendment. When we defeat this, when it comes up for a vote, and if the Republican leadership should decide to bring H.R. 672 back to the floor under a rule, I fully intend to offer that amendment again. If the supporters of H.R. 672 are so confident of the bill's savings and innocuous nature, I can't see why they would object to my amendment.

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

Mr. HARPER. I yield as much time as he shall consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN), chairman of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. You know, Mr. Speaker, my mom was born and raised in Chicago, Illinois, and listening to her stories about what transpired in the political process when she was growing up there, I used to think that the only place that you could find immortality in this world was on the voting rolls of Cook County. But I find here today that Ronald Reagan was right: Immortality is in the name of a Federal Government program.

This was supposed to be a temporary program. It was supposed to give temporary assistance to the States to make sure they could comply with HAVA, and it has done that. It has done that. It has let out all the money, billions of dollar that go to the States to assist in doing that. Its time has come and gone.

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot see that in these very difficult budget times we have to make some difficult decisions with respect to looking at programs to see if they've exhausted their usefulness, then we'll never be able to respond appropriately to what our constituents expect of us.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, carefully drafted, allows for those small elements of this agency to be transferred to the FEC with funds to carry out those responsibilities. The argument that the gentleman has just made, that somehow the FEC is not up to snuff, is not an argument I would think that the gentleman would support to somehow get rid of the FEC. We are giving them some responsibilities with funds, and hopefully they can carry those out.

The idea that we can stand here with a straight face and argue that an agency which spends over 50 percent of its total funding on overhead—and be able to say that to the American people is not only disappointing, but it's dispiriting, because it suggests to the American people that we are incapable of looking carefully at agencies and departments to see when, in fact, they are doing a job that continues and needs to be done, or when they have finished their function and, therefore, no longer need to exist.

Now, the Secretaries of State have spoken rather forcefully before our committee with respect to the fact that they no longer need the assistance of this particular arm of the Federal Government.

□ 1930

How often do we have people who come to us and say, We don't need this assistance anymore? Not very often. Should we ignore that in this particular case?

Admittedly, this is a small amount of money. It's only in the millions. Where I come from, that's important. Millions mean a lot. This is more important, though, as a symbol or a signal as to what we will do.

Look, if we had all the money in the world, maybe we wouldn't have this on the floor. We don't have all the money in the world, although we've tried to prove that we can print all the money in the world. The fact of the matter is folks back home want us somehow to get our house in order. That's the House of Representatives, and it's the house that we call the United States Federal Government. This may be a small room in that house, but, nonetheless, it is one that needs to be addressed.

The gentleman from Mississippi has done an excellent job of holding hearings on this matter, hearing from all parties on this, and has come up with this legislation. The suggestion that somehow by disestablishing the EAC we are going to penalize the military is something that I cannot understand very well at all. The Federal Voting Assistance Program under the DOD will continue to implement the MOVE Act, as they have very ably done since the passage of this bill in the last Congress. If you really examine it, the EAC has a very small role in the process, and that role will be continued after the EAC has been shut down.

States are looking at us to see whether we can give them some relief, and, in most cases, we are not going to be able to give the States some relief because, frankly, we don't have the money.

Businesses are looking at us, those who are in businesses, to see if we will understand the mistakes we've made in the past and do what they have to do, that is, to try to become more effective and more efficient. Our constituents are looking at us as they look for some glimmer that we understand the terrible fiscal situation we find ourselves in. And they're looking for just the littlest, the smallest suggestion that we are going to be serious about the fiscal mess that we find ourselves in.

This is a small start, but it is a start. And again, as the gentleman from Mississippi said, if we can't do this now, when can we do it? When you have a demonstrable record of an agency that's outlived its usefulness, you have to act. That's all we're attempting to do. I would hope that we would have a near unanimous vote in support of the gentleman's bill.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip who was instrumental in a bipartisan effort to actually pass, a few years ago, the Help America Vote Act.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to rise in opposition to this bill.

The gentleman from Mississippi knows as well as any of us that the right to vote is sacred. Access to the polling places ought to be sacred. Every American ought to be facilitated in voting, and every American vote needs to count. That's what the Help America Vote Act was all about.

Bob Ney of Ohio, who was chairman of the House Administration Committee subsequent to the 2000 election, and I worked on this legislation. And as has been pointed out, it passed overwhelmingly in a bipartisan way.

The right to vote is at the foundation of our democracy, so it is extremely disappointing that this bill would undermine our Nation's ability to protect that right. From 1789 to 2000, the Federal Government had elections which it did not pay for nor did it administer. Now, under this bill, we're still not paying for elections and we're still not administering them, not this bill that's on the floor. But under our scheme of things, the elections are still run by States and counties and localities.

What this agency was designed to do was to bring the best information possible so that elections could be run in the best way possible. There are over, I think, 120 million voters in America. So this is 20 cents for each one of those voters, to make sure that they have access and that their vote is counted and counted properly. Eliminating funding for the Election Assistance Commission would harm the integrity of our elections in 2012 and for years to come. Voters deserve assurance that their vote will count.

In 2000, our democracy was blemished by our flawed election systems. This was a response, passed in a bipartisan fashion. Regardless of how we felt about the outcome of that election, Republicans and Democrats agreed that the Federal Government had a duty to improve election systems so that every qualified citizen's vote counts.

Now, the FEC has a responsibility, and that is to monitor contributions and expenditures of political candidates, not to run elections. They had somewhat that responsibility before we created the Election Assistance Commission in HAVA, and they did not carry it out. Why? Because they neither had the resources nor the time to do so.

We need to provide States the financial and informational resources to upgrade their voting registration systems, train their poll workers, and improve access for disabled voters. The result was the bipartisan Help America Vote Act, or HAVA, which I was proud to help write.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. It passed the House by 357 votes to 48 and passed the Senate with only two votes against.

Before HAVA, the Federal Government guaranteed voting rights, but it did little to ensure, on the nuts-and-bolts level, that our objectives were carried out. As part of its efforts toward that end, HAVA created a bipartisan Election Assistance Commission, whose job is to administer grants to States and provide States with ongoing guidance.

My good friend from California (Mr. LUNGREN), with whom I have served for a number of years, is wrong. There was no intention to make this a temporary agency just for the distribution of grants. It was an ongoing advisory agency to make sure that best practices were pursued, not because they can impose but because they can advise, an extraordinarily worthwhile event.

The EAC has created a comprehensive program to test State voting systems for accuracy. Don't we all want that? And use of this program has been shown to save our States millions of dollars, as the ranking member just said.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding the additional minute.

The EAC is not perfect. There is no agency, including the one we're going to fund this week that spends almost $700 billion—that's not perfect. Should we fix it where it's broken? Yes. Should we do that to every agency? Yes. Is it our responsibility to do so? Yes. But to eliminate the very agency constructed to ensure that we do not repeat the travesty of 2000 is to retreat from ensuring fair, open, accessible elections where every vote will count.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this piece of legislation. If, in fact, the EAC needs fixing, let's fix it. That's the responsibility of the House Administration Committee on which I served for, I think, 17 years. You ought to do that if you think this is not working correctly, because what it does is absolutely essential for democracy and for America.

Defeat this legislation.

Mr. HARPER. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, chairman of the Committee on House Administration's Subcommittee on Oversight.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 672, and I commend my good friend from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) for his authorship.

The distinguished minority whip, the former Democratic majority leader, just made the statement essentially saying that few things are more important in this country than ensuring that every American citizen's right to vote is protected, and the EAC helps America to vote.

□ 1940

We agree on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker. We agree that few things are more important than ensuring Americans can vote. However, the Election Assistance Commission's support in this area is negligible at best.

In 2005, and again in 2010, the National Association of Secretaries of State, the individuals in the States tasked with overseeing elections, called for the dissolution of the EAC. The committee heard firsthand testimony from Secretaries of State that affirmed the passion with which they support this bill, the Harper bill, and how useless they feel this agency has become.

When those who oversee elections call for the dissolution of an agency supposedly meant to be supporting their efforts, Congress should listen.

But no, it's like President Ronald Reagan once said, and I quote him: ''No government ever voluntarily reduces itself in size. Government programs, once launched, never disappear. Actually, a government bureau is the nearest thing to eternal life we'll ever see on this Earth.''

Mr. Speaker, the minority whip just basically said the same thing, that once an agency is created, even after it's performed its function, it's done its duty, it's time to eliminate it. And we're talking about millions of dollars.

This is an important bill. As the gentleman from Mississippi so clearly stated, if we can't do this, what can we do in regard to reducing unnecessary spending of the taxpayer dollars so we'll have those precious dollars for other more important matters to help our States?

So I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, please, let's have a unanimous vote in support.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the so-called Election Support Consolidation and Efficiency Act. This would eliminate, as we have heard, the Election Assistance Commission.

And let me remind my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more crucial to democracy than guaranteeing the integrity, fairness, accessibility and accuracy of elections. Democracy works only if the citizens believe it does. The system must work, and the people must believe that it works.

But voting shouldn't be an act of blind faith. It should be an act of record. The EAC helps maintain the integrity of the American electoral process. And too many people across the country lack confidence in the legitimacy of election results, and the dismantling of the EAC would further erode that faith that is so essential to democracy.

How quickly Members seem to have forgotten the Florida recount with its hanging chads and pregnant chads and uncertainty counts of ballots to determine voter intent. The 2000 election exposed critical flaws and inconsistencies in how elections were conducted and, in its wake, Congress, under the leadership of Representative HOYER and others, approved the Help America Vote Act to assist State and local jurisdictions.

Yet, the legislation we're considering today willfully ignores this history. The bill closes the EAC, transfers some of its vital functions to the Election Commission, an agency that doesn't have the capability or the expertise to do the job and has other important work to do.

This bill takes this in exactly the wrong direction. While millions of Americans are casting their votes on unauditable voting machines and the results of many elections are not audited, eliminating the EAC would increase the risks that our electoral process will be compromised by voter system irregularities. Can we afford to take that risk? Certainly not.

H.R. 672 is another example of the desire of this Chamber that seems to exist to cut recklessly valuable services, rather than engage in the hard work of making government work at its best.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this misguided bill.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), also a former Secretary of State for the State of Colorado.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. In listening to the opposition, the statements against this legislation, it would make it sound like the EAC, the Election Assistance Commission, is a branch of the Justice Department, that it's there to enforce the right to vote. It doesn't do any of that at all.

The primary goal for the Election Assistance Commission was, after the Florida recount, the problems there in the 2000 election, that according to the Help America Vote Act, that the States such as Colorado that I was the Secretary of State in, were going to have to have a voter registration system that would be interactive, interactive database, to make sure that there wasn't fraud, that there wasn't duplicative registrations; and that the EAC would be the conduit for Federal resources grants to States to be able to facilitate that, and to make sure that that was carried out by the States. And that was for the 2008 Presidential election, long since done, long accomplished.

As to the EAC, which has no ability to mandate anything to States, but as an advisory tool, election officials across this country don't utilize it. There are associations that provide those best practices at every level of elections, from the county clerks to the Secretaries of State. And so this is an agency who's primary purpose is long since over with, and we can transfer the remaining function over to the Federal Elections Commission. And I rise in strong support for H.R. 672 and would urge its passage.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from the great State of Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing that we are here in the dark of night discussing the issues of election fairness. I would almost imagine it would be somewhat similar to taking up the Voting Rights Act, the one of 1965, in the dark of night.

We can speak lightly about this, but I will tell you that every election time someone is denied the right to vote in the United States. I hope Americans are paying attention tonight to realize that even though it is represented that the change and eliminating the particular agency that deals with the questions of fairness, the Election Assistance Commission, we're actually not saving money, and passing the responsibilities off to the Federal Elections Commission.

Why could we not have accepted the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), who said let's do it right. Let's have a general accountable study and know what we're doing and if we're taking away the rights of those who are desiring to vote.

I will tell you that the purging of voters that occurs in Texas and other places around the Nation, and in particular in Harris County, is not a minor issue. The distraction of African American male voters in Florida during the 2000 election is not simply a distraction.

And so the question is, even if this deals with interactive data, let me suggest to you that it is an important tool for local government because without this particular commission, those resources or those responsibilities and the finding of the money will be on local governments. So now we're doing unfunded mandates.

I would simply say that it was painful to pass the health bill.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, was passed in the backdrop of a great deal of emotionalism.

□ 1950

I am not here to point fingers, but I lived through that emotional time. It is history, my colleagues know that it is, but they know how painful it was to be engaged in hanging chads and discussions about who was turned away from the voting booth—and also the discrepancies on how we count our votes in America, the most sophisticated Nation in the world, the Nation that others look to and say, how do we promote democracy?

Why would we stand on the floor of the House at 8 o'clock tonight and deny democracy? I ask my colleagues to oppose this legislation and to stand for democracy and fairness.

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

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

First of all, I would like to address some of the remarks made by the proponents of this particular bill. First, I know it was not intentional to mischaracterize the words of Mr. HOYER. He did not state that the EAC should have an eternal life. What he said is, it was essential, in its present form, in the function that it provides. I think he also indicated that everything is not a simple budget or mathematical problem. There is cost benefit to look into and see what the true benefit is for the investment of that Federal dollar.

Much has been said about the National Association of Secretaries of State coming out with a resolution. That is not news. From the very inception they opposed the creation of the Election Assistance Commission, and on a regular basis they would pass a resolution expressing that opposition. But I do wish to point out that the president of the National Association of Secretaries of State, Secretary of State of Minnesota Mark Ritchie—whose State knows something about the cost of problematic elections—testified before our committee on March 31 that he was certainly not in favor of terminating the Election Assistance Commission.

I also wish to read from a letter that we received today at about 4 p.m. to a House Administration election staffer:

Dear Mr. Khalil, I am the election director of Harford County Board of Elections in northeastern Maryland. I am a Republican and have been active in the Republican Party since 1968. I am also the Republican member of the Standards Board of the Election Assistance Commission.

As a representative of a local board of elections, we are very isolated and depend on the EAC as a clearinghouse of information and resources. The EAC has been most helpful to local boards of elections in supporting our election administration and providing guidance in future elections. The FEC is too political and cannot do and perform as the Election Assistance Commission.

The passage of H.R. 672 will be a loss to local boards of election nationwide. We are the grassroots of the election community, and we need the support of the EAC.

In closing, we will in fact defeat this tomorrow. I'm hoping that my amendment will be ruled in order and that we will have a chance to really look at the potential effect this bill will have on local election officials. Not to politicize it. This is not about Republicans or about Democrats; it's about how effective and efficient our local election officials can be. With the assistance of the only clearinghouse, the only commission with the expertise and the dedication to that single goal. There will be no other agency like it, there will be no other commission like it, and it's well worth the investment that we make on a yearly basis to assure the integrity and the efficiency of our local elections. I don't know of any better investment.

I understand that we have to tighten our belts. Do we do it, though, at the cost of the efficient running of our elections, the very basis for our democracy?

I commend the Members on the other side of the aisle for this effort, but it is truly misguided. It's not based on facts or the realities on the ground. And almost every local election official will echo those sentiments today.

I oppose this bill. I will be voting against it. And I ask my colleagues to please oppose this bill.

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

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the remaining time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting that the statement was just made that the FEC is too political to take on the responsibilities of

the EAC. That's an amazing statement in light of the fact that the EAC has been sued for political discrimination—the very agency that's supposed to take care of fairness and do things in these issues gets sued for political discrimination. So that is hardly an argument to say that it can't be transferred.

We are looking at transferring the essential functions of the EAC over to the FEC with the personnel and funding that's necessary to do that job. It's a very responsible and adult thing to do to take care not only of spending issues, but we have an agency that is spending 51.7 percent of its budget on administration and management, not in program administration, not in taking care of grants, those have come and gone. So here we are in that situation of an agency that needs to be eliminated.

And I want to make it clear that in no way, by eliminating the EAC, are we doing anything to repeal or have any intent to do away with HAVA. That is something that came about in a bipartisan effort, and it will remain and shall remain as we move forward. But the EAC was created and funded for a 3-year period. Nine years later, we have one of the most inefficient agencies that we will probably ever see. It is beyond tweaking and correcting to do that.

I want to say that we all believe it is essential in our country that everyone has a right to vote and has access to vote and that no one be disenfranchised. In no way does that have any impact in a negative way. In fact, it will make the election process more efficient to do away with an agency like this. It is a Federal agency that has long outlived its usefulness. And if we look at the people that are on the ground in the States, the Secretaries of State in each of our States, that NASS would pass a resolution, not once, but twice, that this agency needs to be done away with—we need to follow that great advice of those that are most intimately familiar with what's going on.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that H.R. 672 eliminates wasteful spending in a responsible way. In particular, H.R. 672 would transfer the Election Assistance Commission's Office of Voting System Testing and Certification to the Federal Election Commission, while maintaining the National Institute of Standards and Technology's (NIST) current role in the accreditation of laboratories to test voting equipment. The bill continues the formal mechanisms for input into the development of Voluntary Voting System Guidelines (VVSGs) by maintaining the current Technical Guidelines Development Committee (which NIST, chairs), and replaces several committees with a streamlined 56-member Guidelines Review Board composed of state and local election officials and other key constituencies including federal representatives.

The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology is the Committee of jurisdiction over the scientific and technological aspects of voting reform including research, development, and testing of voting machine standards. These responsibilities have been assigned by the Help America Votes Act (HAVA) of 2002 to NIST. Within HAVA, the Science, Space, and Technology Committee created provisions to ensure that proper technical standards would be developed to improve voting technology and that a reliable system would be set up to test equipment against those standards. These activities allow states and localities to participate in the standards development process and to trust the systems they choose to invest in. Both are preserved in the legislation we are considering today.

I thank Representative GREGG HARPER (R–MS) and his staff for recognizing the importance of maintaining a pathway for the development of voting standards and ensuring the quality of voting equipment in H.R. 672.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 672.

Today our national debt is 14.344 trillion dollars. Any time we have the opportunity to save taxpayers $33 million over five years, while improving the efficiency of our federal government, we should take it.

Those against this bill have said that elections officials from across the country have called for the agency to be protected. Well, I happen to have been a Secretary of State for the State of Colorado, and I am calling for this Agency to be eliminated. In fact, the National Association of Secretaries of State has passed two resolutions calling for the EAC's termination.

The EAC's election research function is obsolete. It has completed 4 of the 5 federally mandated election studies, and the one outstanding study is six years overdue and mired in interagency controversy.

The agency spends over 50% of its budget on administrative costs. EAC's budget request for 2012 is for 5.4 million dollars to manage programs totaling 3.4 million dollars.

The EAC does not register voters, nor does it have any enforcement authority over laws governing voter registration.

This bill will transfer the EAC's remaining valuable service, its voting system testing and certification program, to the Federal Election Commission (FEC), which is better equipped to perform these functions more efficiently.

It is time to, as this bill does, terminate the EAC promptly and responsibly.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 672, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 2000

THE WAY IT IS ON AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT IN LIBYA

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the war in Libya continues. It is the third war the United States is in. In my opinion, this war is unconstitutional because Congress has not approved it. It also violates the War Powers Resolution, because even after the time limit has expired, the President still engages troops overseas without congressional authority. And this war is not in the national security interests of the United States. Administration officials say so.

This is a war that is sponsored by NATO. It is said we need to help NATO out. Well, if NATO wants to continue this war, let them. The United States is footing this bill, and it has cost us $750 million already.

The President says Muammar Qadhafi is a bad guy and he has got to go. We don't know what is going to replace him. We may have an oppressive regime replaced by an extremist radicalized regime. Who knows? But this war is not in the interests of the United States, and it is now Congress' responsibility to cut off the funds for this war, because this war violates the United States Constitution and it is not in the security interests of the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

MARINE SGT. JEREMY E. MURRAY POST OFFICE

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Marine Sergeant Jeremy Murray.

Today on this House floor we renamed the Post Office in Rootstown, Portage County, Ohio, where Jeremy grew up. He served our country during several tours to the Middle East, and at 28 years old he lost his life.

His mother has worked at this post office for 11 years, so it was a special day today for us to, in a very small way here in the House of Representatives, say ''thank you'' to him for his service and to thank his parents, Pam and Harold, for raising such a great young kid who would be willing to go off to war because his country asked him and serve us in such a noble way.

So, today I rise to say thank you to Jeremy, thank you to his parents, thank you to Rootstown, and thank you to Waterloo High School that instilled in him these values, a terrific young man whom we honor here today and we honor with this post office.

STANDING BEHIND NORTH DAKOTA RESIDENTS AFTER DEVASTATING FLOODS

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

Mr. BERG. Mr. Speaker, today the residents of Minot, North Dakota, and the surrounding communities are preparing for a devastating flood that is going to impact their cities. The water levels in the Souris River have never reached the levels that they will reach in the next 24 to 48 hours. Many parts of the city and the surrounding rural areas will be inundated with water as water levels rise above the current levies. More than 10,000 residents have already been evacuated.

In North Dakota, we pull together in challenging times and we support our friends and our communities. The city and people around Minot need to know that, when the water recedes, we will be there to help. We will be there to clean up, and we will be there to rebuild.

I ask everyone to please join me in keeping these residents who are fighting for their homes and their communities in your thoughts and prayers and to stand with Minot and other communities up and down the Souris River to ensure a strong recovery.

REPUBLICAN WOMEN ON JOB GROWTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with tremendous pride that I stand with my fellow Republican women on the House floor tonight. We stand before you from every corner of America, as businesswomen, nurses, physicians, farmers, mothers, educators, and attorneys to tell you the story of the Republican woman.

While our backgrounds and professions may be different, one thing is not: We are all conservative reformers committed to leaving America better for our children and grandchildren. After all, women in this country know better than anyone the effects of harmful economic policies. Why? Because two out of three businesses are started by women. Women-owned business are the fastest growing segment in the United States economy and they generate over $2.5 trillion in revenue a year. Women manage 83 percent of household income, spend two out of three health care dollars, and make up the majority of health care providers in America.

Women are at the center of this debate, and the House Republican women are committed to leading it. But at a time when our country has accumulated over $14 trillion in debt and faced 28 consecutive months of unemployment above 8 percent, we know this is not an easy task. Yet despite the obstacles and the opposition, House Republican women are committed to fighting this fight, to creating jobs, to making America what she once was—the land of opportunity, innovation, and ingenuity. And that is why we are all here. That is why we ran for Congress and why we stand in the Halls of Congress; some of us for many years, others are brand new, all of us bound by the commitment to real reform.

We have seen the numbers. Eighty-one percent of Americans know someone without a job; the average unemployed American has been searching for over 38 weeks; and since President Obama took office, we have lost over 2 million jobs in this country. We refuse to sit here and watch those numbers rise.

As eastern Washington's Representative, I ran for Congress 7 years ago to help keep that American Dream alive. I spent 13 years working beside my mom and dad and brother in our family-owned business in Kettle Falls, Washington. I was the first in my family to graduate from college, and I later had the honor of serving as State Representative, while continuing to work in our family business and learning firsthand the value of hard work, the value of opportunity. From the fruit stand in Kettle Falls to the Halls of Congress, I am here years later because I refused to let that opportunity be threatened.

I come home every night to two beautiful children, Cole and Grace, and I want them to have the opportunities that I have had. I want them not only to know the American Dream and what it is, but I want them to have the opportunity to live it.

America stands at a crossroads like never before in our Nation's history. Last year at this time the administration was talking about a recovery summer. This year we should be talking about a reality summer. The reality is clear and it is unprecedented. I was just home in Spokane, where unemployment is over 9 percent and there is one thing on the forefront of everyone's minds—jobs.

So, tonight we Republican women are here to remind the American people that creating jobs is our number one priority. Our GOP plan for job creators will empower small businesses, fix the Tax Code, encourage entrepreneurs, increase competitiveness, and pay down America's national debt. We will stand on this House floor, debate in committee hearings, work with our colleagues across the aisle, and continue to listen to those at home until we get Americans back to work. And we will. We are on the road to economic recovery, and the House Republican women are committed to ensuring that we get there.

With that, it is with great pleasure that I would like to yield to the dynamic woman from North Carolina.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much to my colleague from Washington, and thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing us tonight to come as Republican women to speak out to the American people.

I came to Washington as one of the new freshmen here, and I am very honored to be part of this group. We are a group of women who believe in our country. We believe in the right of every American to achieve. There are no guarantees, but if you put your mind to it and you work hard, everyone can achieve.

I, too, came from a family that was not wealthy. My parents did not really see the value in a college education. I am a second generation American here in the United States, and I am first generation college educated. I basically put myself through college and nursing school with many different jobs. I became a nurse, and I have been a nurse for over 21 years and am very happy to be so. I am a wife and a mom. My son, Ben, is 16 years old.

When health care became such a huge issue in this country and when our President spoke about changing it, the best health care system in the world, I knew that that was not only going to be detrimental to health care but also the economy, because it is such a large portion of our economy. So I put myself forward to run for office, because I believed that if you are going to change things in Washington, you have to change Washington itself. So here I am, proud to be serving with these great women.

We have many, many issues in this country right now that we are faced with, and we need jobs. Unemployment has been above 9 percent for over 23 months now. Yes, our colleagues across the aisle put forward their plan over a year ago. That plan has failed, and it is time for a new plan.

As a woman, being a multitasker, Mr. Speaker, as you know how wonderful women are, we can put our minds to it and we can solve these problems.

□ 2010

Speaking as a nurse, I've always taken care of many patients, but none more dear to me than my seniors. And what they are faced with today because of the destruction that has been put forward by our Democrat colleagues across the aisle in ObamaCare, it has truly done just that—destroyed it. And it is our job to rescue it back for the American people so that it will be there for our seniors and it will be there for generations to come.

As it is right now, $500 billion has been taken out, and a 15-person panel will be put in place to decide what kind of health care you receive. That right will be taken away from you and your physician. Imagine a group of individuals without any health care background whatsoever deciding for you whether or not you'll be able to have surgery or whether or not you'll be able to have a treatment. Imagine trying to explain that to your family. Imagine sitting at the bedside of your

loved one and telling them that, No, I'm sorry, your doctor cannot do surgery on you, and there is no way that we can appeal it. That is what has been put in place by ObamaCare, and we are determined as Republican women to pull back on this.

We spoke about jobs. My colleague from Washington has a wonderful illustration of what we need to do. That is the answer to the problems that we face here in America today. And as a woman, I am dedicated, as are my colleagues, to doing just that.

Again, in closing, I'll just say that it is an absolute and incredible honor to be here—and I am getting emotional—with my fellow women who are going to stay tonight and speak to all of you out there in America about the importance of being a good conservative woman and how much we all, if we work together, can come up with the answers to our problems.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. I'd like to yield to the gentlelady from South Dakota.

Mrs. NOEM. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join my fellow female colleagues and Members on this side of the aisle to highlight exactly what it means to be a Republican woman.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up in a family that didn't believe that there were certain tasks for boys or certain tasks for girls, but that we all did it all. My dad taught me how to drive a semi-truck and a combine, just like he did my brothers. I was expected to help with the chores even though they were tough and they were often dirty ones. I grew up thinking that I could do anything that the boys could do, and that way of thinking has certainly stayed with me. Over the years, I helped run our family businesses, including the farm and the ranches. I helped run the family restaurant and our hunting lodge. Although our businesses never grew so large that I was one of the women who are a part of what controls now 51 percent of the New York Stock Exchange, I always remembered what my dad said, and I always remembered that I could work just as hard as the guys could. My contribution was always just as valuable.

A few years ago, with young kids, raising them still at home, I saw that we needed someone with business experience, someone with common sense and ag experience to serve in our State legislature. So I ran and won a seat there. I realized that if I was going to be there and spend time away from my family and away from my businesses, I wanted to be as effective as I possibly could. So that meant running for a leadership position.

So in my second term I became the assistant majority leader in the South Dakota State legislature. I soon realized that the place that really needed a person with common sense and business sense and a place that really needed someone who had worked in agriculture and run businesses and someone who isn't afraid to roll up their sleeves and get to work was in Washington, D.C.

So I ran for Congress last year on the platform that we need people to represent us who have real-life experiences; who have experience running businesses, balancing checkbooks, dealing with regulations, and paying taxes. I didn't run because I was a woman, and I didn't expect people to vote for me because I was a woman. That had never ever even entered into my thought process, as the person I was running against was also a woman. I worked to earn each vote in talking about what was important in this country, in talking to folks about our life experiences and my position on the issues. That's what I knew mattered to South Dakotans, and that's what mattered to me.

Mr. Speaker, my agenda, the Republican agenda, is indeed pro-women. It is pro-women because it's pro-small business, pro-job creator, pro-family, pro-economic growth. You see, just as my dad taught me years ago, women in my home State of South Dakota and all across this country, we care about the same things that men do. They're worried about the security of their jobs; they're worried about their children's future, and they're worried about finding a job if they need one.

We're worried about the excessive spending that this country is engaging in and the overwhelming debt that we're continuing to accumulate and that we're going to leave to our children and our grandchildren. We're worried about what new government regulation is going to come in and hinder our businesses and what is around the corner that's going to try and control our portion of our lives or hurt our small businesses on the street corner.

Mr. Speaker, our Republican Conference has rolled out a jobs plan. It's pro-woman and it's pro-man because it does exactly what we need to get our economy back on track. It cuts burdensome regulation; it fixes the Tax Code; it increases American competitiveness, and it maximizes our production of American-made energy.

I would like to close by thanking all of my colleagues for this opportunity to speak on the House floor tonight on what it means to be a Republican woman and what it means to be someone who serves here with common sense, business experience, and life experience, who cares about our children and grandchildren in this country. I would like to thank my colleagues as well for organizing this special hour. It has been my honor to serve and to speak and to share this evening with you tonight.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Next, I'd like to yield to the gentlelady from Florida.

Mrs. ADAMS. Thank you. I, too, want to join my colleagues here tonight. And like my distinguished colleague from South Dakota, my father always taught me that you can do and be anything you would like as long as you're willing to work hard for it. It had nothing to do with your gender. It's just as long as you're willing to work hard for it.

So I took this to heart, and it is something that has stuck with me throughout my life whether it was when I joined the Air Force at 17 or when I was a single mother working two jobs trying to keep food on the table, or as a person who was working during the day and paying my way through the police academy at night or later on as a State legislator and now as a Member of Congress. I know what it's like to struggle, and I understand how difficult it is for women and families across this Nation during these tough economic times. I never aspired to be in public office, but a strong sense of justice and a love and an appreciation for our great country led me to where I am here today.

I ran for the Florida legislature years ago after I lost my second husband in the line of duty as a deputy sheriff because I was always there testifying on behalf of victims' and citizens' rights issues. One year I couldn't believe what I had heard, and I got involved so much with legislation that had passed that I felt it tied my hands as a police officer to do what I was sworn to do, and that was to protect and serve the community I was hired in in Orange County, Florida. So I decided to do something about it. I ran and was elected to Florida's 33rd district.

Eight years later, as I was preparing to come home and retire and be back and reacquaint myself with my family, I witnessed what a lot of people, a lot of families witnessed throughout this country—and that was our country was accruing an astronomical amount of debt. They were recklessly spending taxpayers' hard-earned money, and the passage of the Obama health care plan and rapid unemployment in Florida and across the Nation was just too much to bear. So I knew our country was heading down the wrong path—an unsustainable path—and something needed to be done.

The trajectory of the Nation's fiscal path was clear. Like so many mothers across this country, I saw the future of our Nation and especially our children's future at risk. I couldn't sit by and watch as our country continued down this reckless fiscal path. I had the strong desire to change our Nation's course, and that's what led me to this Nation's Capital.

The truth is that our Nation expects more from its leaders in Congress. I came here to make a difference—to remove the barriers to job creation that have been imposed by this administration's addition to spending, taxation, and regulation. Only by giving more power back to the families and small businesses that make this great Nation can we put our economy back on a sustainable path and help the private sector put people back to work.

I made a promise to the men and women in District 24 that I would fight

to end the spending-driven debt crisis that led to our Nation's dire economic state. I will continue to keep this promise, and I will continue to fight for families across this country by working towards fiscal responsibility, lower taxes, and by removing job-killing regulations that have stifled our Nation's economic growth for far too long.

□ 2020

We need to get our people back to work. We want jobs, and that's what we are fighting so hard to do. As Republican women, we understand, and we will continue to fight to empower small businesses and to reduce the regulation that is hurting our businesses.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Let's hear from the gentlelady from New York.

Ms. BUERKLE. First of all, let me thank my colleague from the State of Washington for hosting this very special and important Special Order.

When the Obama administration took office, many Americans were so concerned that the administration was too inexperienced to know how to even govern this country; but we soon understood that they were too mistaken to learn and too arrogant to care.

Americans continue to see the unveiling of various provisions of the President's health care bill, such as the creation of the Independent Payment Advisory Board to ration health care, a disastrous half trillion dollars in Medicare cuts for new benefits, the betrayal of our friendship with Israel, and the willful pursuit of Libyan ''kinetic action'' in opposition to the wishes of the American people and in defiance of the War Powers Act. We have been betrayed by the choices of the leaders we depended on to steer this ship safely through troubled waters.

But I have hope, just like the other Republican women here tonight, that while we have to accept the Democrat leadership's choices for a time, nothing says we have to live with them. I am here in Congress because I have watched the American Dream become increasingly fragile, and I said to myself over a year ago that I would not sit this fight out. Mr. Speaker, this is a fight. This is a fight for the very United States we love so dearly.

Both sets of my grandparents came here from Italy. They worked hard; they raised their families, and they gave back to their communities. My presence in Congress, really in so many respects, just like so many of my colleagues', embodies the American Dream. I am a registered nurse, an attorney, and for the last 13 years have represented a teaching hospital. I am the mother of six children and a grandmother of 11. Mr. Speaker, I am a proud Republican woman.

We Republican women stand here tonight not as an anomaly; we represent millions of Republican women who say that we are not going to accept being marginalized because of our political party. We are real women. We are real Republicans. We are here to restore the American Dream.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Next, I would like to yield to the gentlelady from Illinois.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentlelady for having this tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of the Republican women who are here and especially the freshmen because they have brought so much enthusiasm, so much talent, so much intelligence to this body, and it really has been such a help to us.

When I was elected to Congress, I was the only Republican woman to be there. It was kind of lonesome, so I thought, well, at least I can be the president, the vice president, the treasurer, the secretary of the freshmen Republican women that year, but there was nobody else to be there with me, so I had to do it all alone. I've been here a long time. This is my 13th year. To see what has happened and the enthusiasm and what is going on and the changes that are happening is incredible.

I came from a family where my father was the first to go to college. His parents had emigrated from Finland even though they were Swedish. He went to college, but he always said to my three siblings and me, You can do anything you want to do if you get a good education; but he made one mistake, maybe, because he said he would pay for it. So my older sister went to medical school; I went to law school; my brother went to law school; my sister got her master's in Latin and Greek, but she doesn't use that too much anymore.

So that was true, because I never, never expected that I would be in Congress. I never expected that I would be a lawyer. In fact, I went to a wonderful school—Stanford for undergraduate—and then applied to law school. For my first year, I went to the University of California; and the first thing that greeted me was a professor who said, You're taking the place of someone who belongs here, which was a man. That really has changed my life, because I excelled in everything I did. I transferred law schools, by the way, and went back to Illinois.

My first job out of law school was clerking for a judge in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. The reason I got it was that a young man from a different school where the judge had always hired—the judge didn't particularly like him, so he called over to Northwestern, and they sent me over there, and that's how I got that job. I continued in the legal profession, but I found that I got involved in a lot of volunteer work along the way, too—being chairman of boards and whatever and then running for and being elected to the State assembly.

The reason I wanted to go into the State assembly and into Congress was from what I learned from volunteer work—and from having four children, first of all, and then from being president of the high school school board—because I wanted my children to have the best education; and the way to do that is to get involved and to participate as with all of the others, like being chairman of the Visiting Nurses Association of Chicago, and I got into Medicare and Medicaid. So all of these things led me to want to go into Congress. I was asked to do those things. Then finally, when a seat opened up in Congress, I said, I'm going for this. I was elected, and I've been here and on three committees that are really important still—with the Financial Services, the Education and Labor, and the Science Committees.

Let me just talk a little bit about trade because, as has been said by so many Members much more eloquently than I, government does not create jobs; it's the private sector; but government needs to act to reduce and get rid of the barriers that we have put on so many of the businesses so that we can have economic growth so that we can have those jobs. One way is to look at the trade issue.

We cannot have protectionist trade policies. Free trade agreements are one of the many ways to improve all American standards of living and to get our economy back on track. The administration has three trade agreements that are on the shelf, already negotiated and all ready for approval—Colombia, Panama and South Korea. These trade agreements alone have the potential to create 250,000 jobs for Americans in America. What has been so concerning is that the President has not acted, and a failure to act means that we will continue to lose sales and jobs to other countries which do not face the trade barriers that our goods and services are facing. On many products, tariffs would come down immediately upon the enactment of these agreements, giving a boost to exports and jobs.

Let me just tell you about one company that has trade with Colombia. It's a big company with big, big machinery; and every time they send one of those pieces of machinery into Colombia, it's a $200,000 tariff, which shouldn't be there, while we have open doors and while we have trade that can come here.

We have wasted so much time. We have wasted at least 2½ years for not doing this. I think, with these trade agreements, such an increase would provide a tremendous boost to the national economy, especially to my home State of Illinois, where we rank No. 5 in the exporting States for manufacturing and agriculture products. So I would encourage the administration to immediately send up those trade agreements. Doing so would immediately put people back to work and provide a much needed boost to our economy.

I thank all the women who are here today, and I thank you for doing this and for giving us the opportunity.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you. A great point.

Next, I would like to yield to the first woman from Alabama.

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you so much, and to the gentlelady from Washington, I appreciate so much the opportunity.

What an honor and a privilege to serve with each and every one of you and to be here on the floor tonight to just share with Americans about who we are and what we stand for and why we are here.

The question that I'm most often asked in the district and certainly here as well is: Why in the world would a 34-year-old woman with a 6-year-old and a 2-year-old run for Congress?

I will tell you that Margaret and George, my two children, are the very reasons that my husband, Riley, and I decided to enter into the race for Congress to represent Alabama's Second District: because we are committed to leaving this country, the best we can, in better shape for our children than it was for us. That's why we're here—and what a privilege to serve.

□ 2030

In college, I studied music and thought I was going to work in the music industry and went to law school to further those aspirations, where I met my husband, Riley, and we were married shortly after law school and we both went into private practice.

About 2 years practicing law, I was watching the news one night, and my predecessor on the city council said that she wasn't going to seek reelection, and I felt this lurch in my stomach. It was just really a gut check moment for us. I tapped Riley and I said, That's what I need to be doing. I want to serve my community.

Of course I had a wonderful example in both of my parents. My father is a public servant and my mother served in many capacities as a volunteer in our community all growing up, and I think that gave me that sense of urgency of wanting to be involved in my community. Riley and I didn't have children yet, but we knew we wanted to, and I thought, if we're going to live in this city and in this State and raise our children here, then we want to be a part of it.

I served 7 years on the Montgomery city council, and shortly after my son, George, was born—he was 8 weeks old—we started praying about this opportunity to run for Congress, to serve Alabama's Second District and our country. So little George was 8 weeks old, and I felt as a mom of these two small children and as a wife that I had something to bring to the table, that it was an opportunity to bring a perspective as the one that runs through the grocery store and goes to the gas pump as to how much Americans are hurting with the lack of jobs right now. Again, what a responsibility and a privilege. Riley and I wake up every single day and know that we have a real responsibility to serve the people that we represent.

I recently had the distinct privilege of going with you, my colleague from Washington, to Afghanistan for Mother's Day. I serve on the House Armed Services Committee. What an honor to spend that time with our men and women in uniform, but particularly the women that are serving overseas away from their children and particularly on that day. As a mom that's here in Congress, on a plane back and forth, doing my best to serve my constituents and my country, I realize, looking into their eyes, the tremendous sacrifice that they make, that what we do here doesn't even hold a candle to. It was truly an honor to get to spend that time in the war zone, to have a better understanding of what our men and women sacrifice for our liberty and freedom that we have right here.

I am committed to doing my part to help remove this cloud of uncertainty that is hanging over job creators in the United States of America. As I travel throughout my district—and all of you do—I hear story after story about what is the government going to do to us next. I was at a manufacturing company 2 weeks ago in the district where they put a $1 million addition to their 700,000 square foot manufacturing facility, remanufacturing, only to keep up with the regulations that are imposed on them by the Federal Government. This is where we are. How in the world can we expect the private sector to be creating jobs when the heavy hand of government is that strong?

So I am committed to that, and I am committed to real reforms that will allow for the private sector to do what they do best. That is what our country was founded on. I am proud to serve my State and my country as a Republican woman, but more importantly as a conservative committed to doing my part to get our country back on track, not for the next election but for the next generation.

Thank you.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you.

Let's hear from the lady from Ohio.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I thank my good friend from Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I really want to say thank you to my parents for instilling in me the opportunity to live the American Dream. My father didn't have much as a child. He didn't even have an education. But he grew up in a place where he could live his dream. He knew if he worked hard that he could live and do what he wanted to do, and that was to provide for his family, buy a farm, own a business, and give us the opportunity to lead our lives in the way that we wanted to. I instilled that hope and that desire in my own daughter. Over 5 years ago, I decided to run for this office. It was March 23, 2005. I'll never forget the date. It was the day my daughter got engaged. As we celebrated both decisions, I realized the enormity in the decision that I was making. See, back then I realized that government was spending too much money, and we had to do something about it. But now that she is married and I've been here over 5 years and administrations have changed, I realize that we weren't spending as much then as we are today. The accelerated spending is really hurting our American Dream.

My daughter owns her own business, and she has two wonderful little children, but I fear that they won't be able to have the American Dream that she is trying to hold onto and that I was afforded by my own parents. And I look today and I say to myself, what has this administration done to help us move forward? A year ago, the President announced that in 2010, June 17, was going to be the summer of recovery.

How is that recovery going? Well, we're still over 9 percent unemployment. We spent over $1 trillion in stimulus money to no effect. Our underemployment is at 19 percent. We have over 14 million people that are underemployed and looking for work and 9 million people have part-time jobs. But in addition to those statistics, our economy is not growing, and it's not growing because this government is getting in the way of the growth and it's with overregulation.

I worked with BOB GIBBS on one bill, H.R. 872, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act, which took an erroneous court decision and put it in its place. But it's more than just that bill that's in our way. As a mother and a grandmother, I'm alarmed at the USDA getting into my grandchildren's lunch boxes and into my pantry with overregulation, telling schools what they can provide for their students. They're taking potatoes out of the lunch room. It's not just eliminating potatoes to one cup a week, but it's the enormity of the burden of expense that's put onto our school system, over $5 billion mandated to public schools, and most of that burden is on schools that can least afford it.

I could go on and on about the overregulation that is squelching the ability for our country to grow. I have a stake in this. Actually I have two. It's Michael and it's Anthony. They mean everything to me. I want those two wonderful little boys to have all the hopes and dreams that I had as a child fulfilled as an adult. I want them to have the same hopes and dreams that my daughter had fulfilled. I want what my father gave to me, the belief that with God and living in America, all things are possible.

We have to stop the overregulation and the overspending that is occurring in this country today. Our future is at stake, and it is serious. The Republican women in the House get it, and I applaud them for fighting with me for their children, for their grandchildren, but most importantly for my Michael and my Anthony.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Next I would like to yield to the gentlelady from Kansas.

Ms. JENKINS. I thank my friend from Washington for yielding me some time.

My name is LYNN JENKINS, and I am a Republican woman in my second term from the Second District in Kansas. Before entering public office, I worked for over a dozen years in public accounting as a certified public accountant helping businesses and individuals with their tax planning, their tax compliance, and I did that so they could focus on what they did best and that was create jobs and be successful for their local economies.

I originally ran for office for the House of Representatives in Kansas, because I was frustrated by the burdens the State government placed on my clients and the families. As a member of both the Kansas House and the Senate and then as State treasurer for a term and a half, I was pleased to help Kansas work to secure sound economic policies.

□ 2040

But several years ago, I became increasingly concerned about the policies of the Federal Government and how they were holding back our citizens and our job creators. So I ran for Congress, and I am honored to be here this evening with my fellow Republican women to highlight the Republicans' plan to promote job growth.

Over 2 years ago when I came to Washington, my goal was to pass policies to stimulate the flagging economy and get us back on firm financial footing. Unfortunately, one of the first things the Democrat majority did at that time was to ignore our proposals for economic growth and choose instead to pass a stimulus package that we Republicans opposed. And just as we predicted at the time, it has failed.

Let's look at some of the facts. The White House advisers said that passing the stimulus would keep unemployment below 8 percent. The unemployment rate is currently over 9 percent, and it has been above 8 percent for more than 2 years. I've got a visual aid here that shows a new study by economists from the University of Western Ontario and Ohio State University found that the President's failed stimulus, the largest stimulus in American history, destroyed or forestalled roughly 1 million private sector jobs. Taxpayers will end up paying $1.16 trillion for all the private sector jobs lost or forestalled by the Democrats' stimulus.

The facts tell us the total cost of the Democrats' stimulus, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, to be over $820 billion, and interest on the debt for the bill will be nearly $350 billion for over a $1 trillion pricetag. The number of net jobs the economy has shed since the Democrat stimulus was signed into law is reaching almost 2 million. In the last 12 months, entrepreneurs have started up the fewest new U.S. businesses in more than a decade. The national debt has increased by more than $3.5 trillion.

The Federal Government shouldn't be in the business of job creation. We should be focusing our efforts here in Congress on putting policies in place that encourage private sector job growth, and that's why I'm so proud of the Republicans and their job proposal that's before us. Included in the proposal are many reforms. Some include an opportunity to fix the Tax Code to help job creators; spur investment; create more American jobs by streamlining our Tax Code; by increasing competitiveness for American manufacturers; by reining in this unsustainable debt and start living within our means; addressing the issue of regulatory overreach; and encouraging entrepreneurship and growth.

So, tonight, along with my fellow Republican women from across this Nation, I'm calling upon our President and the Democrat majority in the Senate to work with us. Help us pass our jobs plan so we can get Americans back to work.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Great. Thank you.

Next, I would like to yield to my classmate and member of the Rules Committee from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you. I want to thank my colleague from the State of Washington, CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, for organizing this Special Order tonight, and Mr. Speaker, I am a Republican woman and so proud to be a part of this great group of women that we've heard from tonight.

Growing up in a poor family in rural North Carolina meant that there were many opportunities in life that simply weren't available to me. But there was one important opportunity that has always been available to me and to all of us, and that is living in the freest land on Earth, where working hard, taking chances, and persevering are catalysts for success.

I'm a Republican woman because over the course of my life I've seen how the incentive to succeed and the guarantee that the fruits of your labor are your own have shaped a people and a Nation that accomplishes great things.

Before I came to Congress, I worked in higher education and as a small business owner. Over the course of my career, I encountered good government and bad government. Each is a powerful force. Good government frees us to pursue ideas to invest our money as we see fit, to build, create, and grow a business or even to fail in our endeavors. As a small business owner, I also observed firsthand how government has the power to crush people under high taxes and oppressive rules, or it has the power to unleash creativity with a light touch and low taxes.

I came to Congress as a Republican because my life experience in business and education taught me that, by easing off the rulemaking and the tax hiking, government can help foster an environment where hardworking, innovative, and dedicated people can succeed.

I'm a Republican because I want to be part of creating a Federal Government that is nimble, focused, responsive, and aligned with the Constitution. I believe that such a government will capitalize on our strength as a Nation of innovators and entrepreneurs by removing barriers to job creation and wealth creation.

As Republicans we're going to put our government on track to spend less and live within its means, just like women across the Nation do every day with their family budget. When government is right-sized, our economy grows and businesses create jobs.

We know that the Constitution guarantees the rights of the people, not the rights of the government, Mr. Speaker. That's why as a Republican woman I'm focused on making sure government doesn't stand in the way of the people, and that the laws we make here in Congress expand freedom, rather than expand government.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you.

Next, I'd like to yield to the gentlelady from Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, my friend from Washington State.

This is so exciting to get to be here tonight, to get to visit with the American people about what it means to be a Republican woman, and I am honored to represent Missouri's Fourth Congressional District, and as I share with people about the great district that I get to represent, it's a story of the heartland.

Missouri's Fourth District, we are just made of small towns and farms, and we work hard and we hunt on weekends and go to church on Sundays, and we just want the government to leave us alone. And basically, what we have seen over the years is Washington getting bigger and bigger and pushing out the private enterprise and threatening our basic freedoms. And so that's what we have to push back against and restore America's greatness.

Who I am and the reasons I align myself with the Republican Party is a reflection of my background and experiences that I've had over the years. I wanted to share just a few of those things with you.

I grew up on a farm near Archie, Missouri, and my mom and my dad and my sister and I, we raised corn and soy beans and had a lot of hogs and had a cow/calf operation. And one thing that strikes me as very pivotal to my life is my parents in January would sit down and take several days cash-flowing the year, projecting forward what they thought the yields on the crops were going to be, the prices on the crops, looking at the expenses, the payments that we had, seeing if we'd be able to make it all work. And after a few years, my mom and dad called my sister and I over and said, you need to sit here with us and learn this process.

Well, I can tell you, as a little kid, that wasn't the most exciting way to spend our evenings, but it was a wonderful experience because we learned how hard it was to make everything work and to pay for everything and to

live within your means. And I learned that you can't spend more than you take in. I learned fiscal responsibility that is so much a part of the Republican Party, and what we're here trying to do is to restore that because Washington keeps spending money that it doesn't have, and we can't do that at home. We don't do it on our farms. We don't do it in our businesses, and it's time that Washington learned some lessons from the heartland and from ordinary families like mine.

□ 2050

Something else I learned on the farm is that hard work pays off usually. Of course there are a lot of things dealing with weather and other things that you can't control. But one thing lately that you can't control is the amount of government regulations that are threatening agriculture. Now the EPA is trying to regulate dust. Well, I still live on a gravel road. And I have news for people at the EPA: If you farm, if you drive down a gravel road, you are going to get dust. So don't try to fine us or tell us that we can't have that. That's just a lack of common sense. So Washington needs to listen to us ordinary people and not do that.

Something else I learned growing up was a love of our country and a respect for our military. My dad served in the U.S. Army Reserves. That really made a huge impression on me, that he was willing to serve his country. And all of those brave men and women who today are putting their lives on the line for us deserve our highest respect. According to the Constitution, there are only a few things we're supposed to do, and one of them is to provide for the common defense. And I'm so honored to sit on the House Armed Services Committee, where I can work hard for those men and women and keep our country strong and safe and secure.

I grew up and became a teacher, and I taught home economics. Now they call it ''family and consumer sciences.'' I love that. I chose that profession because I believe in the family, and I want to make it as strong as possible, and I love young people. One thing I taught was a class dealing with finances in the home. I taught the kids how to balance a checkbook, and kids got it. I would say, You can't spend more than you take in. They understood it. And I don't understand how come Washington doesn't understand that same principle. So that's what I'm trying to bring here, how we need to have a balanced budget. And that is one thing the Republicans are fighting for.

I also taught a class called food services. It was a vocational class where we actually—I trained them in how to have a job. And a lot of food service jobs are beginning career opportunities for young people, and they can move forward. But I taught them, if you work hard and you do an excellent job and become skilled in what you do, you can move forward in life. And in America, anything is possible. I want that to still be the mantra that we share with our young people today, and make sure we preserve the opportunity that we had.

Later I was a State representative. And then after that, the Governor appointed me as chairman of the Missouri Women's Council, and I enjoyed that for 2 years. In that council, as an agency in the Department of Economic Development, we helped women connect with and meet their economic goals, and that's jobs. You know, Mr. Speaker, women are starting businesses at twice the rate of men, which amounts to 400 new businesses every day that are started by women. And women-owned businesses are the fastest-growing segment of the United States economy. There are 10.6 million businesses owned in the United States by women that employ over 19 million American workers, and women-owned businesses generate some $2.46 trillion in revenue each year. Women are smart. They're able to own their own businesses, and we here in Washington need to help them meet those goals, not provide hindrances for it. And clearly from the last speaker, you see that President Obama's plan has failed. Throwing money at something does not create jobs. There is a better plan.

I'm also a small business owner now. My husband and I own a company where we sell farm equipment. We employ about 50 people, have three stores. So I know the challenges of day-to-day operating a small business in America. Most jobs in America are created by small business owners, the same people that President Obama is trying to tax. What he doesn't understand is that if you tax job creators more, they're not going to have money to be able to hire a worker. It doesn't make sense. We've got to change course here.

A couple of stories, quickly, I wanted to share with you from businesses in my district reflect how the policies here in Washington are killing jobs. One is, when I was on the campaign trail a couple of years ago, I met with a business who told me that they wanted to open up a second location. Things were going pretty well. They had about 30 employees at the time. But they asked about this new health care bill that was being debated, that the President was pushing through. And they said, If this passes, our business will fold. We provide health care for our employees as much as possible. We provide them a stipend so they can go buy their own policies. But if this bill passes, we can't afford that. So they told me they have decided not to open up a second location because of the government's takeover of health care that Washington was forcing down the throats of Americans. That is tragic because in this town, there are hundreds of people out of work. And it broke my heart that what is going on here in Washington was directly causing people to be unemployed back home.

Another example: I've been visiting with a lot of companies in my district that manufacture goods. And thank goodness we still have a lot of manufacturing jobs here in America. But as I visit with them, they share with me the hurdles that they're having to overcome just to stay open because of Washington's policies of high taxes and regulations. Their competition is overseas. And they've told me, VICKY, we do not want to move to China. We do not want to take those jobs there. But yet if we move there, we're not going to have to pay near as many taxes, and we don't have to live by these awful regulations from EPA and all these other government agencies. So we're going to try to stay here as long as possible. But please, please help us get government off our backs. And I assured them I certainly would do everything that I can because, you know, as House Republicans, we know how to create jobs, and that's what we're putting forward.

We're putting forth a plan to lower taxes. We're putting forth plans to push back on these government regulations that are out there that are killing jobs, hurting our farmers. We are promoting trade overseas and want to get these trade agreements passed—and we're also getting rid of that huge uncertainty of debt that is hanging over our country and promoting a balanced budget, like my mom and dad did around the kitchen table at home, like I taught my kids at school how to do.

But the last thing that influences me is being a wife and mother. And that is what inspires me to continue to fight for faith, family, freedom, and our future. That's what we're all about.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the inspiring Representative from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. My name is DIANE BLACK, and I represent the Sixth Congressional District in Tennessee. I am hearing more and more from women in my district. More and more women are decision makers in their households. As a matter of fact, statistics show us that 84 percent of women are primary decision makers today. They set their budgets. They buy groceries. They take their children to school and to doctors, and they also work outside the home. I hear from women all over my district who are on the front lines, and they say that the economy is making life tougher and that they are constantly trying to do more with less. They tell me that when they go to the grocery store, how much the rising food prices are cutting into what they buy. Gas is more expensive, and their budgets are shrinking, and their choices are limited because Washington is deciding for them.

As these past few years got harder, government stood in the way of our economy getting back on track. And in Tennessee, we have an unemployment rate of 9.6 percent. I also hear from women in my district whose husbands are looking for jobs, and these women

are working two jobs to make ends meet, a struggle that is very real to me. As a nurse for over 40 years, I worked two jobs when my children were little and our family was trying to better ourselves, as my husband was working on his degree. I worked not only as a nurse, but I also had a school for children in my home. My fellow GOP women here tonight, we are all with similar stories of struggles and challenges and working hard for our families. Government needs to get out of the way and allow businesses to grow so that jobs are created and America gets back on track.

I am a Republican woman, and I am proud of that. I am proud to say that I am not only protecting children and their families but also am working to make sure that our country gets back on track so that we have jobs that will allow these families to be strong and grow.

□ 2100

I believe that I'm not only speaking for myself, but also for the women back home and across this country.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), chairman of the International Relations Committee.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentlelady from Washington for yielding me the time. I'm inspired to hear my wonderful colleagues, proud Republican women, proud to be Republican, as well as plugging our gender because we have a very positive story to tell our country.

And as my wonderful friend, the colleague from the State of Washington, pointed out, my name is ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN; and I represent Florida's proud and beautiful 18th Congressional District that covers from Bal Harbor all the way down to sunny Key West, 265 miles of coastal beach area.

And I'm a daughter, I'm a mother, I'm a grandmother, I'm a wife of a Vietnam veteran, a former educator and a former small business owner. I fled Castro's communist Cuba with my parents when I was 8 years old. I'm proud to be a naturalized American, so Cuban by birth, American by choice. And I am also a Republican woman.

I entered public service after talking with my parents, with the parents of a school, a small private bilingual school that I operated along with my parents in Hialeah, a blue-collar working town of Miami-Dade County.

And after hearing from the parents of the school that I operated about their hopes and their dreams and the problems and the concerns that they had, I decided that the best way to help them was not just to help them individually, but rather to help them in a bigger way by being involved in the legislative process in order to change the policies that were causing them difficulties.

As we have said here tonight, Mr. Speaker, our Nation faces grave economic dissatisfaction and a sluggish economy and no job recovery. And Republican women understand and recognize the need for creative and bold solutions to get America moving in a positive direction once again so that small business owners, such as the ILEANA ROS-LEHTINENS in south Florida, who have a small school or who have a small business, are not hampered by burdensome regulations that inhibit their growth.

And we know how small business suffers due to this growing bureaucracy and this unnecessary regulatory wrangling that goes on and that has occurred in the last few years, and the previous speakers spoke on this issue of the regulation that has run amuck.

So Republican women also recognize this economic prosperity cannot be created by government because small and medium-sized businesses are the engines that fuel our economy. So together, Republican women don't want to—we're in unison to say that we do not want to leave this burden, this financial debt, this deficit to our children and grandchildren. We want to leave them with a more prosperous and secure Nation. And that's why I'm proud to be a Republican woman.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. I'm proud to yield to my colleague from Washington State.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. As the youngest woman in the U.S. Congress, I'm proud to be here tonight joined by my colleagues from across the Nation. And I'm here tonight to politely decline the anti-woman label that some who must not have better things to do have pushed our way, because the women here in this Chamber, the Republican women on this side of the aisle, as you've heard, are incredibly diverse. They're cops, attorneys. They've served, they're moms, some of them have served in public office like myself. There's a tremendous group of problem-solvers here and that's what we need.

We know that we need solutions, and the most important solution we can find right now has to do with bringing more jobs to folks at home, making sure that we have good, strong American jobs that will support our families.

And as Congress looks for the job creation solutions that so many Americans are craving, I believe that we Republican women possess or bring a special skill to the table. One of my woman colleagues summed it up best when she said, women take technical problems and come up with creative solutions. We're simply better at looking at the issues from outside the box. I believe much of what she said, and I think that's one of the reasons that you see us here tonight fighting for the families back home, whether it's home in southwest Washington, where they've been out of work; where it's the mom who knows how much it costs to put gas in the tank, how much it costs for health care, for the education bills; who's worried about her older parents and making sure that they have access to health care; or thinking about her children and her grandchildren.

It's these women in and throughout our Nation who have really borne the brunt of this economy. So it's very important that we're at the table here tonight pushing back on that label, because we do represent those American women; and the solutions that we're bringing and that we're fighting for are going to make it so that those women who have dreams to start their own business, to plan for retirement, who want to see less of their hard-earned dollars going into the gas tank, those are the women we're standing up for tonight, and the solutions that we're bringing forward are going to help them help their families, help our communities, and help our country.

I recognize we have limited time here tonight, and I thank you for allowing me to share and stand up with these tremendous ladies.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2021, JOBS AND ENERGY PERMITTING ACT OF 2011, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1249, AMERICA INVENTS ACT

Mr. NUGENT (during the Special Order of Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–111) on the resolution (H. Res. 316) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2021) to amend the Clean Air Act regarding air pollution from Outer Continental Shelf activities, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1249) to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of a family medical emergency.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled Joint Resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S.J. Res. 7—Providing for the reappointment of Shirley Ann Jackson as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 9—Providing for the reappointment of Robert P. Kogod as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 22, 2011, at 9:30 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:

2086. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bromoxzynil; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0268; FRL-8873-9] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2087. A letter from the Director, Regulation Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ethylene Glycol; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0361; FRL-8870-7] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2088. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyraflufen-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0426; FRL-8873-5] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2089. 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: Pennsylvania; Revision to the Inspection and Maintenance (I/M) Program — Quality Assurance Protocol for the Safety Inspection Program in Non-I/M Counties [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0379; FRL-9314-4] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2090. A letter from the Director, Regulation Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans: Pennsylvania; Revisions to Requirements for Major Sources Locating in or Impacting a Nonattainment Area in Allegheny County [EPA-R03-OAR-2009-0881; FRL-9308-9] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2091. A letter from the Director, Regulation Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Georgia: Macon; Determination of Attaining Data for the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Standard [EPA-R04-OAR-2011-0055-201136; FRL-9313-8] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2092. 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. (Kalispell, Montana) [MB Docket No.: 11-20] received May 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2093. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of the determination that a continuation of a waiver currently in effect for the Republic of Belarus will substantially promote the objectives of section 402, of the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(c) and (d); (H. Doc. No. 112–37); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2094. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-016, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2095. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-014, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2096. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-117, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2097. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-101, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2098. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Court Orders and Legal Processes Affecting Thrift Savings Plan Accounts received May 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2099. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation; Rewrite of Part 570; Acquiring Leasehold Interests in Real Property [GSAR Amendment 2011-01; GSAR Case 2006-G508 (Change 48) Docket 2009-0017; Sequence 1] (RIN: 3090-AI96) received May 26, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2100. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Contract Closeout [FAC 2005-52; FAR Case 2008-020; Item II; Docket 2009-0031, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AL43) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2101. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC 2005-52; Item VI; Docket 2011-0078; Sequence 2] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2102. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-52; Introduction [Docket FAR 2011-0076, Sequence 4] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2103. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Oversight of Contractor Ethics Programs [FAC 2005-52; FAR Case 2010-017; Item V; Docket 2010-0017, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AL92) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2104. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30781; Amdt. No. 3424] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2105. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30782; Amdt. No. 3425] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2106. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Gruver Cluck Ranch Airport, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0272; Airspace Docket No. 11-ASW-3] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2107. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Livermore, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1264; Airspace Docket No. 10-AWP-23] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2108. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Idaho Falls, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0023; Airspace Docket No. 11-ANM-2] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2109. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; McCall, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0097; Airspace Docket No. 11-ANM-3] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2110. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Ozark, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0432; Airspace Docket No. 11-ACE-8] received May 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2111. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Sundstrand Propellers Model 247F Propellers [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0113; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-25-AD; Amendment 39-16602; AD 2011-04-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2112. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries

GmbH Models DA 42, DA 42 NG, and DA 42 M-NG Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0185; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-002-AD; Amendment 39-16694; AD 2011-10-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2113. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Models 150, 152, 170, 172, 175, 177, 180, 182, 185, 188, 190, 195, 206, 207, 210, T303, 336, and 337 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1101; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-013-AD; Amendment 39-16690; AD 2011-10-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2114. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DASSAULT AVIATION Model MYSTERE-FALCON 50 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0042; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-267-AD; Amendment 39-16695; AD 2011-10-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2115. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 and A310 Series Airplanes, and Model A300 B4-600R, and F4-600R Series Airplanes, and Model C4-605R Variant F Airplanes (Collectively Called A300-600 Series Airplanes) [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0030; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-183-AD; Amendment 39-16698; AD 2011-10-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2116. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211-Trent 800 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1165; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-38-AD; Amendment 39-16685; AD 2011-10-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2117. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B4-600, B4-600R, and F4-600R Series Airplanes, and Model C4-605R Variant F Airplanes (Collectively Called A300-600 Series Airplanes) [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0037; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-273-AD; Amendment 39-16691; AD 2011-10-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2118. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc (RR) RB211-Trent 875-17, RB211-Trent 877-17, RB211-Trent 884-17, RB211-Trent 884B-17, RB211-Trent 892-17, RB211-Trent 892B-17, and RB211-Trent 895-17 Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0821; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-30-AD; Amendment 39-16657; AD 2011-08-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2119. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model ERJ 170 Airplanes; and Model ERJ 190-100 STD, ERJ 190-100 LR, ERJ 190-100 IGW, ERJ 190-200 STD, ERJ 190-200 LR, and ERJ 190-200 IGW Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0038; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-153-AD; Amendment 39-16684; AD 2011-10-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2120. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1276; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-092-AD; Amendment 39-16689; AD 2011-10-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2121. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes; [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1275; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-091-AD; Amendment 39-16688; AD 2011-10-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2122. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes; [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1274; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-090-AD; Amendment 39-16687; AD 2011-10-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2123. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310-203, -204, -222, -304, -322, and -324 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1273; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-089-AD; Amendment 39-16686; AD 2011-10-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2124. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BURKHART GROB LUFT-UND Model G 103 C Twin III SL Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0127; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-065-AD; Amendment 39-16681; AD 2011-09-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2125. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318-112, A319-111, A319-112, A319-115, A319-132, A319-133, A320-214, A320-232, A320-233, A321-211, A321-213, and A321-231 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0390; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-064-AD; Amendment 39-16696; AD 2011-10-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. NUGENT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 316. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2021) to amend the Clean Air Act regarding air pollution from Outer Continental Shelf activities, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1249) to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform (Rept. 112–111). 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. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 2243. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Labor to publish on an Internet website certain information about the number of veterans who are employed by Federal contractors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. BUERKLE, Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 2244. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 67 Castle Street in Geneva, New York, as the ''Corporal Steven Blaine Riccione Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. ROONEY):

H.R. 2245. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide the Food and Drug Administration with improved capacity to prevent drug shortages; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2246. A bill to suspend United States assistance to Brazil until such time as Brazil amends its laws to remove the prohibition on extradition of nationals of Brazil to other countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 2247. A bill to establish within the Department of Education the Innovation Inspiration school grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 2248. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate covered part D drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries; 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. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 2249. A bill to provide for the treatment of certain hospitals under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 2250. A bill to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 2251. A bill to direct the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to amend Regulation D to increase the transaction limits on passbook savings, statement

savings, and money market deposit accounts; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LATTA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HALL, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MICA, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mrs. SCHMIDT):

H.R. 2252. A bill to protect the right to obtain firearms for security, and to use firearms in defense of self, family, or home, and to provide for the enforcement of such right; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 2253. A bill to establish within the Department of Education the Innovation Inspiration school grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 2254. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish national tunnel inspection standards for the proper safety inspection and evaluation of all highway tunnels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 2255. A bill to support the establishment and operation of Teachers Professional Development Institutes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MORAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2256. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to ensure that all dogs and cats used by research facilities are obtained legally; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN (for himself and Mr. DESJARLAIS):

H.R. 2257. A bill to waive the requirement that existing traffic signs meet minimum retroreflectivity standards on or before the compliance dates established by the Federal Highway Administration; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 2258. A bill to establish the National Hurricane Research Initiative to improve hurricane preparedness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H.R. 2259. A bill to require the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from operations in Libya, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed 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 Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2260. A bill to provide for a study by the National Academy of Engineering regarding improving the accuracy of collection of royalties on production of oil, condensate, and natural gas under leases of Federal lands and Indian lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCCOTTER (for himself and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 2261. A bill to withhold United States contributions to the United Nations or a United Nations agency if the United Nations or such agency supports the recognition of an independent Palestinian state, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2262. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts distributed from tax-favored accounts during a period of unemployment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2263. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from Federal tax certain payments made in connection with reductions in force; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYES:

H.R. 2264. A bill to reduce the trafficking of drugs and to prevent human smuggling across the Southwest Border by deterring the construction and use of border tunnels; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and 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. RICHMOND (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 2265. A bill to direct the President to forgo recoupment of liabilities relating to assistance provided under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 2266. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reform Department of Defense energy policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LANCE, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. WU, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TERRY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BOSWELL):

H.R. 2267. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 2268. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that Washington's Birthday be observed on February 22, rather than the third Monday in February, of each year; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.J. Res. 67. A joint resolution authorizing the limited use of the United States Armed Forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed 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. ACKERMAN:

H. Res. 317. A resolution demanding that Hamas immediately and unconditionally release Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. KEATING):

H. Res. 318. A resolution congratulating the Boston Bruins on winning the 2010-2011 Stanley Cup; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H. Res. 319. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that adding art and design into Federal programs that target the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) fields encourages innovation and economic growth in the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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.

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. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 2243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 2244.

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 establish Post Offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, the power to make laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 2249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 2250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 2251.

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.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H.R. 2252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment II, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 2253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 2254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2255.

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. DOYLE:

H.R. 2256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''This law is enacted pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 to the U.S. Constitution.''

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 2257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 2258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 2259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 2260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. MCCOTTER:

H.R. 2261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Sixteenth Amendment, which gives Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, clearly gives Congress the authority to provide tax relief to the unemployed.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Sixteenth Amendment, which gives Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, clearly gives Congress the authority to provide tax relief to the unemployed.

By Mr. REYES:

H.R. 2264.

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 Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Clause 2: To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Clause 4: To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

Clause 5: To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

Clause 6: To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

Clause 7: To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

Clause 8: To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

Clause 9: To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

Clause 10: To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations;

Clause 11: To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

Clause 13: To provide and maintain a Navy;

Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

Clause 15: To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

Clause 16: To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

Clause 17: To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1) and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 2266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 12, which grants Congress the power ''to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.''

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 2267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is pursuant to the following:

1) Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States''

2) 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. WOLF:

H.R. 2268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.J. Res. 67.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, clauses 11, 12, 13, and 14.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 27: Mr. RUSH and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 49: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 166: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 198: Mr. HIMES and Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 360: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 363: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 373: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 374: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 420: Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. BUERKLE, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. YODER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. HURT.
H.R. 421: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 452: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, and Ms. BUERKLE.
H.R. 507: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 512: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 574: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 607: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 610: Mr. CARTER and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 615: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mrs. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 642: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 674: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 687: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 692: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 733: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 735: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr SMITH of Texas, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MACK, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 838: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 860: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 870: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 880: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 894: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 901: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 905: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 942: Mr. AKIN.
H.R. 949: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 972: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 990: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 999: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 1006: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1031: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 1041: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 1085: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1091: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1093: Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1112: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1130: Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 1154: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1173: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. CANSECO.
H.R. 1182: Mr. LATTA and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1186: Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 1193: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Ms. BASS of California.
H.R. 1200: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1206: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 1234: Mr. SHULER and Mr. BECERRA.
H.R. 1253: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1259: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MACK, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. CANSECO.
H.R. 1262: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1269: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 1288: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. WOLF, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SHULER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1297: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1312: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 1351: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1367: Ms. BASS of California and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1370: Mr. PAUL, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1381: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1386: Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1397: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1451: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1459: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 1463: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1475: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1479: MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1489: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1505: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1506: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1509: Mr. TIBERI and Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 1515: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 1527: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1545: Mr. CANSECO.
H.R. 1551: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1558: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. CALVERT and Mr. BARTON of Texas.
H.R. 1561: Mr. CANSECO.
H.R. 1588: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. FINCHER, and Ms. FOXX.
H.R. 1606: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1623: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1631: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1639: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 1659: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1663: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1675: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1676: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1706: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 1724: Mr. HONDA, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 1744: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HARPER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1747: Mr. CANSECO.
H.R. 1755: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 1756: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 1775: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1803: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1810: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 1814: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1832: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1834: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
H.R. 1845: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1848: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mrs. ADAMS.
H.R. 1856: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1862: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1865: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 1872: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 1876: Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 1880: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1901: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 1932: Mr. MACK.
H.R. 1933: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1935: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1938: Mr. PAUL, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1947: Mr. WOLF, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WU, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1955: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1958: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1968: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 1970: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1974: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1982: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1985: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1986: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1993: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 1996: Mr. PAUL and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2000: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2001: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 2018: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BONNER, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 2029: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 2040: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 2042: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 2054: Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 2061: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2068: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 2070: Mr. KISSELL and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2072: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2079: Mr. WEINER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. REED, Ms. HAYWORTH, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2086: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2092: Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 2097: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2102: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 2104: Mr. WELCH and Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 2108: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 2117: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BONNER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MICA, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 2123: Ms. FUDGE and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2139: Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FARR, and Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 2144: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2146: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 2149: Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 2158: Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 2161: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2164: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 2171: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. LANDRY.

H.R. 2185: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2194: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 2218: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. KELLY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 2224: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2236: Mr. FLEMING, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KING of New York, and Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 2242: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. GUINTA.

H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. FOXX, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. FORBES.

H. Res. 20: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H. Res. 25: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H. Res. 47: Ms. BASS of California and Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 111: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. JONES.

H. Res. 137: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H. Res. 243: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H. Res. 268: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DREIER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WU, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. WOODALL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. REYES, Mr. REED, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CALVERT.

H. Res. 286: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Res. 289: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. STARK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BASS of California, and Mr. WATT.

H. Res. 312: Ms. BASS of California and Mr. KUCINICH.

H. Res. 314: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGELL

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out military operations in Libya.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGELL

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support Operation Odyssey Dawn or Operation Unified Protector.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGELL

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support Operation Odyssey Dawn.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. COLE

AMENDMENT NO. 4: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement any rule, regulation, or executive order regarding the disclosure of political contributions that takes effect on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. COLE

AMENDMENT NO. 5: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Central Intelligence Agency or the Department of Defense until such a time that the President formally requests and receives from Congress an authorization for the use of military force in or against Libya.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. COLE

AMENDMENT NO. 6: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Central Intelligence Agency or the Department of Defense to furnish military equipment, military training or advice, or other support for military activities, to any group or individual, not part of a country's armed forces, for the purpose of assisting that group or individual in carrying out military activities in or against Libya.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 109, line 25, strike ''acquisition management'' and insert ''product support''.

Page 110, line 1, after ''systems,'' insert the following: '', other than those mission assignments or transfers approved by the Secretary of the Air Force or the Secretary's designee prior to June 19, 2011,''.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 2011 No. 89

Senate

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 16, 2011)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable MICHAEL F. BENNET, a Senator from the State of Colorado.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

You come to us, O Lord. Into our poverty comes Your wealth. Into our emptiness comes Your fullness. Into our fears comes Your peace. Into our ugliness comes Your beauty. Empower our Senators to prepare themselves for Your coming. Remove any barrier that will keep them from experiencing Your presence. Lord, give them more than human wisdom so that justice, truth, and peace will prevail.

Come to us, O Lord, and make us instruments of Your peace. We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable MICHAEL F. BENNET 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, June 21, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL F. BENNET, a Senator from the State of Colorado, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BENNET thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, 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. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will be in morning business until 11 a.m., with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half. I would ask at this time that the morning business hour be a full hour, not stop at 11.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. The filing deadline for second-degree amendments to S. 782, the Economic Development Revitalization Act, is at 11 a.m. this morning.

Following morning business, the Senate will be in executive session to consider the nomination of Michael Simon to be United States District Judge in Oregon. Then, at noon, there will be a vote on confirmation of the Simon nomination.

Following the vote, the Senate will recess until 2:15 p.m. today for the weekly caucus meetings.

At 2:15, the Senate will consider the nomination of Leon Panetta to be Secretary of Defense, with 2 hours of debate. At about 4:15 this afternoon, Senators should expect up to three rollcall votes: the first on confirmation of the Panetta nomination; the second will be a cloture vote on the EDA bill; and, if cloture is not invoked, there will be a third vote on cloture on the motion to proceed to the Presidential Appointment and Streamlining Act.

I might note that this, or some version of this, we have talked about for a long time. When Senator MCCONNELL and I were both whips, we talked about this legislation and spent a lot of time on it.

EDA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this afternoon we will have a cloture vote on reauthorization of the Economic Development Administration, a law we have depended on for more than 50 years.

This is the fourth jobs bill Democrats have brought to the floor this year. I do hope Republicans will not allow it to be the fourth jobs bill to wither on the vine thanks to their obstructionist tactics. This is a good piece of legislation with decades of helping American businesses in economically distressed communities to innovate, grow, and to hire.

In the last 5 years alone, the Economic Development Administration has created 314,000 jobs and successfully turned every $1 in Federal investment into $7 in private sector investment. It is good legislation that will create good jobs for Americans who need these jobs. Unfortunately, that is not enough to win bipartisan support among Republicans here in the District of Columbia who are more interested in

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

destroying Medicare than creating jobs.

The Small Business innovation research bill is a good piece of legislation too. That also died in the Senate last month under a pile of unrelated amendments. The bills the Senate passed this year reauthorizing the Federal Aviation Administration and reforming America's patent system were good legislation also. They would have created or saved about 480,000 jobs. It made it out of the Senate alive but now languishes in the Republican-controlled House. Will the Economic Development Authority suffer the same fate? I hope not.

Here, 24 hours ago, I presented to the American people in the Senate a myriad of amendments that have been filed in regard to this legislation. A lot have been offered but more filed. I read about 40 of them dealing with different types of endangered species, the lesser sand dune reptile, I don't remember what it was, but all kinds of nonrelated amendments. Global warming. Post office reform. As I said, almost 100 amendments, and I read 35 or 40 of them here yesterday, having nothing to do with this legislation. Nothing.

I hope we don't have another bill that is blocked, the fourth this year. If they do that, it would be clear they are more interested in this rightwing ideology than creating much-needed employment. Of the 90-plus amendments, I repeat, only one of which my staff was able to find had any germaneness to the bill, and that is one the chairman of the committee, Senator BOXER, would agree to anyway because it was offered by Senator INHOFE.

This is an important piece of legislation. This legislation will put hundreds of thousands of people to work. So today's vote is again about priorities. Americans have been very clear, job creation is their No.1 priority, their No. 2 priority, and their No. 3 priority. Democrats share that priority. Republicans obviously don't.

We will never stop bringing jobs bills to the floor, and we will never stop fighting the other side's obstructionism to try to get them passed. Again, Republicans have a different priority, it appears, and that is ending Medicare. And that is too bad. They have worked hard to block three bills that could have created and saved hundreds of thousands of jobs during tough economic times, but they pushed even harder for their ideological plan to kill Medicare as we know it.

The Republican plan would put insurance company bureaucrats between seniors and their doctors. Every senior would pay $6,400 more for health care in the first year alone. It would force more than 7 million seniors to pay more for cancer screenings, wellness checks, and treatments beginning next year.

Americans have been clear about this too, very clear. They have resoundingly rejected this ideological plan to hurt seniors. Republicans think it is a bad idea. Democrats think it is a bad idea. And, of course, the Independents think it is a bad idea. All polls show this.

Unfortunately, I haven't heard a shred of evidence that my Republican friends here in Congress are getting the message on Medicare that the American people have gotten. Today they will have a chance to show the American people once again whether they have heard the message on jobs. I hope they have, because so much is at stake. And America is watching.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

KENTUCKY COAL MINERS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday I came to the floor to report that there were several miners in my State trapped in a mine as a result of floods. I want to start today with an update on that situation.

I am happy to report that all three were rescued after spending 14 hours trapped in a Bell County coal mine. They were all reunited with their families last night, which is great news. Their families were waiting for them at the West Cumberland Baptist Church, and we are certainly glad this particular story had a happy ending.

DEBT REDUCTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. This morning, I wish to say a word about the upcoming vote on the debt ceiling and the bipartisan negotiation surrounding it, to reiterate why we are having these talks and what they ought to achieve. But first, a little context.

Right now, ratings agencies are threatening to downgrade U.S. debt, putting us on red alert that the kind of economic crisis we are seeing in parts of Europe could very quickly happen right here.

We know that failing to do something significant about our fiscal problems would be a serious drag on jobs and our economy. That is why, over the past several weeks, I have come to the floor of the Senate and spoken at press conferences, with a now familiar refrain: The time to act on significant reforms is right now. And I have been crystal clear about what qualifies as significant.

Above all, it means doing something to strengthen and preserve our long-term entitlement programs, so we can actually keep our promises to those who have been paying into these programs for years, and so these programs don't end up consuming every single dollar we take in. Entitlements are the biggest drivers of our debt. By definition, they have to be a part of any plan to lower the debt.

This is hardly a controversial view. Everyone from the President on down has said that entitlements must be reformed if we have any chance at all of reining in our debt and strengthening our long-term fiscal health.

In fact, 3 months ago, 31 Senate Democrats signed a letter to the President urging him to put together a plan to reduce the deficit, a plan they said they hoped would include entitlement changes, 31 members of the Democratic conference right here on the other side of the aisle, including the occupant of the chair.

As the occupant of the chair put it recently, ''I think it's absolutely clear that we have to redesign our entitlement programs.''

Here is how Senator DURBIN put it a few weeks ago: ''We have serious economic problems ahead of us if we don't have some reform in both Medicare and Social Security.''

This was from former President Bill Clinton after the recent congressional election in New York: ''I don't think that the Democrats or the Republicans should conclude from the New York race that no changes can be made in Medicare,'' he said, ''[or] that no changes can be made in Social Security . . . that no changes can be made that will deal with this long-term debt problem.''

Here is President Obama's lead negotiator on the debt talks, Vice President BIDEN, from last January: ''Everybody talks about we have to do something about Social Security and Medicare, and we do.''

Here are the two chairs of the President's debt commission, Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson, in a recent op-ed in ''Politico'': ''A credible plan must address the growth of entitlement spending . . .''

Here is the President himself, about a month after he took office: ''To preserve our long-term fiscal health we must . . . address the growing costs in Medicare and Social Security.''

And, as for me, I have been clear on this same point in public and in private from the moment I stepped out of a meeting with the President and other Members of Congress at the White House on May 12.

So it is not exactly a groundbreaking observation that if these discussions are to mean anything they have to involve entitlement reform since no one believes we actually get at our fiscal problems without it. This is what serious people expect and are hoping for out of these talks.

The moment requires, as I have said for weeks, three things: Real cuts in spending over the short term; that is, over the next 2 years—not more spending increases or ''freezes''; real cuts over the medium-term; that is, over the next 10 years with enforceable caps on spending; and meaningful reforms to entitlements, which are the major drivers of our debt. That is the definition of a significant package.

Some Democrats are insisting that they will only agree to cuts if Republicans agree to raise revenue. That is

Washington speak for tax hikes and it is absurd.

First of all, is there anyone outside of Washington, DC, who really thinks that with 14 million people looking for work in this country, the solution is to raise taxes? The last thing you want to do in the middle of a jobs crisis is raise taxes. Does anyone seriously think that is a good idea? Even the President has said as much. It is just common sense. Remember, the President signed the extension of current tax rates back in December with a similar argument.

But even if we weren't in the middle of a jobs crisis, it would be foolish—and completely dishonest. We are in the middle of a debt crisis right now because we spend too much. The solution is to spend less.

How do we know this?

For 30 years beginning in 1971, Federal spending as a percentage of the economy has averaged around 20.8 percent. But after 2 years of out-of-control spending by the President and his Democrat allies in Congress, government spending is now projected to rise a full 4 percentage points above the historical norm.

That may not sound like a lot, but 4 percent of a $14 trillion economy is an enormous amount of money. Just as the economy sank, Democrats increased government spending by hundreds of billions of dollars. And now they want to make it permanent. That is the reason we have a deficit like we do.

Government spending has gone up, and a bad economy has caused revenue to go down.

That is the reason the debt has gone up 35 percent since the President took office.

Now Democrats want to use that bad economy as an excuse to lock their spending levels in place. They want to use it as an excuse to raise taxes, which would only make the economy worse, cause us to lose even more jobs, and make it even harder to create new jobs.

So let's just be clear about what is going on here. Right now, Washington is borrowing roughly $4 billion every day above what it collects in taxes. And Democrats don't want to admit we have a spending problem?

We have a national debt the size of our entire economy and Democrats are wondering whether they want to do anything about the biggest drivers of the debt?

Look: Democrats can continue to argue among themselves about whether to step up and address this crisis they have helped create, but they can't argue about what is causing it or what is needed to address it.

Republicans have been crystal clear about where we stand. And Democrats have also been crystal clear about what's needed for these talks to be a success. It is my hope that they consider their own past statements on entitlement reform as we approach the end of these talks.

The path to success is clear. Let's not let this opportunity to do something go to waste.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

The Senator from Arizona.

LIBYA

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise to join the Senator from Massachusetts, who will shortly submit the product of many hours of bipartisan cooperation and negotiation, an authorization for the limited use of military force in Libya. The resolution, as will be introduced by my colleague from Massachusetts, as I mentioned, would authorize the President to employ the U.S. Armed Forces to advance U.S. national security interests in Libya as part of the international coalition that is enforcing U.N. Security Council resolutions in Libya. It would limit this authority to 1 year, which is more than enough time to finish the job, and it makes clear that the Senate agrees with the President that there is no need and no desire to commit U.S. conventional ground forces in Libya.

I will be the first to admit that this authorization is not perfect and it will not make everyone happy. It does not fully make me happy. I would have preferred that this authorization make clear that our military mission includes the President's stated policy objective of forcing Qadhafi to leave power. I would have preferred that it urge the President to commit more U.S. strike aircraft to the mission in Libya so as to help bring this conflict to a close as soon as possible. And I would have preferred that it call on the President to recognize the Transitional National Council as the legitimate voice of the Libyan people so as to free Qadhafi's frozen assets for the Transitional National Council to use on behalf of the Libyan people. I have called on the administration to do all of these things for some time, and I do so now again.

That said, this authorization has been a bipartisan effort. My Republican colleagues and I have had to make compromises, just as have the Senator from Massachusetts and his Democratic colleagues. I believe the end result is an authorization that deserves the support of my colleagues in the Senate on both sides of the aisle, and I am confident they will support it.

I know the administration has made it clear that it believes it does not need a congressional authorization such as this because it is their view that U.S. military operations in Libya do not rise to the level of hostility. I believe this assertion will strike most of my colleagues and the Americans they represent as a confusing breach of common sense, and it seems to be undercut by the very report the administration sent to Congress which makes clear that U.S. Armed Forces have been and presumably will continue to fly limited strike missions to suppress enemy air defenses, to operate armed Predator drones that are attacking Qadhafi's forces in an effort to protect Libyan civilians, and to provide the overwhelming support for NATO operations, from intelligence to aerial refueling. Indeed, we read in today's New York Times that since the April 7 date that the administration claims to have ceased hostilities in Libya, U.S. warplanes have struck at Libyan air defenses on 60 occasions and fired about 30 missiles from unmanned drones.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the article from today's New York Times entitled ''Scores of U.S. Strikes in Libya Follow Handoff to Libya.''

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MCCAIN. I certainly agree that actions such as these do not amount to a full-fledged state of war, and I will certainly grant that I am no legal scholar, but I find it hard to swallow that U.S. Armed Forces dropping bombs and killing enemy personnel in a foreign country does not amount to a state of hostilities.

What is worse, this is just the latest way in which this administration has mishandled its responsibility with regard to Congress. The President could have asked to authorize our intervention in Libya months ago, and I believe it could have received a strong, though certainly not unanimous, show of support.

The administration's disregard for the elected representatives of the American people on this matter has been troubling and counterproductive. The unfortunate result of this failure of leadership is plain to see in the full-scale revolt against the administration's Libya policy that is occurring in the House of Representatives. As I speak now, our colleagues in the House are preparing a measure that would cut off all funding for U.S. military operations in Libya, and they plan to vote on it in the coming days.

I know many were opposed to this mission from the beginning, and I respect their convictions. I myself have disagreed and disagreed strongly at

times with aspects of the administration's policy in Libya. But at the end of the day, I believe the President did the right thing by intervening to stop a looming humanitarian disaster in Libya.

Amid all our arguments over prudence, legality, and constitutionality of the administration's policy in Libya, we cannot forget the main point: In the midst of the most groundbreaking geopolitical event in two decades, as peaceful protests for democracy were sweeping the Middle East, with Qadhafi's forces ready to strike at the gates of Benghazi and with Arabs and Muslims in Libya and across the region pleading for the U.S. military to stop the bloodshed, the United States and our allies took action and prevented the massacre Qadhafi had promised to commit in a city of 700,000 people. By doing so, we began creating conditions that are increasing the pressure on Qadhafi to give up power.

Yes, the progress toward this goal has been slower than many had hoped and the administration is doing less to achieve it than I and others would like, but the bottom line is this: We are succeeding, Qadhafi is weakening. His military leaders and closest associates are abandoning him. NATO is increasing the tempo of its operations and degrading Qadhafi's military capabilities and command and control. The Transitional National Council is gaining international recognition and support and performing more effectively, and though their progress is uneven, opposition forces in Libya are making strategic gains on the ground.

We are all entitled to our opinions about Libya policy, but here are the facts. Qadhafi is going to fall. It is just a matter of time. So I ask my colleagues, is this the time for Congress to turn against this policy? Is this the time to ride to the rescue of a failing tyrant when the writing is on the wall that he will collapse? Is this the time for Congress to declare to the world, to Qadhafi and his inner circle, to all of the Libyans who are sacrificing to force Qadhafi from power, and to our NATO allies who are carrying a far heavier burden in this military operation than we are—is this the time for America to tell all of these different audiences that our heart is not in this, that we have neither the will nor the capability to see this mission through, that we will abandon our closest friends and allies on a whim? These are the questions every Member of Congress needs to think about long and hard but especially my Republican colleagues.

Many of us remember well the way some of our friends on the other side of the aisle savaged President Bush over the Iraq war and how they sought to do everything in their power to tie his hands and pull America out of that conflict. We were right to condemn that behavior then, and we would be wrong to practice it now ourselves simply because the leader of the opposite party occupies the White House. Someday—I hope soon—a Republican will again occupy the White House, and that President may need to commit U.S. armed forces to hostilities. So if my Republican colleagues are indifferent to how their actions would affect this President, I would urge them to think seriously about how a vote to cut off funding for this military operation can come back to haunt a future President when the shoe is on the other foot.

The House of Representatives will have its say on our involvement in Libya this week. The Senate has been silent for too long. It is time for the Senate to speak, and when that time comes I believe we will find a strong bipartisan majority in favor of authorizing our current military operations in Libya and seeing this mission through to success. That is the message Qadhafi needs to hear; it is a message Qadhafi's opponents, fighting to liberate their nation, need to hear; and it is a message America's friends and allies need to hear.

So let's debate this authorization, but then let's vote on it as soon as possible.

I wish to thank my colleague from Massachusetts for his hard work on this resolution. I understand he will be submitting it very soon. I hope the majority leader of the Senate will schedule a debate and vote on this resolution as soon as possible. It is long overdue.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, June 20, 2011]

SCORES OF U.S. STRIKES IN LIBYA FOLLOWED HANDOFF TO NATO

(By Charlie Savage and Thom Shanker)

WASHINGTON.—Since the United States handed control of the air war in Libya to NATO in early April, American warplanes have struck at Libyan air defenses about 60 times, and remotely operated drones have fired missiles at Libyan forces about 30 times, according to military officials.

The most recent strike from a piloted United States aircraft was on Saturday, and the most recent strike from an American drone was on Wednesday, the officials said.

While the Obama administration has regularly acknowledged that American forces have continued to take part in some of the strike sorties, few details about their scope and frequency have been made public.

The unclassified portion of material about Libya that the White House sent to Congress last week, for example, said ''American strikes are limited to the suppression of enemy air defense and occasional strikes by unmanned Predator'' drones, but included no numbers for such strikes.

The disclosure of such details could add texture to an unfolding debate about the merits of the Obama administration's legal argument that it does not need Congressional authorization to continue the mission because United States forces are not engaged in ''hostilities'' within the meaning of the War Powers Resolution.

Under that 1973 law, presidents must end unauthorized deployments 60 days after notifying Congress that they have introduced American forces into actual or imminent hostilities. That deadline for the Libyan mission appeared to pass on May 20, but the administration contended that the deadline did not apply because the United States' role had not risen to the level of ''hostilities,'' at least since it handed control of the mission over to NATO.

In support of that argument, the administration has pointed to a series of factors, noting, for example, that most of the strikes have been carried out by allies, while the United States has primarily been playing ''non-kinetic'' supporting roles like refueling and surveillance. It has also said there is little risk of American casualties because there are no ground troops and Libyan forces have little ability to exchange fire with American aircraft. And it noted that the mission is constrained from escalating by a United Nations Security Council resolution.

The special anti-radar missiles used to suppress enemy air defenses are usually carried by piloted aircraft, not drones, and the Pentagon has regularly said that American military aircraft have continued to conduct these missions. Still, officials have been reluctant to release the exact numbers of strikes.

Under military doctrine, strikes aimed at suppressing air defenses are typically considered to be defensive actions, not offensive. On the other hand, military doctrine also considers the turning on of air-defense radar in a no-fly zone to be a ''hostile act.'' It is not clear whether any of the Libyan defenses were made targets because they had turned on such radar.

The administration's legal position prompted internal controversy. Top lawyers at the Justice Department and the Pentagon argued that the United States' military activities did amount to ''hostilities'' under the War Powers Resolution, but President Obama sided with top lawyers at the State Department and the White House who contended that they did not cross that threshold.

On Monday, Jay Carney, the White House press secretary, acknowledged the internal debate, but defended the judgment made by Mr. Obama, noting that the applicability of the War Powers Resolution to deployments has repeatedly prompted debate over the years.

The House of Representatives may vote later this week on a proposal to cut off funding for the Libya mission. The proposal is backed by an odd-bedfellows coalition of antiwar liberals and Tea Party Republicans.

They are opposed by an equally unusual alignment of Democrats who support the White House and the intervention in Libya, and more hawkish Republicans.

On Monday, a group that includes prominent neoconservative figures—including Liz Cheney, Robert Kagan, William Kristol and Paul Wolfowitz—sent Republicans an open letter opposing efforts to cut off funds for the mission.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and 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.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I see another colleague who is waiting for time. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for such time as I might use, but it won't be much over 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Arizona for his important and courageous comments that run counter to the political currents of the day, some of which have been expressed in the other body and elsewhere. I thank him for thinking about the strategic interests of the country ahead of some of the political interests with respect to the next election.

There have been many occasions when this body has behaved very differently when a President, either Republican or Democrat, has engaged American forces in one way or another without authorization within that 60-day—or even outside of the 60-day—parameter of the War Powers Act. The fact is, we have had a number of military actions—Panama, Libya in 1986, Grenada in 1983, Iran in 1980, Haiti in 1993, the Persian Gulf in 1987 to 1988, Lebanon in 1982, and then subsequently Kosovo in 1999, Bosnia in 1992, Somalia in 1992—which didn't have this fight about authorization.

In fact, only Iraq in 2003, Afghanistan in 2001, and Iraq in 1990 were authorized prior to our engagement. The fact is, four of those I mentioned ended before the 60 days had expired, but the others didn't. Bosnia, Kosovo, and Somalia all went beyond 60 days, and the issue was never raised. So I think it is important for us to put this in context, if you will, and to measure some of the realities and the choices we face with respect to Libya today.

We will shortly this morning—a little later—be submitting this resolution. It is a bipartisan resolution. Democrats and Republicans are joining together to put in a very limited authorization with respect to our engagement in a support role—not any direct engagement but a support role only—and it is limited to that support role.

I am particularly familiar with the debate relating to, and with the War Powers Act itself, over these years because that was a debate that took place specifically in response to the war that Senator MCCAIN and I were both a part of—the Vietnam war. The War Powers Act was a direct reaction to that war which was at that time the longest war in our history, until now—Afghanistan—10 years in duration. Over 58,000 Americans lost their lives, and it spanned several administrations, including Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon. The fact is, as a result of that war in which we never declared war, the Congress wanted to assert its appropriate prerogatives with respect to the declaration of war and the engagement of American forces. So the War Powers Act was passed.

The War Powers Act very specifically created this dynamic where the Congress had 60 days to act. The President could deploy troops for a period of 60 days without their action, and if they hadn't acted, the inaction itself would require a President to then withdraw troops. So it didn't actually require the Congress to act, but it created this 60-day period. The fact is, any Member of Congress during those 60 days could bring a resolution to the floor denying the President the right to go forward. Nobody did that in the past 60 days, I am glad to say, and we are now beyond those 60 days.

It is not without precedent, incidentally, that we have authorized an action much later. In fact, I think one action was specifically authorized for about a year, and that was the action in Lebanon. About a year after they had landed it was authorized. So we are within days of that in terms of this discussion.

Let me read specifically what the War Powers Act says. It says:

> In the absence of a declaration of war, in any case in which the United States Armed Forces are introduced into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances. . . .

I think the operative words, the critical words, are ''United States Armed Forces are introduced into hostilities.''

Now, one could argue, as people are—there is an article in the Washington Post today, and there are other articles where people are saying: Well, of course we are in hostilities. Hostilities are taking place. Bombs are being dropped. But that is not, in my judgment, even though I support the War Powers Act—and President Obama, incidentally, has supported it here, which is unique from other Presidents—but the fact is, just because hostilities are taking place and we are supporting people engaged in those hostilities does not mean we are ourselves, in fact, introducing troops into hostilities.

No American is being shot at. No American troop is on the ground or contemplated being put on the ground. So the mere fact that others are engaged in hostilities and we are supporting them I don't believe automatically triggers what was contemplated in the aftermath of the Vietnam war.

Frankly, that is not the principal argument we need to be having. What we need to be doing is looking at the bigger picture. I don't think any country—the United States, the U.N., or any nation—ought to be drawn lightly into any kind of military intervention. I have always argued that. But, in my judgment, there were powerful reasons the United States should have joined in establishing the no-fly zone over Libya and forcing Qadhafi to keep his most potent weapons out of the fight.

If we slice through the fog of misinformation and weigh the risks and the benefits alongside our values and our interests, which are always at stake, I think the justification for the President's involvement, for our country's involvement, and for our supporting it are compelling, and I think they are clear.

What is happening in the Middle East right now could be the single most important geostrategic shift since the fall of the Berlin Wall. It has profound implications for U.S. expenditures and for U.S. military engagement in other parts of the region. It has significant impact on the threats we will face, on the potential strategic risks for our country, and for our interests in terms of that region.

Absent United Nations-NATO resolve, the promise that the prodemocracy movement holds for transforming the Arab world—the whole Arab world—and all it could mean for the United States in terms of hopes for peace between Israel and Palestine, hopes for a different set of relationships, hopes for restraining Wahabiism, hopes for diminishing the levels of religious extremism, hopes for reducing the amount of terrorism—all of those things are contained in this awakening, in this transformation people are trying to achieve. It is an effort which I and others believe would have been crushed if the hopes of the prodemocracy movement were simply ignored and we turned our backs on them.

I can't imagine—just think about the consequences. Colonel Qadhafi says: I am going to show no mercy. I am going to go and kill those dogs—dogs—who have risen up and expressed their desire to have fundamental freedoms and rights. He is going to go into Benghazi and he is going to annihilate anybody who is in opposition to him. We already saw him pulling people out of hospital beds. We already saw him attacking women—using rape as a tool of war—dishonoring people in the Muslim world as a consequence for life. We saw what he was doing.

Are we really serious that in the wake of the gulf states, in an unprecedented request saying to us: We want your help; in the wake of the Arab League in an unprecedented request asking for U.S. and other Western engagement in their part of the world to stand up for these rights, that we would simply say: Too bad, so sad, go about your business, we have better things to do?

The consequences would have been extraordinary. Remember, President Clinton said his greatest regret of his Presidency was he didn't engage in Rwanda and prevent—which we could have done at very low cost—what happened with the genocide in Rwanda. That is his greatest regret.

How many Senators have gone to Israel and gone somewhere else in the world and said to people with respect to the Holocaust: Never again; never again. Do the words only apply to one group of people or do the words have meaning in terms of genocide, in terms of wanton killing of innocent people at the hands of a dictator?

So what is the cost to us of this great effort? I believe other dictators would have seen the failure to challenge Qadhafi as a complete license to act with impunity against their people at any other place.

The vast majority of the protesters in these countries are simply crying out for the opportunity to live a decent life, get a job, provide for a family, have opportunities, and have rights. I think abandoning them would have betrayed not only the people seeking democratic freedoms, but it would have abandoned the core values of our country. And I can hear now—I can hear it. Some of the same people now who are complaining about the President being involved would have been the first people at the barricade complaining about why the United States did not stand up for our values and how feckless the President was that he was not willing to stop a dictator from coming at these innocent people. You can hear it. Everybody in the country knows that is exactly where we would be.

Now, why there and not in Syria? A legitimate question. There are different interests and different capacities. The reality is, the Gulf States asked us to come in. The Arab League asked us to come in. And we knew whom we were dealing with with respect to the council and the players. There is a whole set of uncertainties with respect to Syria, even today, that distinguish it both in terms of what we can assert and what we can achieve, and sometimes both in foreign policy and in domestic policy you are limited to what you can achieve and to what is doable in a certain situation.

I believe if we had simply turned our backs, as some people are now arguing we ought to do now, which would be the most reckless thing I have ever heard in my life—at a moment where people are actually achieving the goals, where the pressures are mounting, where Qadhafi is less able to maneuver, where his forces have been reduced, where many people in our intelligence community and in the NATO intelligence community are saying there is progress being made and the vice is tightening—that we would suddenly just pull the rug out from under that is extraordinary to me. Snatch—snatch—defeat from the jaws of victory. I believe—I cannot tell you when it might happen, but I am absolutely confident it is going to happen—Qadhafi is finished. Ask the people in the country. Even his own supporters are reacting out of fear. And the truth is, the vice is tightening because every day that goes by, the opposition gets stronger; every day that goes by, he has less ability to manage the affairs of the country itself.

I think if we simply send the message the House of Representatives is contemplating today, it would be a moment of infamy, frankly, with respect to the House and with respect to our interests because it would reinforce the all too common misperception on the Arab street that America says one thing and does another.

We are already spending billions of dollars in the fight against extremism in many parts of the world. We did not choose this fight. Everybody knows that. It was forced on us, starting with 9/11. To fail to see the opportunity of affirming the courageous demand of millions of disenfranchised young people who had been the greatest recruits for al-Qaida for the extremism, for any of the extremist groups—to not affirm their quest now to try to push back against repression and oppression and to try to open a set of opportunities for themselves for jobs, for respect, for democracy—I think to turn our backs on that would be ignorant, irresponsible, shortsighted, and dangerous for our country. It would ignore our real national security interests, and it would help extend the narrative of resentment toward the United States and much of the West that is rooted in colonialism and furthered by our own invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan.

Remember, the pleas for help did not just come from the Libyan rebels. And this is not something we just cooked up here at home with some desire to go get engaged somewhere. It came from the Arab League, which has never before asked for this kind of assistance. It came from the Gulf States, which have never before said to the West: We need your help to come intervene.

Even at the hand of their own leader, it seems to me that if we had silently accepted the deaths of Muslims, we would have set back our relations for decades. Instead, by responding and giving the popular uprising a chance to take power, I think the United States and our allies send a message of solidarity with the aspirations of people everywhere, and I believe that will be remembered for generations.

The particular nature of the madman who was vowing to ''show no mercy'' to his own people, to his own fellow Muslims, the particular nature of this man, who was going to go after the ''dogs'' who dared to challenge him, and his role in the past, I believe, mandated that we respond. And we responded in a stunningly limited way.

I do think our colleagues from New Jersey and New York and other States in New England need to reflect on the fact—they do not really need a reminder, I suspect—that Qadhafi is the man who was behind the bombing of Pan Am 103, claiming the lives of 189 Americans.

The intervention in Libya, in my judgment, sends a critical signal to other leaders in the region that they cannot automatically assume they can simply resort to large-scale violence to put down legitimate demands for reform without any consequences. I think U.N. resolve in Libya can have an impact on future calculations. Indeed, I think the leaders of Iran need to pay close attention to the resolve that is exhibited by the international community, and we need to think about that resolve in the context of our interests in Iran.

The resolution we will submit—Senator MCCAIN and myself and other Senators—is absolutely not a blank check for the President. Not at all. It is a resolution that authorizes limited use of American forces in a supporting role. I want to emphasize that. There is only an authorization for a supporting role. It says specifically that the Senate does not support the use of ground troops in Libya. The President has stated that is his policy, but we adopt that policy in this resolution. It authorizes the limited use of American forces for a limited duration, and it would expire 1 year from the time of authorization.

This resolution envisions action consistent with the letter the President sent to congressional leaders on May 20 in which he specified that the U.S. participation in Libya has consisted of nonkinetic support of the NATO-led operation, including intelligence, logistical support, and search and rescue missions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has used 20 minutes.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I think I asked for such time as I would use, but I will try to tighten it up.

The administration informed Congress last week it does not consider the use of U.S. forces to rise to the level of ''hostilities.'' I have already discussed that. I think there is an important constitutional question here, but it is not a new question. The truth is that Presidents—Democratic and Republican—have undertaken limited military action. I mentioned each of those instances.

I think this debate is healthy, but the words we use about it have consequences. They send a message. And I think none of us should send any message to Colonel Qadhafi lightly. The last message any U.S. Senator wants to send, in my judgment, is that all he has to do is wait us out, all he has to do is wait for the Congress—even as the progress is being made and the vice is tightening—because we are divided at home.

I believe passage of this resolution would be an important step in showing the country and the rest of the world and particularly showing Muammar Qadhafi that the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States are committed to this critical endeavor. I firmly believe the country is on the strongest footing when the President and the Congress speak with one voice on foreign policy matters. So I hope our colleagues will support this resolution.

For 60 years, we have been working to build a cohesive and consistent alliance with our partners in NATO. Many times our military and political leaders have complained that our European allies have not carried their share of the burden; that Americans have paid too high a price in blood and treasure; that we have led while others followed. Earlier this month, Secretary Gates warned that the NATO alliance is at risk because of European penny-pinching and distaste for front-line combat. He said the United States was not going to carry the alliance as a charity

case. Well, here is the alliance leading. Here is the alliance doing what we have wanted them to do for years. And here, all of a sudden, are Members of Congress suggesting it is OK to pull the rug out from under that alliance. I think that would really toll the bell for NATO.

I believe we need to see the realities of the strategic interests that are on the table and proceed. Will we stand up for our values and our interests at the same time? Will we support the legitimate aspirations of the Libyan people? I think our own security ultimately will be strengthened immeasurably if we can assist them to transition to a democracy. The cost now will be far, far less than the cost in the future if we lose our resolve now.

I thank my colleague for his generous allowance of the extra time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). The Senator from Nebraska.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. JOHANNS. Madam President, over a year ago now, the President signed into law health care legislation that we are finding is certainly long on promises but short on sound policy. Unfortunately, the legislation did not follow a transparent or thorough process. Instead, it was hastily rushed through on a premise that has now become famous, as said by Speaker PELOSI: We have to pass it to see what is in it. Now, almost daily, newspapers, constituent mail, and independent reports continue to reveal that the law's promises are not reality.

Recently, the Columbus Dispatch told the story of a family with a preexisting condition. Two years ago, their struggles to find health insurance coverage outraged this administration. In fact, their hardship was specifically used as an example of why we needed to get the health care system reformed. Well, party affiliation did not define how we felt about this family. We all empathized and sympathized with their struggles and recognized the need for basic health insurance reforms. But, unfortunately, we did not harness that common ground to develop sound policy that addresses the very real problems within the health care system. Instead, a bitterly partisan bill was shoved through Congress, and now we are stuck with its consequences.

So what are the consequences for the family who struggled to get insurance? The article reports that their annual premium has increased a whopping $12,000. Clearly, one result of the law is soaring premiums. President Obama promised no fewer than 20 times that he would cut premiums by $2,500 for the average family by the end of his term. But, unfortunately, this is not an isolated story. This broken promise is evident in homes all across this great Nation. Mail from frustrated Nebraskans continues to flood my office. They question how a health care law that costs so much yet still allows skyrocketing premiums could have ever passed.

A single mother from Bellevue, NE, recently found out that her family's health care premium increased by $700 per year. Her insurance provider explained it was due to mandates in the new health care law.

She pleaded with me:

> Please stand up on behalf of single moms like me. We do all we can to hold our world together, give up time with our children to work two jobs . . . and now this! How am I supposed to maintain health insurance for my family?

Well, I wish I could tell constituents their premiums will not go up, as the President promised. I wish I could tell them the new health care law addressed the rising costs of health care, as the President promised it would. Instead, these stories reflect what the experts predicted would happen if the law passed. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimated that individual health insurance premiums would increase by an average of $2,100 per family due solely to the new mandates included in the law. That puts the gap between Candidate Obama's promise and President Obama's health care law at an alarming $4,600 per family.

The administration's own Medicare Actuary expects health care costs to increase $311 billion over the next decade under the new law. In fact, the Actuary testified that the President's promise that the health care law would lower costs was ''false, more so than true.''

Now, some may say: MIKE, just wait until the law is fully implemented. That is when the promises will be fulfilled. But I continue to get reports on my desk forecasting the negative consequences of this irresponsible and shortsighted piece of legislation.

For example, one of the law's major flaws is that about half of its new health insurance coverage is achieved by locking millions of more people on an already-broken Medicaid system.

Yet the New England Journal of Medicine recently released a study showing those on Medicaid struggle to find doctors to treat them.

The medical journal's research revealed that 66 percent of individuals who mentioned Medicaid's Children Health Insurance Program when calling to schedule a medical appointment were denied an appointment for the child.

That is compared to only 11 percent who said they had private insurance.

That is right—those on Medicaid's CHIP were six times more likely to be denied treatment.

And when Medicaid was accepted, the children had to wait, on average, 22 days longer than those with private insurance.

Researchers blame low Medicaid payments, delays in paying, and bureaucratic redtape driving doctors from even accepting these patients.

As a former Governor, I can tell you that these problems have long plagued the Medicaid Program.

Yet in 2014 the President's new law dramatically expands Medicaid, dumping over 24 million more Americans onto this very broken system. How can the President promise guaranteed coverage for these millions of Americans when this study shows the majority of our most vulnerable population is denied treatment under the Medicaid system? The bottom line is you cannot receive care if you cannot find a doctor to provide it. The logic simply does not match the promise.

Another recent study by the consulting group McKinsey & Company calls another one of the President's guarantees into question. Their study analyzed the impact of the health care law on employer-sponsored benefits.

Prior to the health care law, America's employers were the backbone of our Nation's health care system, providing 165 million Americans with health care coverage. The McKinsey study found that 30 percent of employers will definitely or probably stop offering their employees health care insurance after 2014.

During the health care debate, supporters of the law insisted that the law builds on the principle of employer-sponsored coverage.

The President even repeatedly promised if you like your plan, you can keep it. But again, this appears to be an empty promise.

According to the study—and others that came before it—employees will be stripped of plans that they like and dumped onto the new law's health care exchanges to fend for themselves.

I realize there is some disagreement surrounding this particular study. But how can we deny this commonsense logic?

The more you know about this law, the more you conclude it just does not make sense for employers to offer a health care plan.

Beginning in 2014, the health care law mandates that employers with more than 50 workers offer health insurance coverage or pay a penalty of $2,000 per worker. And with this mandate comes a slew of other requirements. Suddenly dropping coverage and paying the $2,000 penalty becomes an economic necessity.

During the health care debate, I spoke about this on the Senate floor. I and many others warned that the proposed penalties for businesses would create a perverse incentive. When you do the math, I said back then this is no penalty at all, compared to the cost of private insurance.

It is a wise business decision if you are worried about the bottom line. That is how the law encourages employers to dump their employees onto the exchange.

A Deloitte consultant told the Associated Press, ''I don't know if the intent was to find an exit strategy for providing benefits, but the bill as written provides the mechanism.'' John Deere has responded by saying businesses will look into ''just paying the

fine.'' Not surprisingly, employers have done their own math. AT&T reported that its $2.4 billion cost of coverage would drop to $600 million for the penalties. Estimates reveal Caterpillar could save 70 percent on health care costs by eliminating coverage and paying the penalties. And the list goes on.

Prior to its passage, the Congressional Budget Office predicted 7 percent of employers would drop insurance coverage due to the health care law. Now studies and business logic are challenging that estimate. This may mean the CBO's projected cost of the health care law may be significantly too low.

That is right—the $2.6 trillion cost estimate for the health care law could be surprisingly too low. The President promised that this bill would lift the burden off the middle class. Not only will they see their premiums continue to increase due to out-of-control health care costs, but they will foot the cost of the new exchanges.

Unfortunately, time is confirming what we have been predicting all along. The case for repeal of the health care law grows stronger every day. I will work to overturn these negative consequences. I believe Americans deserve better. They deserve promises that we can keep.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

MONTANA FLOODS

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I wish to talk a little bit about the flooding that is going on in Montana and has been going on for basically better than the last month. The picture I have is that of the Musselshell River east of Roundup. The river channel is not in this area. In fact, it is on the far side of this river.

My guess is—I have not seen this—this picture was taken about 10 days ago. But my guess is, it is still flowing like this and for a number of reasons I want to address in my speech today.

Over the past few months, we have seen severe flooding in Montana that has impacted our homes and businesses. It has devastated farmland and ranch land. It has displaced families across our State.

The flooding has tested thousands of Montanans and the basic services and infrastructure they rely on every day. But when disaster hits Montana, we rise to the occasion. When I meet the families and the community leaders affected by flooding and when I tour their towns, I do not see resignation or hopelessness. I see resilience. I see our traditions of hard work and working together. I see communities that are rebuilding and moving forward, ordinary people and local officials working diligently with local, State, and Federal partners to address urgent and ongoing needs they are unable to address alone.

Thanks to that spirit of working together, neighbor to neighbor, Montana communities are rebuilding and businesses are reopening. We are looking to account for the severe crop damage and livestock loss suffered by Montana's farmers and ranchers, and we are looking for resources to make up for the $8.6 million in damages to our State's infrastructure. Sadly, that number is only getting bigger.

Montana's resiliency is going to be tested because we are not out of it yet—not even close. Given the unusually significant snowpack in the Rocky Mountains that has yet to melt, our rivers and streams will continue to swell. The cost to Montana communities and families will continue to mount, and more and more of them will look to emergency assistance to provide timely services and assistance to those most in need, to help them get back on their feet.

That is why I am particularly alarmed by the looming shortfall in FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund, which the House left dangerously unfunded, even amid a string of weather-related disasters across this country that have led us to 45 declared disasters. We are now looking at estimates of a $2 to nearly $5 billion shortfall for fiscal year 2012 alone.

The total need is estimated to be as much as $6.6 billion. Montana is still tallying the damage. The risk of further damage is still very high. Yet we do not know right now if there will be enough money left over to meet the needs this disaster has already created in our State of Montana.

The House thinks we should pay for past disasters with funding allocated for current and future disasters and by cutting assistance to firefighters and other first responders. In Roundup, Billings, and elsewhere in Montana, the folks who are rescuing stranded residents in boats to take them to get urgent medical care are not from FEMA; they are the same men and women who fight to protect our communities every day—the cops and firefighters who are part of these communities.

Taking away the resources they need will not fly. It is irresponsible and unacceptable. I want all my colleagues to understand the importance of what we are facing, not just in Montana but across this country. There are 45 declared disasters around the country. It is time to do our part for communities all across this country that are facing unprecedented disasters from floods, tornadoes, to wildfires.

Let's make sure this Nation's emergency responders have what they need to do their jobs. They are doing their part for all of us. Tough economic times have forced us all into some very difficult decisions. There is no doubt about that. But it is critical that we do everything we can on behalf of the communities and families across our Nation who are simply looking to pick up the pieces, to rebuild their homes, their schools and businesses, and to get back on their feet.

When small businesses cannot get back on their feet and when our No. 1 industry, agriculture, gets a punch during the growing season, our entire economy will be impacted in a negative way. Montanans will continue to be resilient, and they will continue looking out for one another. But there are some burdens that are simply too big for them to bear alone. It is time for Congress to stand, do its part, and the sooner the better.

I look forward to working with Chairman LANDRIEU and Ranking Member COATS on the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee to make sure that no community from Montana or anywhere else in the country is left wondering if the government will make good on a commitment to help them rebuild.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum call be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL H. SIMON TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

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 assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael H. Simon, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 1 hour of debate on the nomination, equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate will finally consider the nomination of Michael Simon to fill a judicial emergency vacancy on the District

Court for the District of Oregon. Mr. Simon, the head of litigation at the Portland office of Perkins Coie, is one of the most highly regarded lawyers in the country. He spent 5 years as a trial attorney at the Department of Justice during the Reagan administration, including a stint as a Federal prosecutor, and 3 years as a volunteer judge pro tem on an Oregon county court. Mr. Simon's nomination has had the strong support of his home State Senators, Senator WYDEN and Senator MERKLEY, since he was nominated nearly a year ago and has twice been reported by the Judiciary Committee with significant bipartisan support. I mention that because, traditionally, someone like this would go through almost the first day after he was reported.

I thank the majority leader and the Republican leader for finally scheduling this vote. It is most unfortunate that the Republicans objected to considering this nomination when it was reported last year. That meant that we had to spend more time and taxpayer money to consider it a second time in the Judiciary Committee, and the nomination had to be reported again earlier this year. It should not have taken more than 4 months since the committee reported Mr. Simon's nomination for a second time for the Senate Republican leadership to finally consent to debate and a vote.

This is, finally, the last of the judicial nominations reported last year that could and in my view should have been considered then. Now, after 6 months of unnecessary delay, the people of the District of Oregon may finally see a longstanding judicial vacancy filled by a highly qualified nominee who has always had bipartisan support from the days he was working for the Reagan administration. The Senate may finally be able, 6 months into this year, to start to focus on nominees who had hearings and were considered by the Judiciary Committee this year. There are currently 16 judicial nominees who were reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee over the last several months who are still awaiting final Senate consideration and confirmation. They include nominees with the support of Republican home State Senators and nominees for judicial emergency vacancies. These delays mean that judicial vacancies around the country remain well above what they should and could be. With current vacancies hovering around 90 and many more upcoming, the Senate is being prevented from solving the vacancies crisis that the Chief Justice, President, Attorney General and judges around the country have urged us to end.

When we take nominations considered 1 year and then delay them into the next year, it is wrong to say that you are ''moving right along.'' I have served with Presidents Ford, Carter, Reagan, the first President Bush, Clinton, the second President Bush, and now President Obama. During all that time, whether Democrats or Republicans were in the majority, no President had to put up with these unseemly delays, except for President Obama.

The delay in considering this nomination is only the latest demonstration that those on the other side who say the majority leader can simply call up nominations are wrong. Senators know it is not true. If that were true, nominees like Mr. Simon would have been considered and voted on last year.

Some Senators may seek to avoid responsibility for the Senate's historically slow pace of confirming judicial nominations and claim their hands are clean, but they know the Senate is a body that requires consent to avoid extensive delays. They know that if there is no consent, it takes the burdensome requirement of invoking cloture in order to end a filibuster and have a vote. Moving forward to address the ongoing judicial vacancy crisis—and it is a crisis—requires cooperation. It requires the minority to work together with the majority and set aside partisan differences for the good of the American people.

Last week, the Senate was able to get consent to confirm the first two judicial nominees since May 17, even though almost a score of qualified nominees has been awaiting final confirmation since that date. In addition to the Simon nomination, there are 19 judicial nominations currently pending on the Senate's Executive Calendar. Of those, 16 are, by anyone's definition, consensus nominees. Seven of them were nominated to fill judicial emergency vacancies. Sixteen nominees were unanimously approved by every Republican and every Democratic Senator on the Judiciary Committee after thorough review, and an additional nominee was reported with only one Senator in opposition. All are supported by their home State Senators, Republicans and Democrats.

These are the kinds of nominees who in past years would have been confirmed within days of being reported to the Senate. Instead, extended delays now burden every nomination before the Republican leadership finally consents, if it does, to take up nominations. Mr. Simon's nomination was first reported with bipartisan support last December. Three district court nominations reported unanimously by the Committee in early April remain stalled before the Senate, Paul Oetken and Paul Engelmayer of New York, and Romana Manglona of the Mariana Islands. All of these consensus nominations would easily have been confirmed if the majority leader was not blocked from bringing them up. We should not need to file cloture to vote on these kinds of consensus nominees, but that is what has been required by the Senate Republican minority. Incidentally, when we have filed for cloture on these nominees, for many of them we got a vote and they passed overwhelmingly.

We should have regular votes on President Obama's highly qualified nominees instead of more delays. We should also restore the Senate's tradition—a tradition I can speak to as one who has been in the Senate for 37 years—of working to clear the calendar of pending nominations before a recess. Contrast that traditional practice with what the Senate did before the Memorial Day recess, when no judicial nominees were confirmed. With vacancies still totaling more than 90 on Federal courts throughout the country, and with nearly two dozen future vacancies on the horizon, there is no time to delay consideration of these nominations. If we were to take positive action just on the nominees who received unanimous support in committee, vacancies could be reduced below 80 for the first time since the beginning of President Obama's administration.

With judicial vacancies continuing at crisis levels, affecting the ability of courts to provide justice to Americans around the country, I have been urging the Senate to vote on the judicial nominations reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee and pending on the Senate's Executive Calendar. My efforts have not yielded much success or sense of urgency. Nor have the statements by the Chief Justice of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the Federal Bar Association and a number of Federal judges across the country.

Those who delay or prevent the filling of these vacancies must understand they are delaying and preventing the administration of justice. We can pass all the bills we want to protect American taxpayers from fraud and other crimes, but you cannot lock up criminals or recover ill-gotten gains if you do not have judges. The mounting backlogs of civil and criminal cases are growing larger.

I think of the first 2 years of the last President Bush's term in office. During the 7 months that Republicans had the majority, they did not bother to hold a hearing on President Bush's nominees. But in the 17 months that the Democrats were in charge, the Democrats held hearings and confirmed 100 of his nominees. To their credit, in the following 24 months, the Republicans confirmed 105.

Ah, for those days.

Our ability to make progress regarding nominations has been hampered by the creation of what I consider to be misplaced controversy over many nominees' records. As with the long-delayed nomination of Judge Edward Chen, the supposed ''controversy'' that has delayed and obstructed the nomination of Michael Simon is the result of some Senators seeking to impose a partisan litmus test in place of our sworn constitutional duty to offer advice and consent on nominations. That Mr. Simon filed amicus briefs on behalf of the ACLU and several Jewish organizations in cases involving the First Amendment, discrimination against gay and lesbian individuals, and the rights of religious minorities does not

render him unfit to be a judge. Our legal system is an adversary system, predicated upon legal advocacy for both sides. Certainly defending civil liberties is no vice. 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.

I had hoped when 11 Republican Senators joined in voting to end a filibuster against Judge Jack McConnell of Rhode Island that the Senate was moving away from the narrow, partisan attacks on judicial nominations that have slowed us from making progress since President Obama took office. Yet the successful Republican filibuster of the nomination of Professor Goodwin Liu to the Ninth Circuit was one of the most disappointing votes I have seen in the U.S. Senate. There were no ''extraordinary circumstances'' or justification for this partisan filibuster of a good man and brilliant nominee.

In the wake of the filibuster, newspapers around the country decried the Senate for denying Professor Liu the up-or-down vote that Republican Senators argued just a few years ago every nominee was entitled to have when there was a Republican in the White House. The New York Times editorialized that the standard of ''extraordinary circumstances'' for filibustering nominees ''is meaningless if senators are going to define someone like Mr. Liu as a legal extremist.''

The editorial continued:

He is, not surprisingly, a liberal thinker who is nonetheless squarely in the legal mainstream, having even received the support of strong conservatives, including Kenneth Starr and Clint Bolick.

The New York Times also described the filibuster of Professor Liu as ''payback'' making it ''harder to fill benches during this administration and many more to come.''

The Denver Post wrote in an editorial:

The Senate filibuster last week of federal appellate court candidate Goodwin Liu wasn't just a defeat for the president who nominated him. It signifies the dissolution of a truce that had been struck years earlier in which senators had generally agreed not to hold hostage qualified judicial candidates from the opposing political party. It is a shame it has come to this.

The San Francisco Chronicle editorialized:

Fair-minded people who have looked at Liu's record and determined that he has the intellect and temperament to be a superb appellate judge include prominent conservatives Richard Painter, chief ethics lawyer in the Bush White House, and Whitewater prosecutor Ken Starr. But neither fair play nor intellectual honesty carried the day in the Senate, where Liu's nomination remained bottled up through the efforts of multiple Republicans who had opined (in the Bush years) that it was unconstitutional for senators to deprive a judicial nominee of an up-or-down vote.

In an editorial entitled, ''Trashing of Court Nominees Must End,'' the Iowa City Press-Citizen wrote:

What is most disturbing about Thursday's Senate vote is not the fact that the Senate rejected this nominee, but how it was done: by a filibuster. In other words, the Republicans used the Senate rules to prevent a simple up-or-down vote on the Liu nomination.

I ask unanimous consent that copies of these editorials be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEAHY. The question for me about Mr. Simon is the same question I have asked about Judge Chen, Professor Liu, and every judicial nominee, whether nominated by a Democrat or a Republican President: whether he or she will have judicial independence. I don't care what their politics are. I don't care what party they belong to. I don't care who they have represented in the past. All I want to know is: Will they have judicial independence? Do they understand the role of a judge and how that differs from the role of an advocate?

The judge has to protect everybody in their courtroom, on both sides. There is no question that Michael Simon is going to have judicial independence. So I hope Senators today will set aside their partisan litmus test and join me in supporting this fine nomination.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, May 22, 2011]

BREAKING FAITH

''I will not vote to deny a vote to a Democratic president's judicial nominee just because the nominee may have views more liberal than mine.''

That was Senator Lamar Alexander, Republican of Tennessee, promising in 2003 not to filibuster judicial nominees for reasons of ideology. But on Thursday, Mr. Alexander, along with 41 other Senate Republicans, voted to filibuster one of President Obama's judicial nominees for that very reason—breaking a promise and kindling yet another row over a president's right to appoint like-minded judges.

The fight was over Goodwin Liu, a Berkeley law professor nominated by the president for a seat on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. He lost on a vote of 52 to 43, short of the 60-vote requirement demanded by Republicans.

He became the first Obama nominee to be successfully filibustered, and the only nominee since 2005. That year, a Senate ''Gang of 14'' agreed that such nominees should be allowed an up-or-down majority vote except in extraordinary circumstances.

The group was correct in preserving the right to filibuster the most extreme candidates, but the agreement is meaningless if senators are going to define someone like Mr. Liu as a legal extremist. He is, not surprisingly, a liberal thinker who is nonetheless squarely in the legal mainstream, having even received the support of strong conservatives, including Kenneth Starr and Clint Bolick.

What, specifically, made him so extraordinary that he was not worthy of an up-or-down vote? The Republican argument against him is laughably thin. ''He believes the Constitution is a fluid, evolving document,'' said Jeff Sessions of Alabama. John Cornyn of Texas falsely accused Mr. Liu of holding the ''ridiculous view that our Constitution somehow guarantees a European-style welfare state.''

But other Republicans were more forthcoming about the real reason for the blockade: Mr. Liu dared to criticize Justice Samuel Alito Jr. as harshly conservative before he was confirmed to the Supreme Court. The filibuster apparently was payback, and the Republican eagerness for revenge has broken faith and a clear understanding on the Senate floor. That will make it harder to fill benches during this administration and many more to come.

[From denverpost.com, May 28, 2011]

EDITORIAL: SO MUCH FOR THE GANG OF 14 TRUCE

The Senate filibuster last week of federal appellate court candidate Goodwin Liu wasn't just a defeat for the president who nominated him.

It signifies the dissolution of a truce that had been struck years earlier in which senators had generally agreed not to hold hostage qualified judicial candidates from the opposing political party.

It is a shame it has come to this.

Republicans may be celebrating the defeat of President Obama's nominee, who on Wednesday officially withdrew his nomination to the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals; however, it's an action that surely will come back to bite them.

Democrats are unlikely to forget. In fact, Senate Judiciary Chairman Patrick Leahy, D–Vt., told reporters before the vote that a Liu filibuster would mean Democrats would do the same to the next Republican president's nominees.

It would be regrettable if that were to happen. The so-called Gang of 14 had in 2005 joined forces to avert a showdown on judicial candidates nominated by then-President Bush.

Seven Republican and seven Democratic senators, cleaving to the ''advise and consent'' role of senators as enumerated in the U.S. Constitution, agreed not to filibuster or block qualified judicial candidates unless ''extraordinary circumstances'' were in play.

There was, at the time, little consensus as to what constituted ''extraordinary circumstances'' and assuredly even less agreement now.

At the time of the compromise, which then-Sen. Ken Salazar of Colorado took part in crafting, several senators said they would know extraordinary circumstances when they saw them.

The Republican filibuster of Liu, a University of California-Berkeley law professor, will set precedents as to how extraordinary circumstances will be defined. (Colorado's U.S. Sens. Michael Bennet and Mark Udall, both Democrats, voted against a filibuster.)

Extraordinary circumstances, it seems, will come to mean a candidate who holds views that are ideologically repugnant. That is a dangerous standard.

Liu is a liberal and far more so than other prominent judicial nominees President Obama has sent to the Senate for confirmation.

We aren't crazy about some of Liu's positions either, but he is qualified for the job. The American Bar Association, which independently evaluates judicial nominees, gave him their highest ranking: unanimously well-qualified.

We have long favored an up-or-down vote on judicial candidates, and this is no exception. Elections have consequences, and those

include the president getting to choose judicial candidates, even if they are controversial.

A return to the so-called judge wars in an effort to block the president's power to fill vacancies on the federal bench ultimately will serve neither party.

[From SFGate.com, May 20, 2011]

SHAME ON GOP SENATORS WHO BLOCKED GOODWIN LIU

Senate Republicans, dripping with partisanship and hypocrisy, blocked an up-or-down vote Thursday on the nomination of UC Berkeley law Professor Goodwin Liu to the Ninth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco.

Their argument that Liu is a leftist ideologue does not hold up to scrutiny. Instead, the continuing filibuster of Liu's nomination carries the distinct scent of political retribution.

Fair-minded people who have looked at Liu's record and determined that he has the intellect and temperament to be a superb appellate judge include prominent conservatives Richard Painter, chief ethics lawyer in the Bush White House, and Whitewater prosecutor Ken Starr.

But neither fair play nor intellectual honesty carried the day in the Senate, where Liu's nomination remained bottled up through the efforts of multiple Republicans who had opined (in the Bush years) that it was unconstitutional for senators to deprive a judicial nominee of an up-or-down vote. The obstructionists included Sens. John McCain, R–Ariz., and Lindsey Graham, R–S.C., who were among a group of 14 senators who had pledged that they would filibuster a nominee only in ''extraordinary circumstances.''

Both McCain and Graham suggested, unconvincingly, that Liu was sufficiently out of the mainstream to merit such extreme action. Graham specifically mentioned Liu's ''outrageous attack'' on Samuel Alito during his Supreme Court confirmation hearings in 2006. But, again, on closer inspection, Liu's point-by-point dissection of Alito's record was meticulously documented with facts.

Another undercurrent at play is a GOP fear that the 40-year-old Liu, with his sharp intellect and appealing manner, might be a candidate to become the first Asian American on the Supreme Court. The gamesmanship against this well-qualified nominee is a disgrace to the Senate and a disservice to the judiciary.

[From Press—citizen.com, May 23, 2011]

TRASHING OF COURT NOMINEES MUST END

The judicial confirmation wars just got a fresh supply of ammunition. The U.S. Senate on Thursday failed to muster the votes needed to move forward on the confirmation of a nominee for a federal judgeship.

That almost certainly ended the Obama administration's two-year struggle to win confirmation for Goodwin Liu to the 9th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals.

The rejection also shattered any hope that partisan battles over confirmations might finally end. Democrats outraged over this loss will no doubt remember this and look for an opportunity for payback. This has been the story since 1987, when Senate Democrats led the effort to defeat Robert Bork, Ronald Reagan's nominee to the U.S. Supreme Court. Since then, both parties have been guilty of trashing the potential judicial careers of clearly fit nominees: Republicans skewering Democratic presidents' nominees; Democrats returning the favor for Republican presidents.

Sadly, Sen. Chuck Grassley, R–LA, played a role in defeating the Liu nomination. This is especially disappointing since, as the ranking Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee—which vets judicial nominees—Grassley could have helped set a new tone on confirmations. He has done just the opposite.

Grassley has consistently opposed Liu's confirmation because, he has said, the professor and associate dean at the University of California-Berkley Law School is has made numerous controversial statements in his writings and speeches that express an ''activist judicial philosophy'' and because has no prior judicial experience. In a prepared statement, Grassley said ''Liu holds a view of the Constitution that can only be described as an activist judicial philosophy'' and if appointed to the court, ''he will bring a personal agenda and political ideology into the courtroom.''

That is one opinion, and Grassley is certainly entitled to it. Others—including several conservative Republican lawyers, including former Whitewater prosecutor Kenneth Starr and two former lawyers in the Bush administration—disagree. Liu was given a unanimous ''well qualified'' endorsement from the American Bar Association, and his resume bristles with sterling academic and professional credentials. Liu would have been the first Asian-American judge on the 9th Circuit Court.

What is most disturbing about Thursday's Senate vote is not the fact that the Senate rejected this nominee, but how it was done: by a filibuster. In other words, the Republicans used the Senate rules to prevent a simple up-or-down vote on the Liu nomination. The effort to end the filibuster fell eight votes short of the 60 needed. But had the 52 senators who voted for cloture voted for confirmation, Liu would be headed for the bench.

This is the very same tactic Republicans (including Grassley) rightly condemned when Democrats filibustered to block Republican nominees. They said that all presidential nominees deserve an up-or-down vote, and they were right then.

How soon they forget.

Alas, Democrats who are outraged by Thursday's move will not forget, and this mindless back-and-forth battle over judges will continue, probably forever. It is a sad day for the courts, for bipartisanship in the Senate and for the nation.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Today, the Senate will consider the nomination of Michael Simon, nominated to be a U.S. district judge for the District of Oregon. This nominee was reported out of Judiciary Committee with four votes in opposition. I am one of those who opposed the nominee and would like to detail my reasons for doing so.

Mr. Simon received his B.A. summa cum laude from the University of California, Los Angeles, in 1978, and J.D. cum laude from Harvard Law School in 1981. He began his legal career as a trial attorney with the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department.

In 1985, he spent 6 months as special assistant U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia and argued one appeal before the Fourth Circuit. Mr. Simon joined a large law firm as an associate in 1986. Since 1990, he has been a partner and the head of litigation for the firm's Portland office.

Throughout his career, Mr. Simon has advocated on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union of Oregon as a pro bono attorney. But his involvement in the ACLU goes beyond mere representation of a client. Mr. Simon has been a member of the ACLU of Oregon since 1986. He is an active member of their Lawyers' Committee and served as a board member from 1997 to the year 2004, the vice president for legislation 1997 to 1998, and vice president for litigation from 2000 to 2004.

I recognize that judicial nominees should not be evaluated solely on client lists or memberships, that would be very unfair. However, these are relevant bits of information about a nominee.

Listen to the words of one of my Democratic colleagues, who inferred that the ACLU is beyond a moderate and mainstream approach. This was stated during the debate on judges nominated by President Bush:

> If you look at the records of these judges and you put scales, left to right, 10 being the most liberal and 1 being the most conservative, these judges are ''ones'', to be charitable. When Bill Clinton nominated judges, he nominated mainly sixes and sevens, people who tended to be a little more liberal, but were moderate and mainstream—very few legal aid lawyers or ACLU charter members, much more prosecutors and partners in law firms.

My colleague recognized that ACLU lawyers were beyond moderate and mainstream. I would complete his analysis and rank this organization as very liberal.

In Mr. Simon's case, there has been concern about whether or not he shares the far out views of the ACUL. On this question, Mr. Simon refuses to provide a clear answer. At his hearing he stated that ''we do not necessarily agree with all of the positions taken by the American Civil Liberties Union.'' When asked in follow-up questions to describe the legal or policy position with which he disagrees, he argued that his advice to the ACLU was confidential and subject to the attorney-client privilege. In a second round of questions, committee members clarified they were not asking about advice to a client, but policy positions with which he disagreed. This was met with ''I am not at liberty to describe the legal or policy positions advocated by the ACLU with which I disagree.''

The ACLU does hold very liberal views, and Mr. Simon has been the voice for those views. For example, Mr. Simon wrote a letter to the Tillamook County Courthouse in Oregon expressing the ACLU's concern with religious Christmas signs and decorations. The letter encouraged the county to repeal its resolution that deemed the county a ''Merry Christmas County.''

On issue after issue, Mr. Simon refused to disassociate himself from legal and policy positions held by the ACLU, that are far outside the mainstream. This includes the legalization of drugs, the unconstitutionality of the death penalty, the unconstitutionality of the Pledge of Allegiance, the ACLU's opposition to tax exemptions for churches and extreme views regarding separation of church and state.

Mr. Simon's views on the war on terrorism and a liberal view on civil liberties are troubling to me. In a speech in 2007, Mr. Simon argued that Americans' civil liberties have been threatened because of measures undertaken following 9/11. In his speech, he said that ''our thinking would be clearer and our solutions more effective if we stop thinking about—and stop calling—terrorism a 'war' or a 'crime,' '' and argued that calling military action against terrorism a ''war'' ''implies that a military conquest is the best tool for this fight'' and that terminology ''may limit more creative and even more successful techniques to promote and protect our security.''

Perhaps Mr. Simon agrees with the Attorney General who, in a recent speech, asserted that ''our most effective terror-fighting weapon'' is our article III [civil] court system. I certainly disagree with that assertion, and I think most national security experts, our military, and most Americans would disagree as well.

Mr. Simon appears to approach constitutional theory with an activist slant. In remarks before a conference sponsored by the Oregon Lawyers Chapter of the American Constitution Society on May 23, 2007, Mr. Simon stated:

> There is also support for the conclusion that the Founders did not believe that their intentions and understanding should bind future generations. That may be the only real 'original intent' of the Founders.

That quotation makes me wonder, if the Constitution wasn't going to have any hold on future generations, why did the drafters spend so much time during that summer of 1787—and even longer periods of time—getting the Constitution adopted. That seems to be the implication of what he says there.

It is no surprise, then, that Mr. Simon has a hostile view of religion in the public square. He continued in those remarks, ''There is also support for the proposition that the concept of 'separation of church and state' was an 'unfolding and evolving' idea at the time of the Founders. . . .''

Mr. Simon appears to demand an absolute wall of separation between church and state, as opposed to the U.S. Government promoting a specific religion. He has argued against religious displays on public land, against religious visitors to schools, against a coach praying with his football players. I assume that means even if you're praying that they don't get injured. Mr. Simon has argued that it is unconstitutional under the establishment clause to teach intelligent design in public school science classes.

Based on his views regarding the war on terror, his activist approach to constitutional interpretation, his hostility to religion in the public square, and his remarks and advocacy of ideas which indicate a legal view that is outside the mainstream, I will oppose this nomination. I ask my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see my two friends—the two outstanding and distinguished Senators from the State of Oregon—and I yield the floor to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his comments and perspective on judicial independence. It is extremely important in having a court system that can both be effective and reflect the faith of the citizens of this Nation that they have a system of true justice.

I rise in support of the nomination of Michael Simon to the post of U.S. District Judge for the District Court of Oregon. Quite simply, Michael Simon is a man of enormous integrity, intellectual breadth and depth, and good old-fashioned common sense and decency. Michael Simon has earned a reputation as a top lawyer in commercial litigation, appellate law, and constitutional law. He is respected nationally. He is eminently qualified for this seat.

After graduating summa cum laude from UCLA, he attended Harvard Law School, where he graduated cum laude. He began his legal career in the Department of Justice's antitrust division, where he served as a trial attorney for 5 years. During this time, he also volunteered for and served as a special assistant U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Mr. Simon is currently a partner at Perkins Coie in Portland, where he has worked since 1986 and earned a reputation as one of the Northwest's real legal stars. He has engaged in extensive pro bono work and has volunteered for many nonprofit organizations. He has served as an adjunct faculty member at Lewis & Clark Law School, teaching antitrust law, drawing on his earlier life experience. He has also served as a pro tem judge on the Multnomah County Circuit Court.

In the courts, Michael has made his name as a staunch defender of consumer protection, antitrust laws, and the first amendment. He has found the time to be deeply involved in his community, displaying a commitment to voluntarism, civic participation, and public service.

For years, Michael has been a leader of the Classroom Law Project, a nonprofit that prepares youths to become active, engaged and informed participants in our democratic society. Serving as president, and then as a board member, he has helped bring a love of civics and democracy to thousands of public school students across Oregon.

In addition to his service in government and civic organizations, Mr. Simon has been an active member of the Jewish community in Portland. He is a familiar and beloved face at his temple, Beth Israel, and has served on the boards of the American Jewish Committee and the Jewish Federation of Greater Portland.

In short, Michael Simon exemplifies the traits that every Federal district judge should possess—a brilliant legal mind and a heart dedicated to service, fairness, and community.

The U.S. District Court of Oregon has historically had a reputation as a place of efficient and fair courts led by outstanding professional jurists. I know Michael Simon will uphold this tradition. He will be an outstanding judge who will continue the district's tradition of fairness and commitment to public service, and he will fill a critical vacancy in this district.

Michael Simon is an excellent nominee, and I urge all my colleagues to reflect on his record and his capacity in multiple dimensions throughout his life that brings a seasoned judgment and the independence of mind to the judicial system. I urge my colleagues to support his nomination.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, Senator MERKLEY has said it very well this morning. I had a chance to speak about Michael Simon yesterday, and I want to make a few additional remarks this morning.

After the retirement of Senator Hatfield, whom we all know is still beloved by many here in the Senate, I have had a chance to work with our former colleague Senator Gordon Smith and now with Senator MERKLEY to send to both Republican and Democratic Presidents some outstanding men and women for their consideration for the District Court in Oregon. Today, Senator MERKLEY and I send to the Senate for its consideration another outstanding individual—someone who is going to take his place with the other leaders who have been named to the district court of Oregon.

Michael Simon is one of those persons who, when you look at what kind of jurist you want to have, meets all the essential tests. He is a thoughtful man, he is a fair man, and he is an individual who always wants to have all the facts in front of him before he makes a reasoned judgment. When I look at his background—and Senator MERKLEY has laid out several of the areas that were special and that we are especially proud of, his work in the private sector at Perkins Coie—I come particularly to his work in consumer protection and the antitrust field, because it highlights the kind of person Michael Simon is.

He made one of his most notable contributions to strengthening consumer protection law working on behalf of the Department of Justice on the case of the United States v. American Airlines, and he successfully argued then for extending the reach of the Sherman Act to include monopolization and attempted monopolization.

This is not a partisan issue. This is the kind of issue that helps all Americans—all Americans, regardless of their political philosophy or party they belong—to benefit from the fruits of a more competitive American marketplace.

Michael Simon's work in that area benefits each and every one of us every single day.

Second, as I talked about yesterday, and Senator MERKLEY has described eloquently this morning, we are very proud of Michael Simon's championing work as a volunteer. I can tell you, that it seems as though virtually every good cause that comes across my desk at home seems to have Michael Simon's name on it urging that Oregonians participate and volunteer their time.

We are especially proud of his work on behalf of children. His work with the Classroom Law Project, his work at the Waverly Children's Home, where he was past head of the board of directors, these kinds of positions are ones where you make a difference. These kinds of positions give Mr. Simon a chance to teach not just right and wrong to young people but a chance to give them the kind of background about the rule of law and the rights and responsibilities we want to instill in our children. That is why we are very proud to bring to the attention of the Senate his work with Oregon's youngsters.

Finally, I want to stress the immediacy of the need for the Senate to confirm Michael Simon today. This seat has been vacant for 664 days. It is just 1 of 36 judicial emergencies. As it stands, there are nearly 90 Federal court vacancies, some of which have been empty for more than 3 years. Judicial emergencies are not just some sort of Washington phrase to throw around on the floor of the Senate. They are actually an emergency defined by the Chief Justice of the United States, John Roberts. And to earn this designation, filings must exceed 600 per judge in district courts and 700 per judge in circuit courts.

Justice delayed is justice denied. Until the Senate begins to move expeditiously to fill these vacancies, justice will continue to be denied to thousands of Americans who deserve due process.

Both Senator MERKLEY and I are very grateful to Senator LEAHY and Senator GRASSLEY, the majority leader Senator REID, and the minority leader Mr. MCCONNELL for their work to bring this nomination to the floor.

I hope colleagues who have questions about Michael Simon will come to Senator MERKLEY and myself. We will stay on the floor and be available to colleagues to answer any questions.

But this is a good and decent man who possesses all of the requisite qualities we would like in a jurist, whether it is his work in the private sector, whether it is his pioneering work in the field of extending the reach of the Sherman Act to deal with monopolies. This is a person who will reflect great credit on the District Court of Oregon and on the legal system of our country.

I hope all our colleagues will support Michael Simon today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

PANETTA NOMINATION

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of Leon Panetta to be the 23rd Secretary of Defense. Director Panetta has a long history of government and private sector service and experience, including service in the U.S. Army.

Director Panetta served ably for eight terms as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, rising to be chairman of the House Budget Committee. He left that position to be President Clinton's Director of the Office of Management and Budget and later served 2½ years as President Clinton's Chief of Staff, which is where I got to know him well. He then spent 10 years codirecting a foundation with his wife that seeks to instill in young men and women the virtues and values of public service. Knowing Director Panetta, this comes as no surprise. In February 2009, he became the 19th Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and it is in this capacity where I have had the opportunity to work very closely with him over the last several years and consider him a close friend.

Director Panetta has been an outstanding leader of the Central Intelligence Agency, and it is bittersweet to see him leave. Director Panetta is a true leader in every sense of the word. He understands how Capitol Hill works since he served in Congress for 16 years. He has always shown the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, which is the committee that oversees his organization, the right kind of deference and responded to our questions and concerns promptly and directly.

Although he leaves the CIA, he is not leaving the administration and I am quite pleased that I will continue to have the opportunity to work with him as Secretary of Defense. I think he has the right qualifications for his new job. He understands budgets, and in this time of economic austerity we need someone with that knowledge and his ability to understand and manage the resources of a huge organization such as the Department of Defense.

In his current capacity as Director of the CIA, he has also worked and built strong partnerships with the Department of Defense, having been involved in the planning and execution of numerous joint operations, including of course the most recent operation against Osama bin Laden. He will continue this strong partnership in his new position, and I know he will continue to ensure that these two organizations work closely together and cooperate successfully in the interest of our national security and for the safety of our country.

Director Panetta has a very challenging job ahead of him. The United States is involved in three major military operations overseas, as well as countless smaller ones. Budgets are extremely tight, and they are only going to get tighter. However, no country has the global interests and global responsibilities that the United States has, and for that reason we need a military that can protect those interests and carry out those responsibilities. Director Panetta will need to decide how we do that and will also help decide what, if anything, the United States can and needs to stop doing.

He will also need to take responsibility for shaping our military to be prepared for the future. For the last decade, our military has necessarily been focused on fighting and winning the conflicts we are in; namely, Iraq and Afghanistan. We continue to meet that challenge, and I am very optimistic that we, with the Afghan people, will prevail against insurgents in Afghanistan, just as we prevailed with the Iraqi people against insurgents in Iraq. However, we can't take our eyes off the future. As a nation, we have a very poor record of predicting where our next conflict will come from.

I have heard it said that when Secretary McNamara had his confirmation hearing to be Secretary of Defense in 1961, no one asked him a question about a country called Vietnam. And when Secretary Rumsfeld had his confirmation hearing in 2001, no one asked him about Afghanistan. But, in both cases, those were the issues that would dominate their tenure as Secretary of Defense.

If I might say, Director Panetta, if a new global hot spot dominates your tenure as Secretary of Defense, there is a good chance that it will be one that no one asked you about at your confirmation hearing.

For this reason, our Armed Forces need to be prepared to fight conflicts that are unlike our current ones. We cannot, and should not, assume that the next war will be like the current one. We need to be prepared for both high-end and low-end conflict. We need to be prepared not just so that we can fight and win these conflicts but so we can deter potential adversaries and not have to fight in the first place.

I know Leon Panetta realizes that, and I know he will continue to be committed to ensuring our military is as prepared as possible to meet whatever challenges may come our country's way. That will not be easy, and it will take a man of his ability to do this successfully and in a way that takes into account our current fiscal situation. However, I believe the President has chosen the right man for the job.

I support Leon Panetta's nomination to be the next Secretary of Defense, and I encourage my colleagues to support that nomination as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, let me first say I thought the statement from the distinguished Senator from Georgia was spot on, and I particularly appreciated his point that when we confirm Leon Panetta to head Defense, no one can possibly predict what kind of challenges he will face there. But this is the kind of person who, because of ability and background, is up to any kind

of challenges that are thrown to him. So I want to associate myself with my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. President, I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back the remainder of the time and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Michael H. Simon, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 92 Ex.]

YEAS—64

Akaka	Graham	Murkowski
Alexander	Hagan	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Inouye	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Pryor
Bingaman	Kerry	Reed
Blumenthal	Kirk	Reid
Boxer	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Brown (MA)	Kohl	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Kyl	Schumer
Cantwell	Landrieu	Shaheen
Cardin	Lautenberg	Snowe
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Collins	Lieberman	Udall (CO)
Conrad	Lugar	Udall (NM)
Coons	Manchin	Warner
Cornyn	McCain	Webb
Durbin	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Menendez	Wyden
Franken	Merkley	
Gillibrand	Mikulski	

NAYS—35

Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Burr	Hoeven	Roberts
Chambliss	Hutchison	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
DeMint	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	

NOT VOTING—1

Ayotte

The nomination was confirmed.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:45 p.m., recessed and reassembled at 2:15 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. WEBB).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF LEON E. PANETTA TO BE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leon E. Panetta, of California, to be Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 hours of debate, equally divided, between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I understand there is a time agreement on this nomination; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct—2 hours of debate, equally divided.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, the nomination of Leon Panetta to be Secretary of Defense is a wise and a solid nomination. Director Panetta has given decades of dedicated public service to this Nation, and we should all be grateful he is once again willing to answer the call and take the helm at the Department of Defense. We are also grateful to his wife Sylvia for her significant sacrifices over the last 50 years in supporting Leon Panetta's efforts in the public and private sectors.

When Mr. Panetta appeared before the Armed Services Committee at his nomination hearing, all of our Members commented invariably in the same way—reflecting the view that we are grateful Mr. Panetta is willing to take on this position. He is going to bring a reassuring level of continuity and in-depth experience. He has been a critical member of President Obama's national security team during his tenure as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. The Department of Defense will need Director Panetta's skill and his wisdom to navigate the extraordinarily complex set of challenges in the years ahead.

Foremost among those demands are the demands on our Armed Forces, and these are exemplified by the ongoing wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Between those two conflicts, we continue to have approximately 150,000 troops deployed. The U.S. military is also providing support to NATO operations to protect the Libyan people. In addition, even after the extraordinary raid that killed Osama bin Laden, we face potential terrorist threats against us and against our allies which emanate from Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, and other places.

The risk of a terrorist organization getting their hands on and detonating an improvised nuclear device or other weapon of mass destruction remains one of the gravest possible threats to the United States. To counter that threat, the Defense Department is working with the Departments of State, Energy, Homeland Security, and other U.S. Government agencies to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, fissile materials, and dangerous technologies. As Secretary of Defense, Director Panetta's leadership in this area will be of vital importance. Here again, it is that experience as Director of the CIA which will be so invaluable.

In the coming weeks, President Obama and his advisers will face a number of key national security decisions. While the drawdown of U.S. forces in Iraq remains on track, there have been recent signs of instability in that country. As a result, it is possible that Iraq's political leadership may ask for some kind of continuing U.S. military presence beyond the December 31 withdrawal deadline which was agreed to by President Bush and Prime Minister Maliki in the 2008 Security Agreement.

Another key decision point is looming in Afghanistan regarding reductions in U.S. forces starting next month. President Obama said the other day:

> It's now time for us to recognize that we have accomplished a big chunk of our mission and that it's time for Afghans to take more responsibility.

The President also said a few months ago that the reductions starting next month will be ''significant.'' Hopefully, they will be. Director Panetta, while not assigning a specific number, agreed they need to be significant. A significant reduction in our troop level this year would send a critical signal to Afghan leaders that we mean it when we say our commitment is not open-ended and that they need to be urgently focused on preparing Afghanistan's security forces to assume security responsibility for all of Afghanistan. The more that Afghan security forces do that, the better the chances of success because the Taliban's biggest nightmare is facing a large, effective Afghan Army—an army which is already respected by the Afghan people, but now, hopefully—and soon—in control of Afghanistan's security.

Another major issue facing the Department is the stress that 10 years of unbroken war has placed on our Armed Forces. Over the last decade, many of our service men and women have been away from their families and homes for multiple tours. Not only is our force stressed, so are our military families. We owe them our best efforts to reduce the number of deployments and increase the time between deployments.

The next Secretary of Defense will have to struggle with the competing demands on our forces while Washington struggles with an extremely challenging fiscal environment. The

Defense budget will not and should not be exempt from cuts. But Congress, working with the next Secretary of Defense, will need to scrub each Defense program and expenditure and make the tough choices and tradeoffs between our war fighters' requirements today and preparations for the threats of tomorrow.

Last week, the Armed Services Committee marked up the fiscal year 2012 National Defense Authorization Act. The committee cut about $6 billion from the President's budget request. However, the President has decided to reduce the national security budgets for the next 12 years by $400 billion. What we don't know is how much of that $400 billion he will recommend to come from the Defense budget and how much from the intelligence and homeland security budgets or how much is recommended to be in the first of that 12-year period—fiscal year 2012.

The Nation is fortunate that Director Panetta's compelling record of achievement and experience is well suited to the demands of the position of the Secretary of Defense. Mr. Panetta is the right person to help our military through the fiscal challenges that confront this Nation. His service as President Clinton's Director of the Office of Management and Budget is invaluable because he understands the budget process and because he shaped the decisions that helped achieve the budget surpluses of the late 1990s.

Leon Panetta has repeatedly demonstrated an ability to reach across party lines and work in a bipartisan spirit since entering public service 45 years ago. He worked on the staff of the Republican whip in the Senate and headed the Office of Civil Rights in the Nixon administration. He later won election to the House of Representatives as a Democrat, where he served 16 years, earning the respect of his peers and becoming the chairman of the House Budget Committee.

Throughout his time in public service, Leon Panetta has been guided by a clear moral compass. He has said:

> In politics there has to be a line beyond which you don't go—the line that marks the difference between right and wrong, what your conscience tells you is right. Too often people don't know where the line is. My family, how I was raised, my education, all reinforced my being able to see that line.

Leon Panetta has been intimately involved in the most pressing national security issues of our time. During his tenure as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, President Obama turned to Director Panetta to personally oversee the manhunt for Osama bin Laden and the awe-inspiring operation that brought an end to al-Qaida's murderous leader and provided a measure of relief to the families and friends who have suffered since September 11, 2001. The raid on the bin Laden compound epitomizes the way in which the CIA and the Defense Department are finally working together to support each other in counterterrorism operations, and Director Panetta deserves credit for this close coordination.

Before concluding, I wish to pass along my gratitude and deep admiration for the man who is stepping down as head of the Department of Defense, Secretary Robert Gates. Secretary Gates has provided extraordinary service to this country, spanning the administrations of eight Presidents. Four and a half years ago, he left the comfort and rewards of private life, following a long career in government, to once again serve the critical post of President Bush's Secretary of Defense at one of the most difficult times in recent history. Throughout his tenure, across the Bush and Obama administrations, Secretary Gates' leadership, judgment, and candor have earned him the trust and respect of all who have worked with him.

Secretary Gates has combined vision and thoughtfulness with toughness, clarity and courageous decision-making. Secretary Gates established a direct and open relationship with Congress and with our Senate Armed Services Committee in particular. As chairman of that committee, I will always be personally grateful for that.

Secretary Gates' tenure as Secretary of Defense will be judged by history to have been truly exceptional. So our next Secretary of Defense will have enormous responsibilities but also big shoes to fill. I am confident Leon Panetta is the right person to take on that challenge, and I urge our colleagues to support this nomination.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that any time consumed during the quorum call be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of President Obama's nominee to serve as our 23rd Secretary of Defense, Mr. Leon Panetta. These are big shoes to fill. Secretary Gates has had a remarkable term as Secretary and a remarkable career in public service. In addition, the challenges our military faces in this economic climate are significant. We must have a serious discussion about crafting a sustainable way forward.

I sat down with Director Panetta earlier this month to discuss these challenges. I can say with certainty, Leon Panetta is up to the test. He has the experience and wisdom required, and I look forward to working with him once the Senate gives its advice and consent to his nomination.

I have known Leon Panetta for a long time. We served together in the House of Representatives, and we worked together in government for many years. He has an amazing history of public service to America. We served together on the House Budget Committee when we were both Congressmen in the early 1990s, and he chaired that committee. He understands budgets and the challenges they present.

As Director of the Office of Management and Budget, he took that skill to the executive branch; and as Chief of Staff to President William Jefferson Clinton, he crafted the proposal which brought us to balance in our budget as a nation.

It is hard to imagine it was only 10 years ago that we had a balanced Federal budget. In fact, we were generating a surplus, putting that money into the Social Security trust fund to make it stronger. Ten years later, mired deep in debt, it is hard to imagine that happened, but it did, and Leon Panetta was a big part of that occurrence.

He advised President George W. Bush on how to bring a close to the Iraq war in a responsible way. For the last 2 years he has had an awesome responsibility as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Thanks to the President's strategic focus and Director Panetta's extraordinary leadership, Special Forces and CIA operatives were able to locate and capture Osama bin Laden last month in Pakistan. These are precisely the skills and experiences we need at the table at this moment.

I know Leon Panetta as more than just a fellow colleague in the House and a person who shared some time in public service when I did. I know him as a person. I know his family. I know what he thinks. I know his values. I have to tell you, President Obama and America are fortunate to have a person of this quality who is willing to give even more of his life in public service. He could have stayed out in Monterey, CA, his home area, and no hardship assignment, but he chose not to. He came to Washington to head up the Central Intelligence Agency and now has accepted this invitation to head up the Department of Defense. There is no question in my mind that he will bring to it an extraordinary skill level and amazing values.

Director Panetta and I have talked a little bit about some subjects, and one near and dear to my heart, the DREAM Act. The DREAM Act is legislation I introduced almost 10 years ago allowing immigrant students who have no country an opportunity to contribute to America. These young people came to the United States with their parents when they were just kids and infants. They have lived here all their lives. All they want is a chance to prove how much they love this country. The bill I introduced said there are two ways they should be allowed to do it: No. 1, to complete at least 2 years of college, to have, obviously, a high school diploma and good background; but another, to serve in our Nation's military.

I have been proud to have the support of Secretary of Defense Gates in this effort, and I look forward to the same support from the next, Secretary Panetta. The DREAM Act would strengthen our military and strengthen our Nation, and I am sure, as General Colin Powell has said, ''Immigration is what's keeping this country's lifeblood moving forward.'' These young people can help us move forward as a nation to be safer and create more opportunity.

We have a number of challenges ahead. Our men and women are fighting wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, and now Libya. Servicemembers and their families have borne an incredible burden of sacrifice in these conflicts over the last decade. As a nation, we are spending tens of billions of dollars a month to sustain them in their efforts.

At the same time, public support for these undertakings will not last forever. The current situation needs to change, and the President is about to make an announcement when it comes to our troop levels in Afghanistan. We have to craft a way forward and deal honestly and responsibly with what is possibly one of our most challenging situations in Afghanistan. I believe it has to begin with a substantial redeployment of U.S. troops back to America from Afghanistan.

Last week I joined Senator JEFF MERKLEY of Oregon and 24 of my colleagues in a letter to the President expressing these concerns. I trust the President and incoming Secretary of Defense and Congress can find a responsible path forward. We need to take a hard look at every aspect of our Federal budget, including our Department of Defense, to sustain our men and women in uniform but not to waste money on privatization, on contractors, and on runaway contracts.

As Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mullen has commented that our greatest national security threat is our ballooning deficit. Of course, we need to protect our country, but we need to do it in a fiscally responsible manner. Even as we address the path forward in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya, even as we trim the spending in the defense budget, we will not back away from our commitment to the men and women in uniform. I know Leon shares that statement.

I support Leon Panetta as our next Secretary of Defense because now more than ever we need his steady hand, his leadership, to tackle these challenges in budgets, in management, and in the critical conflicts we are engaged in around the world. I congratulate President Obama for selecting Leon Panetta for this awesome responsibility, and I look forward to working with him on these issues and others in the years to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for the nomination of Leon Panetta as the next Secretary of Defense. Director Panetta comes to this job at an extraordinarily challenging time for the Department of Defense and for our Nation. Among the many issues he will confront, Mr. Panetta will oversee the completion of our direct military operations in Iraq, the beginning of the transition of our forces out of Afghanistan, the enhancement of our cyber defenses, and the reduction of our defense budget.

I have known Leon Panetta for many years, and I know he is particularly well suited to address all of these challenges. He is a man of great intellect, of great decency, and great determination.

At the end of this year, for example, in compliance with the Status of Forces Agreement, we will complete the withdrawal of our forces from Iraq and hand over primary responsibility for our ongoing relationship with Iraq to the Department of State. It remains to be seen whether the Iraqi Government will ask us to extend our military presence past December 31. But for now, we are thoroughly and determinately preparing our troops to leave. Having served as a member of the Iraq Study Group, Mr. Panetta certainly understands the importance of this transition and will carry it out.

As the next Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta will also continue to focus our efforts on fighting terrorism in Afghanistan and Pakistan. We are facing a critical turning point in our operations. This week, we expect President Obama to announce his plan to begin reducing our force levels in Afghanistan this summer, a commitment he made in his speech at West Point in 2009.

Along with the reduction in forces we must sustain the security gains that we have accomplished during the past year and further build the capacity of the Afghan forces so they are able to take full responsibility for their own security. Mr. Panetta understands how important it is for all of our agencies to work together in this effort and all security missions; that using military force may be our primary weapon of securing areas but enduring success comes from coordination among the intelligence and law enforcement communities, from effective diplomacy, and from assistance programs administered by the Department of State and the USAID.

The conditions on the ground in Afghanistan are directly related to our ability to successfully attack the terrorist networks that are operating along the border in Pakistan. In his current position as Director of the CIA, Mr. Panetta has reinvigorated these efforts, most notably with the successful raid on Osama bin Laden. Indeed, I believe when history looks back, outside of the critical and ultimate decision by the President of the United States, one of the most important roles played in this effort to prepare the way for those courageous SEALs was the steady leadership of Leon Panetta at the Central Intelligence Agency. He understands the complexities of our relationship with Pakistan and, indeed, throughout the world. This expertise will be critical as we move forward, and critical for our next Secretary of Defense.

He will also lead the Department of Defense in preparing for the emerging threats to our national security, such as attacks to our cyber infrastructure. Indeed, every branch of government is working to define the roles various organizations will play in protecting people, infrastructure, and information within cyberspace.

During his confirmation hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee, I discussed with Director Panetta the strategy the Department of Defense would employ in confronting the potential of a cyber attack against the United States. He responded in no uncertain terms. His words:

> I have often said that there is a strong likelihood that the next Pearl Harbor that we confront could very well be a cyberattack that cripples our power system, our grid, our security systems, our financial systems, our governmental systems. This is a real possibility in today's world. And as a result, I think we have to aggressively be able to counter that.

Indeed, Mr. Panetta understands the future as well as the present, and he will bring his experience as well as his vision to bear on the emerging challenges that face the United States.

Perhaps most challenging of all, Leon Panetta will lead the Department at a time of great fiscal constraints. As our Nation continues to find a path forward to rebound from the economic challenges of the last few years, there is an ever-growing pressure to reduce the size of the defense budget, which has nearly doubled over the past 10 years. But we must be careful to do so in a way that removes unsustainable costs without losing vital capability.

As a result of the high operational tempo and the duration of multiple overseas operations, all of our services are facing serious reset and recapitalization needs. Serious decisions will have to be made to ensure that we have the right systems in place to meet the threats we face, all at a price level that we can afford.

Having served as the House Budget Committee chairman, and as the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, there is no one who has more knowledge, more experience, more sense of the details than Leon Panetta, and I believe he is the most well qualified individual to tackle the huge budgetary issues that are facing the Department of Defense.

Leon will have an extraordinary role to play, particularly in the wake of the extraordinary service of Secretary of Defense Robert Gates. I can't think of anyone I respect or admire more. I can't think of anyone who has served this country with more distinction,

who has served with more selfless dedication to the Nation, and fundamentally who has made his decisions knowing full well that at the end of the day young Americans in the uniform of the United States will carry out his orders.

Bob Gates has done a superb job. But I have every confidence that Leon Panetta will continue to carry on, will continue to meet those standards, will continue to lead the Department of Defense with distinction, with dedication and great loyalty, just as Secretary Gates has done, and ultimately we will know that at the end of all the decisions emanating from the Pentagon there is a young American willing and able and ready to serve, to support this Nation and defend it.

With that, I rise to express my great support for Secretary-designee Panetta and wish him well in all of his endeavors and pledge to work with him closely.

I yield the floor.

I note 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. MANCHIN. 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. MANCHIN. Mr. President, first of all, I rise in total support of Mr. Leon Panetta as the new Secretary of Defense. He is an outstanding public servant who has served in many capacities and he has been a tremendous leader in every role he has held.

THE DEBT CEILING AND AFGHANISTAN

With that being said, I rise to speak on our war in Afghanistan. Very soon our Nation, this esteemed body, and particularly the President of the United States will address two of the greatest challenges our Nation currently faces. The first is Afghanistan.

The second issue is raising the debt ceiling and confronting our Nation's unsustainable spending and debt. To the average American, Afghanistan and raising our debt ceiling may seem unrelated, but they are, in fact, directly related. They are directly related to the hard fiscal and strategic choices our Nation must make if we are to remain safe and secure in the coming decades.

With respect to raising the debt ceiling, the budget realities we face are both striking and frightening. While some may choose to ignore this threat, mere words cannot give weight to the fiscal peril our Nation now faces. Only numbers can.

Since 1992, we have raised the debt ceiling 16 times. In 1992, our national debt stood at $4.1 trillion. Between 2002 and today, our national debt rose from $5.9 trillion to over $14.3 trillion. Now for the first time in our Nation's history, our yearly budget deficits may exceed $1 trillion for 4 years in a row. At the current pace of deficit spending, CRS projects our national debt will exceed $23.1 trillion by 2021.

In order to pay for the financial hole we have dug, the Congressional Budget Office projects that net interest payments will increase fourfold over the next 10 years, from $197 billion in fiscal year 2011 to $792 billion in fiscal year 2021. To put that number into perspective, one decade from today, interest payments on our $23.1 trillion debt will exceed the amount we currently spend on education, energy, and national defense combined. Numbers of this size are not only unimaginable, they will prove catastrophic for our Nation's future.

The fiscal peril we face reminds me of the words a former Senator said on this floor in declaring why he chose in 2006 to vote against raising the debt ceiling when our national debt stood at that time at $8.18 trillion. He said:

> The rising debt is a hidden domestic enemy, robbing our cities and States of the critical investments and infrastructure like bridges, ports, and levees; robbing our families and our children of critical investments in education and health care reform; robbing our seniors of the retirement and health security they counted on. Every dollar we pay in interest is a dollar that is not going to investment in America's priorities.

That former Senator was President Barack Obama.

While his perspective on these words may ring differently today, I believe they accurately capture the difficult choices we face today. The choice is this: Will we rebuild America's future?

Today, with our Nation facing a stagnant economy and a death spiral of debt, we can no longer have it all—or pretend we can. We must choose what as a nation we can and cannot afford to do. Our risky debt will not only undermine our economic security, it also threatens our national security. As ADM Michael Mullen said:

> I believe that our debt is the greatest threat to our national security. If we as a country do not address our fiscal imbalances in the near-term, our national power will erode, and the costs to our ability to maintain and sustain influences could be great.

We can no longer in good conscience cut services and programs at home, raise taxes, or—this is very important—lift the debt ceiling in order to fund nation building in Afghanistan.

Ten years ago, when our mission in Afghanistan began, it was a just and rightful mission to seek out and destroy those responsible for the terrorist attacks on 9/11 and the deaths of thousands of innocent Americans. We overthrew the Taliban government to provide a safe haven to al-Qaida. We have hunted down and killed Osama bin Laden as well as most of the senior members of this terrorist group. Today, in Afghanistan, in a nation of 30 million people, intelligence estimates suggest there are only between 50 and 100 al-Qaida terrorists harbored there. Because of the incredible work of our military men and women, the mission of destroying al-Qaida in Afghanistan by all accounts has been a success. But the real truth is, after 10 years, our current mission in Afghanistan has become less about destroying al-Qaida and more about building a country where, frankly, one has never existed.

In February, I saw firsthand the significant challenges our brave troops face as they pursue this nation building mission. During the trip I heard from Ambassador Eikenberry and General Petraeus. I visited Helmand Province and Kandahar. I met with local tribal leaders and President Karzai of Afghanistan. What I heard from many officials and diplomats was that progress could be just around the corner but only if we give it more time and more money. I heard we must stay to counter the threat of al-Qaida but then was told that only a handful of al-Qaida members existed in Afghanistan. I was told that governance was improving, but that corruption was so rampant that billions—yes, billions—of dollars were lost to corrupt officials who seemed more interested in improving their own lives than the lives of their own people. I was told we need a sizable force to diffuse the threat posed by the Taliban but that estimating the size of the enemy was difficult. Still, everyone acknowledges that their force is a fraction of the number of troops we have there now. I was told that because of rampant corruption and theft, the very cost of moving our supplies was indirectly funding the very enemy we face.

I was told that China—yes, China—could reap billions by extracting resources from Afghanistan, but guess what. They are not contributing anything to the cost of security. I was told that after years of spending billions training a new Afghanistan military and police force, it could be years longer before they could fully defend their nation and their people, and even then it would demand billions more in funding from us. I was also told we were building schools, roads, and infrastructure as well as providing billions in aid for small businesses and job creation so Afghanistan could become more self-sufficient. But today, 97 percent of the Afghan economy is based on foreign aid, and that is after 10 long years. I have been told again and again that American aid is critical to rebuilding Afghanistan but that local projects built with American tax dollars could not be branded as American-funded projects out of fear of reprisals. I was told the people of Afghanistan truly want us there but was then told in a meeting with President Karzai that it was time for America to leave.

The American people have been hearing all of these arguments and the sad facts for nearly a decade. Now, after 10 years, I had truly hoped progress in Afghanistan would be clear and the Afghan people would be united and their government and leaders would be one defined by honesty, integrity, and a shared determination to build a better state. But the real truth is impossible to ignore. After 10 years, we face the choice of whether we will continue to spend tens of billions of tax dollars and lose precious American lives not on

fighting and killing al-Qaida terrorists in Afghanistan but policing and building a state where the leaders seem indifferent to the difficulties of their people and their people seem indifferent at best, if not hostile, to our presence.

Tomorrow, President Obama will present to the American people his latest review on the war in Afghanistan and whether our mission will change. As is already clear, some in this esteemed body will argue for the President to stay the course and others will suggest a very different course. The question the President faces—and we all face—is quite simple: Will we choose to rebuild America or Afghanistan? In light of our Nation's fiscal perils, we cannot do both.

I believe if we are being honest with the American people about the depth of fiscal challenges we face at home, it is impossible to defend the mission in Afghanistan in which we are rebuilding schools, training police, teaching people to read—in other words, building a country—even at the expense of our own.

Neither the President nor any Senator can divorce the difficult decisions we must now make on Afghanistan from the equally difficult decisions we must now make on cutting domestic spending in order to raise the debt ceiling.

While the truth is the war on terrorism must be fought and it must be won, that war is not in Afghanistan. Yet, with every passing month, we are choosing to spend billions we can't afford to fight a war against an enemy that is no longer there.

Since the day I was sworn in, I have heard from countless of my fellow West Virginians who ask, How is it possible we are willing to spend hundreds of billions of dollars in Afghanistan while we face mountains of debt and spending cuts here at home? How is it possible we will choose to spend hundreds of billions of dollars to build Afghanistan when our children, our seniors, our veterans, the poor, and the middle class are being asked to bear the brunt of massive spending cuts?

I have carefully thought over these questions over these many months, and after hearing from my constituents, seeing Afghanistan again with my own eyes, listening to our soldiers on the ground, hearing from dozens of diplomats, foreign policy experts, and the military leaders over these many months, as well as confronting the truth about the fiscal and economic peril our Nation faces in the coming years, I believe it is time for President Obama to begin a substantial and responsible reduction in our military presence in Afghanistan. I believe it is time for us to rebuild America, not Afghanistan.

That is why I strongly agreed with Senators MERKLEY and LEE, and the words of 27 of my Republican and Democratic colleagues, who made it clear in a letter they sent to the President last Thursday that:

> . . . we must accelerate the transfer responsibility for Afghanistan's development to the Afghan people and their government. We should maintain our capacity to eliminate any new terrorist threats, continue to train the Afghan National Security Forces, and maintain our diplomatic and humanitarian efforts. However, these objectives do not require the presence of over 100,000 American troops engaged in intensive combat operations.

I believe it is time for us to compel the elected leaders of Afghanistan and its people to take responsibility for the destiny of their nation so we can ensure the destiny of ours. In that spirit, I have sent President Obama a letter calling on him to pursue significant reductions and end the scope of our current mission in Afghanistan well before 2014. I believe any further mission in Afghanistan should, as my Senate colleagues suggested in their letter, focus primarily on responding to any resurgent terrorist threat as well as providing targeted training for the Afghan military and police.

Throughout this transition period and beyond, I have asked the President to provide the American taxpayer a monthly accounting, to be published online, of every dollar that will be provided to Afghanistan government officials and agencies so as to ensure that no American tax dollars are lost to corruption and greed.

As for those on the right or the left who believe that leaving Afghanistan sooner is irresponsible, I simply ask them: Is 10 years not long enough? I ask them to tell the families of our brave military men and women who are on their third and fourth tour of duty, how much longer must they wait to come home. I ask them to look into the eyes of any American child and ask them to surrender our Nation's future for the sake of another. I ask all of them to explain to the American people the sanity of spending $485 billion more, on top of the $443 billion we have spent, to build Afghanistan over the next decade at the very same time our Nation drowns in a sea of debt.

The time has come to make the difficult decision. Charity begins at home. We can no longer afford to rebuild Afghanistan and America. We must choose, and I choose America.

As I made clear when I ran for this esteemed office, I would not put my political party before country, but I would do my best to do what is right for the people of my beloved State and great Nation. To that end, I promised to speak out and take positions, as difficult as they may be, not for the benefit of my next election but that are best for the next generation.

It is why I spoke out about the debt, to tell the American people and the people of West Virginia that I would not vote to raise the debt ceiling without a long-term permanent fix. I did this not because it was popular or easy but because we, as elected leaders of this great Nation, have a solemn obligation to rebuild our Nation before all others.

Our economy, our prosperity, our schools, our children, our veterans, our soldiers, our workers, our seniors, our Nation's future must come first. I, for one, will not look West Virginians in the eye and tell them that in order to raise the debt ceiling, vital programs and funding for Social Security, Medicare, our schools, roads, health care, veterans, seniors, and infrastructure will be slashed but we will continue to spend billions building schools, roads, and infrastructure in Afghanistan.

The time has come for us to realize the people of Afghanistan have to choose their own destiny. We cannot build it for them. The time has come for us to realize that in this time of fiscal peril, our solemn obligation is to build our own Nation, and that by doing so we will make America safer and stronger for generations to come.

The words of the great West Virginia statesman Robert C. Byrd ring even more true today than in October 2009 when he gave his last floor speech about the war in Afghanistan. Our friend said this:

> During a time of record deficits, some actually continue to suggest that the United States should sink hundreds of billions of borrowed dollars into Afghanistan, effectively turning our backs on our own substantial domestic needs, all the while deferring the costs and deferring the problems for future generations to address. Our national security interests lie in defeating—no, I go further, in destroying al-Qaida. Until we take that and only that mission seriously, we risk adding the United States to the long, long list of nations whose best laid plans have died on the cold, barren, rocky slopes of that far off country, Afghanistan.

May God bless the brave men and women who serve this Nation and the United States of America.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Leon Panetta to succeed Robert Gates. But first I feel compelled to respond to the statements by the Senator from West Virginia which characterize the isolationist, withdrawal, lack of knowledge, of history attitude that seems to be on the rise in America.

In case the Senator from West Virginia forgot it or never knew it, we withdrew from Afghanistan one time. We withdrew from Afghanistan, and the Taliban came, eventually followed by al-Qaida, followed by attacks on the United States of America.

The Senator from West Virginia has expressed his admiration for the men and women who are serving. I hope he would pay attention to the finest military leader who will now be the head of the CIA, General Petraeus, whose knowledge and background may exceed that of the Senator from West Virginia.

If we leave Afghanistan in defeat, we will repeat the lessons of history. It is not our expenditures on Afghanistan that are the reasons we are now experiencing budget difficulties.

I am pleased the Senator from West Virginia went to Afghanistan once. I would suggest he consult with the people who know best that since 2009, when the surge began, we have had success on the ground in Afghanistan, and we are succeeding.

There are enormous challenges ahead of us. But as Secretary Gates has said: Withdrawal to ''Fortress America''—which is basically the message of the Senator from West Virginia—will inevitably lead to attacks from them on the United States of America. I view the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia as at least uninformed about history and strategy and the challenges we face from radical Islamic extremism, including al-Qaida.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to vote in favor of this nomination today.

Director Panetta has had an extraordinary career of public service. He served in the House of Representatives, representing his California district for eight terms. He served in the White House as President Clinton's Chief of Staff and Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Since February 2009 he has been the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, strengthening that agency and forging positive relationships in the interagency process and with the congressional intelligence oversight committees. It is my expectation that Director Panetta will work closely with GEN David Petraeus, the nominee to succeed him at the CIA, and continue the cooperation and commitment that enabled the finding and elimination of Osama bin Laden.

I am certainly hopeful that as Secretary of Defense Director Panetta will successfully lead the effort to find and eliminate Ayman al-Zawahiri, who we are told has assumed leadership of al-Qaida, and other al-Qaida leaders. Zawahiri is a sworn enemy of the United States and our way of life and, like bin Laden, must be dealt with in similar terms.

Before discussing the challenges Mr. Panetta will encounter, I want to express my thanks and admiration for the service of Secretary Gates as he nears the end of his 4½-year tenure as Secretary of Defense. I recall that through much of 2007 and 2008 we heard about Secretary Gates' countdown wristwatch that displayed the number of days until a new administration would take over in January 2009, and he and his wife Becky could finally return to their peaceful lakeside home and retirement in Washington State. It is fortunate for the country that President Obama asked, and Secretary Gates agreed to postpone retirement, and that he continued to serve and, presumably, discarded that wristwatch.

Secretary Gates testified at his nomination hearing on December 5, 2006, that he agreed to leave Texas A&M University and return to government out of love for his country, and he and his family have provided one of the greatest examples I have seen of that kind of patriotism, answering the call to duty when his talents were most needed. For this, and for innumerable other contributions he has made to the men and women of the Armed Forces, he has truly earned a place in history as one of America's greatest Secretaries of Defense.

In December 2006, at a time when so many Senators were clamoring for a cut-and-run strategy in Iraq—just as they are calling for a cut-and-run strategy in Afghanistan—Secretary Gates made the following statement at his nomination hearing:

> While I am open to alternative ideas about our future strategy and tactics in Iraq, I feel quite strongly about one point. Developments in Iraq over the next year or two will, I believe, shape the entire Middle East and greatly influence global geopolitics for many years to come. Our course over the next year or two will determine whether the American and Iraqi people, and the next President of the United States, will face a slowly, but steadily improving situation in Iraq and in the region or will face the very real risk, and possible reality, of a regional conflagration. We need to work together to develop a strategy that does not leave Iraq in chaos and that protects our long-term interests in, and hopes for the region.

Mr. President, you could substitute the word ''Afghanistan'' for exactly what Secretary Gates then said in December 2006. Then we had the surge. There were 59 votes against the surge that would have called for withdrawal in the summer of 2007. Some of us knew what was right and fought for it, and we have succeeded in Iraq, just as we will fight to continue the surge in Afghanistan. We will succeed in Afghanistan, and we will come home with honor, and Afghanistan will not deteriorate to a cockpit of conflict between regional countries that will then cause again the threat of radical Islamic extremism to threaten our very existence—certainly pose threats of attacks on the United States.

Secretary Gates was, of course, correct then about Iraq. Today we must add Afghanistan and Libya to his warning about the future consequences of the decisions we make today. In the next few months, our country faces decisions related to our national security and defense that will echo for decades to come—decisions that will determine whether we remain the world's leading global military power, able to meet our many commitments worldwide, or whether we will begin abandoning that role.

One of these decisions that will have perhaps the most impact on this outcome is our response to the President's stated goal of cutting $400 billion in national security spending by 2023—on top of the $178 billion in efficiencies and top line reductions that Secretary Gates already has imposed.

Secretary Gates and Admiral Mullen have sounded the alarm against misguided and excessive reductions in defense spending that cut into the muscle of our military capabilities. If we get this wrong, it will result in a dramatic drop in U.S. influence and, as Secretary Gates has said, ''a smaller military able to go fewer places and do fewer things.''

Defense spending is not what is sinking this country into fiscal crisis, and if the President and Congress act on that flawed assumption they will create a situation that is truly unaffordable: the decline of U.S. military power and influence.

It is inevitable there will be cuts to defense spending, and some reductions are no doubt necessary to improve the efficiency of the Department of Defense. But I also remember GEN Edward Meyer, then-Chief of Staff of the Army, who warned in 1980 that excessive defense cuts over many years had produced a ''hollow army.'' That is not an experience we can or should repeat in the years to come. We must learn the lessons of history.

I sincerely hope Director Panetta, upon assuming office, will not focus exclusively on how but on whether the President's proposal should be implemented and will apply his independent judgment in providing advice to the President on the cuts that can be made without damage to our national security.

Last week, the Committee on Armed Services completed its markup for the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012. In a very tough fiscal environment, this markup represents an effort to support our warfighters and bolster the readiness of the U.S. military. Unfortunately, the committee chose to authorize hundreds of millions of dollars in unnecessary and unrequested porkbarrel projects and rejected my efforts to stop the out-of-control cost overruns of the F–35 program.

The Defense authorization bill is an important piece of legislation while our country continues to be engaged in two wars; therefore, I voted to move the bill out of committee. Nevertheless, I will continue my efforts to fight the egregious and wasteful spending during debate on the floor of the Senate, and I will urge Director Panetta, once he is confirmed, to favorably endorse the proposals I will make to properly use precious national defense dollars.

In addition, especially in this budget environment, it will be important to continue to eliminate weapons programs that are over cost, behind schedule, and not providing improvements in combat power and capabilities. After 10 years of war, we must continue to eliminate every dollar of wasteful spending that siphons resources away from our most vital need: enabling our troops to succeed in combat.

One of the key criteria I am looking for in the next Secretary of Defense is continuity—the continuation of the wise judgment, policies, and decision-making that have characterized Secretary Gates' leadership of the Department of Defense. As Director of the CIA, Mr. Panetta has demonstrated that he possesses the experience and

ability to ensure that we achieve our objectives in the three conflicts in which U.S. forces are now engaged: Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya.

In Iraq, the key question now is whether some presence of U.S. forces will remain beyond the end of this year, pending an Iraqi request and approval, to support Iraq's continuing needs and our enduring national interests. I believe such a presence is necessary, and I encourage the administration to work closely with the Maliki government to bring about this outcome.

In Afghanistan, the main question is the size and scope of the drawdown of forces beginning this July. Here, too, I agree with Secretary Gates that any drawdown should be modest so as to maximize our ability to lock in the hard-won gains of our troops through the next fighting season. I hope Director Panetta, as the Secretary of Defense, will support ''modest'' reductions and take no action that would undermine the hard-won gains in Afghanistan.

Finally, we know that there is growing opposition to continuing the U.S. involvement in Libya. There has already been one legislative attempt to bind the President's authority as Commander-in-Chief, and there will likely be others. In short, the accumulated consequences of the administration's delay, confusion, and lack of meaningful consultation have been a wholesale revolt in Congress against the administration's policy.

Although I have disagreed, and disagreed strongly at times, with aspects of the administration's policy in Libya, I believe the President did the right thing by intervening to stop a humanitarian disaster in Libya. Amid all of our present arguments about legal and constitutional interpretations, we cannot forget the main point: In the midst of the most groundbreaking geopolitical event in two decades, as peaceful protests for democracy were sweeping the Middle East, with Qadhafi's forces ready to strike Benghazi, and with Arabs and Muslims in Libya and across the region pleading for the U.S. military to stop the bloodshed, the United States and our allies took action and prevented the massacre that Qadhafi had promised to commit in a city of 700,000 people. By doing so, we began creating conditions that are increasing the pressure on Qadhafi to give up power.

Director Panetta has been nominated to lead our Armed Forces amid their tenth year of sustained overseas combat. Not surprisingly, this has placed a major strain on our forces and their families. And yet, our military is performing better today than at any time in our history. That is thanks to the thousands of brave young Americans in uniform who are writing a new chapter in the history of our great country. They have shown themselves to be the equals of the greatest generations before them. And the calling that all of us must answer, in our service, is to be equal and forever faithful to the sacrifice of these amazing Americans.

I have outlined some of the challenges that lay before Mr. Panetta. I have the highest confidence, however, that he is their equal.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the nomination of Leon Panetta to be the 23rd Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Panetta, who currently serves as the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, was nominated by President Obama on April 28. The Senate Armed Services Committee held a hearing on his nomination on June 9, and I was honored to introduce him at that hearing. His nomination was approved unanimously by the committee on June 14.

I would like to speak briefly about Director Panetta's career, and in particular his time at the Central Intelligence Agency.

In his 47 years of public service, Director Panetta has held the positions of Congressman, chairman of the House Budget Committee, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, chief of staff to the White House, codirector, with his wife, of the Leon & Sylvia Panetta Institute for Public Policy, which I have had the pleasure of speaking before, member of the Iraq Study Group, and Director of the CIA.

His career and service started in 1964 as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army, and now 47 years later he has come full circle to be nominated to lead the Department of Defense and U.S. Armed Forces.

In the course of 2 years as Director of the CIA, Mr. Panetta has mastered the intelligence field, led the CIA through a very tumultuous time, restored badly damaged relationships with Congress and with the Director of National Intelligence, and carried out President Obama's personal instruction to him to find Osama bin Laden.

It has been my pleasure to serve as the chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence during this time and to be able to work closely with Mr. Panetta.

I have no doubt that his past experience and his capabilities prepare Leon Panetta to meet the major challenges before the Department of Defense.

With knowledge of CIA operations and analysis, he will come to the Pentagon with a thorough understanding of the situation in Afghanistan as well as the aggravating factors of our relationship with Pakistan. Through CIA analysis and operations, he is also well aware of the other contingencies around the globe where the U.S. military may be called to deploy.

Director Panetta is also well positioned to guide the Department through the constrained budget environment. The budget cuts to the Pentagon have already begun, for the first time in 10 years, with the appropriations bills now moving through the Congress.

The Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, on which I serve, held a hearing last week with Secretary Robert Gates and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ADM Mike Mullen. Both of them expressed concerns that budget cuts not lead to a ''hollow force'' or deprive the Department and the Nation of needed capabilities.

I am confident that Leon Panetta possesses the credentials and experience to make cuts where needed and where prudent, but that he will do so in a way that keeps the military strong and capable, and in a way that maintains the cohesion of the Department and its services.

Beyond Director Panetta's experience is his leadership style, his character, and a deft personal touch. As we all know, personal relationships and the way one approaches things matter a great deal, whether within Cabinet meetings or negotiating with foreign counterparts. Mr. Panetta's approach is effective, and it provides for a very good working relationship with the Congress.

Positions like the Director of the CIA or the Secretary of Defense require a strong character and a strong moral compass, qualities that this nominee possesses.

Let me give you an example. Early in his tenure at the CIA in 2009, Director Panetta was briefed on a number of active and recent intelligence programs. One of them, which I can't describe here, was particularly sensitive and provoked questions and concern. Director Panetta asked the CIA staff if the congressional intelligence committees had been briefed on this program. He was told they had not.

Mr. Panetta immediately requested an urgent meeting with the Intelligence Committee to brief us. He said he found it unacceptable that this program had been withheld from Congress, and terminated it in large part on that basis.

In the 2 years since, he has never declined to answer a question or provide us with his candid views. He has been completely forthright, and motivated only by what is best for the CIA, and more importantly, this nation.

The Department of Defense is the largest Department in the Federal Government. As Secretary Gates recently noted, the health care budget of the Department of Defense is bigger than the entire budget of the CIA. The Secretary of Defense is responsible for thousands of young men and women serving in Afghanistan, Iraq, and deployed around the world, and bears the burden of every death and casualty we suffer.

I agree with Secretary Gates that no other position can fully prepare someone to be Secretary of Defense. But I believe that Leon Panetta, who has served honorably and successfully in Congress, at the Office of Management and Budget, at the White House, and now the CIA, is uniquely qualified to be

another outstanding Secretary of Defense in this very challenging time.

I urge his confirmation.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to enthusiastically support the nomination of Leon Panetta, the current Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, to be the 23rd Secretary of Defense.

Director Panetta has contributed nearly five decades of public service to our Nation, including as an officer in the U.S. Army, a distinguished Congressman, and most recently as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, a position for which he was confirmed by the Senate on February 12, 2009. He and I served together in the House of Representatives from my first term in 1979 until he departed in 1993 to become Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Over the past 2½ years, I have had the opportunity to frequently work with Director Panetta, in my role as a senior member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

Like his predecessor, Dr. Robert Gates—who also served as CIA Director before becoming Secretary of Defense—Director Panetta brings to the Pentagon a wealth of experience built over a lifetime of service to his Nation and his fellow Americans. Over the past 2½ years, Director Panetta has repaired a damaged relationship between the CIA and Congress, an impressive accomplishment, to say the least, and led the agency and the Nation's human intelligence activities at a time when the Nation waged two wars and contended with such threats as Islamic extremism, terrorism, and cyber intrusion and attack.

And of course, Director Panetta will forever be remembered as the CIA Director during the May 1, 2011, mission in which U.S. forces once and for all rid the world of public enemy No. 1 and brought justice to the evil incarnate that was Osama bin Laden. On that night, the combined might of our Nations military, intelligence, and counterterrorism professionals sent the unmistakable message to the terrorists of the world that America will prevail in this fight.

I deeply appreciate Director Panetta's efforts at the CIA, and believe he leaves the entire Agency, from the halls of Langley to its agents in the farthest reaches of the world, a better and more capable organization than it was when he arrived. I am confident that Director Panetta's unique experiences within the military, the Congress, and the intelligence communities will serve him, the Department of Defense, and the Nation well when he assumes the role of Secretary of Defense.

More than 4½ years ago, in December 2006, I rose in support of the nomination of Dr. Gates for the position for which we consider Director Panetta today. At the time, I said that Dr. Gates and the Nation were facing the imperative of charting a new course and strategy in Iraq, rising violence in Afghanistan, global terrorism, the threats posed by nuclear states such as North Korea and possibly Iran, and the increasing strains on our military.

Director Panetta faces similar challenges today. He must continue to help shape our role in Iraq, define our strategy for the Nation's future involvement in Afghanistan, and recapitalize and reconstitute the elements of our military that have been at war for nearly a decade, while ensuring that the U.S. military is prepared to meet and overcome any hurdle on the horizon, whether in North Korea, China, Africa, the Middle East, Eastern Europe, or other, as yet unknowable, places around this globe.

At his confirmation hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee on June 9, Director Panetta said, ''We are no longer in the Cold War. This is more like the blizzard war—a blizzard of challenges that draws speed and intensity from terrorism, from rapidly developing technologies, and the rising number of powers on the world stage.''

Director Panetta must confront the unpredictable vagaries of this ''blizzard war'' within perhaps the most arduous budgetary environment our Nation has faced since the Great Depression—an environment in which President Obama has already called for $400 billion in reductions to national security spending over the next decade, much of which will come out of Department of Defense budgets.

It is hard to imagine how exactly cuts of hundreds of billions of dollars to national security budgets can be possible without both significant tradeoffs and a fundamental retooling of our national security strategy. Perhaps more imperative than any other task confronting him, Director Panetta will likely be the individual most responsible for ensuring that our national security strategy is appropriate for meeting our global and national security interests, and that our defense budgets are sufficient to meet those challenges.

In this era in which distance alone is insufficient to insulate the United States and our global interests from terrorists and nations that wish to do us harm, Director Panetta faces the extraordinary task of ensuring that our Armed Forces remain able to defeat today's conventional and irregular threats, project power and U.S. presence around the world, and develop the war fighting capabilities necessary for our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines to prevail in the conflicts of the future.

If any nominee possesses the defense and budget bona fides required for such times, it is Director Panetta, who has demonstrated his capabilities as Director of the CIA, as former OMB Director, and as the former chair of the House Budget Committee. I believe that he is well prepared for the challenges of leading the Department of Defense, and I will vote to confirm Director Panetta as our 23rd Secretary of Defense.

On a final note, Secretary Gates will soon take leave from his post at the Pentagon, and I believe that he will be remembered for his consummate role in transforming our Nation's military from a force that focused on Cold War operations to one that was capable of defeating threats in Iraq and Afghanistan, while possessing the flexibility necessary to successfully carry out a mission like the one that killed bin Laden.

As Secretary Gates prepares to depart public life, I would like to thank him for the countless sacrifices he has made over a lifetime of contributions to the nation, which includes serving eight Presidents, as well as the distinctions of being the only Secretary of Defense in U.S. history asked to remain in that office by a newly elected President, and the only career officer in the CIA's history to rise from entry-level employee to Director. These two standout achievements speak volumes about Secretary Gates' work ethic and love of country. Our country and our security have been forever enhanced by his dedication to public service, and I wish him well in his future endeavors.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANCHIN. 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. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I have the utmost respect for the Senator from Arizona and his commitment to this country and his service to this country.

I can only report what I have seen. I was in Afghanistan twice—as a Governor in 2006, representing the National Guard of West Virginia, and I went back in 2010. While there, I saw deterioration. I did not see a country that had an infrastructure and an economy. I saw corrupt leadership and nothing good coming of it.

With that, I know that the Senator has had much more experience. I can only speak from common sense and for the people of West Virginia about what they feel. We are a very hawkish State and a patriotic State. If 10 years is not enough, how long is enough—I think that is the question being asked—for the sacrifices being asked of them? When we cannot buy water lines and sewer lines or fix roads and repair bridges in West Virginia, yet they hear about the billions we are spending in a country that doesn't want us there, I think it is time to leave.

Respectfully, that might be the disagreement we have.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. 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. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Leon Panetta for Secretary of Defense. The President has chosen wisely. He has a terrific national security team in place. General Petraeus has become the CIA Director. Mr. Donilon has done a great job as National Security Adviser. In Leon Panetta, the President could not have chosen better. I am pleased with Ambassador Crocker, Ambassador Eikenberry, and General Petraeus did a heck of a job in Afghanistan. Ambassador Crocker will be the best we have to offer on that side for the military-civilian partnership in Afghanistan.

Leon Panetta heading up the Department of Defense is a home-run choice. I have known Leon for quite a while. I want to let the country know I think the President made a very wise decision. Tomorrow night, he is supposed to tell us about Afghanistan.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I wish to add my accolades about Leon Panetta. I know him well. We roomed together for 11 years here in Washington. He is a strong, smart, honorable, and devout man. He will be a great Secretary of Defense. I thank my colleague for praising him and add my accolades.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, that shows you how bipartisan it is going to be—GRAHAM and SCHUMER. That shows you the depth and breadth of Leon Panetta—the way people view him here.

One of the first decisions he will have to make is what to tell the President about Afghanistan. I know we are war weary and have been there for 10 years. We didn't just throw a dart at the map when we decided to go there. That is the place the Taliban was controlling, they invited al-Qaida to be their honored guests, and bin Laden had a welcome home in Afghanistan. The rest is history.

President Bush understood that the Taliban was a force for evil. They allowed bin Laden to come to Afghanistan and plan the 9/11 attacks. They had a choice to make, and they chose poorly. We went in there to take the Taliban down.

We have a war in Iraq—and we can debate whether we should have done that. One of the reasons we are still not where we would like to be 10 years later is because a lot of the resources we had in Afghanistan went to Iraq. Now we finally got it right.

For the last 17 months, we have had enough troops in Afghanistan to make a difference. To President Obama, that was a hard decision for you to make—to add 30,000 additional troops at a time when most people said: Why are we still there? Can't we come home? But the President chose wisely, and 2014 is the transition goal—to transition to Afghan control. I think we are well on track.

Tomorrow night, the President will tell us about withdrawing troops. I believe we can, not because we are tired but because of the success on the ground. Let me point out some successes that would allow the President to make a reasoned judgment to withdraw troops. The one thing I urge the President to do is never lose sight of why we went there and our national security goals in Afghanistan. We will all be judged by what we leave behind. We want to leave behind the ability of the Afghan people to say no to the Taliban and reject extremism. They have the will, but they don't have the capacity yet. But they are getting there. Anytime you have the desire of the people who are oppressed by the Taliban and al-Qaida and you can help them help themselves, that makes it all safer.

Here is what happened since the President sent surge forces in. In November of 2009, there were two nations and 30 NATO trainers—two nations helping train the Afghan security forces from NATO. They had a combined 30 people. You could put them all in a bus. One thing the President did when he surged American forces in was that he insisted NATO step up their game. Here we are today, and we have 1,300 NATO trainers in Afghanistan with 32 countries providing assistance. We have 49 different countries helping in some form of training.

In the last 17 months, we have added 90,000 Afghan Army and police forces. So there has been a surge, far beyond the American coalition surge, in Afghan forces. How did that happen? We have better training. In September of 2009, 800 people were joining the Afghan Army per month. They were losing 2,000 a month. That was a terrible trend. In December of 2009, because of this new construct we came up with, we have been averaging 6,000 army recruits a month and 3,000 for the police. Today, we have 160,000 in the Afghan National Army and 126,000 in the Afghan National Police. By the end of the year, we will have 305,000 army and police under arms in Afghanistan. And the reason that has happened is because we have changed the way we train the Afghan security forces.

So I hope the President, listening to Leon Panetta, Secretary Gates, and Secretary Petraeus, will tell the American people we can start bringing forces home beginning this summer because we have been successful, and we are not going to do anything to undermine that success because it has come at such a heavy price.

In reality, ladies and gentlemen, we have been in Afghanistan with the right configuration for about 18 months. The army retention rates today in the Afghan Army are 69 percent—almost doubled. The literacy rate among the Afghan Army and police force is twice that of the national population because we have focused on literacy. It is hard to be a policeman or army officer if you can't read or write. We are helping a people who have been dirt poor, who have been at war for 30 years, and who have been treated very poorly by everybody in the world. At the end of the day, it is in our national security interest to make sure the country where the Taliban took over and allowed bin Laden to come in as an honored guest never goes back into the hands of an extremist.

I am confident Leon Panetta has the wisdom and background, as the CIA Director, as a former Member of Congress, and as a successful businessperson, to lead the Pentagon at the most challenging time since World War II.

He is taking over from Bob Gates. There is not enough we can say or do for Secretary Gates to thank him. He has had the job for 5 years. When he came on board, Iraq was a hopeless, lost cause in the minds of many, and he and General Petraeus, Ambassador Crocker, and many others—mainly our troops and coalition forces—took an Iraq that was on the verge of an abyss and we are now on the verge of a representative government that can defend itself and be an ally of the United States. Having Saddam Hussein replaced by a representative government in Iraq aligned with us is priceless. If we could as a nation take the place from which we were once attacked and turn it over to people who want to go a different way than the Taliban, and they have the ability to fight back and say no, all of us will be safer.

I congratulate the President on picking Leon Panetta to be Secretary of Defense. I know he has had a lot of hard decisions in the war on terror, and one of the biggest decisions he will make is coming up maybe tomorrow night. I want to work with him, Republicans and Democrats together, in making sure our Nation is never attacked again from Afghanistan. That is possible. We are on the verge of getting that right.

As we draw down troops, I ask the President to please tell those who are left behind still fighting in Afghanistan that he hasn't lost sight of the prize. The prize is not just bringing our troops home, the prize is to make sure their children never have to go back and fight in the future. That is the goal—to withdraw from Afghanistan in a way that we are safer and that our national security is enhanced. We are on the verge of achieving that goal.

What Secretary Panetta and others are going to be challenged with as we go forward in the 21st century is going to be substantial. The enemy is still alive, even though not well. We have punished the enemy—al-Qaida and other extremist groups—but they will not give up easily. At the end of the day, the goal is for our country to be safe, and it will take more than killing bin Laden to do that. Killing bin Laden was a form of justice long overdue, and it did make us safer, but the ultimate security in this world lies not with our ability to kill individuals but with our ability to help those who need to fight in their own backyard and protect

themselves from terrorism. That really is security that is sustainable.

If we can leave Afghanistan in 2014 in a fashion that they have the capacity to marry up with their will to say no to the Taliban and turn their country around toward the light and not the darkness, then I say without any doubt that our country did them right. If we cut this operation short because we are tired and weary, we will pay a price. Our values are so much better than the enemy's. They have patience and bad ideas. We have a lot of good ideas for the future of mankind. The question is, Do we have the patience to make sure those ideas can flourish?

This is a long, hard war, fought by a few. We are on the verge of success. I could not think of a better person to lead us to a complete success, an enduring success, than Leon Panetta. So I look forward, in a bipartisan fashion, to voting for I think one of the best choices the President could have made as Secretary of Defense.

To Bob Gates, I would say: Whatever you do in retirement, wherever you go, you have my respect, my admiration, and on behalf of the American people you will go down in history as one of the steadiest hands America could have ever had during challenging times.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, first, let me thank the Senator from South Carolina for his analysis on Afghanistan as well as his great support for Leon Panetta and his comments about Bob Gates, which I very much share and commented about this afternoon in a very similar way.

I particularly wish to commend Senator GRAHAM for his analysis of what has changed in Afghanistan in the last 17 or 18 months, so that the reductions which will be announced tomorrow are not based on getting tired but are being based, I am sure, on the conditions on the ground or in Afghanistan and on the critical changes which have taken place in Afghanistan.

I very much agree with his assessment about the surge in the Afghan forces. I was listening to his comments from a monitor, and when I heard his analysis about 90,000 additional Afghan forces, he is exactly right. The surge has not just been 30,000 of our troops but three times as many in terms of Afghan troops. And the importance of that is not just the numbers, not just the training, and not just the literacy, which the Senator pointed out, but also the mentoring and the partnering in the field with coalition forces.

We have tracked this very carefully, and there has been a significant increase in the number of Afghan units that consistently are in the field partnering with our troops and with other coalition members' troops, and that makes a huge difference too because when the Afghan people see Afghan troops in the lead instead of foreign nations' troops in the lead, they understand that, in fact, the Taliban's argument that they are being occupied is a false propaganda argument, and that weakens the Taliban tremendously as well.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the time to have some good bipartisanship.

Senator LEVIN, is it not true—I have to ask you a question—that you have been saying as long as I can remember that the surge that really needs to occur is on the Afghan side?

You have focused like a laser in the last couple of years on training capacity. Not only are we producing 90,000 additional Afghan Army and police forces, 97 percent of them now can pass Western shooting standards. Two years ago, that number was less than a third. Of the NCOs—noncommissioned officers—graduating from the schools in Afghanistan, there is about an 80-percent literacy rate. Two years ago, it was less than 50 percent.

So what I wish to acknowledge is that Senator LEVIN has been focusing on what I think is the ticket home with honor and security: building up an Afghan army and police force that can fight the fight without 100,000 Americans. We are well on the way. If we had not changed our training program—which the Senator has been focused on for a very long time—we would not have had this success. And General Caldwell is one of the unsung heroes of this war.

But I couldn't agree more with my colleague from Michigan. The reason we can bring American troops home is because there are more Afghans to do the fighting. And the Senator mentioned that during the surge in Helmand, it was a 10-to-1 ratio. For every Afghan, there were 10 American forces. It is almost 50–50 today, with a climb to where it will be Afghans in the lead.

The final thought is that among the trainers themselves, the goal by 2013 is to replace NATO trainers with Afghan trainers, and we are well on our way to having a majority of the training done by Afghans themselves. So if we can get the fighting ratios to 1-to-1 this year and improve on that by 2014, we will be able to turn the country over to the Afghan security forces. And I think we have a good plan. Let's just stick with it.

Mr. LEVIN. I want to first of all thank my good friend from South Carolina for those comments. He has been very perceptive of the importance of turning this responsibility over to the Afghans as soon as possible, and we are clearly on track to do exactly that. It is that improvement in the situation on the ground that will allow, hopefully, for a significant reduction that will be announced tomorrow. That is our hope—my hope.

But I think the Senator from South Carolina has seen this right from the beginning, that we wanted success and we could have success in Afghanistan. Indeed, we see some real evidence of that success in the military situation on the ground. If only that could be equivalent to the governance situation, we all would be a lot more comfortable.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the Senator will yield for one final thought, the two big impediments to our success in Afghanistan are Pakistan and poor governance. The reason the Taliban came back is because the governance in Afghanistan was poor, not well-accepted by the people, and lack of security. We now have better security, and I do see signs of better governance. And we have to fix the Pakistan side of the equation. On the Afghan side of the border, we are doing about everything we can do to build up the Afghan people. We will deal with Pakistan and we will deal with better governance, but none of that is possible without better security. Now we have a security environment that I think will lead to better governance. But don't lose sight of the prize, and that is to leave the country in a sustainable manner.

I look forward to working with Senator LEVIN to push the Afghan Government to do their part and also to engage Pakistan and say: What you are doing in Pakistan is unacceptable. Stop the double-dealing. Get involved.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEVIN. I think we know our Presiding Officer, Senator SHAHEEN, is very much into the issue of putting some real pressure on Pakistan to end the Haqqani network's intrusions and excursions into Afghanistan. And I think we are all together on that essential goal of changing Pakistani behavior in terms of what they are allowing to occur on their soil, which is that safe haven, particularly for the Haqqanis.

I again thank my friend from South Carolina, and I am reminded by something he said of an earlier visit I made to Afghanistan, by the way, with a number of colleagues—I think Senator REED and one other Senator were with me. We were with a bunch of Afghan leaders in a small town. This is what they call their Shura. It just happened that they were having this the day we were visiting. There were maybe 50 or 60, 70 guys—old guys, all guys—sitting on the ground on a dirt floor. We intruded, barged in, and I asked one question.

I said: Do you want us here?

The answer: We want you to train our army and leave, and then we will invite you back as guests.

You can't say it much more succinctly.

I thank my colleague.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. We are prepared to yield back the remainder of our time and do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Leon E. Panetta, of California, to be Secretary of Defense?

Mr. LEVIN. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 93 Ex.]

YEAS—100

Akaka	Gillibrand	Moran
Alexander	Graham	Murkowski
Ayotte	Grassley	Murray
Barrasso	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Hatch	Paul
Bennet	Heller	Portman
Bingaman	Hoeven	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hutchison	Reed
Blunt	Inhofe	Reid
Boozman	Inouye	Risch
Boxer	Isakson	Roberts
Brown (MA)	Johanns	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Burr	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Cantwell	Kerry	Schumer
Cardin	Kirk	Sessions
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Kohl	Shelby
Chambliss	Kyl	Snowe
Coats	Landrieu	Stabenow
Coburn	Lautenberg	Tester
Cochran	Leahy	Thune
Collins	Lee	Toomey
Conrad	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Corker	Lugar	Vitter
Cornyn	Manchin	Warner
Crapo	McCain	Webb
DeMint	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	Wyden
Feinstein	Merkley	
Franken	Mikulski	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table.

The President shall be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate shall resume legislative session.

The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, we have 10 minutes. Senators should listen to the debate. It is very important. We have an important vote in just 10 minutes, and it is my understanding that the arrangements have been made that Senator BOXER would close. She would have the final 5 minutes. Does anybody have any problem with that?

I ask unanimous consent that be the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVITALIZATION ACT OF 2011

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 782, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 782) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes.

Pending:

DeMint amendment No. 394, to repeal the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

Paul amendment No. 414, to implement the President's request to increase the statutory limit on the public debt.

Cardin amendment No. 407, to require the FHA to equitably treat home buyers who have repaid in full their FHA-insured mortgages.

Merkley/Snowe amendment No. 428, to establish clear regulatory standards for mortgage servicers.

Kohl amendment No. 389, to amend the Sherman Act to make oil-producing and exporting cartels illegal.

Hutchison amendment No. 423, to delay the implementation of the health reform law in the United States until there is final resolution in pending lawsuits.

Portman amendment No. 417, to provide for the inclusion of independent regulatory agencies in the application of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

Portman amendment No. 418, to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) to strengthen the economic impact analyses for major rules, require agencies to analyze the effect of major rules on jobs, and require adoption of the least burdensome regulatory means.

McCain amendment No. 412, to repeal the wage rate requirements commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act.

Merkley amendment No. 440, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an Energy Efficiency Loan Program under which the Secretary shall make funds available to States to support financial assistance provided by qualified financing entities for making qualified energy efficiency or renewable efficiency improvements.

Coburn modified amendment No. 436, to repeal the Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit.

Brown (MA)/Snowe amendment No. 405, to repeal the imposition of withholding on certain payments made to vendors by government entities.

Inhofe amendment No. 430, to reduce amounts authorized to be appropriated.

Inhofe amendment No. 438, to provide for the establishment of a committee to assess the effects of certain Federal regulatory mandates.

Merkley amendment No. 427, to make a technical correction to the HUBZone designation process.

McCain amendment No. 441 (to Coburn modified amendment No. 436), to prohibit the use of Federal funds to construct ethanol blender pumps or ethanol storage facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 10 minutes of debate only equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I yield back Republican time.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the one thing that all Members of Congress agree we need more of is jobs.

Illinois recently published its most recent statewide unemployment numbers and there is no question that the numbers are disappointing. Following 15 straight months of declining unemployment, unemployment rates rose for the first time to 8.9 percent. The only way to decrease the unemployment rate is to ensure robust job growth in all parts of the country. And while Members from different parties often disagree on how to help create jobs, the Economic Development Administration, EDA, reauthorization before us today is a great example of bipartisan legislation that can help.

On May 1, 1961, President Kennedy signed into law a bill creating the precursor of the Economic Development Agency, the Area Redevelopment Administration, ARA. The ARA was championed by another Illinois Senator and the man who gave me my start as an intern in this building, Senator Paul Douglas.

ARA provided assistance to distressed areas through loans and grants for public facilities; technology and market information; and research grants in order to spur economic growth. Sound familiar? Paul Douglas believed then, as I believe now, there is a proper role for government to play in assisting distressed communities and regions.

Now for 50 years, the ARA and then the EDA have helped communities identify the best strategies for creating economic growth and leveraging private investment to help create jobs. EDA remains focused on assisting distressed communities and communities recovering from disasters.

And it has been very effective. Every Federal dollar invested in EDA projects attracts $7 additional dollars in private investments in these distressed communities. And even in the midst of this last recession and sparse private investments, EDA-funded public/private projects created an estimated 161,500 jobs in the last 2½ years.

In Illinois in 2009 and 2010 alone, EDA funded 52 projects that resulted in nearly $70 million in new investments in the State. But beyond just the numbers, I want to give you some real life examples of EDA's impact in Illinois communities

Under the 2010 EDA Community Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, the city of Galesburg and Knox County identified themselves as significantly impacted by trade. EDA funded a project that allowed for the creation of the Entrepreneurs Innovate & Go Global Initiative to help develop entrepreneurs at every level. The grantees are putting together workshops and training that focuses on entrepreneurship, innovation and globalization. EDA assistance also includes technical

assistance in commercialization that will ultimately help small businesses and new entrepreneurs streamline business plans and create new jobs.

Under the Recovery Act, EDA helped fund the creation of a micro revolving loan fund for Accion Chicago, a spinoff of an international nonprofit organization dedicated to microfinance. ACCION is using the project funds to expand its existing microlending activities in Cook County and to promote entrepreneurship by providing loan capital and financial literacy counseling to clients who don't have access to traditional bank credit. The $1,200,000 revolving loan fund is projected to make 120 loans in the initial round of lending—creating or saving about 400 jobs.

After terrible flooding in 2008 and the subsequent disaster declaration, EDA was able to award $677,000 in disaster supplemental funding to the city of Princeton. The city of Princeton used these funds to build infrastructure for a 137-acre industrial site, including rehabilitation of existing roadway, construction of new roadway, water-main, sewer lines, and city-owned electric and fiber optic cable. This project not only will improve the long-term economic options for the community, but is expected to create 500 jobs and induce $50,000,000 in private investment in the region.

The bill on the floor right now would reauthorize EDA to continue making these necessary investments for an additional 5 years. And it would also improve flexibility and efficiency at the agency. For example, the bill would allow EDA to do more in the most distressed communities by increasing the cap on the Federal share of projects in areas that have very high unemployment rates and very low per capita income. And it would allow communities using EDA's revolving loan fund to more easily shift those dollars to the economic development project with the greatest potential to help the region.

When Senator Douglas led the effort to create ADA he faced opposition from none other than Senator Goldwater. Senator Goldwater argued that distressed regions are, and I quote, ''perfectly normal to the economic cycle of American enterprise, and not in need of government intervention.''

While history has proven he is wrong, at least this is a debatable argument. At least he was grappling with policy issues actually being considered. The reality is, if Congress wants to help create jobs and bring down the unemployment rate, we need to be able to pass simple pieces of legislation that will help create jobs with little to no costs. Instead for the second time in 2 months, we find a jobs bills fillibustered by amendment.

If we can't find a way to work together on bills like EDA reauthorization or SBIR/STTR reauthorization, the American public is justified in believing that we will do nothing to help create jobs. And to borrow a quote from Paul Douglas during his work on ADA, ''The lives of too many human beings are at stake to sit by and do nothing . . .''

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation and move quickly to final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, we have spent many days talking about the importance of the bill before us which would reauthorize the Economic Development Administration. The EDA is a proven success. I think it is instructive that no one on the other side is speaking out against it. It is amazing to me they do not speak out against it, but I have a feeling we may not get this cloture vote. I hope I am wrong.

As I look at ways for us to be bipartisan, there are a couple of areas where I think we can come together. One would certainly be deficit reduction. We Democrats know how to do it. We did it under Bill Clinton, and we are the only party in 50 years to pass a budget that actually brought us to a surplus. We can do that with our friends on the other side, and I am glad there are talks going on.

The other area is job creation and job preservation. The other side says they want to do it with us. This is a golden opportunity for them to join with us. We have seen—and Leader REID knows this because he has selected various jobs bills to bring to the Senate floor. It was not by chance this bill came. He wanted committee chairmen to say which bills had bipartisan support in their committees. We voted this bill out nearly unanimously. We had one objection in a time when things are pretty contentious. Why is it? I will tell you why it is.

One of the best ways to tell you is to quote Senator JOHN CORNYN, who said a $2 million EDA grant for a water tower in Texas will ''pave the way for creation of new jobs and business opportunities.'' That says it all.

We have 27 Republicans who went on the record saying the EDA was a good job creation bill. We know that historically $1 of EDA investment attracts $7 in private sector investment. So while this is a $500 billion bill, if you see that it is $7 for each $1, it is into the millions in terms of the job creation that will follow. As a matter of fact, we know the jobs created will be between about 250,000 and 1 million over the life of the bill. One million jobs. All we need is a cloture vote.

This EDA started in 1965, and it has been supported by Democrats and Republicans. I gave you an example of Senator CORNYN and what he said. These are just some of the people who are supporting us: the Conference of Mayors, the Public Works Association—it goes on into all of our States—the University Economic Development Association—why do they support it? They know this particular program is a spark plug. Put in $1 and attract $7 of private sector investment. People get to work again.

I am just hopeful that we do not see this bill die today. This is a moment in time we can show that we mean what we say. Senator CRAPO said the EDA business grant will help ''keep Idaho firms on the cutting edge.''

Senator LUGAR said EDA funding is ''essential in our efforts to improve the quality of life and the standard of living for Hoosier families.''

It goes on. Senator COLLINS has some beautiful statements. Twenty-seven of our colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, have always supported this legislation. The last time it was signed into law was by George W. Bush, yes, and it passed this Senate unanimously. If this bill goes down because our friends on the other side keep wanting to offer—they have offered tens of amendments. It is up to about 100 amendments: one about the prairie chicken, another one about a lizard—all fine but do not belong on this bill. This bill is about jobs.

I hope our friends will vote with their hearts and will look back on their press releases. I certainly think if they did that, they would cast an ''aye'' vote, and we would pass this bill and do something for jobs in this Nation.

Thank you very much.

I yield back my time, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 38, S. 782, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that act, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Barbara Boxer, Kent Conrad, John F. Kerry, Sheldon Whitehouse, Amy Klobuchar, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeff Bingaman, Jeff Merkley, Patty Murray, Robert Menendez, Jeanne Shaheen, Bernard Sanders, Frank R. Lautenberg, Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Daniel K. Akaka.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 782, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that act, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 94 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Akaka	Begich	Bingaman
Baucus	Bennet	Blumenthal

Boxer	Kerry	Reid
Brown (OH)	Kohl	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Landrieu	Sanders
Cardin	Lautenberg	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Conrad	Lieberman	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Durbin	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Merkley	Warner
Franken	Mikulski	Webb
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Hagan	Nelson (FL)	Wyden
Harkin	Pryor	
Inouye	Reed	

NAYS—51

Alexander	Graham	McCaskill
Ayotte	Grassley	McConnell
Barrasso	Hatch	Moran
Blunt	Heller	Murkowski
Boozman	Hoeven	Nelson (NE)
Brown (MA)	Hutchison	Paul
Burr	Inhofe	Portman
Chambliss	Isakson	Risch
Coats	Johanns	Roberts
Coburn	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Collins	Kirk	Shelby
Corker	Klobuchar	Snowe
Cornyn	Kyl	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
DeMint	Lugar	Vitter
Enzi	McCain	Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 51. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. If we could have the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Senator SCHUMER and Senator ALEXANDER are that far from an agreement that we can move forward on the next bill. So with everyone's patience, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote scheduled to occur immediately—right now—be postponed until Wednesday; that is tomorrow, June 22, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader, and that if cloture is invoked tomorrow, time postcloture be counted as if cloture was invoked at 6 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business until 6 p.m. this evening, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each during this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

NUCLEAR POWER

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about a critical issue for the State of Vermont and for my State's energy future, and that deals with the Vermont Yankee nuclear powerplant. The Vermont Yankee nuclear powerplant is one of 23 plants in our country with the same design—General Electric Mark One—as the Fukushima plants that have experienced partial or perhaps full meltdowns in Japan.

All of us feel terribly about what has happened in Japan, and our hearts go out to that struggling country. But at the same time, in our Nation, we also have some very disturbing developments regarding nuclear power, and I wish to touch this afternoon on two of them.

The first is, we have a situation in the State of Vermont in which a powerful $14 billion energy company called Entergy is trying to force the people of my State to keep an aging and troubled nuclear reactor open for another 20 years. This is a plant that is 40 years old. They want to keep it open for another 20 years. The Vermont Yankee plant's original 40-year license expires in March of 2012, and I firmly believe 40 years is enough. But that is not just my opinion.

Vermont, uniquely, thanks in part to an agreement between the State and Entergy when it purchased Vermont Yankee in 2002, has asserted its authority through our State legislature to decide whether Vermont Yankee should operate beyond March of 2012. The Vermont State Senate, representing the wishes of the people of our State, voted on a bipartisan basis, 26 to 4—26 to 4—not to grant an extension of the license of that plant. The law is clear that States have the right to reject nuclear power for economic reasons, and that is exactly what the Vermont State Senate did in an overwhelming bipartisan vote.

We know Vermont Yankee has had serious problems in the last several years, including a collapse of its cooling towers in 2007 and radioactive tritium leaks in 2005 and 2010. The tritium leaks came from pipes plant officials claimed under oath did not exist.

In support of the Vermont legislature's decision, the Vermont congressional delegation has been clear that Entergy should respect Vermont's laws. In other words, what we are saying—the delegation here—is that Entergy should respect the laws of the State of Vermont and what our State senate has done. However, just last week, we learned that Entergy's well-paid corporate lobbyists and lawyers have been meeting in secret with Federal agencies, including the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff, pushing the Federal Government to intervene in the lawsuit Entergy filed against Vermont. Entergy wants the Federal Government to take up its extreme argument that Vermont's right to decide its own energy future is preempted by Federal nuclear safety laws.

It so happens that NRC Chairman Greg Jazcko, who is, in my view, a fair-minded public servant, does not agree with Entergy. He told me last week at a Senate hearing that ''I see nothing that would tell me that there's a preemption issue here.'' He said in a conversation with reporters that Vermont had a ''role to play in determining Vermont Yankee's future'' and that he ''doubted the NRC would do anything to interfere with the state's process.'' I believe the Chairman's position is correct. The NRC regulates safety—safety—although some Vermonters believe they do not do that very well. Nevertheless, it is not the arbiter of political or legal disputes between a powerful energy company and the State of Vermont. That is not the business of the NRC.

So I was very surprised to learn last week that against the Chairman's public recommendation, the NRC voted in secret, by a 3-to-2 margin, to tell the Department of Justice to intervene on Entergy's behalf. When I questioned the NRC's Commissioners at a hearing last week, they refused to tell us how they voted. Several of them admitted they had not even read the major 1983 Supreme Court opinion on this issue—a case between PG&E v. California, where the Supreme Court said—and I quote an important point regarding States rights and nuclear energy. This is the quote from the Supreme Court:

> The promotion of nuclear power is not to be accomplished ''at all costs.'' The elaborate licensing and safety provisions and the continued preservation of state regulation in traditional areas belie that. Moreover, Congress has allowed the states to determine—as a matter of economics—whether a nuclear plant vis-a-vis a fossil fuel plant should be built. The decision of California to exercise that authority does not, in itself, constitute a basis for preemption. . . . the legal reality remains that Congress has left sufficient authority in the states to allow the development of nuclear power to be slowed or even stopped for economic reasons.

That is the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, 1983.

I reminded the NRC at that hearing, and do so again today, that this lawsuit is none of their business, and their getting involved damages the credibility of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The NRC opted to relicense Vermont Yankee based on safety, and that is where their concern and authority begins and ends. The main point is this: The NRC does not represent the people of Vermont and has no right to tell us what kind of energy future we will have. The people of Vermont believe—and I agree—that our future lies significantly with energy efficiency and sustainable energy. Today, I renew my call on the floor of the Senate for the Federal Government to stay out of this case. Entergy is a $14 billion corporation. They have all kinds of lobbyists and they make all kinds of campaign contributions. They don't need the help of the Federal Government.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SANDERS. Yes.

Mrs. BOXER. I am very pleased the Senator took to the floor to speak to the American people about what they are going through in his State. I am

not as familiar with the condition of the nuclear powerplant, so I will not go there. I trust my friend's judgment. There are some serious issues raised—a different design of the plant—and the fact that it is close or identical to the design of the plant in Japan that had all the issues. Here is the point. I support the Senator. I was proud of the way he questioned the issues.

I will pose a question to the Senator. Isn't it true that there is a lot of talk around Washington about how States rights should be protected?

Mr. SANDERS. I tell my good friend from California, day after day, we hear from some of our colleagues how they don't trust the Federal Government and they don't want the Federal Government getting involved in the issues impacting their constituents. So the answer to the Senator's question is yes.

Mrs. BOXER. Building on that, isn't it true that the NRC—as we have learned by reading their founding documents—is an independent commission; isn't that a fact?

Mr. SANDERS. Yes, that is true.

Mrs. BOXER. I say to my friend, given those two points, plus the ones my friend made, it seems untenable that the NRC, which is supposed to be an independent agency, would assert itself into a matter between the State of Vermont and a private company. I just say, as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, how strongly I support what the Senator is trying to do, which is to allow his State to, frankly, have a say over something as important as the economics surrounding energy. My friend knows we work hard in this day and age to make sure America can leap forward and save energy and lead the world and invent alternatives.

In light of what happened in Japan, this becomes more and more important. I hope my friend will take heart and know that this chairman of the committee stands with him on this battle.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank Senator BOXER for her thoughts and the extraordinary leadership she is providing on the Environment Committee.

I think everyone understands that the function of the NRC is very simple. It is to make sure the 104 nuclear powerplants in this country run as safely as possible. That is their job. Their job is not to tell the State of Vermont or the State of California or the State of Pennsylvania what future they might want to pursue in terms of energy. They are not supposed to be a proponent of the nuclear industry. That is not their job. Their job is to make sure our nuclear plants are being run safely. So in terms of economics, the people of Vermont or any other State in this country have the right to determine what the future of nuclear powerplants is in their State. What our State is saying is, after 40 years, we want to shut down Vermont Yankee. We want to move in a new direction that we think benefits our State. We do not want the Department of Justice to intervene in this case, where Entergy is suing Vermont.

Let me conclude, while we are on the issue of nuclear power, and point out that the Associated Press recently revealed that 48 out of 65 nuclear power sites in this country have leaked radioactive tritium, and Vermont Yankee is one of those sites. Thirty-seven facilities had leaks at levels that violated Federal drinking water standards, and some leaks have migrated off the sites, contaminating private wells, although none is yet known to have contaminated public drinking water supplies.

These allegations by the Associated Press are extremely disturbing. Safety at our nuclear plants should be the most important priority at the NRC, particularly after what we saw happen in Japan. The function of the NRC is not to represent the nuclear power industry; it is to represent the needs of the people of the United States.

That is why I will be working as a member of the Environment Committee, which has oversight over the NRC, with our chairperson, Senator BARBARA BOXER, and others on the committee who are interested in this issue, to call for a GAO investigation of the allegations made by the Associated Press. We need to determine whether it is true that the NRC is systematically working with the industry to undermine safety standards for aging plants in order to keep them operating.

Let me conclude by mentioning that around the world there is growing concern about the dangers of nuclear power, and I think that concern has been heightened by the terrible tragedy in Japan. It is important to note that Germany has decided to close all 17 nuclear plants in the next decade and not to build any new ones. They are getting out of the nuclear business. Switzerland is also phasing out nuclear power. In Italy, just a few weeks ago, 94 percent of the people voted in an election against restarting the nuclear power industry.

Here in the United States, some States are moving in the same direction. In addition to Vermont, New York, led by Governor Cuomo, wants the Indian Point plant shut down. Massachusetts is supporting Vermont in its lawsuit to preserve States rights to decide their own energy future, and I believe other States will support us as well.

The bottom line—and the law supports this—is that if States such as Vermont want to move away from aging and troubled nuclear reactors and to a sustainable energy future, we have the right to do that. I will fight tooth and nail to protect that right.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, Senate Republicans, in their typically unanimous way, just blocked this Chamber from even voting on the Economic Development Revitalization Act of 2011.

We heard Senator BOXER point out how many Republicans have supported the Economic Development Administration many times in what they did for economic development in their States. We know in Vermont, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, how EDA works with small Federal investments, leveraging that money in the private sector through incubators, in many cases, or accelerators or whatever the communities call them, and they do, in fact, create jobs. Unfortunately, every Republican in this Chamber decided that wasn't such a good thing—perhaps to deny a political victory to President Obama. What it did was take away another tool to get this economy back on course.

So many people in this body seem to think it is all about reducing the debt. It is about reducing the debt, but it needs to be largely about creating jobs. There doesn't seem to be that much interest in that on the other side of the aisle.

Just last week, I spoke with economic development directors and county commissioners from the city of Moraine, a suburb of Dayton where a GM plant closed, and Ashtabula County, my wife's home county in the northeast corner of the State. They explained the importance of EDA funding and how it supports economic growth in their communities.

EDA has traditionally been a noncontroversial and bipartisan job-creation bill. It helps broker deals between the public and private sectors, which is critical to economic growth and recovery. It is particularly important to economically distressed communities and in these types of economic times.

Every $1 of EDA grant funding leverages $7 worth of private investment. For every $10,000—and this is one study, proven by evidence and fact—of EDA investment in business incubators, which helps entrepreneurs start companies, between 50 and 70 jobs are created. When we put money into the Youngstown incubator or a bit of Federal money into LaunchHouse in Shaker Heights—an incubator just launched, if you will—it creates jobs. It helps entrepreneurs and startup companies create jobs in our communities. Some of these businesses will fail. A few of them will wildly succeed. Many will hang on for several years, hiring 5, 10, 20 or maybe hundreds of people.

In Ohio, since 2006, more than 40 EDA grants worth $36 million have leveraged a total of more than $87 million once private resources were matched.

Colleges and universities from Bowling Green in the northwest to Ohio University in the southeast, to Miami

in the southwest, have received EDA funds. So too have port authorities in Toledo and Ashtabula—the Presiding Officer's border with Erie—in that part of Ohio and entrepreneurs in Cleveland and Appalachia.

If we are going to strengthen our competitiveness, communities will need to equip businesses with the tools they need to survive, and communities will need to create higher skill, living wage jobs and attract private investment.

That is what EDA is designed to do; it is the ''front door'' for communities facing sudden and severe economic distress.

When economic disaster hits, communities turn to the government, and in so many cases it is EDA that does the job.

EDA has helped redevelop the former GM plant in Moraine—several thousand GM jobs, Frigidaire jobs. Because of EDA, local partnerships, and outside private investments, we expect to see hundreds and hundreds, maybe a few thousand jobs in manufacturing in that Moraine plant. We have seen EDA help redevelop the DHL plant in Wilmington. Ashtabula's Plant C received EDA investments to make vital repairs. The bill Republicans just blocked us from even voting on would have strengthened a proven job-creating program.

How many times do we hear about businesses worried about uncertainty created in a still recovering economy? This bill would have provided certainty in funding for an established job-creating problem. It would have reduced regulatory burdens to increase flexibility for grantees. It would have encouraged public-private partnerships that we have already seen make a difference across Ohio.

I offered two amendments that would have further strengthened EDA. One would have assisted former auto communities when a plant closure or downsizing causes economic distress, such as Wilmington or Moraine.

The other would have made more Ohio communities eligible to receive funds for business incubators. Ohio is the home of the National Business Incubator Association—the trade association for all incubators in southeast Ohio and Athens. We have a model for business incubators in Toledo, Youngstown, and now Shaker Heights.

This amendment would have allowed more Ohio communities to support homegrown entrepreneurship.

Republican Senators chose to bog down the EDA bill with other unrelated amendments. All of them were unrelated to the task at hand; that is, how do we create jobs? Just yesterday, I was at Cleveland State University, where its Veteran Student Success Program goes above and beyond in serving our Nation's veterans.

Unemployment among young Americans is especially acute and disproportionately affects young veterans, and that is an outrage. Today, the unemployment rate for returning servicemembers between 20 and 24 is 27 percent—almost 3 times the national unemployment average. That means more than one in four veterans can't find a job to support his or her family, easing the transition to civilian life. When our economy needs their skills, when veterans can get the job done, too often veterans are turned away. Cleveland State University has a Project SERV Program to ensure servicemembers who return home and into the classroom receive the educational benefits they earned and deserve. Imagine the difficulty for someone 25 years old, who has done two combat tours in Iraq, who comes back to Cleveland or to Philadelphia or anywhere else in this country and tries to integrate into a classroom of 18- and 19-year-olds who have seen nothing like the 25-year-old who has been in combat in Iraq or Afghanistan.

This Project SERV at Cleveland State has been groundbreaking and is one of the few in the country—and now at Youngstown State University. What they are doing is establishing veteran support programs at colleges and universities. It started as an idea at a community roundtable I convened at Cleveland State a few years ago. It became law in the last Congress, and we have ensured its funding.

Yesterday, I met with Clarence Rowe, a staff sergeant in the Marine Corps, who is using the veterans resources at CSU to translate his military skills to the needs of the civilian job market. But as much as CSU and other universities do to assist our veterans, high unemployment continues to hurt all Americans. Too often, people such as Staff Sergeant Rowe, who has put years into serving his country, come back and, even with developing their job skills in school, they simply can't find jobs.

Education, workforce investment, and EDA have long been sound Federal investments that have helped to create jobs and strengthen our economy. It is a shame Republicans have yet again placed a roadblock on the pathway toward a strong and more prosperous middle class. We can do better than that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise tonight to speak about our policy in Afghanistan. We know the President is about to announce a major decision on the policy. As the President determines the degree and scope of the drawdown in Afghanistan, there will be a lot of debate, about troop levels, principally. But while this is an important discussion, we need to step back and comprehensively focus on overall U.S. strategic interests in the region.

Over the course of my time in the Senate, some 4½ years now, I have participated in more than 20 Foreign Relations Committee hearings on Afghanistan and Pakistan. This week we will hear from Secretary Clinton on the U.S. policy on both Afghanistan and Pakistan. I personally chaired four hearings on U.S. policy in the region, I have traveled to Afghanistan and Pakistan on two occasions, and met with our military and civilian leadership as well as senior government officials in both countries. I have spoken repeatedly on the Senate floor about the importance of accountability of U.S. military and civilian programs.

When it comes to matters of war, the Senate has a special responsibility to ask questions and to hold the executive branch accountable no matter what party is in the White House. I have taken this responsibility very seriously and have repeatedly questioned and examined U.S. policy in south Asia.

There has been substantial progress in Afghanistan. On the battlefield, the United States coalition and Afghan forces have rolled back advances made by the Taliban. We have made measurable, albeit fragile, gains on security in key provinces of the country. Al-Qaida, operating from Pakistan, has been significantly degraded.

There has also been measurable progress in the education and health fields. Only 900,000 boys and no girls attended school under the Taliban. Today more than 6 million children are in school and a third of them are girls. In the field of health, more than 85 percent of Afghans now have access to at least some form of health care, up from 9 percent in the year 2002.

These gains have not come without immeasurable sacrifice on the part of our Armed Forces and of course their families. In Pennsylvania we have lost 30 servicemembers killed in action in Operation Enduring Freedom since 2001. To date, 461 have been wounded, some of them grievously wounded.

In Iraq, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania lost 197 servicemembers killed in action and 1,233 were wounded. These courageous men and women gave what many years ago Lincoln called ''the last full measure of devotion'' to their country. We owe them a debt of gratitude. We owe the same debt of gratitude to their families and to all veterans and their families returning from the battlefield.

After this exhaustive review, and based upon measurable gains in Afghanistan, I believe the United States can shift from a strategy of counterinsurgency toward an increased focus on counterterrorism. It is time for the United States to lighten its footprint in the country. It is also a time to accelerate the shift in responsibility to Afghan forces and for a drawdown of a significant number of United States troops from Afghanistan. The capabilities of both al-Qaida and the Taliban have been severely degraded.

The United States-led development projects have strengthened the health and education sectors, as I mentioned before. At a time of economic austerity here in the United States, the approximately $120 billion per year pricetag is, for sure, unsustainable. We must take a significant shift in our strategy.

As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Near Eastern, South, Central Asian Affairs, I am focused on our broader national security interests in both regions. We must focus on extremist groups that have the capability and intent to project terrorism on the United States homeland and interests around the world. We should continue to conduct counterterror operations on al-Qaida, Pakistani Taliban, and others who seek to strike the United States homeland and our interests.

Significant challenges, however, do remain and the United States should focus on the following. First, we must redouble our efforts to train the Afghan security forces. We made substantial progress in recruiting and training, but this needs to be ramped up. In the long run, Afghanistan's ability to deny safe haven to al-Qaida or any terrorist organization will depend upon a strong and durable army and police in Afghanistan.

Second, much work remains in Pakistan. In Senate hearings and meetings with U.S. and Pakistani officials, I have questioned Pakistan's full commitment to addressing the extremist threat within its borders. For example, Pakistan has done little to stop the flow of bomb components across the border into Afghanistan, where they are used against our troops. Terrorists in Pakistan have the capability to strike internationally, and have done so in recent years.

These terrorists are also the central threat to the Pakistani state itself, a concern that grows as Pakistan inexplicably expands its nuclear arsenal.

The Pakistani people have suffered greatly in the struggle against these extremist groups as thousands of civilians and security forces have died. This is precisely why it is so unfortunate that the Pakistani Government is not fully committed to confronting this threat.

I have been very patient with respect to this critical relationship, but I am compelled to speak the truth when the stakes are so high for the American people. The United States troops and the people of Pakistan both have a lot at stake, in addition to the American people. In my judgment, recent developments are unacceptable and merit a serious examination of U.S. aid to Pakistan. The Senate should hold hearings so we have a full accounting of Pakistan's efforts to combat terrorism.

The third area of our focus should be the grave concerns that many of us have—and I have for sure—about the future of women and girls in Afghanistan. If nothing else, we cannot lose precious ground gained in rights for this critical 50 percent of the population—women and girls. Over the past 10 years, women have assumed seats in Parliament and girls have returned to school. I mentioned the number earlier. Women's rights have become a part of the public dialog at long last.

When speaking to a group of Afghan women in May, Secretary of State Clinton said, ''We will not abandon you, we will stand with you always.''

We must as a nation stand by this commitment to the women and girls who live in Afghanistan. Empowered women are the most influential voice to dissuade young men from taking up arms in Afghanistan and places around the world. These women are the most likely to develop their own communities as well.

Finally and most importantly, it is our moral obligation to protect those who are most vulnerable in Afghanistan.

I have significant concerns about governance in Afghanistan. I have closely examined Afghanistan's uneven governance record and have serious questions about the viability of the democratic experiment in that country. The foundational act of democracy, elections, has not met international standards in Afghanistan and has established the basis for an unresponsive government and unresponsive government officials and corruption.

As the United States draws down its military presence, the international community must renew its focus on governance in Afghanistan and efficient disbursal of U.S. assistance. A recent Senate Foreign Relations Committee report suggests that we must do a better job of accounting for the resources spent on bolstering the Afghan Government.

In conclusion, we have made progress in Afghanistan all these years. The surge in U.S. troops, working with coalition forces and the Afghan Army, has rolled back gains made by the Taliban. Our special forces have killed Osama bin Laden and several other senior al-Qaida leaders. The numbers and capabilities of the Afghan security forces have increased. Women and girls are better off than they were in the year 2001, and the health sector has improved.

Significant challenges remain, but based upon these advances and on the significant costs of our current policy, it is time, after 10 long years, to begin the drawdown process.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO DR. CONRAD JONES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to recognize a distinguished doctor and Kentuckian, Dr. Conrad Jones. Dr. Jones has risen to become one of the most admired and applauded physicians in the Bluegrass State, a feat that was recognized at the Murray-Calloway County Hospital in 2007 when they opened their new women's health facility and named it the Conrad Jones Women's Pavilion. As Dr. Jones has contributed to the field of women's health for six decades now, it was a very fitting tribute.

When Dr. Jones was born in 1922, there was not yet the MRI, the ultrasound or the home pregnancy test. Dr. Jones's father, Dr. Cody Jones, was also a physician, and a young Conrad would accompany him on his rounds as a country doctor. The Jones family had come to Kentucky from the Carolinas and Tennessee before the Civil War. Conrad's mother was a school teacher who taught in Hazel and at Murray High School.

Conrad remembers his father worked long, hard hours. His father would have preferred that Conrad become a farmer instead of a doctor, in fact, because a doctor's life was too hard. Luckily for the people of Kentucky, Conrad did not take that particular piece of advice.

Dr. Conrad Jones attended Murray State and then went to medical school at the University of Louisville. After serving his country in uniform, he returned to Murray, KY, to work at what was then the new city-county hospital and its obstetrics unit. He helped patients from the immediate area as well as all over Marshall, Graves and Henry counties.

Dr. Jones has practiced medicine in Murray so long he can tell you the history of how medicine and medical technology has advanced in the area. Dr. Jones certainly keeps up with the technology, and is proud that Murray has what he calls by today's standards state-of-the-art facilities.

I wish to commend Dr. Conrad Jones for his many decades of service to his community. The people of Murray, Calloway County and Kentucky are lucky to have him. I know my colleagues join me when I say this U.S. Senate is grateful to him and his family for all he has contributed to make ours a stronger country.

The Murray-Calloway County Chamber of Commerce published a 2008 Viewbook that contained an illuminating article detailing Dr. Conrad Jones's life and career. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed, as follows:

[From the Murray-Calloway County Chamber of Commerce 2008 Viewbook]

MURRAY'S CONRAD JONES: A LIFE IN MEDICINE

(By Robert A. Valentine)

In February 2007, the Murray-Calloway County Hospital opened a state-of-the-art facility dedicated to women's health. Almost everyone there recognized the appropriate name of the new facility: The Conrad Jones Women's Pavilion. Dr. Conrad Jones, who had already witnessed six decades of progress in women's health, was looking on in a state of near-speechless humility.

He was born long before the MRI, the ultrasound or even the home pregnancy test. Most women had yet to vote in their first presidential election, and all but a very, very few babies were born at home. It was a warm October in 1922.

''My father wanted me to be a farmer because a physician's life was hard,'' Dr. Jones told us in an interview in his offices at the Murray Woman's Clinic. He was attracted to the life of the country doctor, despite its perils and long, hard hours. ''Work in the tobacco fields made me know that I didn't want that.''

After Murray State, he entered medical school at the University of Louisville. Following that, he went directly into the service. ''There were few specialists there,'' he remembers. ''You did whatever was necessary for the patient.''

He returned to Murray after the service. By that time, the new city-county hospital had come into being with an obstetrics unit on the second floor of the northwest wing. ''It was pretty crude by today's standards,'' he remembers, ''But it was probably the best OB unit for several counties around. We did about as many deliveries then as we do now,'' Dr. Jones observed, because many patients came from Marshall, Graves and Henry counties.

''Murray has always been a very progressive community in terms of technology'' he reminded us. ''By today's standards, what we have now is the state-of-the-art. This should serve us well for several years.''

We asked Conrad Jones how long he has been in Murray. With a broad smile, he answered, ''Always.'' That makes him the ideal source of information on changes in women's healthcare over the years. We also asked about the most important changes during his career.

''Today there are far more caesarian sections being performed. In the '50s and '60s, if your section rate got above 5 or 6 percent, it was uncommon. Now, we see 23 to 30 percent. Surgery is much safer now, and we have better tracking technology, so you can tell how the fetus is under stress. Fetal monitors were a major step forward by in the late '60s and early '70s.''

Modern techniques make it much safer for the mother. ''Anesthesia is also another big change. Not too many years back, the only anesthesia was the 'saddle block' (a procedure which cuts off sensation in the pelvic region) or nitrous oxide. Now, the epidural has replaced that.''

But the main change is the technology and the facility. The custom of hospital instead of home deliveries has drastically reduced the infant mortality rate. Only two generations ago, maternal and infant mortality was all too common. ''The mothers of today have no idea how dangerous childbirth used to be,'' he recalls with a serious look.

And women are presenting more challenges. Today, there are more career or professional women, and more women remain in the workforce longer. ''The age at which women start families is higher, and I don't know what affect that's going to have on the family. But we know that, as a mother ages, there is a greater risk to her and to the child. However, medicine is keeping pace, I think, so it's safer.'' He points with pride to the work of his associates in fertility treatments and in the new outpatient, non-invasive surgeries for incontinence hysterectomies, and non-surgical permanent birth control. ''Fifty years ago, that would have seemed like a miracle,'' he says.

THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN MURRAY MEDICINE

In the future, he expects to see more women entering medicine, and he welcomes it. ''We had two women in my medical school class of 100; now about half of the classes are women. It's a growing thing, and very important. Most of the pediatricians in Murray are women, and there are two top-notch internists. We have Dr. Deeter and Dr. Burnett in our practice (Murray Woman's Clinic) and three outstanding nurse-practitioners, and that is very important to good, modern family care.''

After so many sleepless nights and the constant drive to remain ''current'' in technology and practice, we had to ask if he would still choose medicine as a career if he were starting over, today. ''Most emphatically, yes! The hours are very difficult, but you get so much joy out of helping others. It's a very happy, joyous experience; you are helping people at a vital time in their lives.''

And what would he tell someone starting out in medicine today? ''Well,'' he smiled, and leaned over his desk, ''You've got to have a good partner—and that's my wife. She was with me all the way; when I was gone all night, she had to be alone. We couldn't take vacations as other folks might, and maybe we missed a lot of things. She has been a real trooper; without her, I couldn't have done it.''

Would he change anything about his career? ''Not a bit,'' he smiled. After all, it has been not merely a career so much as it is a life in medicine.

FELONY STREAMING

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to address S. 978, legislation passed by the Judiciary Committee last week that would increase the penalties for willful copyright infringement by ''streaming.'' I would like to explain why I voted ''pass'' on the bill at the Judiciary Committee markup, and to express what my concern is.

First, I very much appreciate the intent behind this legislation, and commend Senators KLOBUCHAR and CORNYN for bringing it forth. Online infringement of copyrights has had a very serious, detrimental, effect on the entertainment industry, which is based in large part in my State of California. Those who willfully infringe copyrights for the purpose of commercial advantage or private financial gain deserve to be punished like the thieves that they are.

But in doing this, we must make sure that the punishment is proportionate to the crime. This bill simply copies the penalty structure from the current law that makes larger scale illegal downloading a felony. That law makes ''the reproduction or distribution, including by electronic means''—i.e. downloading—a felony punishable by up to 5 years imprisonment, if it involves: 10 or more copies; with a total retail value of more than $2,500; and within a 180-day period.

This bill just replicates that penalty structure, with the additional element of an alternative ''fair market value'' threshold. It makes willful infringement through ''public performances by electronic means''—i.e. streaming—also a felony, subject to the same 5-year maximum sentence, if it involves: 10 or more public performances; within a 180-day period; with either a total retail or economic value of more than $2,500; or total fair market value of licenses of more than $5,000.

As I stated at the beginning, I have no problem with increased punishment for large-scale infringers, whether they infringe through downloads or through streams. The problem, though, with this structure is that it treats streaming as being as serious as downloading. But a download, in my view, is obviously much more serious, because it makes a permanent copy of the song or movie or show, as opposed to the one-time viewing or listening that streaming creates. This is very likely why downloading was made a felony to begin with, while streaming wasn't. Given that downloading is much more serious and damaging, to have a moral consistency with the downloading penalties, the streaming thresholds, at least in quantity, should be much higher.

Therefore, I hope to work with the bill's sponsors before this legislation goes to the floor, to craft a more appropriate threshold, which reflects the differences between downloading and streaming. As the sponsors and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY, have stated, there are other outstanding issues that they are committed to addressing before this bill comes to the floor, and I hope this concern that I have can be resolved in the same way.

SUMMER LEARNING

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss the importance of summer learning, and to draw attention to the significance of high-quality summer learning opportunities in the lives of young people.

The effort to keep kids learning during summer is based on research that shows that without effective summer learning opportunities: students fall more than 2 months behind in math over the summer; low-income children fall behind 2 to 3 months in reading each summer; and that by the end of fifth grade, lower income children can be nearly 3 years behind their higher income peers in reading.

Last year, nearly 500 events were held nationwide that highlighted how summer learning programs advance academic growth, support working families, keep children safe and send students back to school ready to learn.

I am proud to recognize the importance of summer learning and encourage communities across the country to celebrate and acknowledge the importance of providing all young people with high-quality learning opportunities during the summer months.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO LINDA RUNDELL

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, today I recognize Ms. Linda Rundell, the Bureau of Land Management's New Mexico State director, for her exemplary public service and to express my congratulations on her upcoming retirement after 32 years.

Linda has held many titles during her time with BLM, including range

conservationist, wildlife biologist, environmental impact statement team leader, program analyst, congressional fellow, and district manager. And her work has taken her to nearly as many parts of our country, including Alaska, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington, DC.

But the majority of her career has kept her in my home State of New Mexico where she will finish her tenure with BLM as State director for New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and Kansas. Since 2002, Linda has overseen an annual budget of $250 million and is responsible for 13.4 million acres of public lands in New Mexico and nearly 54 million acres of Federal and tribal subsurface minerals underlying non-BLM lands in the four States.

With a mission of multiple-use management, the BLM is tasked with balancing competing uses of our public land—including oil and gas development, wildlife protection, recreation, grazing, landscape conservation, and cultural resource protection—to name just a few. Attempting to balance these activities can be a challenging task for any land manager. However, Linda's career demonstrates how well she has personified this mission by assisting groups with opposing viewpoints to find common ground through collaboration.

Restore New Mexico, a program Linda established in 2005, demonstrates the benefits that can be achieved through collaboration. In only about 6 years the BLM—in partnership with environmental groups, ranchers, oil and gas companies, and sportsmen—has begun the restoration of 1.5 million acres of grasslands and woodlands in New Mexico. These efforts are reversing decades and even centuries of habitat fragmentation, encroachment by invasive species, and the legacy of orphaned oil and gas wells across the State. The results have been excellent, and the partnerships that have been built between long-time adversaries cannot be understated. With this collaboration as a framework, the long-term successful restoration of our public lands is more likely than ever.

Linda's impressive record as State director is no doubt a product of what she learned in the years leading up to it. Her background as a wildlife biologist, for example, gave her the foresight to recognize that the BLM had a significant role to play if further population declines of the lesser prairie chicken were to be averted. Before this small grouse began gaining headlines in newspapers, Linda knew that a continued decline of this species would have far-reaching implications. For this reason, she has worked diligently to protect and expand lesser prairie chicken habitat in the State.

Linda exemplifies the attributes found in effective leaders—honesty, a strong work ethic, and a willingness to make the right decision even when it may be difficult. She is highly respected within and outside the agency for her leadership skills and her staff in New Mexico mirror these traits. I appreciate how helpful she and her staff have been while working with my office in the development of various policy initiatives including conservation measures—many of which have been signed into law—like the Ojito Wilderness, Prehistoric Trackways National Monument, Fort Stanton-Snowy River Cave National Conservation Area, and Sabinoso Wilderness.

Linda's tenure as BLM State director will leave a lasting legacy that has and will continue to benefit the health of our public land and wildlife as well as the economy of our State and Nation. Our Nation is grateful for her service, and I wish her the best on her future endeavors.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

At 12:38 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolutions:

S.J. Res. 7. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Shirley Ann Jackson as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Robert P. Kogod as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The enrolled joint resolutions were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 21, 2011, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled joint resolutions:

S.J. Res. 7. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Shirley Ann Jackson as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Robert P. Kogod as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

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–2207. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Robert L. Van Antwerp, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2208. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General David H. Petraeus, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2209. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the RQ–4A/B Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Global Hawk Block 30 Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2210. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to depot-level maintenance and repair workloads by the public and private sectors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2211. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Conservatorship and Receivership'' (RIN2590–AA23) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2212. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Turkey; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2213. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Bangladesh; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2214. A communication from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Atlanta, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's management reports and statements on system of internal controls for fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2215. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Standards for Toddler Beds'' (RIN3041–AC79) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2216. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulation of Fractional Aircraft Ownership Programs and On-Demand Operations; Technical Amendment'' ((RIN2120–AH06) (Docket No. FAA–2001–10047)) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2217. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for General Law, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pipeline Safety: Control Room Management/Human Factors'' (RIN2137–AE64) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2218. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; BAE SYSTEMS (OPERATIONS) LIMITED Model BAe 146 and Avro 146–RJ Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2010–0673)) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2219. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model DC–10–10, DC–10–10F, DC–10–15, DC–10–30, DC–10–30F (KC–10A and KDC–10), DC–10–40, DC–10–40F; Model MD–10–10F, MD–10–30F, and MD–11, and MD–11F Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2010–1044)) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2220. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Various Aircraft Equipped with Rotax Aircraft Engines 912 A Series Engine'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0504)) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2221. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Model DA 42 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0231)) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2222. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Application for Reinstatement and Retroactive Reinstatement for Reasonable Cause under Internal Revenue Code Section 6033(j)'' (Notice No. 2011–44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2223. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers from the Dow Chemical Company in Madison, Illinois, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2224. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers from the Bliss and Laughlin Steel Company located at 110 Hopkins Street, Buffalo, New York, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2225. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers from the Chapman Valve Manufacturing Company (i.e., Building 23 and the Dean Street facility) in Indian Orchard, Massachusetts, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2226. A communication from the Inspector General of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Semi-Annual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2227. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Education's Semi-Annual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2228. A communication from the Staff Director, United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the appointment of members to the Tennessee Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2229. A communication from the Staff Director, United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the appointment of members to the Connecticut Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2230. A communication from the Staff Director, U.S. Sentencing Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2010 Annual Report and Sourcebook of Federal Sentencing Statistics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany S. 1103, a bill to extend the term of the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (Rept. No. 112–23).

By Mr. LIEBERMAN, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

Report to accompany S. 679, a bill to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation (Rept. No. 112–24).

By Ms. STABENOW, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, without amendment:

H.R. 872. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes.

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. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 1237. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow manufacturing businesses to establish tax-free manufacturing reinvestment accounts to assist them in providing for new equipment and facilities and workforce training; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 1238. A bill to make bills implementing trade agreements subject to a point of order unless certain conditions are met, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1239. A bill to provide for a medal of appropriate design to be awarded by the President to the memorials established at the 3 sites honoring the men and women who perished as a result of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1240. A bill to support the establishment and operation of Teachers Professional Development Institutes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. KYL, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1241. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1242. A bill to provide for the treatment of certain hospitals under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 1243. A bill to require that certain Federal job training and career education programs give priority to programs that provide an industry-recognized and nationally portable credential; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KYL, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. KIRK):

S.J. Res. 20. A joint resolution authorizing the limited use of the United States Armed Forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. Res. 212. A resolution congratulating the people and Government of the Republic of Slovenia on the twentieth anniversary of the country's independence; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. VITTER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. Res. 213. A resolution commending and expressing thanks to professionals of the intelligence community; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 56

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 56, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve access to advanced practice nurses and physician assistants under the Medicaid Program.

S. 339

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Delaware

(Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 339, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions.

S. 343

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 343, a bill to amend Title I of Pub. L. 99–658 regarding the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Palau, to approve the results of the 15-year review of the Compact, including the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Palau Following the Compact of Free Association Section 432 Review, and to appropriate funds for the purposes of the amended Pub. L. 99–658 for fiscal years ending on or before September 30, 2024, to carry out the agreements resulting from that review.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) 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. 418

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) 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. 462

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to better protect, serve, and advance the rights of victims of elder abuse and exploitation by establishing a program to encourage States and other qualified entities to create jobs designed to hold offenders accountable, enhance the capacity of the justice system to investigate, pursue, and prosecute elder abuse cases, identify existing resources to leverage to the extent possible, and assure data collection, research, and evaluation to promote the efficacy and efficiency of the activities described in this Act.

S. 528

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 528, a bill to provide driver safety grants to States with graduated driver licensing laws that meet certain minimum requirements.

S. 534

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 534, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain small producers.

S. 541

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to allow State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools to increase implementation of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports and early intervening services in order to improve student academic achievement, reduce disciplinary problems in schools, and to improve coordination with similar activities and services provided under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

S. 596

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 596, a bill to establish a grant program to benefit victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

S. 652

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 652, a bill to facilitate efficient investments and financing of infrastructure projects and new job creation through the establishment of an American Infrastructure Financing Authority, to provide for an extension of the exemption from the alternative minimum tax treatment for certain tax-exempt bonds, and for other purposes.

S. 679

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 679, a bill to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation.

S. 726

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 726, a bill to rescind $45 billion of unobligated discretionary appropriations, and for other purposes.

S. 755

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 755, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an offset against income tax refunds to pay for restitution and other State judicial debts that are past-due.

S. 769

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 769, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prevent the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from prohibiting the use of service dogs on Department of Veterans Affairs property.

S. 778

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 778, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 797

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 797, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 800

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) 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. 834

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve education and prevention related to campus sexual violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

S. 946

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 946, a bill to establish an Office of Rural Education Policy in the Department of Education.

S. 951

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 951, a bill to improve the provision of Federal transition, rehabilitation, vocational, and unemployment benefits to members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1025

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1025, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the National Guard, enhancement of the functions of the National Guard Bureau, and improvement of Federal-State military coordination in domestic emergency response, and for other purposes.

S. 1056

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1056, a bill to ensure that all users of the transportation system, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, children, older individuals, and individuals with disabilities, are able to travel safely and conveniently on and across federally funded streets and highways.

S. 1088

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr.

BROWN) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1088, a bill to provide increased funding for the reinsurance for early retirees program.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1094, a bill to reauthorize the Combating Autism Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–416).

S. 1167

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1167, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the diagnosis and treatment of hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia, and for other purposes.

S. 1189

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1189, a bill to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) to provide for regulatory impact analyses for certain rules, consideration of the least burdensome regulatory alternative, and for other purposes.

S. 1211

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1211, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to preserve the effectiveness of medically important antibiotics used in the treatment of human and animal diseases.

S. 1214

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1214, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, regarding restrictions on the use of Department of Defense funds and facilities for abortions.

S. 1224

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1224, a bill to amend Public Law 106–392 to maintain annual base funding for the Upper Colorado and San Juan fish recovery program through fiscal year 2023.

S.J. RES. 17

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 17, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

S. CON. RES. 23

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 23, a concurrent resolution declaring that it is the policy of the United States to support and facilitate Israel in maintaining defensible borders and that it is contrary to United States policy and national security to have the borders of Israel return to the armistice lines that existed on June 4, 1967.

S. RES. 80

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) 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. 211

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 211, a resolution observing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day.

AMENDMENT NO. 405

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 405 proposed to S. 782, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 440

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 440 proposed to S. 782, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 476

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 476 proposed to S. 782, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1240. A bill to support the establishment and operation of Teachers Professional Development Institutes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation, along with my colleague from Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL, which will strengthen the content knowledge and instructional skills of our present K–12 teacher workforce. Our goal with this legislation, like any education legislation I support, is to ultimately raise student achievement.

The Teachers Professional Development Institutes Act would establish up to eight new Teachers Professional Development Institutes throughout the nation each year over the next 5 years based on the successful model that has been operating at Yale University for over thirty years. Every Teachers Institute would consist of a partnership between an institution of higher education and the local public school system in which a significant proportion of the students come from low-income households. These Institutes will strengthen the present teacher workforce by giving each participant an opportunity to gain more sophisticated content knowledge and a chance to develop curriculum units with other colleagues that can be directly applied in their classrooms. We know that teachers gain confidence and enthusiasm when they have a deeper understanding of the subject matter that they teach and this translates into higher expectations for their students and an increase in student achievement.

The Teachers Professional Development Institutes are based on the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute model that has been in existence since 1978. For over 30 years, the Institute has offered, five or six 13 session seminars each year, led by Yale faculty, on topics that teachers have selected to enhance their mastery of the subject areas they teach. The subject selection process begins with representatives from the Institutes soliciting ideas from teachers throughout the school district for topics on which teachers feel they need to have additional preparation, topics that will assist them in preparing materials they need for their students, or topics that will assist them in addressing the standards that the school district requires. As a consensus emerges about desired seminar subjects, the Institute director identifies university faculty members with the appropriate expertise, interest and desire to lead the seminar. University faculty members, especially those who have led Institute seminars before, may sometimes suggest seminars they would like to lead, and these ideas are circulated by the representatives as well. The final decisions on which seminar topics are offered are ultimately

made by the teachers who participate. In this way, the offerings are designed to respond to what teachers believe is needed and useful for both themselves and their students.

The cooperative nature of the Institute seminar planning process ensures its success. Institutes offer seminars and relevant materials on topics teachers have identified and feel are needed for their own preparation, as well as what they know will motivate and engage their students. Teachers enthusiastically take part in rigorous seminars they have requested, and practice using the materials they have obtained and developed. This helps ensure that the experience not only increases their preparation in the subjects they are assigned to teach, but also their participation in an Institute seminar gives them immediate hands-on active learning materials that can be used in the classroom. All of this is a very empowering experience for teachers.

The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute conducted a National Demonstration Project from 1999–2002 that showed that similar Institutes could be created rapidly at diverse sites with large concentrations of disadvantaged students. After 2 years of research and planning, and based on the success of that project, the Institute in 2005 launched the Yale National Initiative to strengthen teaching in public schools, a long-term endeavor to assist with the establishment of Teachers Institutes of this specific type in most states. As a result, new Institutes already have been established in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Charlotte, North Carolina, and New Castle County, Delaware. Nine other school districts in 6 states, including California, Arizona, Oklahoma, Illinois, Virginia, and Georgia, are currently participating in the Initiative to learn how to develop a new Institute.

The teachers surveyed for the National Demonstration Project reported that student motivation, student interest, and student mastery were higher during the Institute-developed unit than during other work. Subsequently, the findings of a 2009 Report on Teachers Institute Experiences found that teachers participated out of desires to obtain curricula that suited their needs, increased subject mastery, and motivated students. Mr. President, 96 percent of the teachers rated the Institute seminars as useful, partly due to the reported increase in knowledge and in raising expectations for their students.

A retrospective study showed that over 5 years, Teachers Institute participants were almost twice as likely as non-participants to remain teaching in the district 5 years later. Research has shown that longevity in a district leads to increased teacher effectiveness.

Many agree that teacher quality is the single most important school-related factor in determining student achievement. High-quality teacher professional development programs that focus on subject and pedagogy knowledge are a proven method for enhancing the effectiveness of a teacher in the classroom. A recent review of professional development studies by the Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences found that, and I quote ''teachers who receive substantial professional development, an average of 49 hours in the 9 studies, can boost their students' achievement by about twenty-one percentile points.''

The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute model enhances teachers' basic writing, math, and presentation skills. It increases expectations of student achievement and enthusiasm for teaching while developing skills for motivating students. These are key features that research suggests are effective in producing gains in both teacher knowledge and practice and student achievement. The Teachers Institutes lead to student achievement gains through a proven approach distinguished from both conventional professional development offerings of school districts and from traditional continuing education and outreach programs of colleges and universities.

Education Secretary Arne Duncan said recently, and I quote, ''the practices of high-performing countries show clearly that America in particular has to do much more to elevate the teaching profession, from the recruitment and training of teachers to their evaluation and professional development.''

This is precisely what the Teachers Professional Development Institutes Act strives to accomplish. The need for effective teachers with deep content knowledge is most apparent and urgent in schools and school districts that enroll a high proportion of students from low-income families, exactly the schools and school districts that Teachers Institutes serve.

The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute has already proven to be a successful model for teacher professional development as demonstrated by the high caliber curriculum unit plans that teacher participants have developed and placed on the web, and by the evaluations that support the conclusion that virtually all the teacher participants felt substantially strengthened in their mastery of content knowledge and their teaching skills. The finding that Institute participants were almost twice as likely as non-participants to remain teaching in high-need schools is especially encouraging. Our proposal would open this opportunity to many more teachers in high-need schools throughout the nation.

I urge my colleagues to act favorably on this measure.

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. 1240

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

SECTION 1. TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part A of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Subpart 6—Teachers Professional Development Institutes

"SEC. 2161. SHORT TITLE.

''This subpart may be cited as the 'Teachers Professional Development Institutes Act'.

"SEC. 2162. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

''(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

''(1) Teaching is central to the educational process and the ongoing professional development of teachers in the subjects they teach is essential for improved student learning.

''(2) Attaining the goal of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107–110)—having a classroom teacher who is highly effective in every academic subject the teacher teaches—will require innovative approaches to improve the effectiveness of teachers in the classroom.

''(3) The Teachers Institute Model focuses on the continuing academic preparation of schoolteachers and the application of what the teachers study to their classrooms and potentially to the classrooms of other teachers.

''(4) The Teachers Institute Model was developed initially by the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute and has successfully operated in New Haven, Connecticut, for more than 30 years.

''(5) The Teachers Institute Model has also been successfully implemented in cities larger than New Haven.

''(6) In the spring of 2009, a report entitled 'An Evaluation of Teachers Institute Experiences' concluded that—

''(A) Teachers Institutes enhance precisely those teacher qualities known to improve student achievement;

''(B) Teachers Institutes exemplify the crucial characteristics of high-quality teacher professional development; and

''(C) Teachers Institute participation is strongly related to teacher retention in high-poverty schools.

''(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subpart is to provide Federal assistance to support the establishment and operation of Teachers Institutes for local educational agencies that serve significant low-income student populations in States throughout the Nation, in order to—

''(1) improve student learning; and

''(2) enhance the quality and effectiveness of teaching and strengthen the subject matter mastery and the pedagogical skills of current teachers through continuing teacher preparation.

"SEC. 2163. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subpart:

''(1) SIGNIFICANT LOW-INCOME STUDENT POPULATION.—The term 'significant low-income student population' means a student population of which not less than 40 percent of the students included are eligible for free or reduced price lunches under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act.

''(2) TEACHERS INSTITUTE.—The term 'Teachers Institute' means a partnership or joint venture—

''(A) between or among—

''(i) 1 or more institutions of higher education; and

''(ii) 1 or more local educational agencies that serve 1 or more schools with significant low-income student populations; and

''(B) that improves the effectiveness of teachers in the classroom, and the quality of teaching and learning, through collaborative seminars designed to enhance both the subject matter and the pedagogical resources of the seminar participants.

''SEC. 2164. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to award grants under this subpart in order to encourage the establishment and operation of Teachers Institutes.

''(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may reserve not more than 50 percent of the funds appropriated to carry out this subpart to provide technical assistance to facilitate the establishment and operation of Teachers Institutes. The Secretary may contract with the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute to provide all or part of the technical assistance under this subsection.

''(c) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting Teachers Institutes to support through grants under this subpart, the Secretary shall consider—

''(1) the extent to which a proposed Teachers Institute will serve schools that have significant low-income student populations;

''(2) the extent to which a proposed Teachers Institute will follow the understandings and necessary procedures described in section 2166;

''(3) the extent to which each local educational agency participating in the Teachers Institute has a high percentage of teachers who are unprepared or underprepared to teach the core academic subjects the teachers are assigned to teach; and

''(4) the extent to which a proposed Teachers Institute will receive a level of support from the community and other sources that will ensure the requisite long-term commitment for the success of a Teachers Institute.

''(d) CONSULTATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In evaluating applications using the criteria under subsection (c), the Secretary may request the advice and assistance of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute or other Teachers Institutes.

''(2) STATE AGENCIES.—If the Secretary receives 2 or more applications for grants under this subpart from local educational agencies within the same State, the Secretary shall consult with the State educational agency regarding the applications.

''(e) FISCAL AGENT.—The fiscal agent for the receipt of grant funds under this subpart shall be an institution of higher education participating in the partnership or joint venture, as described in section 2163(2)(A), that is establishing or operating the Teachers Institute.

''(f) LIMITATIONS.—A grant under this subpart—

''(1) shall provide grant funds for a period of not more than 5 years; and

''(2) shall be in an amount that is not more than 50 percent of the total costs of the eligible activities supported under the grant, as determined by the Secretary.

''SEC. 2165. ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.

''Grant funds under this subpart may be used—

''(1) for the planning, development, establishment, and operation of a Teachers Institute;

''(2) for additional assistance to an established Teachers Institute for its further development and for its support of the planning, development, establishment, and operation of a Teachers Institute under paragraph (1);

''(3) for the salary and necessary expenses of a full-time director for a Teachers Institute to plan and manage the Teachers Institute and to act as a liaison between all local educational agencies and institutions of higher education participating in the Teachers Institute;

''(4) to provide suitable office space, staff, equipment, and supplies, and to pay other operating expenses, for the Teachers Institute;

''(5) to provide a stipend for teachers participating in the collaborative seminars conducted by the Institute in the sciences and humanities and to provide remuneration for members of the faculty of the participating institution of higher education leading the seminars; and

''(6) to provide for the dissemination, through print and electronic means, of curriculum units prepared in the seminars conducted by the Teachers Institute.

''SEC. 2166. UNDERSTANDINGS AND PROCEDURES.

''A grantee receiving a grant under this subpart shall abide by the following understandings and procedures:

''(1) PARTNERSHIP.—The essential relationship of a Teachers Institute is a partnership between a local educational agency and an institution of higher education. A grantee shall demonstrate a long-term commitment on behalf of the participating local educational agency and institution of higher education to the support, including the financial support, of the work of the Teachers Institute.

''(2) SEMINARS.—A Teachers Institute sponsors seminars led by faculty of the institution of higher education partner and attended by teachers from the local educational agency partner. A grantee shall provide participating teachers the ability to play an essential role in planning, organizing, conducting, and evaluating the seminars and in encouraging the future participation of other teachers.

''(3) CURRICULUM UNIT.—A seminar described in paragraph (2) uses a collaborative process, in a collegial environment, to develop a curriculum unit for use by participating teachers that sets forth the subject matter to be presented and the pedagogical strategies to be employed. A grantee shall enable participating teachers to develop a curriculum unit, based on the subject matter presented, for use in the teachers' classrooms.

''(4) ELIGIBILITY AND REMUNERATION.—Seminars are open to all partnership teachers with teaching assignments relevant to the seminar topics. Seminar leaders receive remuneration for their work and participating teachers receive an honorarium or stipend upon the successful completion of the seminar. A grantee shall provide seminar leaders and participating teachers with remuneration to allow them to participate in the Teachers Institute.

''(5) DIRECTION.—The operations of a Teachers Institute are managed by a full-time director who reports to both partners but is accountable to the institution of higher education partner. A grantee shall appoint a director to manage and coordinate the work of the Teachers Institute.

''(6) EVALUATION.—A grantee shall annually review the activities of the Teachers Institute and disseminate the results to members of the Teachers Institute's partnership community.

''SEC. 2167. APPLICATION, APPROVAL, AND AGREEMENT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—To receive a grant under this subpart, a Teachers Institute, or a partnership or joint venture described in section 2163(2)(A) that is proposing to establish a Teachers Institute, shall submit an application to the Secretary that—

''(1) meets the requirement of this subpart and any regulations under this subpart;

''(2) includes a description of how the applicant intends to use funds provided under the grant;

''(3) includes such information as the Secretary may require to apply the criteria described in section 2164(c);

''(4) includes measurable objectives for the use of the funds provided under the grant; and

''(5) contains such other information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

''(b) APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) promptly evaluate an application received for a grant under this subpart; and

''(2) notify the applicant, within 90 days of the receipt of a completed application, of the Secretary's determination.

''(c) AGREEMENT.—Upon approval of an application, the Secretary and the applicant shall enter into a comprehensive agreement covering the entire period of the grant.

''SEC. 2168. REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS.

''(a) REPORT.—Each grantee under this subpart shall report annually to the Secretary on the progress of the Teachers Institute in achieving the purpose of this subpart.

''(b) EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate the activities funded under this subpart and submit an annual report regarding the activities assisted under this subpart to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives. The Secretary shall broadly disseminate successful practices developed by Teachers Institutes.

''(c) REVOCATION.—If the Secretary determines that a grantee is not making substantial progress in meeting the purposes of the grant by the end of the second year of the grant under this subpart, the Secretary may take appropriate action, including revocation of further payments under the grant, to ensure that the funds available under this subpart are used in the most effective manner.

''SEC. 2169. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are authorized to be appropriated, for grants (including planning grants) and technical assistance under this subpart, such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2012 and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2151 the following:

''SUBPART 6—TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTES

''Sec. 2161. Short title.
''Sec. 2162. Findings and purpose.
''Sec. 2163. Definitions.
''Sec. 2164. Program authorized.
''Sec. 2165. Eligible activities.
''Sec. 2166. Understandings and procedures.
''Sec. 2167. Application, approval, and agreement.
''Sec. 2168. Reports and evaluations.''.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. KYL, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1241. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking

minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, it is an honor to stand alongside Senator HATCH today as we introduce the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act. This bill, which would help States enforce laws requiring that parents be notified before their child has an abortion, is supported by many pro-life groups and organizations. But perhaps most importantly, it is supported by a broad majority of parents, who are in a much better position to help children with tough decisions than virtually anyone else.

Many States require that a parent be notified before a minor has an abortion, while even more require the consent of a parent before a physician can legally perform an abortion. Unfortunately, these laws are undermined and circumvented by those simply willing to travel to a State without these restrictions.

This important legislation would put an end to this practice permanently by simply enabling States to enforce their existing laws, which are designed to protect our children and defend parents' rights. While this legislation serves that goal, it also promotes a culture of life in our nation that is critical to ensuring we continue to cherish and defend the self-evident, fundamental right to life, especially as it applies to the unborn.

Specifically, this bill has two parts: First, it prohibits the act of knowingly taking a minor across State lines with the intent of obtaining an abortion if this action evades the parental involvement law in her home State. Second, it would require abortion providers to notify a parent of an out-of-State minor before performing an abortion.

Sadly, many are willing to circumvent State law and shuttle young girls across State lines in order to avoid parental notification laws. With the help of my Senate colleagues, we will put a stop to this and ensure that parents are aware of profound medical operations involving their children. With that thought in mind, I ask you to support this legislation to help keep parents informed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I am proud to stand with my friend from Florida, Senator RUBIO, as he introduces an important piece of legislation, the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act. This bill, which today is being introduced in the House by Representative ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN of Florida, is based on the belief that children should not make profound life-changing decisions by themselves and that parents are generally in the best and most responsible position to help them.

One of the many disturbing ironies in the abortion debate is that parental consent is needed for such things as tattoos or school fieldtrips but not always for abortions that will end one life and change another forever. Abortion advocates say that abortion should be treated as any other surgical procedure, but many of them oppose requiring the same parental consent for abortion that is required for any other procedure.

What is worse, there are individuals and organizations out there who appear to care more about money an about kids. They are willing to help young girls get abortions by any means necessary, including taking them to other States without the knowledge or consent of their parents. Mind you, those same parents will be responsible for the aftermath, for the physical, emotional, and spiritual consequences of the abortion. If parents are to be responsible at the end, they have the right to be there at the beginning.

If it were possible, just for a moment, to take the abortion politics out of the picture, every parent knows that kids have to develop over time the judgment and maturity to make decisions. No one is more committed to them, no one has more love for them, no one has more responsibility for them than their parents.

This bill has two parts. First, it prohibits taking a minor across State lines for an abortion if doing so evades the parental involvement law in her home State. In the 109th Congress, this portion of our bill passed the Senate with 65 bipartisan votes. More than 80 percent of our fellow Americans support it. Second, this bill requires abortionists to notify parents of an out-of-State minor before performing an abortion. Fifty-seven Senators voted for cloture on this combined bill in 2006.

I urge my colleagues to read the bill. It does not apply when an abortion is necessary to save a girl's life or if the girl is a victim of abuse or neglect. Again, please read the bill. It is carefully drafted with the appropriate exceptions and safeguards in order to focus on what unites the vast majority of Americans, that parents should be involved before their child has an abortion. The majority of States have laws requiring parental involvement and, with its interstate component, this bill is a legitimate and constitutional way for Congress to help protect children and support parents.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1242. A bill to provide for the treatment of certain hospitals under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I, along with my colleague Senator MANCHIN, rise today to introduce the Fair Competition for Hospitals Act of 2011, legislation that will level the playing field for a handful of hospitals in the Northern Panhandle of West Virginia who are burdened by a payment disparity as compared to hospitals in neighboring States serving the same patient population. This legislation will adjust the wage index determination for these hospitals to make sure they are treated the same as the nearby facilities in other States. It will also help hospitals in other areas of the country facing a similar situation.

Medicare's hospital wage index system was created to reflect the variation in the price of labor across the country. Usually, hospitals in different States are located far enough apart that they do not compete for the same patients or workforce, within the same labor market. However, the geography in the Northern Panhandle of West Virginia presents a unique situation; with a geographic area as little as 6 miles wide, hospitals in West Virginia are much more akin to hospitals in Ohio and Pennsylvania, on either side of the panhandle. Therefore, this small group of hospitals is competitively disadvantaged because of wage index differences across state borders. This competitive disadvantage is causing these hospitals to struggle under the weight of providing the same care for a lower payment and making it more difficult to continue the high level of care for which they have become known.

These hospitals are vital cornerstones to the people in their communities. They employ more than 4,000 people and provide health care for tens of thousands more. As an essential part of the community, they should not be significantly disadvantaged by a payment structure that does not take into account the unique makeup of this area.

The solution I am introducing today is budget neutral and fair. It will make sure that these hospitals in my State are treated on a level playing field with their competitors and not disadvantaged by an economically meaningless State border. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 1243. A bill to require that certain Federal job training and career education programs give priority to programs that provide an industry-recognized and nationally portable credential; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to reintroduce a very important piece of legislation to accelerate job growth across America, the American Manufacturing Efficiency and Retraining Investment Collaboration Achievement Works Act, also known as the AMERICA Works Act. This bill is part of the solution to the Nation's economic and unemployment problem.

We all know that American families, as well as the manufacturing industry, have faced difficult times over the last few years. But the truth is that the manufacturing industry will always be a vital part of our Nation's economy.

The national unemployment rate has stabilized somewhat, but almost 14 million Americans remain out of work. We still have a long way to go. In my home

State of North Carolina, unemployment hovers at 9.7 percent, with several counties facing double-digit unemployment rates. Job creation is my number one priority and this legislation is an innovative way to get Americans back into the workforce.

The United States needs a strong technical workforce. The AMERICA Works Act would encourage national industries, such as biotechnology, construction, and machinery, to come together and agree on the skill sets they most value in prospective employees. Community colleges would participate, creating the appropriate curricula to meet those needs. Students who complete the programs would receive an industry-recognized credential. Workers who carry these industry-backed credentials would be able to market themselves in any area of the country. Businesses could count on the fact that workers with these credentials have the expertise and skills they are looking for.

The AMERICA Works Act would require certain Federal job training and career development education programs to give priority to programs that provide an industry-recognized and nationally portable credential. This credentialing system starts out with basic competencies that prepare individuals for the workplace. Once basic competencies are completed, individuals can work toward high performance technical competencies and then progress further to highly skilled technical and management competencies. The credentialing levels are stackable, allowing workers flexibility along their career tracks. Stackable credentials provide straightforward paths, with clear entry and exit points, for workers to advance their careers and attain high quality jobs.

In North Carolina, we have an advanced manufacturing skills program at Forsyth Technical Community College in Winston-Salem. Forsyth Tech is participating in the National Association of Manufacturers' Manufacturing Skills Certification System, which offers credit programs toward nationally recognized, stackable credentials. They have had hundreds of students enroll in their programs. Forsyth Tech has already collaborated with state and local businesses to begin the process of incorporating their credentials into job descriptions. They believe that introducing graduates with skill certifications into the local workforce will help improve the hiring process, and the nationally recognized credentials will improve employment opportunities.

When the President's Jobs Council met earlier this month in North Carolina, a leading topic of discussion, and something the President himself mentioned, is the need to improve job training for American industries so that our workers can be competitive in the global economy.

The AMERICA Works Act will help job seekers and employers keep America competitive in every industry, from textiles to aerospace, high-tech to biotech, and connect programs like those offered at Forsyth Tech with employers in the community, region, and across the United States.

As I mentioned before, job creation is my number one priority. I want to do everything I can to create jobs and make sure our workers have the skills necessary to help our businesses grow and thrive. By incentivizing industry-recognized, nationally portable, stackable credentials, we can ensure that America has the best businesses, with the best-trained workers leading the world.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bill to expand employment opportunities for hardworking Americans.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 212—CONGRATULATING THE PEOPLE AND GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA ON THE TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COUNTRY'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 212

Whereas, on December 23, 1990, the people of Slovenia voted overwhelmingly in favor of independence from the former Yugoslavia in a national referendum;

Whereas, on June 25, 1991, the Republic of Slovenia declared itself as an independent and sovereign nation;

Whereas, on December 23, 1991, the parliament of Slovenia adopted a constitution based on the rule of law, respect for human rights, and democratic ideals;

Whereas, during its 20 years of independence, Slovenia has been an important United States ally in Central Europe and a strong advocate of democracy, the rule of law, and the merits of an open, free market economy;

Whereas the Government of Slovenia has made important contributions to international efforts to promote peace, stability, and development in Southeast Europe, Afghanistan, and elsewhere;

Whereas the Government of Slovenia serves as a leader in efforts to remove destructive land mines in parts of Southeast Europe and in other parts of the world;

Whereas Slovenia has become an active member of international organizations, including the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Council of Europe, the World Trade Organization, the European Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; and

Whereas Slovenia has further consolidated its international role through successful chairmanship of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe in 2005, and, as the first new member from Central and Eastern Europe, the presidency of the Council of the European Union in 2008: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby—

(1) congratulates the people and the Government of the Republic of Slovenia as the country celebrates 20 years of independence on June 25, 2011;

(2) commends the people of Slovenia on the significant progress made in the last 20 years;

(3) recognizes the important role of the Slovenian community in the United States to promote partnership and cooperation between the two countries; and

(4) encourages the Government of the Republic of Slovenia to continue its important work in the transatlantic alliance, and the efforts to further peace, stability, and prosperity in Southeast Europe and elsewhere.

SENATE RESOLUTION 213—COMMENDING AND EXPRESSING THANKS TO PROFESSIONALS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. VITTER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Select Committee on Intelligence:

S. RES. 213

Whereas since the attacks on September 11, 2001, the United States intelligence community has gathered critical information that has helped to prevent additional attacks on United States soil;

Whereas the Central Intelligence Agency (hereinafter referred to as the ''CIA'') plays a vital role in United States intelligence collection;

Whereas the importance of the CIA's work was exemplified by the successful operation against Usama bin Laden;

Whereas, as authorized by the President and in accordance with specific legal guidance provided by the Department of Justice, the CIA lawfully detained and interrogated certain high-value suspected terrorists;

Whereas information obtained from high-value detainees who had been detained and interrogated by the CIA was essential in determining the organizational structure, key operatives, modus operandi, and other relevant information on al-Qaeda operations;

Whereas information obtained from high-value detainees who had been detained and interrogated by the CIA was crucial to tracking down Usama bin Laden;

Whereas Michael Hayden, a former Director of the CIA, wrote, ''Let the record show that when I was first briefed in 2007 about the brightening prospect of pursuing bin Laden through his courier network, a crucial component of the briefing was information provided by three CIA detainees, all of whom had been subjected to some form of enhanced interrogation. One of the most alerting pieces of evidence was that two of the detainees who had routinely been cooperative and truthful (after they had undergone enhanced techniques) were atypically denying apparent factual data—a maneuver taken as a good sign that the CIA was on to something important. So that there is no ambiguity, let me be doubly clear: It is nearly impossible for me to imagine any operation like the May 2 assault on bin Laden's compound in Abbottabad, Pakistan, that would

not have made substantial use of the trove of information derived from CIA detainees, including those on whom enhanced techniques had been used.'';

Whereas a May 30, 2005, Department of Justice memo stated, ''In particular, the CIA believes that it would have been unable to obtain critical information from numerous detainees, including KSM [Khalid Sheikh Mohammed] and Abu Zubaydah, without these enhanced techniques. . . . Indeed, before the CIA used enhanced techniques in its interrogation of KSM, KSM resisted giving any answers to questions about future attacks, simply noting, 'Soon, you will know.' '';

Whereas according to such May 30, 2005, memo, Abu Zubaydah explained the effect of enhanced techniques as, ''Brothers who are captured and interrogated are permitted by Allah to provide information when they believe they have reached the limit of their ability to withhold it in the face of psychological and physical hardships.'';

Whereas such May 30, 2005, memo further indicates that after using enhanced interrogation techniques, high-value detainees became cooperative stating, ''since the use of enhanced techniques, 'KSM and Abu Zubaydah have been pivotal sources because of their ability and willingness to provide their analysis and speculation about the capabilities, methodologies, and mindsets of terrorists.' '';

Whereas mastermind of the attacks of September 11, 2001, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed disclosed to CIA interrogators information about a ''second wave'' plot using an East Asian al-Qaeda group known as Jemmah Islamiyah to hijack and crash an airliner into the Library Tower in Los Angeles;

Whereas Khalid Sheikh Mohammed gave CIA interrogators information that led to the capture of Riduan bin Isomuddin, known as Hambali, the leader of the Indonesian terrorist organization Jemaah Islamiyah;

Whereas al-Qaeda senior operational planner Abu Zubaydah and Khalid Sheikh Mohammed supplied important intelligence about Abu Musab al-Zarqawi and his terrorist network, aiding United States operations against al-Qaeda in Iraq;

Whereas in a May 2011 interview, Leon Panetta, the Director of the CIA, in response to a direct question about enhanced interrogation and the successful bin Laden operation, stated that, ''Obviously there was some valuable information that was derived through those kind of interrogations.'';

Whereas, although the President issued an Executive Order in January 2009 that effectively ended the CIA's interrogation and detention program, the Administration has yet to establish clear policies for the detention and interrogation of suspected high-value detainees, particularly those captured overseas by foreign governments;

Whereas in 2009, the Attorney General launched a preliminary review into whether Federal laws were violated in connection with the interrogation of specific detainees, even though career prosecutors had previously considered and rejected filing criminal charges in those cases; and

Whereas the preliminary review initiated by the Attorney General will determine whether CIA employees involved in the detention and interrogation of terrorists should be prosecuted for alleged violations of Federal law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the professionals of the United States intelligence community for their dedication;

(2) expresses thanks to the employees of the Central Intelligence Agency for their selfless service;

(3) recognizes that continued investigation of employees of the Central Intelligence Agency for their involvement in a detention and interrogation program that helped to save lives by averting terrorist attacks on the United States is unwarranted and will likely have a chilling effect on the critical work of their colleagues and other United States national security professionals;

(4) urges the President and the Attorney General to immediately close the Department of Justice's ongoing investigation, and decline future prosecution, of Central Intelligence Agency employees for actions related to the interrogation of detainees at overseas locations, including the use of enhanced interrogation techniques on detained terrorists at such locations; and

(5) urges the President to develop and implement policies allowing for the long-term detention and interrogation by the intelligence community of high-value detainees, including detainees who are captured overseas or are in the custody of foreign countries.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 494. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 434 submitted by Mr. GRASSLEY and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 782, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 495. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 679, to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 496. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 679, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 497. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 679, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 498. Mr. CASEY (for Mr. CONRAD) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 202, designating June 27, 2011, as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day''.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 494. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 434 submitted by Mr. GRASSLEY and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 782, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the matter proposed to be inserted, add the following:

SEC. 23. PERMANENT REAUTHORIZATION OF EB–5 REGIONAL CENTER PROGRAM.

Section 610 of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (8 U.S.C. 1153 note) is amended—

(1) by striking ''pilot'' each place such term appears; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''until September 30, 2012''.

SA 495. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 679, to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE MATTERS AND NOMINATIONS.

(a) DEBATE ON MOTIONS TO PROCEED.—Rule VIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking paragraph 2 and inserting the following:

''2. Debate on a motion to proceed to the consideration of any matter, and any debatable motion or appeal in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees except for a motion to go into executive session to consider a specified item of executive business and a motion to proceed to consider any privileged matter, which shall not be debatable.''.

(b) RIGHT TO OFFER AMENDMENTS.—Paragraph 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting at the end the following:

''After debate has concluded under this paragraph but prior to final disposition of the pending matter, the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader may each offer not to exceed 3 amendments identified as leadership amendments if they have been timely filed under this paragraph and are germane to the matter being amended. Debate on a leadership amendment shall be limited to 1 hour equally divided. A leadership amendment may not be divided.''.

(c) POSTCLOTURE DEBATE ON NOMINATIONS.—The second undesignated paragraph of paragraph 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting at the end the following: ''If the matter on which cloture is invoked is a nomination, the period of time for debate shall be 2 hours.''.

SA 496. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 679, to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ESTABLISHING MAJORITY VOTE THRESHOLD FOR PROCEEDING TO NOMINATIONS.

The second undesignated paragraph of paragraph 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

''Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'' And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn — except on a nomination to an Executive Branch position requiring the advise and consent of the Senate, in which case the necessary affirmative vote shall be a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn — then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.''.

SA 497. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 679, to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. _____. POSTCLOTURE DEBATE ON NOMINATIONS.

The second undesignated paragraph of paragraph 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting at the end the following: ''If the matter on which cloture is invoked is a nomination, the period of time for debate shall be 2 hours.''.

SA 498. Mr. CASEY (for Mr. CONRAD) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 202, designating June 27, 2011, as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day''; as follows:

On page 2, beginning on line 4, strike ''urges'' through ''working'' on line 5 and insert ''supports the efforts of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2011, at 4:15 p.m. in room S–216 of the Capitol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2011, at 10 a.m., to conduct hearing entitled ''Cybersecurity and Data Protection in the Financial Sector.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2011, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2011, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate to conduct a hearing entitled ''Senior Hunger and the Older Americans Act'' on June 21, 2011, at 10 a.m. in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2011, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND TERRORISM

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Cybersecurity: Evaluating the Administration's Proposals.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Inspiring Students to Federal Service.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Shelby Clark and Dan Majewski from Senator BINGAMAN's office be given the privileges of the floor for Tuesday, June 21, 2011.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Danielle DeFant, a fellow with my office, be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of the 112th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AWARENESS DAY

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 202 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 202) designating June 27, 2011, as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be considered; the Conrad amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the matter be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 498) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the resolution)

On page 2, beginning on line 4, strike ''urges'' through ''working'' on line 5 and insert ''supports the efforts of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense''.

The resolution (S. Res. 202), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 202

Whereas the brave men and women of the United States Armed Forces, who proudly serve the United States, risk their lives to protect the freedom of the United States and deserve the investment of every reasonable resource to ensure their lasting physical, mental, and emotional well-being;

Whereas 2.4 percent of servicemembers returning from deployment to Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom are clinically diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder (referred to in this preamble as ''PTSD'') and up to 17 percent of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom veterans exposed to sustained ground combat report PTSD symptoms;

Whereas up to 10 percent of Operation Desert Storm veterans, 30 percent of Vietnam veterans, and 8 percent of the general population of the United States suffer or have suffered from PTSD;

Whereas the Department of Veterans Affairs reports that more than 438,000 veterans were treated for PTSD in 2010 alone;

Whereas many cases of PTSD remain unreported, undiagnosed, and untreated due to a lack of awareness about PTSD and the persistent stigma associated with mental health issues;

Whereas PTSD significantly increases the risk of depression, suicide, and drug- and alcohol-related disorders and deaths, especially if left untreated;

Whereas the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs have made significant advances in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of PTSD and the symptoms of PTSD, but many challenges remain; and

Whereas the establishment of a National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day will raise public awareness about issues related to PTSD and help ensure that those suffering from the invisible wounds of war receive proper treatment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 27, 2011, as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day'';

(2) supports the efforts of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to educate servicemembers, veterans, the families of servicemembers and veterans, and the public about the causes, symptoms, and treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense.

CONGRATULATING THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 212, which was submitted earlier today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 212) congratulating the people and Government of the Republic of Slovenia on the twentieth anniversary of the country's independence.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CASEY. 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 any statements related to the measure be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 212) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 212

Whereas, on December 23, 1990, the people of Slovenia voted overwhelmingly in favor of independence from the former Yugoslavia in a national referendum;

Whereas, on June 25, 1991, the Republic of Slovenia declared itself as an independent and sovereign nation;

Whereas, on December 23, 1991, the parliament of Slovenia adopted a constitution based on the rule of law, respect for human rights, and democratic ideals;

Whereas, during its 20 years of independence, Slovenia has been an important United States ally in Central Europe and a strong advocate of democracy, the rule of law, and the merits of an open, free market economy;

Whereas the Government of Slovenia has made important contributions to international efforts to promote peace, stability, and development in Southeast Europe, Afghanistan, and elsewhere;

Whereas the Government of Slovenia serves as a leader in efforts to remove destructive land mines in parts of Southeast Europe and in other parts of the world;

Whereas Slovenia has become an active member of international organizations, including the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Council of Europe, the World Trade Organization, the European Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; and

Whereas Slovenia has further consolidated its international role through successful chairmanship of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe in 2005, and, as the first new member from Central and Eastern Europe, the presidency of the Council of the European Union in 2008: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby—

(1) congratulates the people and the Government of the Republic of Slovenia as the country celebrates 20 years of independence on June 25, 2011;

(2) commends the people of Slovenia on the significant progress made in the last 20 years;

(3) recognizes the important role of the Slovenian community in the United States to promote partnership and cooperation between the two countries; and

(4) encourages the Government of the Republic of Slovenia to continue its important work in the transatlantic alliance, and the efforts to further peace, stability, and prosperity in Southeast Europe and elsewhere.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 2011

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 22; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 679, the Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, we are working on an agreement for consideration of the Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act. We will notify Senators when votes are scheduled.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:30 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 22, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 21, 2011:

THE JUDICIARY

MICHAEL H. SIMON, OF OREGON, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

LEON E. PANETTA, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE SMITHSONIAN FOLKLIFE FESTIVAL

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to invite my colleagues and members of their staffs to attend a free musical event that will be held this afternoon (Tuesday, June 21, 2011) from 1:00–2:00 p.m. on the West Front Lawn of the United States Capitol. This event will feature music performed by the David Pernell Ensemble as a preview to the Smithsonian's annual Folklife Festival. This year, one of the Folklife Festival themes is Rhythm and Blues: Tell It Like It Is.

The 2011 Smithsonian Folklife Festival will celebrate the people and culture of R & B music in the United States. R & B encompasses jump blues, soul, funk and more contemporary styles and is recognized throughout the world as one of the most identifiably American forms of popular music. The Festival program will explore the social and cultural history integral to the development of R & B and will present not only performances, but also conversations and discussions with some of the artists, songwriters, radio personalities, and others who have worked behind the scenes to produce the music.

From June 30th–July 4 and from July 7–11, the Rhythm and Blues: Tell It Like It Is program will consist of two large covered stages on the National Mall and a smaller discussion/narrative stage, highlighting select styles associated with African American urban centers in the United States. Through performance and narrative presentations, Festival visitors will discover exciting connections between different forms of musical performance, social dance, the recording industry, and broadcast radio—all of which accompanied and contributed to shaping the musical heritage of R & B. The program is being produced in partnership between the Smithsonian's Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, the Folklife Festival, and the National Museum of African American History and Culture.

I encourage my colleagues and their staff to take a few minutes and enjoy some great R & B music today as a preview to the Smithsonian's 2011 Folklife Festival.

REMEMBERING LAURENCE BUTLER DILLARD

HON. ERIC CANTOR

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory and legacy of an individual that served this body, the Commonwealth of Virginia and our Nation tirelessly for many, many years, Mr. Laurence Butler Dillard, who most of us came to know simply as Larry.

I had the pleasure of meeting Larry many years ago, during the early days of my own journey in public service. Larry proudly served the people of Virginia's 3d Congressional District in the office of my friend and colleague, BOBBY SCOTT. With Larry's passing, Congressman SCOTT's office has lost not just an employee, but a friend, and I offer my condolences to Representative SCOTT and his entire staff.

Larry's quest for knowledge and genuine appreciation for history, especially Virginia's history and culture, was infectious to all that had the pleasure of interacting with him.

In an environment that is often described as unyieldingly partisan, Larry's approach to the legislative system and constituent service was indeed refreshing. His unique ability to overcome differences, backed up by his positive and enthusiastic personality, bridged the parties together and remains a model for all of us. And that's how Larry was—never deterred, no issue insurmountable, always finding that common ground. He devoted his life to the service of others.

I hope this body will join me in offering sincere condolences to Larry's wife Sherry, his son Brandon, his brother Randy, Congressman SCOTT and his staff and Larry's many family members and friends. Larry Dillard's contributions to this institution will always be remembered.

PROCLAMATION FOR COLTON BULLARD, RECIPIENT OF THE ''2011 LITTLE LEAGUE INTERNATIONAL'S GOOD SPORT OF THE YEAR AWARD''

HON. FRANK C. GUINTA

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 2011, Colton Bullard, from Rye, NH will be receiving the ''2011 Little League International's Good Sport of the Year Award.'' Colton has exceptional work ethic and drive as well as a deep passion for the sport of baseball. His dedication to his team and to improving his skills is known and witnessed by all. Colton not only is a huge asset on the team but he is the epitome of what this award represents.

This award is a testament to his spirited and dedicated commitment to the ideals and goals of the Little League program. Colton has become a true student of the game and is always listening and learning. Everyone who knows Colton recognizes his humble and modest personality and consider him to be the ''best kid on the field.'' He is a shining example of all that is positive and beneficial through participating in Little League.

I congratulate Colton for receiving this award and for his outstanding sportsmanship. I wish him the very best in his athletic career and for a bright future.

IN HONOR OF HENRY L. MEYER III

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Henry L. Meyer III and his leadership of KeyCorp on the occasion of his retirement.

Henry L. Meyer began his long career with KeyCorp in the summer of 1970, when he worked as a teller. After receiving a Bachelor of Arts degree in econometrics from Colgate University in 1972, Mr. Meyer joined KeyCorp, formerly Society National Bank. In 1978, he received a Master of Business Administration degree from Harvard University.

In 1984, Mr. Meyer relocated for his position with Society National Bank to Dayton, but moved back to Cleveland in 1987 after being elected Executive Vice President of Society Corporation and Senior Executive Vice President of Society National Bank. In 1990, he was elected as Society National Bank's President and Chief Operating Officer, and became the Chief Executive Officer in 1993. After Society National Bank became KeyCorp in 1994, Mr. Meyer became the Chief Executive Officer in February of 2001. In May of 2001, he was elected as KeyCorp's Chairman of the Board.

In addition to his career, Mr. Meyer is involved in his community. He serves on a number of civic and cultural boards in the Cleveland area, including the Northeast Ohio Council on Higher Education, Law Enforcement Foundation, Inc., ideastream (WVIZ/PBS and WCPN), United Way of Greater Cleveland, University School, the Greater Cleveland Partnership, University Hospitals Health System, Inc., and University Hospitals of Cleveland. Mr. Meyer is also on the Federal Advisory Council of the Federal Reserve System and serves as a director of Continental Airlines, Inc.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor of a hardworking and worthy individual, Mr. Henry Meyer. We should reflect on his good deeds and his admirable work ethic.

THE OFFICIAL FEDERAL HOLIDAY OF GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to reestablish the legal public holiday for Washington's Birthday from the third Monday of February to the actual date of George Washington's birth on February 22.

I have long admired President Washington and have found inspiration in public service from studying his life. Unfortunately I have found that students today have a dearth of knowledge about our nation's beginnings and

the man from Virginia who led the colonies to form the union known as the United States of America.

Two-time Pulitzer Prize winning history author David McCullough recently observed, ''We're raising young people who are, by and large, historically illiterate.'' The 2010 National Assessment of Educational Progress, or Nation's Report Card, in U.S. history underscores that concern. Students in grades 4, 8, and 12 participated in the assessment. At each grade, students responded to questions designed to measure their knowledge of American history in the contexts of democracy, culture, technological and economic changes, and America's changing world role. The levels—Basic, Proficient and Advanced—measure what students should know and be able to do at each grade assessed. At all grade levels, less than one-quarter of students performed at or above the Proficient level in 2010. Only 20 percent of fourth-graders, 17 percent of eighth-graders, and 12 percent of twelfth-graders performed at or above the Proficient level on the 2010 U.S. history assessment.

I believe Congress has unwittingly contributed to this lack of historical understanding by relegating Washington's Birthday to the third Monday of February to take advantage of a three-day weekend. We need to change the focus from celebrating sales at the mall to celebrating the significance of President Washington's birth to the birth of our nation.

There is a reason the birthday of President George Washington is the only legal federal holiday observed for a president of the United States. He is called the ''father of our country'' because he is without compare in our nation's history. We need to reestablish Washington's Birthday on the actual date of his birth to honor his legacy and in doing so call upon schools across the nation to focus on Washington as the soldier, legislator, and president who shepherded our young nation through war, political turmoil, rebellion and expansion as no other single individual was capable of doing.

Washington's Birthday has been celebrated since the final days of the Revolutionary War. French and American troops paraded through Newport, Rhode Island, in 1781 and celebrations were held in Richmond, Virginia, in 1782. Organized by French General Rochambeau and others who knew him personally, these celebrations drew special attention to the bravery, courage, leadership and perseverance of the Revolutionary War hero.

From the beginning of our country, the importance of this day has been recognized. As President James Buchanan said in 1860, ''. . . when the birthday of Washington shall be forgotten, liberty will have perished from the earth.'' In response, President Rutherford B. Hayes signed legislation in 1879 that made Washington's Birthday a holiday for District federal workers. The holiday was extended to all federal workers in 1885.

This legislation I introduce today is not without precedent. In 1975, Congress amended the Uniform Monday Holiday Act and President Gerald R. Ford signed legislation into law returning the annual observance of Veterans Day from the fourth Monday in November to its original date of November 11, beginning in 1978.

The Uniform Holiday Bill signed in 1968 and effective in 1971 was intended to ensure three-day weekends for federal employees by celebrating four national holidays on Mondays: Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Veterans Day, and Columbus Day. Originally called Armistice Day to mark the signing of an Armistice on the 11th hour, of the 11th day, of the 11th month in 1918 that ended World War I, the date of November 11 holds historic and patriotic significance as a day of thanks and remembrance for all veterans. The law change brought widespread public protest and 46 states refused to recognize any day other than November 11 to honor the sacrifice made first by World War I veterans and subsequently by all veterans. The restoration of the observance of Veterans Day to November 11 not only preserves the historical significance of the date, but helps focus attention on the important purpose of Veterans Day as a celebration to honor America's veterans for their patriotism, love of country, and willingness to serve and sacrifice for the common good.

Likewise, we need to restore the observance of Washington's Birthday to February 22 to preserve the date of his birth for history and to focus attention on his life of service and duty to his country. Even George Washington's home state of Virginia, where he was born and raised, which he served in elected office, where he accepted General Cornwallis' surrender, and where he is buried, celebrates Washington's Birthday in accordance with the Uniform Monday Holiday Act. I believe all school children in every state should dedicate February 22 each year to learning about our greatest leader, foremost patriot, first president and the only six-star general in the nation's history.

George Washington began his career in public service in the Virginia militia, eventually promoted to Colonel in command of the Virginia Regiment. He served as a voluntary aide-de-camp to British General Edward Braddock as part of the ill-fated Monongahela expedition before resigning his commission in 1759 and returning to Mount Vernon.

His military career earned him a seat in the Virginia House of Burgesses representing Frederick County, Virginia. The 10th Congressional District, which I currently represent, includes the City of Winchester, where the building that housed his office still stands. In 1774, Washington was a natural selection to be one of Virginia's representatives at the First Continental Congress. During the Second Continental Congress in 1775, he was unanimously chosen to lead the Continental Army and subsequently led a team of young officers through eight years of war against the most powerful military in the world. Perhaps Washington's greatest accomplishment during the Revolutionary War was building a professional army and keeping it together during long stretches of inactivity.

After the peace treaty was signed in Paris in 1783, Washington set perhaps one of the most important precedents in our history. When he resigned his commission in the Continental Army, Washington made it clear that the military was subordinate to the civil government. Washington had gone to great lengths to observe this subordination during the war years, and made sure that this act solidified its importance. Desiring simply to retire in peace to Mount Vernon, Washington voluntarily handed over the reins of power to the elected legislature.

But despite his desire to stay a private citizen, he left Mount Vernon in 1787 to serve as the president of the Constitutional Convention because he felt that his country needed him. The power of his presence was perhaps the single most important factor in bridging the divide between the disparate interests of the newly created states. Through eight years of war and the voluntary relinquishment of power, the American people and his peers trusted Washington, noting that if he supported the new Constitution, it was worthy of adoption. This trust overcame the objections of many who continued to have problems with the document until passage of the Bill of Rights.

After the Constitutional Convention adjourned, Washington again made plans to permanently leave public life. But as he closely monitored the ratification process at Mount Vernon between 1787 and 1788, Washington became resigned to the fact that he was the only person that could hold the new union together. Washington moved to New York to take the position of chief executive after he received word that he had been unanimously by the Electoral College. To this day, Washington is the only president to be elected unanimously, first in 1789 and again in 1792.

Perhaps most importantly, Washington set the precedent of presidents serving a maximum of two terms. This precedent was followed by the following 31 presidents, until Franklin Roosevelt won a third term in 1940 and a fourth term in 1944. It is important to understand that historically, most victorious revolutionary generals grabbed as much power as possible and served as long as they possibly could. Washington, whose devotion to serving his country was only outdone by his love of his family, broke with this dubious tradition and began 219 years of peaceful transitions of power.

President Washington exemplifies the best that America and Americans have to offer the world; principled leadership, personal bravery, a sense of duty and public service, patriotism, recognition of our unique role in world history, and a reverence for his Creator. His enduring service deserves to be remembered on his actual birthday.

This legislation is supported by George Washington's Mount Vernon Estate and its executive director James Rees. A copy of his letter appears below.

Mr. Speaker, it is only right that we hold February 22 as a date of reverence to commemorate the unique person without whom the tide of American history may well have taken a different turn. I urge my colleagues to join in cosponsoring this legislation to forever honor President George Washington's Birthday.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S
MOUNT VERNON,
Mount Vernon, VA, June 21, 2011.

Hon. FRANK WOLF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: I would like to thank you for introducing legislation to restore the nation's official observance of George Washington's Birthday to February 22, the actual date of his birth 279 years ago. We are writing today in strong and enthusiastic support of your efforts.

Today many states, the media, advertisers and the general public have abandoned recognition of Washington's Birthday and replaced it with a commercial ''shopping holiday'' that leaves American history and patriotism by the side of the road. The holiday

was far more meaningful when it revolved around George Washington, and schools were able to focus on his sterling example of character and leadership. We look forward to the day, when once again, February 22 is marked by patriotic festivities and lessons about the life of George Washington, which can teach and inspire American leaders of today and tomorrow.

As our nation's foremost founding father, Washington is relevant to each new generation because his prominent character traits—undaunted courage, unabashed patriotism, reasoned judgment, a profound sense of civic responsibility, and a deep, selfless commitment to country—never go out of style. Educating the children of America about the life and leadership of George Washington is an important investment in the future of our nation.

Your efforts are particularly important because as noted author and historian David McCullough has said many times, we are ''raising a generation of historically illiterate children.'' Surveys and focus groups over the years tell us that most Americans—particularly young Americans—know the face of Washington because they see it every day on their dollars and quarters, but they don't know much more about him.

Why should we be concerned? Because George Washington was the most important, the most effective, the most powerful leader of our nation's founding era, and the shining example of his life is needed today more than ever.

To those like you who know and respect George Washington, it is crystal clear that many today have drifted so far from his standards of leadership that there is a real cause for concern for the future of our nation. We believe that George Washington is the best example of leadership and character the nation has ever known; therefore, it is our duty, our responsibility and our privilege to teach today's leaders and young people about George Washington's leadership with the hope that they will follow in his footsteps. Your legislation will be a significant step in that direction.

For example, a most compelling lesson for young people today is that George Washington served in the three most important leadership roles in the founding era. Quite remarkably, the Father of our Country was selected for each of these jobs unanimously, and, contrary to the common practice of the day, he gave up power and walked away from each of the positions despite strong support for him not to do so.

First, as Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army, he surmounted incredible odds, never took a day off in eight years of battle, and emerged victorious. But perhaps Washington's greatest moment came when he halted an attempt by his officers to overthrow the civilian government and make him king. He then resigned from the military entirely and returned to his life as a farmer at Mount Vernon.

With this resignation, Washington actually established a new definition of power. Before George Washington the road map was for great leaders to gain as much power as possible and keep it. But Washington truly believed in the concept of liberty—where the power rests with the people. He taught the world how to relinquish power—what an important lesson for the leaders of today.

Less than four years after his return to Mount Vernon, Washington was drafted to be President of the Constitutional Convention—because only he could bring the delegates together. He was elected as our first President and after serving two terms—he exited. He could have been elected again and again but he peacefully transferred power demonstrating that democracy really works.

Celebration of George Washington's Birthday on February 22 will help restore the position of the Father of Our Country as ''First in War, First in Peace, and First in the Hearts of his Countrymen,'' as Light-Horse Harry Lee said so many years ago. George Washington's sterling example of character and leadership provides the opportunity to refresh and inspire our country as we face formidable challenges both at home and abroad.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. REES,
President.

IN HONOR OF JAMES H. TROUT

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor James H. Trout who is being honored as a 2011 Father of the Year by the Father's Day Council of Northeastern Ohio and the American Diabetes Association.

Mr. Trout is the Executive Vice President of Acme Fresh Market Stores, serving on its Board of Directors and its Executive Committee. He has been with Acme Stores since 1973, working in a number of different capacities in increasingly important roles, serving as Director of General Merchandise, Senior Director of Merchandising, and Vice President of Sales and Merchandising.

Mr. Trout and his wife, Debbie, are the proud parents of two children—Jennifer, 31, and Jeff, 29—and one grandchild. Jim and Debbie currently reside in Suffield, where they are active in their community. Mr. Trout, former President of the Suffield Jaycees, also serves as a trustee for the F.W. Albrecht Family Foundation.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring James H. Trout, a hardworking and industrious man, and a wonderful husband, father and grandfather, on the occasion of his recognition as Father's Day Council's Father of the Year 2011.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF MS. CONNIE FERRIS BAILEY

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career and achievements of Ms. Connie Ferris Bailey, Executive Director of Operation Fresh Start, OFS, as she retires from her esteemed position after 34 years of service.

OFS was founded in 1970 and provides young offenders and high school dropouts with opportunities to learn basic work skills, prepare for high school equivalency exams, and secure employment. Furthermore, OFS stresses the importance of giving back to the community by renovating housing into safe, energy-efficient, affordable homes for low-income families. Over the past forty years OFS has built over 215 quality homes.

It is undoubtedly because of Connie's tireless leadership and energy that OFS is what it is today. In 1979, three years after joining OFS, Connie assumed the role of Executive Director. Under her tutelage OFS expanded annual enrollment to over 150 youth and focused on helping participants achieve self-sufficiency and become contributing citizens of the community. Connie's dedication to building a sustainable future and continuing Wisconsin's proud environmental legacy led OFS to begin providing conservation and stewardship services in and around Dane County in 1980. Additionally, since 2005, OFS builds new homes to meet or exceed Wisconsin Energy Star standards.

Connie transformed lives of at-risk youth in Madison, Dane County, and across Wisconsin. To date, OFS has served over 7,000 people. Eighty-five percent of participants are between the ages of 16–24 and 80 percent complete the goals of the program. Studies show that an astounding 60–65 percent of graduates remain self-sufficient. These numbers only begin to explain why the OFS model that Connie helped shape is so successful. It is not surprising that, in 1998, then Governor Tommy Thompson was eager to work with Connie to establish Wisconsin Fresh Start, WFS, a network of non-profit agencies operating under the OFS model that provide services aimed at increasing self-esteem and self-sufficiency of troubled youth. Today, WFS includes 9 agencies in 12 communities around the state and OFS continues to provide technical assistance to WFS.

Over the years, Connie held every employment title within OFS, highlighting how vital each position is to the program's overall success. It is an understatement to say that Connie has been and forever will be an invaluable asset to OFS and our community as a whole. Her emphasis on the value of hard work, respect, and self-worth and her recognition of potential in each and every person makes her an inspirational role model. Thankfully, although Connie is retiring, she will continue to provide essential technical assistance to new Youthbuild USA programs throughout the Midwest. People like Connie and programs like Operation Fresh Start are yet another reason I am so proud to represent the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin. I join those across Wisconsin, the Midwest, and our great Nation in thanking Ms. Connie Ferris Bailey for her lifetime of service.

CONGRATULATING GEORGE DAWSON MIDDLE SCHOOL ON BEING RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF THE NATION'S TOP 100 SCHOOLS TO WATCH

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I rise today to recognize and congratulate George Dawson Middle School in Southlake, TX for being recognized as one of the Nation's Top 100 Schools to Watch. George Dawson was chosen for its academic excellence, developmental responsiveness to students and ability to provide students with the resources, teachers and support they need.

Sponsored by The National Forum To Accelerate Middle Grades Reform, the Schools

to Watch program looks at schools that have the whole picture of education. After a written application is approved, state teams observe schools and conduct numerous interviews. Those who pass expectations are then approved to be Schools to Watch for three years. High-performing teachers, strong leadership, and a commitment to bring about continuous improvement are but a few of the strict criteria George Dawson met to receive this prestigious honor.

Educational success is the result of many factors, including hard work, innovation and a supportive community. I am proud to represent such a community, and especially a school that is reaching and surpassing all expectations. On behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating George Dawson Middle School on its recognition as one of America's Top 100 Schools to Watch.

IN HONOR OF KENNETH A. LANCI

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Kenneth A. Lanci who is being honored as a 2011 Father of the Year by the Father's Day Council of Northeastern Ohio and the American Diabetes Association.

Mr. Lanci, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Consolidated Graphics Group, Inc., is also the Chairman of Project Love and Purple America. While Consolidated Graphics, Inc. is a leader in graphic art technology, Purple America is a leader in uniting Americans through shared values. Its mission is to create new forums to share beliefs, engage young people in meaningful dialogue, and connect all Americans through shared American ideals. Purple Love is a character-building program that has trained thousands of American teens and their educators to build a culture of kindness, caring and respect in their schools.

Mr. Lanci has also brought OneSight to Cleveland's Municipal School District, a nonprofit organization which has given free eye exams and eye glasses to thousands of children in the area.

Mr. Lanci's good work extends to his family as well. Mr. Lanci is a devoted husband to his high school sweetheart, father to his three children, and grandfather to his six grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Kenneth Lanci, a man of great honor and spirit, a wonderful husband, father and grandfather, on the occasion being recognized as Father's Day Council's Father of the Year 2011.

RECOGNIZING THE DALLAS HISPANIC YOUTH INSTITUTE

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding students who are participating in this week's Dallas Hispanic Youth Institute. Each year, the Hispanic College Fund hosts this empowerment event to help inspire Hispanic high school students in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex to overcome barriers to higher education and pursue careers that only a college education can provide.

By attending the Hispanic Youth Institute, these students have shown their desire to continue their educational attainment and taken proactive steps to achieve those dreams. Despite being the largest minority group in the United States, Hispanics have the lowest rate of higher education completion. As the Hispanic population in Texas and throughout the United States continues to grow, ensuring opportunities and success for all is essential to our economy and welfare. We cannot continue to compete globally as a country if we let millions of bright minds slip through the cracks.

The Hispanic Youth Institute connects disadvantaged Hispanic high school students with local Hispanic professionals, college admissions officers, mentors, and other inspirational speakers. By providing informational seminars at on-campus settings, the Hispanic Youth Institute helps students build confidence and receive practical tools to help achieve a pathway to college.

Many of the students at this week's Hispanic Youth Institute will become the first person in their family to attend and complete college. This is an important step for these young people, as well as the next generation who will look towards their example. They will become the role models of tomorrow, and I hope that this week's event will inspire them to give back.

I would like to recognize the Social Security Administration for its commitment to volunteerism at the Hispanic Youth Institute under the direction of Raul Garduño. Additionally, I'd like to recognize Raul Magdaleno and all of the other individuals who have worked to make the Hispanic Youth Institute a success. Raul Magdaleno is the Chair of the Dallas Hispanic Youth Institute and has served as a key advocate for the program and Hispanic students since its inauguration in 2009. Each year, Raul inspires students through his story of overcoming extreme adversities to obtain a higher education by teaching students that the "number one ticket we have to fight poverty is education."

I am confident that this year's Dallas Hispanic Youth Institute will be a great success, and wish the 200 student participants best wishes in their studies and attaining their goals.

IN HONOR OF MR. BRIAN E. HALL AND MR. WILLIAM D. HALL

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. William D. Hall and Mr. Brian E. Hall who are being honored as a 2011 Father of the Year by the Father's Day Council of Northeastern Ohio and the American Diabetes Association. This father-son duo demonstrates the long-lasting, positive effect that one father can have on another.

Mr. William D. Hall is the founder of Hall's Trucking, which later became Industrial Transport, Inc. and later, Industrial Inventory Solutions. He also founded the Holly Development Company. Mr. Hall has been active in public policy as well as redeveloping neighborhoods. Despite Mr. Hall's many successful endeavors, his greatest source of pride remains his two children and ten grandchildren.

Mr. Brian E. Hall is the son of William D. Hall. He is the current Chairman and CEO of Industrial Inventory Solutions, where he has helped the business grow into a national comprehensive logistics firm. Mr. Hall also holds many other positions, including Secretary and Governance Chairman for the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, Chairman of the President's Council Foundation, Trustee of the University of Cincinnati Foundation and Trustee of University Hospitals. Brian E. Hall's main commitment, however, is to his three children.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in recognizing Mr. William D. Hall and Mr. Brian E. Hall who exemplify model citizens and outstanding fathers. I wish Mr. William D. Hall and Mr. Brian E. Hall the best in all of their future endeavors.

HONORING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SERVICE ACADEMY SELECTION BOARD

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend my Service Academy Selection Board, an exemplary group of selfless, dedicated Washingtonians who have served our country and have been so generous to continue their service by helping me select nominees to the United States Service Academies. Although academy nominations and appointments are attributed to me, they are not, by any means, my singular effort. Most of the work, involving careful vetting and painstaking evaluation of each applicant, as well as encouragement and recruitment, is done largely by my Service Academy Selection Board.

The work of the Service Academy Selection Board is so critical to our nation that I ask the entire House to join me in recognizing and thanking the members of the District of Columbia's Service Academy Selection Board, who recommend to me the nominees from whom the academy selects appointees: Cdr. Kerwin E. Miller, USN (Ret), Chair, U.S. Naval Academy, Class of 1975, attorney in private practice; George R. Keys, Jr., immediate past Chair, U.S. Air Force Academy, Class of 1970, Rhodes Scholar, partner with Jordan & Keys LLP; Wesley Brown, Chair Emeritus, U.S. Naval Academy, Class of 1949, Academy's first African-American graduate, for whom the Academy's new field house is named; Steven Blust, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, Class of 1971, President of the Institute of International Containers, former Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission; Capt. Karen Courington, USAFR, Air Force Academy Admissions Liaison Officer, C–17 pilot, employee of Deutsche Bank designing their "Veterans on Wall Street" initiative; David Gragan, U.S. Air Force Academy, Class of 1977, Senior Procurement Executive of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Department of the

Treasury; Anthony K. Hollinger, U.S. Naval Academy, Class of 1987, established a Veterans Affairs program for the University of the District of Columbia; OV Johnson, U.S. Air Force, retired 1974, served in the Air Force's Office of Special Investigations; Daniel J. Keenaghan, U.S. Military Academy, Class of 2000, international trade specialist who specializes in logistics and export promotion; Charles B. King, III, U.S. Military Academy, Class of 1994, Risk Analysis Branch Chief with the Transportation Security Administration; Riaz Latifullah, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, Class of 1978, employee of AARP, Inc; Tony Montes, U.S. Army veteran, longtime D.C. resident and community activist; James Nelson Rimensnyder, U.S. Military Academy, Class of 2005, whom I nominated in 1999 and 2000, deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom from 2006–2007 as an armor platoon leader and again in 2008–2009 as a Task Force Intelligence officer; Barbara J. Smith, Chair of the Department of Teaching, Learning and Professional Development at Bowie State University and; Joel C. Spangenberg, U.S. Naval Academy, Class of 2000, Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

These D.C. residents each have lead outstanding lives of professional accomplishment and service. Together, they make an awe-inspiring group. Their service to the District of Columbia and to our nation has been outstanding in every way.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the District of Columbia Service Academy Selection Board for their diligent work and dedication to our youth, for their continuing service, and for their commitment to our country.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SECURITY ACT OF 2011

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Congresswoman GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, I have introduced the Department of Defense Energy Security Act of 2011. As many of you know, Congresswoman GIFFORDS has been a staunch advocate of energy alternatives and its impact on national security. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, she has worked on a number of initiatives since she arrived in Congress, and many of those proposals have been included in the committee's annual defense authorization bill. The bill that I am introducing for her today continues this legacy.

The Department of Defense Energy Security Act of 2011 is a comprehensive bill that seeks to move the Department forward on energy security. It includes a number of initiatives based on input from various national security and energy organizations, the Department of Defense, and industry.

These include initiatives such as: Joint Contingency Base Resource Security Pilot Project; Tactical Vehicle Efficiency Report; Conversion of Non-Tactical Vehicles; Alternative Fuels Contracting Authority; Designation of an Executive Agent for Alternative Fuel Development; Energy Test Bed Initiative; Energy Conservation Investment Program; Report on ASHRAE Building Standards; Continually-updated List of Energy Technologies for DOD Facilities; Energy Manager Certification; Energy Management Data Needs; Interim Renewable Electricity Standard (RES) Goals; Remove Technology Bias in Permissible Land Use; Strategic Plan for Renewable Energy Development; Report on Cross-Agency Renewable Energy Development Efforts; Elimination of Approval Requirement for Long-Term Contracts for Energy/Fuel at Military Installations; Report on Energy Security and Renewable Energy Development; Report on Installation Energy Security and Societal Impacts.

Several of the provisions proposed in the bill, already have been included H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I am pleased to assist Congresswoman GIFFORDS in her efforts to continue to improve the energy security of the Department of Defense.

HONORING ROCKY RUN MIDDLE SCHOOL'S ''THE LATEST GENERATION MEETS THE GREATEST GENERATION'' PROGRAM

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I recently attended a wonderful event at Rocky Run Middle School in Chantilly, Virginia. The program brings World War II veterans together with 7th grade students for one-on-one interviews about the veterans' experiences during war.

The event was initiated 10 years ago by history teacher Jamie Sawatzky and for his efforts, he was selected as the Fairfax County Public Schools Teacher of the Year. Rocky Run Middle School is the only school in the region with this type of program.

The event was attended by 125 World War II veterans, representing all branches of the Armed Forces and nearly every theater of the war. I was touched to hear the recollections from so many members of the ''Greatest Generation'' who sacrificed so much to protect our nation's freedom. Students got to hear from Edward Connor, who served with the U.S. Army Air Corps in Papua, New Guinea, and Guadalcanal; Lucas Dargan, who served aboard a U.S. Navy destroyer in the north Atlantic guiding supply convoys; Donald Graul, a paratrooper with the 82nd Airborne Division who parachuted into Normandy on D-Day and was captured by the Germans, spending the rest of the war in a POW camp, and Richard Graff, who marched with the Army through France, Belgium, and Holland and met the Russian Army at the Elbe River.

These men, and many more, volunteered their time to share their views with today's students. With fewer and fewer World War II veterans still living, I applaud the efforts of these and all veterans who share this living history and make their memories part of children's learning experience and the historical record.

I also want to draw attention to the Rocky Run students, who recognize the importance of learning from previous generations. Knowing about one of the most traumatic episodes in world history and the sacrifice it required of all Americans, these students will have an appreciation of what it takes to preserve our nation's freedoms. The 7th graders of Rocky Run Middle School took on a challenging assignment and carried it out in a fashion of which we can all be proud.

There can be no better learning experience than combining the knowledge and experience of the ''Greatest Generation'' with the ''Latest Generation.'' I hope schools across America can learn from the example of Rock Run Middle School in Chantilly, Virginia.

TRIBUTE TO SARAH ZABEL

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Sarah Zabel, one of my constituents and I am proud to say one of this year's 141 U.S. Presidential Scholars.

Sarah is one of the top students in her graduating class at Brownsburg High School in Brownsburg, Indiana, while balancing work and numerous extracurricular activities. She is a member of the Girl's Varsity Tennis Team and writes for the Y-Press, the youth news bureau of the Indianapolis Star. Sarah also sings in Starlight Voices, a competitive women's choir. She has held several leadership positions within her community, including Vice President of the National Honor Society, copy editor of Brownsburg High School's student newspaper, and was a participant in the National Young Leaders Conference. It is clear, Sarah succeeds not only in the classroom, but as an active member of her community. In Sarah's free time, she tutors second grade students, serves food for Beggars for the Poor, and collects non-perishable goods for local food pantries.

I am proud to honor Sarah Zabel in recognition of all her achievements, admirable leadership, and superior contributions to her local community. As she heads to Xavier University in the fall, I wish her the best of luck for a bright and successful future.

IN HONOR OF MARY ANNE CRAMPTON

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mary Anne Crampton to acknowledge her tremendous service to the Northeast Ohio community.

A native of Pittsburgh, Mary Anne relocated to the Cleveland area to begin her career and has prospered in various organizations since. She has been credited with transforming the downtown area of Lakewood, Ohio, into a lively, historic area.

Mary Anne served as the Executive Director of LakewoodAlive, an economic development organization that strives to facilitate economic stability and growth in the Lakewood area, since its inception. She was recently was chosen as the Lakewood Chamber of Commerce 2011 Business Person of the Year. Her unwavering devotion to furthering economic development in Lakewood has proven beneficial

for the Cleveland suburb. Prior to working for LakewoodAlive Mary Anne was Manager of Marketing and Public Relations at Cleveland Sight Center, a nonprofit organization that works to enhance the lives of blind persons.

In addition to her career, Ms. Crampton is a dedicated and involved member of the Northeast Ohio community. Mary Anne is a member on the board of the Lakewood Hospital Foundation where she serves on the governance committee. She is a board member of the Lakewood Chamber of Commerce where she serves on the economic development committee, and she chairs the board resources committee for the Beck Center for Cultural Arts.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, Mary Anne Crampton has proven herself a very valuable citizen of the Cleveland community and surrounding areas. Her exceptional passion to better the lives of the members of her community is truly a blessing. Mary Anne's vision and hard work make her one of Northeast Ohio's most remarkable citizens.

WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM CONSERVATION SEMIPOSTAL STAMP ACT OF 2011

HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN

OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H.R. 2236, the Wildlife Refuge System Conservation Semipostal Stamp Act of 2011. This bill would let Americans donate to the upkeep of the National Wildlife Refuge System by purchasing semipostal stamps. There are 553 refuge sites in or nearby almost every congressional district in this country; and those refuges need financial help.

Last month, Chairman FLEMING of the Natural Resources Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs held an oversight hearing on the National Wildlife Refuge System's finances. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which manages the System, testified that it has $3.3 billion in unmet operational needs and deferred maintenance projects.

A semipostal stamp could help—at least in some small way—to pull the Refuge System out of that deep hole. Semipostals are postage stamps sold at a premium, with the difference going to fund a cause of national interest. The stamps have proven successful. The Breast Cancer Research Stamp has raised over $71 million since it was authorized in 1998.

Now, in times of budget constraint, Americans are looking for ways to revitalize the wildlife refuges in their backyards without increasing the demand on taxpayers. The semipostal stamp authorized in H.R. 2236 would provide Americans a way to support their 553 refuge sites without increasing taxes or taking funds from other important government services.

The National Wildlife Refuge System was created by President Theodore Roosevelt and today it is the world's premier system of public lands and waters set aside to conserve fish, wildlife and plants. In my district, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Volcanic Unit and the Mariana Trench Unit of the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument are parts of the National Wildlife Refuge System. The Volcanic Unit is an arc of undersea mud volcanoes and thermal vents where exotic animals thrive in some of the harshest conditions imaginable. This is an area of cutting-edge scientific scrutiny, and awakens dreams of deep-sea exploration and discovery in us all.

In almost every state and territory wildlife refuges are similarly important. They provide recreational opportunities. By exposing our young people to the natural world, refuges inspire the next generation of scientists and researchers. And the wildlife refuges are economic assets. Every year, the Refuge System attracts 44 million tourists, generating $1.7 billion in sales and sustaining 27,000 jobs.

Despite the value of the National Wildlife Refuge System, it remains drastically underfunded—unable to keep up with basic operations and maintenance costs. My bill would help alleviate that problem. H.R. 2236 brings a fresh source of income to the National Wildlife Refuge System without drawing on taxpayers or increasing the national debt. The bill gives Americans the choice to contribute to a program deeply important to our Nation and I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2236.

TRIBUTE TO BILL HAWKINS

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a true leader from my home State of Minnesota, William A. Hawkins. Bill has recently retired as Chairman and CEO of Medtronic, the world's leading medical technology company. He has been an insightful leader and his legacy includes the launch of important new technologies, major investments in quality and innovation, and the successful navigation through an increasingly challenging environment.

Bill's years at Medtronic have been filled with competition and innovation—serving with unwavering commitment to global growth, encouraging and acquiring technology, and growing the ability to meet patient needs in emerging markets. Under his guidance, Medtronic became a chronic disease management company and not just a medical technology company.

As Co-Chair of the Medical Technology Caucus, I am a major proponent of advancing life-saving technologies for patients. I have worked with Bill for a number of years in support of the medical technology industry on many issues such as trade, tax, payment, regulatory and research policies. Minnesota is one of the top med-tech epi-centers in the country. It remains one of few industries in the U.S. that exports more products than it imports—approximately $36 billion annually. Our work helps to ensure that the medical technology industry continues to play a major role in the positive economic growth of our State and Nation.

Bill has nearly 35 years of career experience in the medical device industry, serving in leadership positions at Novoste Corporation; American Home Products; Johnson & Johnson; Guidant Corporation; and Eli Lilly. He began his medical technology career with Carolina Medical Electronics in 1977.

He joined Medtronic in 2002 as Senior Vice President and President of the company's Vascular business before serving as Corporate President and Chief Operating Officer. Bill Hawkins was named Chief Executive Officer of Medtronic in 2007 and assumed the additional role of Chairman in 2008.

In March of 2010 Bill received the Biomedical Engineering Society's Distinguished Achievement Award. This award is given to recognize those that have made great contributions to the field of biomedical engineering/bioengineering.

Bill is also committed to giving back to our community by serving on the Board of Visitors for the Duke University School of Engineering and the Board of Directors for the Guthrie Theater and the University of Minnesota Foundation.

I am pleased to join Bill's friends, family, and colleagues in congratulating him on his many accomplishments, and wish him well as he starts the next chapter in his life. His passion for advancing innovations will keep him taking broad and bold steps to make the world a better place.

Congratulations Bill Hawkins!

HONORING GEORGE ROBERT LUDWIG

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to recognize Lieutenant George Robert Ludwig for his heroic service to our country. Lieutenant Ludwig entered the Army Aviation Flight School at Fort Rucker, Alabama in 1963 and served in Vietnam and Bien Hoa.

Lieutenant Ludwig was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for his heroism while participating in aerial flight. He first distinguished himself by exceptionally valorous action while serving as an aircraft pilot in action at Dong Xoai, Republic of Vietnam from June 10, 1965 to June 14, 1965. When battle erupted on morning of June 1, 1965, he was flying his aircraft with the mission of providing radio relay and acting as an artillery observer. When word was received that the United States compound at Dong Xoai was under heavy attack by a regiment of Viet Cong, Lieutenant Ludwig, who was flying the only aircraft in the immediate area, unhesitatingly volunteered to act as forward air controller for United States fighter bombers en route to the area. During the five-day period following the Viet Cong attack, Lieutenant Ludwig flew numerous radio relay and artillery adjustment missions, successfully and accurately directing many air strikes in support of the besieged compound.

Lieutenant Ludwig also received twenty Air Medals, two Medals of Valor and was the only Army pilot in the Vietnam War to receive the Distinguished Flying Cross by the United States Air Force.

I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the residents of the 5th District of Texas, to thank Lieutenant Ludwig and his family for their service to this country. We are

eternally grateful for our service men and women, past and present, who have fought to preserve liberty for our generation and generations to come.

INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY OF WAYS TO IMPROVE THE ACCURACY OF THE COLLECTION OF FEDERAL OIL, CONDENSATE, AND NATURAL GAS ROYALTIES ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the Study of Ways to Improve the Accuracy of the Collection of Federal Oil, Condensate, and Natural Gas Royalties Act, which successfully passed the House in the last Congress as an amendment to the Consolidated Land, Energy, and Aquatic Resources (CLEAR) Act. I thank original cosponsors Representatives HINCHEY and GRIJALVA for their support.

At a time of record high gas prices, it is vital to ensure the American taxpayer is fairly and accurately compensated for energy resources extracted from leased federal onshore and offshore lands. This legislation would commission the National Academy of Engineers to study if the production volume measurement of oil, condensate, and natural gas collection on federal lands (including submerged, deep water, and Indian lands) could be improved with alternative methods.

In April 2010, the Government Accountability Office released a study showing the management of production from oil and natural gas leases has been inconsistent and inadequate in past administrations. With revenues from leases amounting to billions of dollars, it is important that American taxpayers accurately know the amount of oil and gas that is extracted on leased federal lands.

A better understanding of the best extraction measurement methods could ultimately result in increased revenue for the federal government. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation in the 112th Congress.

HONORING PAUL E. LANDERS, JR.

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to recognize Major General (Retired) Paul E. Landers, Jr. for his heroic service to our country. General Landers served as deputy chief of staff, operations and transportation at Headquarters Air Mobility Command on Scott Air Force Base, Illinois.

General Landers was a command pilot, logging more than 5,600 flying hours. His military awards and decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster, Distinguished Flying Cross with oak leaf cluster, Meritorious Service Medal with oak leaf cluster, Air Medal with 15 oak leaf clusters, Air Force Commendation Medal and Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Cross with two silver stars. While commander of the 437th Military Airlift Wing, he was awarded the Order of the Sword, the highest honor bestowed by the enlisted force.

I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the residents of the 5th District of Texas, to thank General Landers and his family for their service to this country. We are eternally grateful for our service men and women, past and present, who have fought to preserve liberty for our generation and generations to come.

HONORING CHAD OBERMILLER'S IRONMAN

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Chad A. Obermiller, an integral member of my staff and even prouder member of an elite group of athletes—athletes who compete in the phenomenon known only as ''The Ironman.''

Few sane individuals voluntarily sign themselves up to compete in such a harrowing and humbling experience. For Chad, he has made such a decision three times, and will be crossing the line this Sunday, June 26, 2011 in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, to complete his third Ironman.

A 2.4 mile swim, followed by a 112 mile bike, and capped by a full marathon—yes, a 26.2 mile run—it is no surprise that a phrase has been coined specifically to describe those who drag themselves to the finish line following this arduous task: ''The Crawl.''

But, I have complete confidence that Chad will cross that line proudly and upright, as he has promised both my staff, as well as me, that he intends to win.

To quote one of Chad's greatest heroes, Lance Armstrong: ''Life, to me, is a series of false limits and my challenge as an athlete is to explore those limits.''

Chad, may you know no limits in Coeur d'Alene.

HONORING RICHARD E. DWELLE

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to recognize Captain Richard E. Dwelle from Athens, Texas for his heroic service to our country.

In 1942, Mr. Dwelle joined the United States Army Reserves and in 1944, he was commissioned for active duty as a 2nd Lieutenant. In December of 1944, Mr. Dwelle arrived in Europe and was assigned as a replacement officer to M Company, 329 Regiment, 83rd Infantry Division where he received a promotion to 1st Lieutenant. Following his valorous service at the Battle of the Bulge and during the Rhine Campaign, Mr. Dwelle was discharged from active duty in June of 1946 and promoted to Captain in the Reserves. Mr. Dwelle later resigned from Reserves after a decade of service.

Mr. Dwelle and his wife Peggy have been an integral part of Henderson County, Texas serving on numerous charitable boards. Mr. Dwelle was named Citizen of the Year in Athens in 1971 and was inducted into the Rice University Sports Hall of Fame in 1997.

I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the residents of the 5th District of Texas, to thank Mr. Dwelle and his family for their service to this country. We are eternally grateful for our service men and women, past and present, who have fought to preserve liberty for our generation and generations to come.

RECOGNIZING MORTON MUSEUM OF COOKE COUNTY

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of the Morton Museum of Cooke County in Gainesville, Texas. I am proud to announce that this small local history museum, which has been serving the historical curiosity of the public since 1968, is one of the newest participants in the 2011 Conservation Assessment Program (CAP), a program administered by the Heritage Preservation and funded through the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

CAP is a technical assistance program that, for over twenty years, has been helping small museums that lack conservators or building experts of their own to improve their collections care efforts in terms of their individual budget, staffing, and fundraising capacities. The Morton Museum is one of only five museums in Texas selected for this prestigious grant, and one of only one hundred museums nationwide. With its participation in the Conservation Assessment Program, the museum will receive a professional site visit for assessment and prioritized recommendations for improvements. Together, CAP and the Morton Museum are working hard to ensure an enriching experience for all who visit the museum.

It is not only an honor for the Morton Museum to be selected to participate in this program, but it is also an honor for me to have the opportunity to represent the museum and the people who work so hard to maintain its tradition of excellence in the 26th District of Texas. I commend the Morton Museum's continuing efforts to improve and serve the people and visitors of Cooke County.

SALUTING WELCOME HOME A HERO

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a 29-year Air Force veteran and a former Prisoner of War for nearly 7 years, more than half of that time in solitary confinement, it gives me great joy to request that the U.S. House of Representatives formally recognize and commemorate the 7th anniversary of the

"Welcome Home a Hero Program" at Dallas-Fort Worth (DFW) International Airport. I especially want to thank the kind folks at DFW, the North Texas Commission, and the USO for their efforts to recognize and show their appreciation to the brave men and women who serve our country.

"Welcome Home a Hero" is a volunteer program to encourage and support our deployed military and greet troops at DFW International Airport as they return home for two weeks of R&R. Anywhere from 150 to 275 troops come through DFW each day, with one flight arriving daily and one flight departing daily. Volunteers gather each day to welcome these troops off their flight, thanking and encouraging them for their service to our great nation.

This wonderful program started in the summer of 2004 when the U.S. military selected DFW to begin receiving the daily 20-hour flights from Kuwait. Once the flights began, grassroots groups, schools, churches, scouts and veterans organizations began to greet the troops on a daily basis. DFW fire trucks welcome every military charter on the runway with a "shower of affection" to begin the celebration.

In fact, "Welcome Home a Hero" has greeted more than 1 million troops during the course of the program by dedicated volunteers who greet troops daily. I had the privilege of attending the one millionth warrior ceremony at DFW and let's just say that there wasn't a dry eye in the place.

If you want to experience the best America has to offer—respect for freedom, gratitude for service and sacrifice and a deep, deep love of country—just head on down to Terminal D or Terminal B depending on the day. You'll witness the show of support from volunteers from across North Texas and the unbridled joy and emotional high of a family embracing a returning warrior. Cheerful and faithful patriots of all ages and stages wearing their finest red, white and blue attire show up so that they can let complete strangers who dedicate their lives to our armed forces know that we love them, we care about them, we pray for them and we appreciate them.

You'll see humble veterans from wars gone by who know that freedom is not free. You'll meet Vietnam veteran Bert Brady who makes a point of ensuring that this generation of soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines returns with honor and a warm welcome—unlike the men who came home from Vietnam. You'll feel a sweet embrace from the "huggin' and kissin' grandmas" who make it a habit of planting a big one on digi-cammie clad warriors. Each volunteer offers a sweet smile, a love of country and respect for service that truly welcomes home our troops with the way they deserve to be treated.

As a combat veteran who witnessed the ultimate low for returning warriors from Vietnam, I made a promise to myself that when, not if, I escaped my captivity in Vietnam, I would do anything and everything in my power to treat our men and women of the United States Armed Forces with the respect and honor that they deserve. "Welcome Home a Warrior" is a shining example of that golden homecoming and showcases how much North Texans—and Americans—support our troops.

If people across America find themselves traveling through DFW, I encourage them to call the R&R update line 972–574–0392 to learn of the next arrival ceremony and to see if they may participate in a truly heartwarming and uplifting welcome home celebration for our armed forces. They also may go to www.dfwairport.com/heroes.

On this day, I respectfully request that the United States House of Representatives reaffirms our unwavering commitment to actively promote and support the "Welcome Home a Hero Program" and its invaluable importance to the morale and welfare of those men and women who serve our country.

Make no mistake—America remains the land of the free because of the brave. God bless America.

RECOGNIZING BROOKS BYERS OF FLOWER MOUND

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of our youth who show an outstanding capacity for service. In particular, I would like to commend the achievements of Brooks Byers of Flower Mound, Texas. Mr. Byers is the newest winner of The Congressional Award Gold Medal, Congress's only and very prestigious award for youth.

Earning the Gold Medal requires great commitment and devotion to service; each award-winner must spend two or more years completing more than 400 hours of community service Mr. Byers's service projects included organizing youth tennis camps and gift-wrapping fundraisers to raise more than $3,000 for Susan G. Komen for the Cure, tutoring at-risk children each week and raising money for their after-school program through a book drive, and organizing homecoming celebrations for soldiers each weekend as part of the Welcome Home a Hero Program.

Mr. Byers's accomplishments do not end here. The Congressional Award Gold Medal also requires participants to complete 200 hours of personal development and physical fitness activities, which Brooks fulfilled through a junior golf league and his high school's tennis team. For the Expedition part of the Gold Medal program, Brooks planned a trip to enrich his understanding of ancient European history in Scotland and France.

The Congressional Award Gold Medal recognizes youth who show great initiative and an inspiring ability to reach complex, self-imposed goals. This experience, what Mr. Byers himself calls "transformative", shows an incredible commitment to excellence and the principles of our country's future leaders. It is an honor for me to have the opportunity to recognize and represent Mr. Brooks Byers.

A TRIBUTE TO JOSÉ R. SÁNCHEZ

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize José R. Sánchez.

José R. Sánchez, is President and Chief Executive Officer of Norwegian American Hospital, Chicago's only Latino hospital. José has a 30-plus year career as a health care executive and possesses a wealth of knowledge of the health care industry.

As President and CEO of Norwegian American, José is dedicated to enhancing the quality of services provided to more than 112,000 patients annually. Among his first priorities was to lead the management executive team to critically assess and refine the quality of all systems, structures and services that are currently in place. José is committed to pursuing collaborative and innovative solutions to combat the health care challenges of the communities the hospital serves: Humboldt Park, West Town, Wicker Park, Logan Square and Austin.

Before joining Norwegian American Hospital, José was the Senior Vice President of the Generations +/Northern Manhattan Health Network, one of the largest health care networks in the New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation. During his tenure, he oversaw three acute care hospitals of which two were level one trauma centers, and 34 community-based health centers in East Harlem, Central Harlem and the South Bronx in New York City.

José is the architect of the Urban Health Conference, an annual national forum in existence since 2001 that brings together more than 300 health care providers to focus on the disparities in health care for minority populations and strategies to eliminate them. He serves as Chairman of the East Harlem Business Capital Corporation Board of Directors, which provides microlending and business development services for community businesses. In addition, he is a member of the Board of Boricua College in New York. The college was designed to serve the educational needs of Puerto Ricans and other Hispanics. In October 2009, José was named among the "Most Influential Latinos" in the United States by Hispanic Business Magazine, a New York Times Co. syndicated publication.

José has been a licensed social worker since 1979. He holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology from the City College of New York and a Master of Social Work from Adelphi University. In 2002, he was conferred an honorary doctorate degree from the New York College of Podiatric Medicine. This honor recognized his measurable accomplishments and steadfast commitment to improving the health status of the poorest and most disadvantaged populations in New York City.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mr. José R. Sánchez for his extraordinary accomplishments and his spirit that reflect the best our nation has to offer.

HONORING CAROLE M. WATSON

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary career of Carole M. Watson as she retires from over 30 years of nonprofit management, including the last ten years as Chief Community Investment Officer with the United Way of the Bay Area, UWBA. I join our community in celebrating the many ways in which her life's work has contributed to the success and well-being of countless people throughout the Bay Area and beyond.

In addition to holding a Master of Social Work from Wayne State University and a bachelor's degree in Education & Social Work from Western Michigan University, Ms. Watson completed the United Way of America/Annie E. Casey Foundation's Family Strengthening for Success Fellowship at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government in 2002. Ms. Watson's experience in academia also includes serving as a university faculty member for undergraduate and graduate students of Social Work while residing in Tennessee.

During three decades of leadership experience in the nonprofit sector, Ms. Watson served two Urban League affiliates located in Nashville, Tennessee and the San Francisco Bay Area. In her Urban League roles, she managed job development, led training programs and coordinated job fairs serving thousands of job seekers. Over the years, she has helped over 7,000 job seekers in securing employment opportunities with roughly 100 employers.

In her most recent role as UWBA's Chief Community Investment Officer, Ms. Watson managed grants, programs, volunteers, marketing strategies, donor cultivation, collaborative fundraising, fund distribution and community building across seven Bay Area counties.

As a member of UWBA's senior management team for the last 10 years, Ms. Watson has been known as a fearless and effective leader and mentor. She managed a $6 million portfolio with a Community Investment Team and Community Project staff, comprising over 20 members. And in 2002, she was voted the esteemed UWBA Percy C. Moore Employee of the Year by her colleagues.

The recipient of numerous honors and accolades, Ms. Watson received the National Philanthropy Day Foundation Professional Award co-sponsored by the Northern California Grant Makers and Association of Fund Raising Executives in 2006. She was also recognized as the 2006 San Francisco Boy Scouts of America's Whitney M. Young Community Leader.

Ms. Watson's dedication to improving the lives of children, youth and families through economic development is evident from her countless community affiliations and activities. Whether serving as a liaison to the United Way World Wide Income Advisory Group, creating the Earn It! Keep It! Save It! Campaign, EKS, to provide free tax preparation for eligible EITC tax filers, or serving as Board President of the Oakland Emiliano Zapata Street Academy, Ms. Watson has donated her time to lead bold initiatives for the benefit of her community. She has truly created pathways out of poverty.

On behalf of the residents of California's 9th Congressional District, Ms. Carole M. Watson, I salute you for three decades of outstanding service in assisting families to achieve financial stability and secure future success. I congratulate and thank you for your unparalleled service to our community. You have touched many lives in profound ways throughout your career, and we wish you and your family continued prosperity and happiness as you transition to this exciting new chapter of life.

A TRIBUTE TO FELICIA LEMONS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Felicia Lemons.

Felicia Lemons is a Human Rights Specialist for the New York City Commission on Human rights. She spent her formative years growing up in Linden Plaza, Brooklyn, New York. Her family then moved to Cambria Heights, Queens where she expanded upon the value of family and love of community. Both her parents, Hank and Sadie Lemons emphasized the importance of education, social justice and helping one's neighbor.

During a bible study meeting at the House of the Lord Church in Brooklyn, the Rev. Dr. Herbert Daughtry approached Felicia with an opportunity to work in his outreach ministry. He recruited her to advocate for formerly incarcerated women, as well as minister the gospel of Jesus Christ to the community at large. While under the mentorship of Pastor Daughtry, she trained in all matters of social justice, gender discrimination and serviced the ''least of these'' in the neighborhood.

Also while in training, Felicia attended Long Island University, Brooklyn Campus. Felicia was on the Dean's List for seven consecutive semesters and is a member of the Alpha Chi Honor Society. Graduating Magna Cum Laude, she earned a Bachelor of Fine Arts Degree.

From Long Island University under the advice of Pastor Daughtry and Rev. Dr. Syl Shannon, National Convention Chaplain for Alpha Phi Alpha, Felicia pursued a Masters in Divinity Degree from Duke University. While working on her Masters, she served marginalized communities as a volunteer for Center for community Help in Durham, North Carolina.

Felicia returned to New York to work for Commissioner Patricia Gatling at the NYC Commission on Human Rights. Serving as a Human Rights Specialist, she directs her talent and passion to educated and advocate for people transitioning back into the community from prison. In doing so, she works closely with organizations such as Alpha School Project in Brooklyn, Women's Prison Association, Young Women's Leadership program of August Martin High School, New York State Division of Parole, as well as Community Liaison for the Commission on Human Rights. From this work, she has coauthored ''Turning the Game Around,'' a comprehensive resource guide to Employment discrimination under the Human Rights Law for returning citizens of incarceration who desire to have a successful transition in New York City. Felicia continues to persist in her work. She believes to leave one person behind of a million under her watch, is to lose the battle at large.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mrs. Lemons for her extraordinary accomplishments and her spirit which reflect the best our nation has to offer.

REINTRODUCTION OF THE HURRICANE RESEARCH INITIATIVE ACT OF 2011

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, June first marked the official start of the 2011 hurricane season. As we prepare for this upcoming season, I am proud to reintroduce the Hurricane Research Initiative Act of 2011.

I cannot help but recall the devastation left in the wake of hurricanes that have hit my home State of Florida, such as Andrew, Ivan, Jeanne, and Katrina. These storms were some of the worst any of us had ever seen. We can all remember the haunting images of our coastal communities from Florida to Louisiana left in utter destruction. It is easy to picture the faces of those who were most affected, and to remember the stories told by survivors. Even today, the impact of these disasters are still being felt in many communities along the Gulf Coast region.

The damage from these storms affects us all. Hurricane damage has cost our Nation an average of $35.8 billion in economic losses per year since 2001. Between 2002 and 2007, we experienced over $180 billion in losses due to hurricanes.

As a nation, we have been caught off-guard by these storms. In the past, we were not ready for the destructive forces that came our way. We could not anticipate the extent to which these storms would change our coastal towns and cities. In short, we were unprepared.

Looking back, it is easy to see why. In recent years, we have allowed hurricane research to lapse. It is a failure that must be addressed. Every year, we pay the price in environmental damage, fiscal devastation, and human lives.

More research must be done on these storm systems. Therefore, I am proud to reintroduce the Hurricane Research Initiative Act of 2011, which authorizes critical hurricane research funding to help our scientists study and better understand how hurricanes form and intensify, research that will help us prepare for many hurricane seasons to come.

The legislation also provides for enhancing early warning systems, infrastructure durability standards, and severe weather tracking and prediction capabilities. A National Infrastructure Database will be established under this legislation in order to develop standards and create public policy to better understand hurricanes and tropical storms.

This version of the bill also restores funding to perform a necessary update to our Nation's Joint Polar Satellite System, funds that were cut in the Republican budget for Fiscal Year 2011. The Continuing Resolution eliminated the means to perform this necessary update. Satellites are designed with a limited lifespan. When the end of that lifespan is reached, our ability to track severe weather systems such as hurricanes and blizzards also ends. By restoring funding for the JPSS, this bill ensures the continuation of our ability to forecast and track severe weather systems before they happen.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to close the gap in hurricane research funding. Correcting this lack of scientific research is imperative and will help us to preserve our environment, protect our property, and save lives. I urge my colleagues to support this critically important legislation.

A TRIBUTE TO CHRISTOPHER BANKS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Christopher Banks.

Christopher Banks is the Executive Director and CEO of the East New York United Concerned Citizens, Inc. Born twenty-seven years ago in Brooklyn, NY to immigrant parents from Trinidad and Tobago, his first-hand witness to the struggles of disenfranchised individuals in his community greatly influenced his dedication to public service and advocacy.

Mr. Banks attended the New York City High School for Leadership and Public Service, and CUNY John Jay College of Criminal Justice where he pursued a degree in political science. He founded the East New York United Concerned Citizens, Inc. making his dream of creating a social service and nonprofit organization come true.

Over the past ten years, Mr. Banks has focused his advocacy on the areas of youth, seniors, block associations and tenant associations to provide services to the East New York community. He has worked in partnership with organizations such as NYC Citizens Committee, East New York Development Corporation, Linden Houses Tenant Association, Emerald Green Tenants Association, The Justice Fund, The East New York Council for the Aging, the National Association of Black Business and Professional Women's Brooklyn Club, and a host of other organizations.

Mr. Banks was appointed to Community Board #5, serving as one of the youngest members in the capacity of Executive Board Member and Chair of the Transportation Committee. He also served as Co-Chair of the Youth Services Committee, Co-Chair of the Aging Committee and Public Safety Committee. He is currently President of his Block Association, has previously served as President of the Black Business Professional Women's Youth Club and as an Advisory Member of the Pink House Cornerstone Program. Additionally, Mr. Banks has worked for organizations over the past eight years such as the Italian American Civil Rights League and The Federation of Multicultural Programs, and has served as an Adolescent Services liaison for the Youth Services Department. Mr. Banks is a proud member of Changing Lives Christian Center.

He is an innovative, charismatic and dynamic young man, on a mission to empower and change the dynamics of his community and the world at large.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 439, the Kind Amendment to H.R. 2112, I voted "aye" when I intended to vote "nay."

A TRIBUTE TO ALAN D. COHEN

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alan D. Cohen.

Alan was born and raised in Brooklyn, New York. He is one of four siblings and is a proud graduate of the New York City school system. He received his bachelor's degree from Brooklyn College and holds a master's of Science, Special Education from New York University. He is a Cahn Fellow at Columbia University.

Alan has 34 years of educational experience having filled many roles as a teacher, administrator and principal for the New York City Department of Education. He is currently a Network Leader providing support and supervision for principals in 32 New York City schools and prior to that completed seven years as principal of P.S. 69 in the Bronx. In the past he has had various responsibilities in the New York City system, including teaching, mentoring teachers and aspiring principals, high school admissions and supervising student support services. He also implemented a Reggio Emilia inspired early childhood program and spent time in Italy studying as a member of the North American Reggio Emilia Alliance and International Association Friends of Reggio Children.

Recently, he has spent his mummers as a group leader at the Principal's Center Summer Institute of the Harvard Graduate School of Education. He also serves as an advisory board member at the Principal's Center. He is also the recipient of the 2007 Time Warner Principals of Excellence Award and the 2006 Outstanding Educator of the Year Award from Education Update.

Alan's focus is on enhancing a dynamic child-centered curriculum, fostering professional development and creating a strong sense of community. He will be returning to his passion as a building principal in September, at the Portledge School in Locust Valley, New York. Alan is the ideal educator to build on the traditions and foundations and has the professional background and the enthusiasm to establish Portledge as a leader in early childhood and elementary education.

Alan looks forward to a long future of educating the children who will be our leaders of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mr. Alan D. Cohen for his extraordinary accomplishments and his spirit which reflect the best our nation has to offer.

RECOGNIZING 2011 APPOINTEES TO THE UNITED STATES SERVICE ACADEMIES

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my 2011 appointees to the United States Service Academies, an outstanding group of young Washingtonians who have a combination of academic and athletic prowess, dedication, and leadership, as they leave their families to embark on their new lives in service to the nation: William Westbrook Moore, Atticus Lee Sawatzki, William Guy Merkle, and James David Rice.

William Westbrook Moore is my appointee to the United States Military Academy. He graduated from the Potomac School, where he was a varsity athlete and founder of the school's chess club. Atticus Lee Sawatzki departs for the United States Merchant Marine Academy. He is an alumnus of St. Anselm's Abby School, was a lifeguard for the D.C. Department of Parks and Recreation and is an active parishioner at St. Paul's Episcopal Church, K Street. William Guy Merkle, whom I have twice had the pleasure of nominating to the United States Air Force Academy, is an alumnus of St. Anselm's Abby School. Bill is a thespian, crack shot, and an Elder in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He returns to the Air Force Academy after completing his two year mission for his church in Japan. James David Rice leaves for the United States Naval Academy Prep School. He graduated from The Bullis School, where he was both a varsity athlete and an honors student.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking these young men in advance for their service, in wishing them success, and in offering them the hearty congratulations of the House of Representatives.

CONGRATULATING SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT R. GERALD TURNER

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Southern Methodist University (SMU) President R. Gerald Turner for receiving a quadrangle on the SMU Campus named in his honor. This week current and former members of the SMU board of trustees approved the naming of the R. Gerald Turner Centennial Quadrangle. This project is currently under construction and will be complete in the fall so SMU students, faculty and campus visitors can enjoy this gathering place for many years to come.

SMU is currently celebrating its Centennial Celebration, and I commend President Turner on his accomplishments and vision for the century ahead. I am a proud alumnus of SMU, and have greatly appreciated President Turner's service and leadership. He and his wife Gail Turner have made tremendous contributions to the university and this honor is well deserved.

SMU has made amazing strides over the past century, rising from a small rural college to an internationally renowned university. From its founding in 1911 till today, SMU has graduated more than 100,000 alumni. The outstanding achievement and leadership of those alumni serves as a testament to SMU's tradition of success. With seven different schools, SMU ranks as one of the best universities in the nation. The Cox School of Business routinely ranks in the top 25 business schools in the United States. In addition to twelve alumni who are past and present Members of the

U.S. Congress, SMU has graduated such notable individuals as: John Tyson, CEO of Tyson Foods; former First Lady, Laura Bush; Lamar Hunt, founder of the American Football League; Harriet Miers, former White House Counsel and Supreme Court nominee; James Cronin, Nobel Prize winning physicist; Mary Ellen Weber, NASA astronaut; and Karen Hughes, former Under Secretary of State.

For these well-known alumni, myself, and thousands of former and current students, SMU holds a special place in our hearts. There is a strong sense of pride amongst the SMU community, and the values we learned in school have stayed with us throughout our lives. We were and always will be SMU Mustangs.

With an eye towards the next generation, SMU is not only celebrating the past, but planning for the future. This Centennial Celebration will serve as a time to ensure the next hundred years are even more successful than the first one hundred. I am confident that under President Turner's leadership, SMU will continue to thrive as a center of excellence not only for Dallas, but for the world.

A TRIBUTE TO ROBERT E. CORNEGY, JR.

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Robert E. Cornegy, Jr.

Robert E. Cornegy, Jr. is the son of the late Reverend Dr. Robert E. Cornegy, Sr., Pastor of the Mount Calvary Baptist Church in Bedford-Stuyvesant, Brooklyn, and (the late) Ellen Journey Cornegy. Both of his parents were active members of the church for a quarter of a century, and it is their spirit of servant leadership that continues to inspire and guide him. Rob is married to his beautiful wife Michelle, and he is the father of six wonderful children (Robert E. Cornegy III, Nicholas Ethan, Nia Imani, Nala Catherine Ellen, Noah and N'Kosi).

As a dedicated and passionate community advocate, Rob recognized the needs of the community and used his own funds to purchase and rehabilitate a brownstone where he created ''The Cornegy Residence'': an 18-bed shelter for men suffering from substance abuse and mental health related issues.

Rob has a long history of service implementation and delivery focusing on mental health, substance abuse, and homelessness. He gained valuable hands-on experience by implementing an innovative service-delivery program that increased the number of inmates serviced dramatically while working at the Rikers Island Prison Complex. Rob holds a Professional Certificate in the treatment of individuals suffering from substance abuse issues; earned a Bachelor's degree in Organizational Management and holds a Master's degree in Organizational Leadership from Mercy College. He is currently a member of Cornerstone Baptist Church and is the former Director of the Christopher Wallace memorial foundation and Director of the Regional Resource Prevention Center for the Children's Aid society.

Rob is also an adjunct professor of Marketing at Brooklyn College. Rob is a community organizer, advocate, and political activist with more than 20 years experience working in underserved communities around New York. He has also worked in various high-capacity political roles ranging from Campaign Manager to Chief of Staff for numerous elected officials in the New York State Assembly and Senate. In 2009 Robert ran for City Council for the 36th District serving Bedford Stuyvesant and Crown Heights. Currently, Rob is State Committeeman/District Leader of the 56th Assembly District serving Bedford Stuyvesant, Crown Heights and parts of Bushwick.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mr. Cornegy for his extraordinary accomplishments and his spirit that reflect the best our Nation has to offer.

HONORING ROCKY RUN MIDDLE SCHOOL'S ''THE LATEST GENERATION MEETS THE GREATEST GENERATION'' PROGRAM

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I recently attended a wonderful event at Rocky Run Middle school in Chantilly, Virginia. The program brings World War II veterans together with 7th grade students for one-on-one interviews about the veterans' experiences during war.

The event was initiated 10 years ago by history teacher Jamie Sawatzky and for his efforts, he was selected as the Fairfax County Public Schools Teacher of the Year. Rocky Run Middle School is the only school in the region with this type of program.

The event was attended by 125 World War II veterans, representing all branches of the Armed Forces and nearly every theater of the war. I was touched to hear the recollections from so many members of the ''Greatest Generation'' who sacrificed so much to protect our nation's freedom. Students got to hear from Edward Connor, who served with the U.S. Army Air Corps in Papua, New Guinea, and Guadalcanal; Lucas Dugan, who served aboard a U.S. Navy destroyer in the north Atlantic guiding supply convoys; Donald Graul, a paratrooper with the 82nd Airborne Division who parachuted into Normandy on D-Day and was captured by the Germans, spending the rest of the war in a POW camp, and Richard Graff, who marched with the Army through France, Belgium, and Holland and met the Russian Army at the Elbe River.

These men, and many more, volunteered their time to share their views with today's students. With fewer and fewer World War II veterans still living, I applaud the efforts of these and all veterans who share this living history and make their memories part of children's learning experience and the historical record.

I also want to draw attention to the Rocky Run students, who recognize the importance of learning from previous generations. Knowing about one of the most traumatic episodes in world history and the sacrifice it required of all Americans, these students will have an appreciation of what it takes to preserve our nation's freedoms. The 7th graders of Rocky Run Middle School took on a challenging assignment and carried it out in a fashion of which we can all be proud.

There can be no better learning experience than combining the knowledge and experience of the ''Greatest Generation'' with the ''Latest Generation.'' I hope schools across America can learn from the example of Rock Run Middle School in Chantilly, Virginia.

A TRIBUTE TO ISRAEL VELAZQUEZ

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Israel Velazquez.

As founder and President of Velazquez Associates, Inc., and its subsidiary Velazquez Accounting Services, a New York based accounting and nonprofit development consulting firm that bears his name, Israel Velazquez has worked tirelessly to develop partnerships with community leaders, development corporations, and other public and private partners.

For the past thirty years, Mr. Velazquez, known as ''Izzy'' to many, has assembled public and private partnerships in the areas of local community issues, affordable housing and economic development projects in urban cities throughout the United States of American and in several Caribbean islands.

Mr. Velazquez holds a Master's in Taxation from Long Island University in Brooklyn, NY and a Bachelor of Science in Accounting and Mass Communications from C.U.N.Y., Hunter College. In 2009, Mr. Velazquez was designated an adjunct Professor in the Gates Foundation and Warren Buffett Enterprises Fellows Program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating Mr. Velazquez's extraordinary achievements.

LIBERTY HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS VARSITY SOCCER TEAM

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize the outstanding achievement of the Liberty Lady Jays Varsity Soccer team on defeating Ursuline Academy, by a score of 2–1, to win the Class 3 State Championship for the second straight season.

The Lady Jays finished their incredible season by posting a strong record of 27–3, while scoring a total of 147 points and only allowing 29 points. In the Championship game, they finished spectacularly by scoring the winning goal with one second left on the clock of the first overtime period. The dedication and teamwork displayed by the Lady Jays is impressive and evident in their success.

I want to recognize the great leadership of the team, including Head Coach Tom Rottjakob and the work of his assistant coaches. I also want to recognize the work of the school administrators, Superintendent Mike Brewer, Principal April Adams, and Athletic Director Jason Cahill, as additional keys to success.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in congratulating the achievement of the Liberty

Lady Jays Varsity Soccer Team on winning their second consecutive State Championship. It is an honor to represent this team in Congress.

THE STATE OF TEXAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

H.R. NO. 1694, RESOLUTION

Whereas, On September 11, 2001, Osama bin Laden, a sworn enemy of the United States of America, coordinated a series of monstrous and cowardly terrorist attacks that resulted in the tragic loss of 2,977 innocent lives, leading to an engagement in a war on terrorism across many fronts; and

Whereas, On May 1, 2011, after nearly 10 years of bin Laden's evasion of military and intelligence forces seeking his capture, President Barack Obama declared to the nation and the world that bin Laden had finally been killed, and that ''Justice has been done.''; and

Whereas, The president's patience, leadership, wisdom, and determination have led directly to the demise of the most wanted man in the world and have hardened this nation's resolve to defeat the forces of malevolent fanaticism, and by destroying the mastermind behind the worst terrorist attack on American soil he has struck a significant and historic blow against Al Qaeda; and

Whereas, Following the death of the perpetrator of the attacks, the family members and friends of those who lost their lives in the attacks on September 11 are able to achieve a greater sense of closure; and

Whereas, After months of meetings of the National Security Council, led by President Obama, who directed intelligence officials to zero in on bin Laden's whereabouts, intelligence officials devised and carefully carried out a clandestine operation, which had frequently been rehearsed in an effort to minimize casualties, both civilian and military; and

Whereas, As commander-in-chief of our great nation, he boldly gave the final authorization to commence the operation to brave and highly trained members of our nation's armed services; and

Whereas, Upon hearing the news of bin Laden's elimination, in an impressive show of unity and in defiance of the fanatics who still today seek to destroy our free way of life, jubilant citizens expressed pride in our nation and our president by spontaneously celebrating the news in cities across the country, singing ''The Star Spangled Banner'' and loudly chanting ''U-S-A,'' and former presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush have offered him their congratulations; and

Whereas, Domestically, he has acted with both initiative and organizational acumen toward the precautionary defense of our citizens and has successfully prevented a terrorist attack on American soil during his service to our nation as president; and

Whereas, Internationally, he has wisely exercised the use of diplomacy to nurture collaborative relationships with other nations, which has helped improve the freedom and safety of the world's people; and

Whereas, President George W. Bush had the near universal support of the freedom-loving peoples and countries of the world after the attacks on September 11, 2001, when he famously pledged to defend freedom, against fear, saying ''We will not tire, we will not falter, and we will not fail,'' and President Obama had the strength and wherewithal to see that pledge through to fulfillment; and

Whereas, Legislators in Texas reaffirm the solemn creed that we are one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all, who stand strongly behind the president with respect to these several issues as he confronts the grave problems of national and international security; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 82nd Legislature of the State of Texas hereby congratulate President Obama on his proven and successful policies in the war on terrorism and in homeland security; and, be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 82nd Legislature of the State of Texas hereby commend the intelligence personnel who diligently and quietly toiled for years to uncover the whereabouts of bin Laden and whose achievement, while historic, may never be fully known to the public; and, be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 82nd Legislature of the State of Texas hereby commend the members of the armed forces who successfully and heroically carried out an incredibly sensitive mission with no military losses and with a minimal loss of civilian lives; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the Texas House of Representatives forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the speaker of the House of Representatives and the president of the Senate of the United States Congress, to the governor of Texas, and to all the members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be officially entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

JOE STRAUS,
Speaker of the House.

I certify that H.R. No. 1694 was adopted by the House on May 2, 2011, by a non-record vote.

ROBERT HANEY,
Chief Clerk of the House.

HONORING RYAN WIST

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ryan Wist. Ryan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 692, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Ryan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Ryan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Ryan has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Ryan constructed extra storage space in the basement of the Dillingham-Lewis Museum in Blue Springs, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Ryan Wist for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

SOUTHWEST AIRLINES TURNS 40

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to congratulate Southwest Airlines on the 40th anniversary of the airline's first passenger flight on June 18th, 1971.

I also commend Herb Kelleher and Rollin King who came up with a vision for a low cost and quick airline. Together they came up with the idea of Southwest Airlines in 1967. Unfortunately, Southwest was forced to hold off on its plans as it was being held in litigation for three and a half years.

And on June 18, 1971, Southwest Airlines started service among Dallas, Houston and San Antonio with three Boeing 737s. Right from the start, Kelleher and Southwest emphasized the business philosophy of taking care of employees first, and they will take care of your customers.

In 1973, when Southwest ran into some financial difficulties, they had the choice of either letting go of some of their employees or selling one of their planes. They sold the plane and kept their employees.

Kelleher infused Southwest's culture with his personal values—humbleness, warmth, sincerity and a care and service of people. If you treat people with respect, they will feel valued and add their own personality to whatever they do. If you empower people at all levels of the organization to be able to make decisions, you'll make leaders everywhere. It's about putting the team first and serving the greater good.

In May 2008, Kelleher stepped down as the airline's Chairman, but stayed on as an adviser and employee. Kelleher, who turned 80 this year, is chairman emeritus.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Transportation Subcommittee on Aviation and a senior Texan on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I am pleased to recognize Southwest Airlines' great contribution to the transportation industry.

HONORING KYLE DOWELL

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Kyle Dowell. Kyle is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 692, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Kyle has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Kyle has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Kyle has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Kyle constructed 15 duck nest boxes for the Jackson County, Missouri, Department of Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Kyle Dowell for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for

his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE BRAZOSWOOD BUCCANEERS

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 11, 2011, the Brazoswood Buccaneers baseball team won the title of Texas 5–A State Champions at the Dell Diamond in Round Rock, TX. It is with great pleasure that I extend my congratulations to the players and coaches of the Brazoswood Buccaneers baseball team on their outstanding victory.

The Brazoswood Buccaneers baseball team finished the playoffs with an undefeated 12–0 record, which put their season-ending winning streak at fourteen. Their hard work and dedication to the sport was rewarded with Brazoswood's third State Championship. Winning this title is not only a major accomplishment for the Buccaneers, but also for Houston 5A baseball. The Buccaneers' have brought the championship back to the Greater Houston area for the first time in three seasons. The 2011 Buccaneers are part of proud tradition in the Houston area as Houston 5A teams have won seventeen out of thirty State Championships.

Mr. Speaker, my grandson Michael Pyeatt is a member of this team. I am extremely proud of my grandson and his teammates' accomplishments, and inspired by their steadfast efforts to achieve their goal. It is therefore my pleasure to once again extend my congratulations to the players and coaches of the Brazoswood Buccaneers baseball team on the occasion of being named the Texas State 5–A Champions.

HONORING HAYDEN WHITE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Hayden White. Hayden is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 692, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Hayden has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Hayden has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Hayden has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Hayden renovated and constructed extra storage space in the basement of the Dillingham-Lewis Museum in Blue Springs, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Hayden White for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2112) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes:

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Chair, I am compelled to rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2112, the Fiscal Year 2012 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for three reasons.

First, the bill makes drastic and dangerous cuts to food safety programs and nutrition assistance for women, children, and seniors.

Second, by underfunding President Obama's request by 23 percent, this bill also makes draconian cuts to necessary conservation programs that protect our country's water supplies and manage critical natural resources.

Third, this substantially reduces funding for the Commodity Futures Trading Corporation, the watchdog agency designated by Congress to protect consumers from Wall Street greed and predatory conduct.

Madam Chair, the funding reductions in this bill will adversely affect every American. For example, the $285 million slashed from the Food and Drug Administration will be a devastating blow to the agency tasked with ensuring food safety standards. The FDA is our country's first and most important line of defense against diseases such as E.coli and Salmonella, and with outbreaks of these illnesses on the rise, this cut endangers everyone in America.

In my home state of California, agriculture is a $36.6 billion industry that generates at least $100 billion in related economic activity. Any threat to the quality of our produce jeopardizes the economy of our state and the health of all who enjoy our products.

Madam Chair, this bill recklessly cuts funding for the Commodities Futures Trading Commission by 44% below the President's budget request. The CFTC was established to implement Wall Street reforms and is charged with policing price speculation in commodities, futures, and derivatives markets. The reduction in funding obviously is intended to deprive the CFTC of the resources needed to detect, deter, and prevent the abusive practices that culminated in the economic collapse of 2008. Crippling the CFTC will leave Wall Street speculators free to drive up the price of oil and other commodities while making it more difficult to protect the pension plans of hard working Americans from the effects of another economic downturn.

Madam Chair, this bill also hurts our environment by cutting $1 billion from conservation programs. The Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP) would be cut $171 million relative to its FY 2012 farm bill-mandated level, and if this bill becomes law the government would be unable to honor contracts it has already signed with farmers across the country employing environmentally sustainable agricultural methods.

The bill also cuts the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) by $350 million. The bill cuts the Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) by 64,200 acres and the Grasslands Reserve Program (GRP) by 96,000 acres. In addition, the Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program (FRPP) and the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP) would be cut $50 million and $35 million, respectively. The bill would also cut the Natural Resources Conservation Service's (NRCS) conservation operations budget by nearly $128 million.

Another troubling aspect of this bill is the reduction made to domestic and international nutrition programs, which hurt the most vulnerable among us.

The proposed cuts to the Women, Infants, and Children nutrition program (WIC), the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP), and the Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP) would see hundreds of thousands of low-income women, infants, children and seniors losing their food aid.

Last year, WIC provided nutritious food, counseling on healthy eating and health care referrals for over 9 million women and children under age five and saved more than 200,000 babies from dying at birth. Proper nutrition combats low birth weights and improves a baby's immune system, saving on healthcare costs. The Republican-proposed $650 million cut to the WIC program would deny these services for up to 350,000 low-income women and young children for the next year. In California, 31,800 to 55,700 women and children would be turned away.

Cuts to the CSFP and TEFAP would hurt low-income senior citizens who have extremely limited options when it comes to proper nutrition. There are 52,000 seniors living in the 37th Congressional District of California, which I represent, and nearly 15 percent of them depend on these programs to stay healthy and avoid hospital visits due to poor dietary health. For this reason, I offered an Amendment to H.R. 2112, redirecting $10 million to CSFP so senior citizens will not have to choose between paying for medication and paying for food.

Finally, H.R. 2112 makes drastic cuts to international food aid and poverty alleviation programs. These programs constitute a critical component of US foreign policy, expressing humanitarian goodwill to our allies around the world and promoting a positive image of America abroad. Given all the President and Secretary of State have done to improve our international standing, it makes no sense for Congress to undo this good work by lessening its commitment to combat world hunger.

I. disturbs me than in their short-sighted rush to cut spending, my Republican colleagues would take food from the weakest and the poorest among us while preserving the Bush-era tax cuts for the super-rich. The American people do not accept this trade-off. My constituents in the 37th Congressional District reject this trade-off. I urge my colleagues to join them and me in voting against this unfair and ill-considered legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF COLONEL KEITH A. LANDRY

HON. JOHN A. YARMUTH

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the exemplary service of Colonel Keith A. Landry. This month, Colonel Landry will end his tenure as Commander of the Louisville District of the Army Corps of Engineers after establishing a record of service that has helped strengthen and protect our community. While he may be leaving Louisville, his service and contributions will be visible for decades to come.

Born in North Carolina and hailing from Beaufort, South Carolina, Colonel Landry was commissioned in the Corps of Engineers upon graduation from the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1985. From there, he embarked on a career driven by his dedication to service and country that has taken him around the world and back. After completing combat tours during both Operations Desert Storm and Iraqi Freedom, Colonel Landry began his command in Louisville in 2008, leading the District's significant engineering achievements to include over a billion dollars worth of military construction, the inspection of hundreds of miles of levee, and operation and maintenance of reservoirs, locks, and dams.

Since arriving in Louisville, Colonel Landry has worked to ensure that ''River City'' is not just our nickname, but a source of pride. His committed leadership helped shepherd the McAlpine Locks and Dam expansion project to completion, ensuring that Louisville would continue to benefit from the billions of dollars of cargo transported up and down the Ohio River year after year. And thanks to his expertise and guidance, the Ohio River has not had an unexpected closure to commercial navigation for more than a day during his command—an extraordinary feat, given extreme weather and flooding that we experienced during that time.

Through his 26 years of service to our nation—and counting—Colonel Landry's work has not just helped improve our infrastructure and safeguard our communities, but it has contributed to our economy and the strength of our nation. We in Louisville are grateful for the time he has dedicated to our city, and will surely miss his expertise, commitment, and leadership.

I am proud to join all of our community in thanking him for his outstanding service, dedication, hard work, and faithfulness to our nation. And I urge all of my colleagues to join me in wishing the best to a true public servant, Colonel Keith Landry, and his family in this next chapter of their lives.

INTRODUCING A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE LIMITED USE OF FORCE IN SUPPORT OF THE NATO MISSION IN LIBYA

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce legislation authorizing the limited use of United States forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya. This resolution is a companion to a Senate joint resolution introduced today by Senators JOHN KERRY, JOHN MCCAIN, BENJAMIN CARDIN, and RICHARD DURBIN.

Since Libyan dictator Muammar Qaddafi responded to peaceful demonstrations by attacking Libya's own citizens, the United States has been actively engaged with our international allies in thwarting the ability of the Qaddafi regime to visit violence, murder, and destruction on the people of Libya. This past February, the United States imposed economic sanctions on Libya and froze the assets of its leadership, promising to hold Qaddafi, his family, and the government of Libya accountable for its human rights abuses. Qaddafi responded by increasing his assaults on civilians. As Libyan forces approached the city of Benghazi, in which Qaddafi vowed to show ''no mercy'' to opposition forces which had captured the city, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 1793, mandating ''all necessary measures'' to protect civilians in Libya, implementing a ''no-fly zone'', and enforcing an arms embargo. On March 19, the United States Armed Forces and our coalition partners launched Operation Odyssey Dawn in an effort to enforce the Security Council resolution. That mission has since come under NATO command and is now called Operation Unified Protector.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no question that the United States is engaged in hostilities in Libya. Our Armed Forces have assisted in combat operations including providing intelligence, aerial refueling, targeting, and other aspects of NATO's daily bombardment of Libyan forces loyal to Qaddafi. The President engaged in these hostilities without an authorization from Congress, and has anyway exceeded the 60-day War Powers limitation on the use of force without congressional consent. It is high time that Congress asserts its authority and engages proactively with the administration on this most serious question of war.

But the solution, Mr. Speaker, is not to simply cut off funds. Instead, Congress must limit and closely monitor the President's commitment of forces. This resolution authorizes the use of force in Libya for one year from the date of enactment, limiting the President's ability to engage our Armed Forces indefinitely. This resolution bans the use of ground forces and requires the President to continually report to Congress on the progress of our military operations, the plans to achieve our stated goals, and the changing situation on the ground. We must also make an effort to put Libya's frozen assets to good use, returning funds to the Libyan people and using some of that money to offset the cost of NATO's operations.

It is too late to debate whether we should be involved or not: we already are. What we must do is ensure that the legislative and executive branches are working in harmony to maintain a military commitment that is limited and brief, and that best serves the people of Libya. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

DEDICATION OF N.C. VETERANS PARK

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, today citizens and communities all across the United States join together to celebrate our nation's 235th birthday. In doing so, we rejoice in the moment, reflect on the past, and recommit ourselves to a brighter future for our wonderful nation.

One very special celebration is taking place today in Fayetteville, North Carolina, that deserves the special recognition of the U.S. Congress—the dedication of the North Carolina Veterans Park.

Fayetteville, and all of North Carolina, have a long and historic commitment to the men and women who have protected our country's freedoms. From Cherry Point Air Station to Charlotte Air National Guard, from Camp Lejeune to U.S. Coast Guard Air Station Elizabeth City, from Fort Bragg and Pope Army Air Field to New River Air Station and Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, from the Military Ocean Terminal at Sunny Point to the Oak Island and Wrightsville Beach Coast Guard Stations, North Carolina has opened its hearts and hands to support those who have made so many sacrifices and opportunities for all of us.

Embracing the military and its veterans have earned North Carolina the distinction as the ''most military friendly state'' and home to one of the largest percentages of veterans in America. Ensuring that our veterans' service and sacrifice are never forgotten will be the legacy of the North Carolina Veterans Park.

This multi-dimensional park will capture the commitment, courage, and country-first attitude that shines through the veterans of our nation. And in doing so, it will be a legacy that generations and generations can learn how the actions of a few saved so many.

I want to share the words of our 16th President, Abraham Lincoln, who once said, ''With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations.''

The North Carolina Veterans Park will be another chapter in our state's and nation's efforts to honor those who have served and lived with great distinction.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, the North Carolina Veterans Park storyline states:

From the soils of North Carolina,
You left your families and homes
With purpose to serve your country.
You are our veterans.
This is your place to reflect on and
Share your experiences.
To feel pride in your service,
Bond with fellow veterans, and heal.
Here, may you find your support and inspiration
To live your lives today.
The people of North Carolina
Honor your service and welcome you home.

TRIBUTE TO AL LIPSCOMB

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 18, 2011, the people of Dallas, Texas and the United States suffered a great loss with the passing of Al Lipscomb. Al Lipscomb was a strong community leader, businessman and a devoted public servant. He was never afraid of controversy; he was a true advocate for peace, racial justice, and social equality. He was 86 years old.

Mr. Lipscomb was born in East Dallas. He was educated in the Dallas public schools, attending Booker T. Washington High School and graduating from Lincoln High. He joined the Army Air Force in California with the military police in 1943. He returned to Dallas in 1950, married and became the head waiter in the executive dining room of the First National Bank. He was reprimanded by his boss after going to the courthouse to watch Thurgood Marshall file a Dallas school desegregation case.

In 1966, he became a neighborhood organizer for the Dallas Community Action Agency. He was also an organizer for the Dallas chapter of Dr. King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Al Lipscomb is known for filing a groundbreaking lawsuit that forced Dallas to elect council members by individual districts. He served on the city council for 15 years and was the first black person to run for Dallas mayor.

In 1972, Mr. Lipscomb opened the South Dallas Information Center on Pennsylvania Avenue, where he handled a constant stream of phone calls and questions from passersby seeking assistance. The center was supported by donations. He also kept a high profile by making the rounds at public meetings, asking tough questions, and offering suggestions.

In 1984, he was elected to the City Council and became a vocal critic of the Dallas Police Department's treatment of minorities. And in the late 1980s, Mr. Lipscomb and Ms. Diane Ragsdale—the only black members of the council—drew national media attention and local death threats. Despite the hostilities toward him, he remained both a critic and a skeptic of the city he loved. "I see a great change," he said. "I see a great change, a change for the better."

Al was a man of great commitment. He provided tremendous support for me as a public official. I am deeply grateful for his counsel, support, assistance, and unquestionable trusted friendship.

I remember him as being extremely affable, charismatic, and passionate about the needs of community. For all of us he was as one of the most accessible elected officials, always available to listen and reach out to us in addressing complex issues in a hands-on and collaborative fashion.

Today, Texas's 30th Congressional District salutes and honors Al Lipscomb. We thank Mr. Lipscomb's wife, Lovie, his children, and his grandchildren for sharing his exuberant and compassionate spirit with us. His family was always supportive and understanding of his commitment. His fight for justice and equality should not, can not, and will not be forgotten.

HONORING NATHAN CHARLES DARRAH

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Nathan Charles Darrah. Nathan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 692, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Nathan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Nathan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Nathan has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Nathan reclaimed and built over a mile of hiking trail around Lake Jacomo in Jackson County, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Nathan Charles Darrah for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING THE DEDICATED SERVICE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL DONALD C. WURSTER, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Lieutenant General Donald C. Wurster upon his retirement from the United States Air Force.

For over 38 years of service to our nation, Lieutenant General Donald Wurster lived the core values of Integrity First, Service before Self, and Excellence in All We Do. On June 24, 2011 General Wurster relinquishes command of Air Force Special Operations Command and leaves behind a hallmark of accomplishments generated through his leadership of some of America's finest men and women.

Since his graduation from the United States Air Force Academy, he has been a part of some of the most dynamic changes in airpower's history. Along the way, General Wurster's vision and leadership helped usher in some of the most unique warfighting capabilities in the Air Force. From counter-insurgency leadership to building aviation programs that provided national power any time, any place, his legacy will remain one of steadfast dedication.

As a tip-of-the-spear helicopter pilot, General Wurster amassed more than 4,000 flying hours, including assignments in both rescue and special operations. During his career, he commanded special operations units at the squadron, group, wing, joint task force, sub-unified command, and finally Air Force major command level where he led over 16,000 personnel executing missions across the globe in support of national interests and objectives.

Throughout his career, his wife Ronda has been there every step of the way. For over the three and a half decades, Ronda supported her husband, their growing family, and the fellow men and women who have chosen to wear the uniform as protectors of our nation's freedom. She has been there in times of celebration for graduations, promotions, and unit gatherings, as well as during the difficult times when someone has been lost or injured in the line of duty.

Let it be recognized that in a time of persistent combat and other military operations, the United States Air Force had the right guy, in the right place, at the right time. Furthermore, his leadership and framework for success has helped build a strong following of talented warriors ready to protect our nation.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am honored to congratulate General Wurster on his retirement. My wife Vicki and I wish him and Ronda all the best for continued success.

AGE NOT AN ISSUE FOR BASEBALL'S JACK McKEON

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, many senior citizens who travel to Florida are doing so to enjoy the retired life after years of working while filling their days with hours spent on the beach. Jack McKeon, from the Sixth District of North Carolina, crushes this stereotype as he begins his second term as manager of baseball's Florida Marlins.

McKeon has the full support of his family to leave his home in the town of Elon to return to the world of professional baseball, a move that makes him the second-oldest manager in history. This calculated return comes with pressure as McKeon led the Marlins to the 2003 World Series championship. His age is sometimes criticized, but the 80-year-old McKeon said, "I look at it this way—why should experience get penalized? I've managed since I was 14 years old. I'll probably manage until I'm 95."

Marlins president of baseball operations, Larry Beinfest, said, "It's good to see [McKeon] back. He never really left. We turn to him to help us at a very difficult time." The Florida Marlins seem to be in need of McKeon after a recent 10-game losing streak and the resignation of former manager Edwin Rodriguez. McKeon is passionate and optimistic about his return and has high hopes for the coming season. "I don't need this job," McKeon said, "but I love it."

From one octogenarian to another, and on behalf of the citizens of the Sixth District of North Carolina, we congratulate Jack McKeon on resuming his duties as manager of the Florida Marlins and wish him the best of luck for the remainder of this season and for however long he wishes to manage. We know that whenever he retires for good, we are sure that it will be in the Sixth District of North Carolina.

A SALUTE TO MAYOR KYLE R. HASTINGS AND THE RESIDENTS OF ORLAND HILLS, ILLINOIS ON THE OCCASION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION, JUNE 24–26, 2011

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to rise today to mark the 50th Anniversary of the founding of the Village of Orland Hills, Illinois. Orland Hills is nestled in the southwest corner of Cook County in the 1st Congressional District. Its growth speaks to the dynamic and dedicated leaders who have built Orland Hills with an eye towards the connectedness that is the true definition of community. At a time when social networking via technology has increasingly replaced face to face interaction, the real life network that exists among the residents of Orland Hills should be seen as a model for us all.

Originally founded on June 30, 1961 as the Village of Westhaven, residents held their first Village Board Meeting on August 3, 1961. A president, Raymond Pecor, was elected. Shortly afterwards, the village annexed 10 acres at the southeast corner of 167th Street and 94th Avenue. A Zoning Commission was formed and a Planning Commission was appointed to prepare a zoning ordinance and a zoning district map. Over the years, as the village's population continued to grow, annexations of adjacent land took Westhaven south to 171st Street. In 1970, the U.S. Census Bureau set the population at 470. Today the name is Orland Hills and the population is more than 7,000 and growing. During difficult economic times, village leaders found a way to build roads, schools, churches, shopping centers and beautiful homes. Racial and ethnic diversity occurred on its own as people found themselves feeling welcomed, accepted and at home with others who shared the American dream of building community through determination and hard work.

As the village continued to grow its reputation as a family friendly community with modest to low property taxes also grew. The village began to celebrate itself. In 1993 the first Orland Hills Jamboree became a success. That same year, it's fair to say another very important event took place. A man who, over the years has grown to be a very dear friend of mine, Kyle R. Hastings, was elected to serve as the Mayor of Orland Hills.

As history would have it, 1993 was also the year I was first sworn in as the U.S. Representative for Illinois' First Congressional District. And, while there are many things I could say to describe the leadership that Mayor Hastings has brought to this thriving community his own words best describe his dedication to public service. In an interview he gave to the Chicago Tribune in May 2004 Mayor Hastings said ''I'm like the DePaul Basketball Coach Ray Meyer of mayors. If someone needs something, I'm there to help 'em, and we're always winning.''

In that same story, the newspaper reported that under Mayor Hastings' leadership, the village had balanced its budget for 10 consecutive years. It built lighted ballfields, greatly expanded its recreational programs and resurfaced about half its streets. Orland Hills also spent more than $4.5 million building a village government complex, a public works facility and a recreation/senior center without issuing bonds or increasing property taxes. The report also noted Hastings' ability to attract a Wal-Mart and other small businesses to a strip mall, a decision that, today, continues to bring tax revenue and jobs into the Orland Hills community.

Mr. Speaker, I must also take a moment to highlight the Village's Administrator, John A. Daly, whose effective leadership played a decisive role in securing a $6,000 Local Tourism Grant from the Chicago Southland Convention & Visitors Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, for all these reasons and more, it is my sincere honor to enter into the Congressional Record this heartfelt tribute to the residents of Orland Hills, their Honorable Mayor Kyle R. Hastings, the trustees and appointed leadership of Administrator John A. Daly, and the Chairman of the 50th Anniversary Committee, an Orland Hills Trustee and the Mayor's son, Kyle R. Hastings II. I also want to pay tribute to the thousands of Orland Hills residents who spend significant social capital every day to make their village a true social network . . . a real place to live and work and raise families.

At a time when so much of our nation is beset with tough budgets or less than stellar policy and political leaders, the Village of Orland Hills has much to celebrate. I am deeply proud to serve the interests of this thriving community and I pray for the good health and prosperity of its citizens—and good weather this weekend—as thousand assemble to take part in a festive atmosphere of family, food and fun from June 24 through 26, at Kelly Park at 16675 S. Haven Avenue in Orland Hills. It will be a true American celebration, not of bricks and mortar but of the power of people and the spirit of sharing that makes our nation great and makes Orland Hills a place of pride for us all.

May God continue to bless and keep this community, the state of Illinois and our nation. Amen.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS TO HELP THE UNEMPLOYED

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two pieces of legislation to help the increasing number of Americans who, because of the Government-created recession, have lost their jobs. The first piece of legislation, the Unemployed Tax Relief, makes a laid-off worker's last paycheck tax free.

The second bill, the Unemployment Assistance Act, allows the unemployed to make penalty-free withdrawals from accounts such as Roth IRAs or 401(k)s, to cover routine living expenses, health care expenses, or to help pay for education and job training. Those who make these penalty-free withdrawals while unemployed will be able to replenish their accounts once they have started a new job.

Mr. Speaker, while we may disagree on the best solutions to the economic crisis gripping the Nation, I hope my colleagues will at least agree on these common-sense measures and cosponsor the Unemployed Tax Relief Act and the Unemployment Assistance Act.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3939–S3979

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1237–1243, S.J. Res. 20, and S. Res. 212–213. **Page S3970**

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany S. 1103, to extend the term of the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. (S. Rept. No. 112–23)

Report to accompany S. 679, to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation. (S. Rept. No. 112–24)

H.R. 872, to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters. **Page S3970**

Measures Passed:

National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 202, designating June 27, 2011, as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day'', and the resolution was then agreed to, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S3978–79**

Casey (for Conrad) Amendment No. 498, to improve the resolution. **Page S3978**

Republic of Slovenia 20th Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 212, congratulating the people and Government of the Republic of Slovenia on the twentieth anniversary of the country's independence. **Page S3979**

Measures Considered:

Economic Development Revitalization Act: Senate resumed consideration of S. 782, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S3962–64**

Pending:

DeMint Amendment No. 394, to repeal the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. **Page S3962**

Paul Amendment No. 414, to implement the President's request to increase the statutory limit on the public debt. **Page S3962**

Cardin Amendment No. 407, to require the FHA to equitably treat homebuyers who have repaid in full their FHA-insured mortgages. **Page S3962**

Merkley/Snowe Amendment No. 428, to establish clear regulatory standards for mortgage servicers. **Page S3962**

Kohl Amendment No. 389, to amend the Sherman Act to make oil-producing and exporting cartels illegal. **Page S3962**

Hutchison Amendment No. 423, to delay the implementation of the health reform law in the United States until there is final resolution in pending lawsuits. **Page S3962**

Portman Amendment No. 417, to provide for the inclusion of independent regulatory agencies in the application of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.). **Page S3962**

Portman Amendment No. 418, to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) to strengthen the economic impact analyses for major rules, require agencies to analyze the effect of major rules on jobs, and require adoption of the least burdensome regulatory means. **Page S3962**

McCain Amendment No. 412, to repeal the wage rate requirements commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act. **Page S3962**

Merkley Amendment No. 440, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an Energy Efficiency Loan Program under which the Secretary shall make funds available to States to support financial assistance provided by qualified financing entities for making qualified energy efficiency or renewable efficiency improvements. **Page S3962**

Coburn Modified Amendment No. 436, to repeal the Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit. **Page S3962**

Brown (MA)/Snowe Amendment No. 405, to repeal the imposition of withholding on certain payments made to vendors by government entities. **Page S3962**

Inhofe Amendment No. 430, to reduce amounts authorized to be appropriated. **Page S3962**

Inhofe Amendment No. 438, to provide for the establishment of a committee to assess the effects of certain Federal regulatory mandates. **Page S3962**

Merkley Amendment No. 427, to make a technical correction to the HUBZone designation process. **Page S3962**

McCain Amendment No. 441 (to Coburn Modified Amendment No. 436), to prohibit the use of Federal funds to construct ethanol blender pumps or ethanol storage facilities. **Page S3962**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action: By 49 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 94), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the bill. **Pages S3962–63**

Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 679, to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation, at 11 a.m., on Wednesday, June 22, 2011, and that the Tuesday, June 21, 2011 vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, be postponed until Wednesday, June 22, 2011, at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Republican Leader, and that if cloture is invoked, time post-cloture be counted as if cloture was invoked at 6 p.m., Tuesday, June 21, 2011. **Pages S3964, S3979**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 64 yeas 35 nays (Vote No. EX. 92), Michael H. Simon, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon. **Pages S3946–52, S3979**

By a unanimous vote of 100 yeas (Vote No. EX. 93), Leon E. Panetta, of California, to be Secretary of Defense. **Pages S3952–62, S3979**

Messages from the House: **Page S3969**

Enrolled Joint Resolutions Presented: **Page S3969**

Executive Communications: **Pages S3969–70**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3970–72**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3972–77**

Additional Statements: **Pages S3968–69**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S3977–78**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S3978**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S3978**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—94) **Pages S3952, S3962–63**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:30 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 22, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3979.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee ordered favorably reported H.R. 872, to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters.

CYBERSECURITY AND DATA PROTECTION IN THE FINANCIAL SECTOR

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine cybersecurity and data protection in the financial sector, after receiving testimony from Pablo A. Martinez, Deputy Special Agent in Charge, Criminal Investigative Division, Secret Service; Kevin F. Streff, Dakota State University Information Assurance Center, Madison, South Dakota; and Stuart K. Pratt, Consumer Data Industry Association, Leigh Williams, BITS, on behalf of the Financial Services Roundtable, and Marc Rotenberg, Electronic Privacy Information Center, all of Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of John Edgar Bryson, of California, to be Secretary, who was introduced by Senators Feinstein and Boxer, and Terry D. Garcia, of Florida, to be Deputy Secretary, both of the Department of Commerce, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Anne W. Patterson, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Arab Republic of Egypt, Michael H. Corbin, of California, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Emirates,

Matthew H. Tueller, of Utah, to be Ambassador to the State of Kuwait, Kenneth J. Fairfax, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kazakhstan, and Susan Laila Ziadeh, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the State of Qatar, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

INSPIRING STUDENTS TO FEDERAL SERVICE

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia concluded a hearing to examine inspiring students to Federal service, focusing on efforts taken to ensure effective campus recruitment, after receiving testimony from Christine M. Griffin, Deputy Director, U.S. Office of Personnel Management; Michael C. Kane, Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy; Carolyn M. Taylor, Chief Human Capital Officer, Government Accountability Office; Timothy McManus, Partnership for Public Service, Laurel McFarland, National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), and Witold Skwierczynski, American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO, all of Washington, D.C.; and Anne Mahle, Teach for America, New York, New York.

SENIOR HUNGER AND THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Primary Health and Aging concluded a hearing to examine senior hunger and the "Older Americans Act", after receiving testimony from Kathy Greenlee, Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging; Kay E. Brown, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues, Government Accountability Office; Bob Blancato, National Association of Nutrition and Aging Services Programs, Washington, D.C.; Kenneth E. Gordon, Area Agency on Aging for Northeastern Vermont, Johnsbury; and Mary Jane Koren, Commonwealth Fund, New York, New York.

CYBERSECURITY

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism concluded a hearing to examine cybersecurity, focusing on evaluating the Administration's proposals, after receiving testimony from Representative Langevin; James A. Baker, Associate Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice; Greg Schaffer, Acting Deputy Undersecretary of Homeland Security for National Protection and Programs Directorate; and Ari Schwartz, Senior Internet Policy Advisor, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce.

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: 26 public bills, H.R. 2243–2268; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 67; and H.Res. 317–319 were introduced.

Pages H4363–64

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4366–67**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 316, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2021) to amend the Clean Air Act regarding air pollution from Outer Continental Shelf activities, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1249) to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform (H. Doc. 112–111).

Page H4361

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Simpson to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4335**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:32 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H4339**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:07 p.m. and reconvened at 5:31 p.m. **Page H4340**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Sergeant Chris Davis Post Office Designation Act: H.R. 1632, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5014 Gary Avenue in Lubbock, Texas, as the "Sergeant Chris

Davis Post Office'', by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 396 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 460;

Pages H4340–41, H4344–45

Marine Sgt. Jeremy E. Murray Post Office Designation Act: 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'', by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 397 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 462; **Pages H4341–42, H4346**

Schertz Veterans Post Office Designation Act: H.R. 771, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1081 Elbel Road in Schertz, Texas, as the ''Schertz Veterans Post Office'', by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 398 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 461; and

Pages H4342–43, H4345–46

Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr. Post Office Designation Act: 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''. **Page H4344**

Recess: The House recessed at 6:05 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. **Page H4344**

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in honor of the men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our nation in Iraq and Afghanistan, their families, and all who serve in the armed forces and their families.

Page H4345

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow for morning hour debate, thereafter to resume its session at 11:30 a.m. **Page H4346**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed:

Election Support Consolidation and Efficiency Act: H.R. 672, amended, to terminate the Election Assistance Commission. **Pages H4347–54**

Recess: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on page H4367.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4344–45, H4345–46, H4346. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Committee Meetings

DUAL-ELIGIBLES: UNDERSTANDING THIS VULNERABLE POPULATION AND HOW TO IMPROVE THEIR CARE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Dual-Eligibles: Understanding This Vulnerable Population and How to Improve Their Care.'' Testimony was heard from Melanie Bella, Director of the Federal Coordinated Health Care Office, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); Billy Millwee, Associate Commissioner for Medicaid/CHIP, Texas Health and Human Services Commission; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and Economy held a markup of legislation regarding the ''Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act.'' The bill was forwarded without amendment.

HATCH ACT: THE CHALLENGES OF SEPARATING POLITICS FROM POLICY

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Hatch Act: The Challenges of Separating Politics from Policy.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

JOBS AND ENERGY PERMITTING ACT OF 2012; AND AMERICA INVENTS ACT

Committee on Rules: The Committee granted, by a vote of 7 to 2, a structured rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2021, the ''Jobs and Energy Permitting Act of 2012''. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of H.R. 2021. The rule provides that H.R. 2021 shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in H.R. 2021. The rule makes in order only those amendments to H.R. 2021 printed in Part A of 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. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in Part A of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit H.R. 2021 with or without instructions.

The rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 1249, the ''America Invents Act,'' under a structured rule. The rule provides for 20 minutes of initial debate confined to the question of constitutionality of the bill equally divided and controlled by Representative Smith (R–TX) and Representative Kaptur (D–OH) or their designees. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of H.R. 1249. The rule makes in order the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill as an original bill for purpose of amendment, which shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those amendments to H.R. 1249 printed in Part B of 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. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in Part B of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit H.R. 1249 with or without instructions. The rule provides that upon receipt of a message from the Senate transmitting H.R. 1249 with a Senate amendment or amendments thereto, it shall be in order to consider in the House a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary or his designee that the House disagree to the Senate amendment or amendments and request or agree to a conference with the Senate thereon. The rule waives all points of order against the motion. The rule provides one hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Testimony was heard from the following on H.R. 2021: Rep. Whitfield; Rep. Rush; Rep. Hastings of Florida; Rep. Jackson Lee of Texas; and Rep. Wilson of Florida. Testimony was heard from the following on H.R. 1249: Rep. Smith of Texas; Rep. Conyers; Rep. Sensenbrenner; Rep. Zoe Lofgren of California; Rep. Jackson Lee of Texas; Rep. Polis; Rep. Rohrabacher; Rep. Baldwin; Rep. Manzullo; Rep. Moore; Rep. Terry; and Rep. Boren.

Joint Meetings

GROWING THE ECONOMY

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine spending less, owing less, growing the economy, after receiving testimony from John B. Taylor, Stanford University Hoover Institution, Stanford, California; Simon Johnson, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Sloan School of Management, Cambridge; and Kevin A. Hassett, American Enterprise Institute, and Chad Stone, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, both of Washington, DC.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Department of Defense, to hold hearings to examine outside witness statements, 10:30 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Finance, to hold hearings to examine preventing overpayments and eliminating fraud in the unemployment insurance system, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, to hold hearings to examine the next steps for securing rail and transit, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine transforming lives through diabetes research, 1:30 p.m., SD–G50.

Committee on the Judiciary, to hold an oversight hearing to examine intellectual property law enforcement efforts, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Christopher Droney, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Robert David Mariani, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, Cathy Bissoon, and Mark Raymond Hornak, both to be a United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and Robert N. Scola, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry, hearing on Agricultural Program Audit: Examination of Conservation Programs, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, markup of the First Semiannual Report on the Activities of the Committee on Armed Services for the 112th Congress. 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, hearing on the evolution of the terrorist threat, 1:30 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Full Committee, markup of the following: H.R. 2218, the ''Empowering Parents through Quality Charter Schools Act''; and the Report on the Activities of the Committee on Education and Workforce for the First Quarter of the 112th Congress. 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Protecting Medicare with Improvements to the Secondary Payer Regime.'' 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled ''Reforming FCC Process.'' 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, markup of the following: the Report on the Activity of the Committee on Financial Services for the 112th Congress; H.R. 2072, the ''Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011''; H.R. 1070, the ''Small Company Capital Formation Act of 2011''; H.R. 1082, the ''Small Business Capital Access and Job Preservation Act''; H.R. 33, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to specify when certain securities issued in connection with church plans are treated as exempted securities for purposes of that Act; H.R. 1062, the ''Burdensome Data Collection Relief Act''; and H.R. 940, the ''United States Covered Bond Act of 2011.'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing on Piercing Burma's Veil of Secrecy: The Truth Behind the Sham Election and the Difficult Road Ahead, 12:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, markup of the following: Consideration of the Committee Activity Report for the First Quarter of the 112th Congress; and H.R. 901, the ''Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Security Authorization Act of 2011.'' 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, hearing entitled ''Opportunities for Outdoor Recreation on Public Lands.'' 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Affairs, hearing on H.R. 1158, to authorize the conveyance of mineral rights by the Secretary of the Interior in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; and H.R. 1560, to amend the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama and Coushatta Indian Tribes of Texas Restoration Act to allow the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo Tribe to determine blood quantum requirement for membership in that tribe. 11 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, business meeting, 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, Stimulus Oversight, and Government Spending, hearing entitled, ''Last Implications of the General Motors Bailout.'' 1:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on TARP, Financial Services, and the Bailout of Public and Private Programs, hearing entitled ''The Changing Role of the FDIC.'' 1:30 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on Adoption of the Activity Report for the First Quarter of the 112th Congress; and H.R. 2219, the ''Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2012.'' 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing on Examining NOAA's Climate Service Proposal, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn. Prior to the start of the hearing there will be a Full Committee Business Meeting: Adoption of the 1st Semiannual Report of the Activities of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The State of Small Business Access to Capital and Credit: The View from Secretary Geithner.'' 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, markup of the following: H.R. 1073, to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed in Jackson, Mississippi, as the ''R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse''; H.R. 1264, to designate the property between the United States Federal Courthouse and the Ed Jones Building located at 109 South Highland Avenue in Jackson, Tennessee, as the ''M.D. Anderson Plaza'' and to authorize the placement of a historical/identification marker on the grounds recognizing the achievements and philanthropy of M.D. Anderson; H.R. 1791, to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 101 South United States Route 1 in Fort Pierce, Florida, as the ''Alto Lee Adams, Sr., United States Courthouse''; H.R. 2018, the ''Clean Water Cooperative Federalism Act of 2011''; and the Summary of Legislative and Oversight Activities Committee Report. 9:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Full Committee, hearing on the Committee print ''Competition for Intercity Passenger Rail in America.'' 11 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on the recently released 2011 Annual Report of the Boards of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, 9:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Joint Committee on the Library, organizational business meeting to consider committee's rules of procedure and budget for the 112th Congress, 11:30 a.m., SC–6, Capitol.

Joint Committee on Printing, organizational business meeting to consider committee's rules of procedure and budget for the 112th Congress, 11:30 a.m., SC–6, Capitol.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, to hold hearings to examine addressing ethnic tension in Kyrgyzstan, focusing on the report of the International Commission of Inquiry into the events in Southern Kyrgyzstan in June 2010, 1 p.m., 2118, Rayburn Building.

Joint Economic Committee, to hold hearings to examine manufacturing in the United States, focusing on why we need a national manufacturing strategy, 10:15 a.m., SH–216.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 11 a.m.), Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 679, Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 22

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of the bills (H.R. 2021) to amend the Clean Air Act regarding air pollution from Outer Continental Shelf activities and (H.R. 1249) to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baldwin, Tammy, Wisc., E1137
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E1141, E1142
Cantor, Eric, Va., E1135
Coble, Howard, N.C., E1149
Conaway, K. Michael, Tex., E1146
Graves, Sam, Mo., E1144, E1145, E1146, E1146, E1147, E1149
Guinta, Frank C., N.H., E1135
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1143, E1148
Hensarling, Jeb, Tex., E1140, E1141, E1141
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1138, E1144, E1146, E1149
Johnson, Sam, Tex., E1135, E1141
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E1135, E1137, E1138, E1138, E1139
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E1142
McIntyre, Mike, N.C., E1148
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1141
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E1137
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1149
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1138, E1144
Paul, Ron, Tex., E1147, E1150
Paulsen, Erik, Minn., E1140
Quigley, Mike, Ill., E1141
Richardson, Laura, Calif., E1147
Rokita, Todd, Ind., E1139
Rush, Bobby L., Ill., E1150
Sablan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho, Northern Mariana Islands, E1140
Smith, Adam, Wash., E1139
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E1142, E1143, E1144, E1144, E1145, E1145
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1135, E1139, E1145
Yarmuth, John A., Ky., E1148

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.