United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 7, 2011 No. 100

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 7, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

SYRIA'S BLOODY SPRING

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, there are moments in the lives of nations when the existing order is suddenly revealed as bereft of legitimacy and no longer viable. The wave of unrest spreading across the Arab world, touched off by the self-immolation of a Tunisian fruit vendor tired of petty humiliation by corrupt governments, has exposed the rot of decades of caprice, corruption, and incompetence. That this one man's desperate act could lead to the downfall of the governments of Tunisia, Egypt, and perhaps Yemen is testament to the pent up frustration of millions of people who were denied the basic rights and economic opportunity that we take for granted here in the West.

But it is in Syria, where the future of the Arab Spring seemingly hangs in the balance and where the security services have acted with the least restraint and maximum violence. Like marauding armies of old, select units of military and security services troops have been moving from city to city in a quest to quash the ever-spreading demonstrations that have become a feature of life in Syria.

Deraa, a town of some 75,000 lying near the border with Jordan, has emerged as one of the centers of the Syrian uprising against the 40 years of rule by the Assad family. Army and security forces have repeatedly assaulted the town and surrounding villages, killing hundreds of civilians and arresting anyone suspected of taking part in demonstrations against the regime. On April 29 in the village of Jiza, the Syrian secret police rounded up anybody it thought was involved with the protests, including Hamza Ali al-Khateeb, who had gone to watch the demonstration with other members of his family.

For a month, Hamza's family waited for him to return, worried but hopeful that he would be released unharmed. It was not to be. On May 30, Hamza's mutilated body was returned to them. He had been tortured, subjected to repeated electric shocks, and whipped with cables. His eyes were swollen and black, and there were identical bullet wounds where he had been apparently shot through both arms, the bullets lodging in his belly. On Hamza's chest was a deep, dark burn mark. His neck was broken, and parts of his body were cut off. Hamza Ali al-Khateeb was 13 years old. Video of the boy's shattered body has been seen by millions on television and the Internet.

Hamza, like the Tunisian fruit vendor who set himself alight, has become a symbol to his countrymen and the world of the depravity and illegitimacy of a regime that would torture its own children to death.

Our ability to bring additional economic pressure on Syria is limited. Its economy is already under immense strain. It is small, weak, and isolated. Political pressure, in the form of a U.N. security resolution condemning the violence and crackdown, has been blocked by Russia and China. And there is dread over what will happen when Assad falls, given the internal divisions between Sunni and Shia, Muslim and Alawi, Christian and Druze. The confessional and sectarian splits are as pronounced as in Lebanon, the potential for large scale violence as great as Iraq.

The dangers are real, but the promise of what began in Tunisia and is now materializing in Egypt and elsewhere is also real. People of courage can determine their own destiny, and it need not be one of hereditary dictatorship, kleptocracy, or lack of opportunity and stagnation. In the Arab world, as elsewhere, people should be free to choose their own government to represent them and to chart peace with their neighbors.

To conclude otherwise means that we relegate tens of millions of people to suffer the capricious ruthlessness of their despots for generation after generation, or that we are willing to trade the illusion of stability for the harsh reality of their suffering. That is not the choice we made for ourselves 235 years ago, and it is not one that we should presume to make for others.

Bashar Assad is a ruthless tyrant whose time has passed and who clings to power only by virtue of brutal force. Our role and that of the international community should be to work with

Printed on recycled paper.

Syrian opposition figures and others to advance a negotiated transition to a new Syrian Government that will represent all Syrians and prevent the trading in of one set of thugs for another. The Arab Spring cannot be allowed to fail because of brutal repression, the specter of religious fanaticism, a fear of the unknown, or the cynicism born of unmet expectations. The region's many millions must have the freedom to write a new chapter for themselves and their posterity.

In this, the younger Assad has taken a page from his father, who unleashed his troops in 1982 to suppress a revolt by the Muslim Brotherhood in the city of Hama, an offensive that may have cost as many as 20,000 civilian lives. Indeed, history may be repeating itself as Hama has become a focus of both anti-government activity on the one hand, and the use of extreme violence by the Assad government on the other.

For American policymakers, Syria presents a collection of overlapping and sometimes contradictory challenges. Like his father, President Assad has repeatedly tantalized the United States and the west with the possibility of a new opening, but he has never followed through. Syria's illegal and clandestine nuclear program, its alliance with Iran and its meddling in Lebanon, a policy that culminated in the 2005 murder of Lebanese Prime Minister Rafik Hariri, form a compelling case that the Syrian people and the world would be better off with a new leader in Damascus.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND RELIGION UNDER ATTACK

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, freedom of speech, the free exercise of religion, two of our most important, fundamental principles that this Nation was founded upon, have recently become under attack by none other than this Federal Government. The authoritarian behavior and attack on the First Amendment rights is an attack now on the veterans that have served our Nation.

Last week, while in Houston, Texas, I met with members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. They shared with me very descriptive and disturbing stories about the aggressive and hostile censorship of religion and speech that is occurring at none other than the veterans cemetery in Houston, the second largest cemetery for our veterans in the United States, next to Arlington, which is right down the street across from the Potomac River.

The director of the Houston National Cemetery, Arleen Ocasio, is accused of attacking the constitutional rights of our military who have fought and died for this country. The very rights that they fought and died for are being under attack by none other than this director. The thought that someone would have the audacity to censor religion and speech anywhere is despicable, but censoring the funeral services of the veterans who spent their lives protecting the First Amendment is malicious and it's not forgivable.

Director Ocasio is an unelected bureaucrat, a nonveteran who is clearly out of touch with our veterans and the Constitution. And it's unbelievable that she would be put in charge of the sacred burial ground in Houston, Texas.

Here's what the accusations against her are, according to the Veterans of Foreign Wars who I met with. And these are the men who go to those funeral services and are the honor guard for America's war dead that are buried. And here's what they say that she has done. The chapel that is on the premises has been closed. The Bible has been removed. The cross has been taken out of the chapel. We don't know what the chapel's being used for. Some stay a storage place. Some say a meeting place. Some say it's not being used at all. This is what she is accused of doing.

She censors the prayers that are being given at the burial services of our veterans. She's banned the word ''God,'' the words ''Jesus Christ'' from these funeral services. And it is the very utterance of the word ''God'' that's put this director in a tizzy, so much so that she wants to approve all the prayers that are given at these private veterans funerals that take place on these sacred grounds.

There are 60 burials a week of our veterans at Houston National Cemetery. And this action has got to cease, this unconstitutional action by the director. It's not the business of the Federal Government to be engaged in anti-religious activity, especially at what some consider to be a religious ceremony, the burial of our veterans. The philosophy behind such politics is anti-Christian, anti-religious, and anti-American.

Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment is first because it's the most important. It protects the freedom of speech, the freedom of press, the freedom of free exercise of religion, and the freedom to peaceably assemble. And that is under attack at this cemetery because the director wants to be in charge and make sure that none of these burials are a religious ceremony. And that's got to stop.

This cemetery, Mr. Speaker, does not belong to Director Ocasio. In fact, I don't think it belongs to the Federal Government. It belongs to the veterans who have served this Nation all over the world in all wars. It belongs to them, and it belongs to their families who bury them. And religious censorship has got to cease at this cemetery. Americans are irate about this government attack on religion. I have heard from numerous veterans and loved ones all over the country who are shocked that this government, our government, would allow such a thing to occur.

□ 1010

One man in particular stood out who called my office and he was in tears, Mr. Speaker, because his father, a World War II veteran, was days away from being buried in Houston National Cemetery. And his father had heard about the censorship of religion and speech, and he doesn't want to be buried in that cemetery with other veterans any longer.

So no wonder that so many people are shocked by the actions of this director. After all, it reminds me of the old Soviet Union, the way they used to censor speech and prevent the free exercise of religion.

The First Amendment is sacred. Funerals are sacred; and when our veterans are buried, that soil becomes sacred. And this action has to stop, and if these actions are true, the director needs to be terminated.

The government's attack on the very freedoms that these people have lived and died for is a violation of the freedom of speech and the freedom to freely exercise religion promised to all Americans in the Constitution, and that must be upheld.

And that's just the way it is.

CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS CRISIS IN PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Yesterday, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Educational Fund, and the National Institute for Latino Policy published this full-page ad in Roll Call, one of the key newspapers here on Capitol Hill.

These respected civil rights and policy organizations have investigated and denounced the civil and human rights crisis in Puerto Rico. They bought a full-page ad to alert Congress about the ''serious concerns about civil and human rights abuses against the citizens of Puerto Rico by their government, including the infringement on the rights of free speech, peaceful assembly and freedom from police violence and abuse.''

And they make an essential point: If these abuses were happening anywhere in the 50 States, they would not be tolerated. These abuses would be on the front page of every newspaper, as they are in Puerto Rico.

It's time for this Congress to start paying attention. Students and working people, journalists and environmentalists in Puerto Rico are paying attention because the freedoms we take for granted in America are being denied to them each day.

I would like today to remind you what has happened. On this floor I have condemned the use of heavily armed riot squads against peaceful student and labor protesters at the University of Puerto Rico and in the streets of San Juan. I have denounced the beatings of students by police armed with night sticks, the use of pepper spray on protesters and even journalists, the groping of female students.

I have stood up to defend the Puerto Rican Bar Association, a clear voice for justice that has been attacked by the ruling party and their legislature and their allies on the Federal bench.

I have spoken on the House floor and leaders have spoken on the island about the environmental emergency the ruling party has brought on to Puerto Rico. The government declared an energy emergency to avoid routine fact-finding and licensing procedures so that it could build a 100-mile long, $500 million gas pipeline on a tropical island that is designed more to help wealthy insiders than the people of Puerto Rico.

While actions in Wisconsin and Ohio and other States that threaten workers' rights are discussed routinely in the U.S., the fact that the Governor of Puerto Rico has fired tens of thousands of public employees and canceled labor agreements, all contrary to contract promises, is largely unknown.

But Tea Partyers don't rejoice: he has also doubled the property taxes on everyone.

Even the courts are under attack on the island. This Governor has packed the Puerto Rican Supreme Court with activists of the ruling party. He created two new positions on the supreme court in order to add two new judges to a court that already had a majority of the ruling party. He did this, of course, despite the fact of having denounced Hugo Chavez when he believed he was doing the same thing in Venezuela.

Just 2 weeks ago, the ruling party yet again changed the law so they could fire the island's ombudswoman for the elderly, who had years left on her 10-year appointment, because of her independence and vocal disagreement with the ruling party.

And because I have spoken out against the ruling party of Puerto Rico, I have earned a resolution of censure from the ruling party's legislature. I have earned a full-page ad in Roll Call condemning me for using my right to speech.

Only the ruling party of Puerto Rico would respond to complaints about free speech and civil rights abuses by officially passing a resolution condemning someone for speaking. Should any of my colleagues not believe this absurdity, you just need to come to my office where I display proudly these documents. I invite you to come and see them.

I ask my colleagues today: please pay attention to what is happening in Puerto Rico. If it were happening in Illinois, New York, Texas or Wyoming, or any of the States of our Union, this Congress would have great concerns.

One meaningful first step would be to join me in urging the Department of Justice to complete the investigation that they have initiated and to police abuses in Puerto Rico that started in 2008 and promptly release the results. I would also ask my colleagues and their staffs to attend the congressional briefing organized by the ACLU next Tuesday, July 12, at 10 a.m.

And, finally, I ask my friends and colleagues to do what we do whenever we see regimes that refuse to treat people fairly: please speak out for the values that define us as Americans. Please join me in standing for liberty and justice for all.

THE VOTE TO INCREASE DEBT LIMIT

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today the United States Government owes close to $14.3 trillion. It's estimated by the Congressional Budget Office that by the year 2021, the government will spend 100 percent of every dollar raised in revenue on entitlements. And yet we are being asked to raise the debt limit to $16.3 trillion. That's a $2 trillion increase, or 14 percent increase. In 2010, our national GDP was $14.6 trillion. Raising the debt to $16.3 trillion means our debt ceiling will surpass our country's GDP.

And yet for the 81st time since 1940, we are being asked again to raise the debt ceiling. In 2002, our debt stood at $6.2 trillion. Now, not even 10 years later, we are asked to raise it to $16.2 trillion. That's a 250 percent increase, or an average of 16.7 percent increase per year. Obviously, continuing on this path next year, it is likely we will be asked in this Chamber to raise the debt ceiling to $19 trillion. That's staggering.

In keeping with this 70-year tradition, we are certain to force our Nation's spiraling and out-of-control debt onto the backs of our country's children and grandchildren. Raising the debt ceiling today without reform will merely lead to a new call, a new call to raise the debt again tomorrow.

Is the United States disciplined enough to solve this debt problem through austerity and productivity? I think it is. Yet I believe we can, but only if we break this tradition of continued spending.

Now recently a constituent of mine wrote a simple letter to the editor of my hometown paper and this what is he said: ''If you and your wife haven't made a budget for the last 2 years, and now you have maxed-out the $14,300 credit limit on your Visa card, do you: A, expect Visa to raise your limit to $16,700; B, print counterfeit money to cover your debts; C, borrow more money; or, D, sell the Cadillac.''

Responsible Americans would sell the Cadillac. It's time for the Federal Government to do the same thing: reduce spending or sell unneeded assets.

We must begin to closely scrutinize our bills and eliminate wasteful and fraudulent programs, sunset some of them. As we negotiate the upcoming vote on the debt ceiling, we should ensure that any cut in spending exceeds any increase in the debt limit. Selling the Cadillac is meaningless when you continue to max out on your credit card. The point here is to make a difference in our debt, not to merely provide a vehicle to continue Washington's spending addiction.

Moreover, any future spending must be restricted. We cannot sell the Cadillac this year only to buy a Mercedes Benz next year. Again, we must begin to live within our means.

I know that leadership is working tirelessly to ensure that a compromise can be reached and the Republicans' demands can be met, and it appears we are making progress.

□ 1020

But, the President has in one breath asked both parties to leave their rhetoric at the door, but then in the same next breath he accused Republicans of refusing to cut tax loopholes for the rich in order to curb the debt problem. But that alone won't do it. Beyond being contradictory and self-serving, these accusations demonstrate that Democrats continue to misunderstand the real problem. CBO has nailed it. They recently revealed that it is runaway spending, not a lack of revenue, that is driving our debt today. According to CBO's long-term budget forecast, even with a tax increase that raises revenues from its historic 18 percent of GDP to 23 percent of GDP, the national debt will continue to grow unless we have the spending reductions.

Everyone here in Congress understands how important this vote is, but surely after the CBO analysis, we must confront the fact that spending is growing relentlessly and needs to be placed under control. Therefore, to move the debt ceiling up another $2 trillion, we need to see corresponding spending reductions regardless—regardless—without tax increases. Now is the time to do it. It can be done. And it must be done today.

WHAT DOES $10 BILLION A MONTH BUY?

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, since 2005, I have spoken from this very spot 399 times. On nearly every occasion that House rules allow, I have stood to deliver a 5-minute special order speech highlighting the moral outrage of the United States' continued military engagements in Iraq, Afghanistan and now Libya. I speak of the need also for a new Smart Security to keep America safe.

Today will be my 399th speech. I look forward to reaching number 400 next week, and I will continue this drumbeat until my last day as a Member of Congress, which gives me approximately 18 months, 1½ years, time to bring our troops safely home.

During this week, the week that the House is debating defense appropriations, I thought it would be fitting to focus on war spending, on the staggering costs that taxpayers are being

asked to bear for our military occupations.

Ten billion dollars a month is a lot of money. That's the price tag for the privilege of continuing to wage a 10-year war against Afghanistan: $10 billion a month. The American people who are writing that check have a right to ask and to get answers to some very important questions: Where is that money going, and what exactly is it accomplishing? What are we getting for our $10 billion a month? Are we more secure here at home? Is the Afghanistan central government introducing the rule of law? Have we not already defeated al Qaeda? And so who are we fighting and why?

For $10 billion a month, Mr. Speaker, our expectations as taxpayers, as Americans, and as Members of Congress, should be high. Is it too much to think that $10 billion a month could buy a stable ally, an ally capable of standing on its own two feet, taking responsibility for its own security, and having respect for the rule of law? Instead, corruption and chaos are ruling the day in Kabul. Basic government institutions are failing to provide services. President Karzai has tried to establish a special court, in fact, for the purpose of stripping 62 members of Parliament of their seats. The financial system is teetering on the brink of collapse with the head of the central bank fleeing the country and accusing Karzai's regime of fraud and cronyism.

And just a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, a brawl broke out on the floor of the Afghan Parliament with one member throwing a shoe at another member when a motion was proposed to impeach President Karzai. For $10 billion a month, is it not too much to ask that the Afghan Parliament not look like an episode of the ''Jerry Springer Show''?

There is so much we could do with $10 billion a month right here at home, especially at a moment when so many of our people are struggling and so many of our communities so badly need public investment, especially at a moment when the clock is ticking toward a catastrophic default on the national debt. I'm not suggesting that we ignore or that we run away from Afghanistan's deep-seated problems, but I believe we cannot begin to address their needs with a military solution. It will never work. It is time to reinvest at pennies on the dollar in Smart Security efforts, humanitarian and civilian aid, aid that will promote democracy, and economic support to address poverty and to rebuild infrastructure in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, this is a moment and this is a time where we put our priorities in order, but it's not a job for our troops. They have served with unbelievable valor. Now it's time to bring them safely home and invest in a humanitarian way in Afghanistan.

DEBT CEILING SOLUTIONS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, Congress has a very important decision to make very soon on whether or not to increase the national debt ceiling. Today, our national debt limit is a staggering $14.3 trillion, and the President is seeking a $2.2 trillion increase in our debt limit. An increase to our Nation's debt ceiling that is not accompanied by equal or larger spending reductions would be reckless and arrogant.

Speaker BOEHNER was right when he said, ''It's true that allowing America to default would be irresponsible, but it would be more irresponsible to raise the debt ceiling without simultaneously taking dramatic steps to reduce spending and reform the budget process.''

This debate is a unique opportunity to achieve significant and serious spending reforms in Washington and to prove to the American people that their employees, the Members of the United States Congress, are listening to them.

I believe this is our best chance for the foreseeable future to obtain substantial and credible long-term deficit reductions, to reform the way Washington spends taxpayer dollars, and save America from ruin.

Elections matter. Last fall changed the debate here in Washington. We may not be cutting spending as fast as some of us prefer, and quite frankly, I have been frustrated by the pace. But the discussion has shifted to how much should we cut, not how much should we spend. This distinction is critical to getting our Nation's fiscal house in order and one that has been driven by conservatives in the House.

House Republicans have developed a three-fold ''cut, cap and balance'' strategy that includes deep spending cuts, enforceable spending caps and a balanced budget amendment with strong protections against Federal tax increases. These proposals will ensure that the Federal Government adheres to the same parameters that families and businesses live with every single day.

The time for irresponsible Federal spending is over. With each passing day, our Nation's fiscal problems only compound, leaving our children and grandchildren with a larger legacy of debt. My colleagues on the other side have advocated an increase to our debt with no strings attached. They continue to stand for business as usual right here in Washington, DC. But we cannot ignore the problem, nor can we simply tax our way out of this mess.

Furthermore, in the event we fully reach the debt ceiling, we cannot trust the White House to prioritize our debt payments, nor can we trust the administration not to default on our obligations. The American people must remember that if we default on our debt, the executive branch would have full control over what programs get cut, not Congress.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, the only resolution to this problem is to secure trillions in spending cuts and put our Nation on a solid fiscal path to financial sanity, and ensure a strong and prosperous future for our children and our grandchildren.

IMPROVING FEDERAL GRANT SOLICITATION PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, each year, 26 Federal agencies award over half a trillion dollars in grant funding. Earlier this year, Congress significantly changed the manner in which the Federal Government allocates funding. In the past, State and local governments and nonprofit organizations spent a great deal of time trying to persuade individuals Members of Congress to earmark funds to support local projects.

While debate will no doubt continue on the value of congressionally directed spending, the reality is that, at least for the time being, the days of earmarks are over. With a ban on earmarks, a greater emphasis will now be placed on competitive grants, whereby applicants from across the Nation compete for funding made available for different purposes.

In theory, a larger role for competitive grants in the Federal appropriations process holds promise. Under a well-administered grant competition, an application is judged on its merits. In practice, however, an increased emphasis on competitive grants will only improve the overall process if the Federal Government announces and publicizes grant opportunities in a clear and organized manner. Grant seeking will not be a true meritocracy if the process of identifying, applying for, and obtaining Federal grants is clouded in mystery and confusion and understood only by paid experts.

In 1999, Congress created a Web site, grants.gov, which allows applicants to search and apply for grants online. But much more needs to be done to make the grant solicitation process as transparent and user friendly as possible.

Many of my constituents have expressed frustration with the manner in which the Federal Government makes grant opportunities known. Often, a potential grantee will seek to apply for needed funding only to learn that the deadline for the most relevant grant passed days or weeks earlier. In other instances, prospective applicants will search grants.gov, but become frustrated upon finding that they need to scroll through pages and pages of grant listings, some of which are outdated or have not been funded by Congress.

To address these problems, I recently introduced H.R. 2393. This bipartisan

legislation would make two important changes to the Federal grant solicitation process. First, my bill would require each Federal agency, within 2 months of the start of any fiscal year, to submit a forecast of all grants solicitations that the agency expects to issue for that year. Such a forecast would allow prospective applicants to determine in advance which grant opportunities they wish to apply for.

The second improvement my bill would make is to require each grant solicitation forecast or listing to be organized by detailed subject area. Grants.gov currently organizes grant opportunities by agency and by very broad areas such as energy or housing. As a result, when an applicant seeks to search for health-related grants, for example, he or she must scroll through 30 pages of grant listings. My bill would require grants.gov, as well as all other Federal agencies, to organize grant opportunities by specific subject areas so that the applicants can more easily identify those grants that are most likely to address their needs.

Now, let me turn to Puerto Rico, which I represent in this Congress. And it pains me that some statements were made earlier on this floor regarding my beautiful island and its government. Puerto Rico shines because of its democracy. Every 4 years we have free elections, and our voters go out and express their will at the rate of 80 percent, which is something that we are very proud of.

We do have a police department in Puerto Rico, actually the second-largest in the Nation, and there is an ongoing civil rights investigation by the Department of Justice. But I am sure, and I can vouch, that the police department of Puerto Rico is doing everything it can so that any civil rights violations are corrected and are not repeated.

Again, I wish when we talk about Puerto Rico in this Congress, we talk about all of the positive things that are happening in that island, including our people's love of their American citizenship and their rights under the U.S. Constitution.

TOUGH DECISIONS TO SOLVE FISCAL PROBLEMS

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

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, let's think about something very quickly. What is the most basic job that we can do—in the House of Representatives or in the Senate of the United States—in government?

One of the most basic jobs we do is to pass a budget; to figure out where we are going to spend money and how we are going to spend money. Yet it has been 799 days today since the other Chamber has passed a budget out of the Senate. Since that day, we have added $3.2 trillion in debt to our country and we have spent $7.3 trillion.

Now we are finding ourselves bumping up against this debt ceiling, against the statutory limit of where we can spend and borrow money. We are on this record clip, this record pace to blow through this debt ceiling, and we are here.

In 2006, now-President Obama stood in front of the Senate and said that raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. Well, sounds like we are in that position today. Five years later, we are once again talking about an over $2 trillion increase in our Nation's ability to borrow money, which we are tacking on to the responsibility of our kids and our grandkids. Once again, we're back.

We have an extreme failure of leadership in this country that is of epic proportions. We know, we look at our budget, we see over a trillion-and-a-half dollars this year that we are spending that we haven't taken in, and yet we are continuing to haggle about whether we need to just raise taxes or have spending cuts.

We have a spending problem in this country; we don't have a revenue problem in this country. We have a problem with how much money we are spending.

I am a new Member of Congress. I came here and was sworn in in January, and within a couple of days the President of the United States asked us to increase the debt limit without any corresponding cuts or anything along those lines. I actually thought it was a joke. I mean, really, we are going to add another $2 trillion onto our debt and not even take seriously the fact that we are just piling on more and more interest.

I mean, we're spending more in interest right now than we do in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan combined. Think about that; two wars, and we are spending more in interest. And it is only going to increase every year.

I can tell you, the youth of America, the current generation that is in charge in America is all sitting around saying at some point the insanity has to end. You know, I travel around the 11th Congressional District in Illinois, which includes Joliet, places like Ottawa and Morris, Bloomington, Princeton, Peru. And you know what I hear from people? I don't hear them say, Congressman KINZINGER, boy, we sure have a revenue problem in this country; don't we? I hear them say, Congressman, we are spending too much money. We have a spending problem.

The President is asking us to increase the debt limit. We have to be willing to have at least as much as we are going to increase the debt limit or more in spending cuts for us to even consider it at this point. It has got to be done. And how best are we going to get out of debt? Yes, we have to have these spending cuts. And, yes, we have to get serious about our budget. But we have to get America back to work.

I think it was put well yesterday. Mr. President, where are the jobs? Where are the jobs? Mr. Speaker, I'm asking: Where are the jobs?

It is time that we get America back to work. We turn people then from tax recipients to taxpayers. And as much as I like to say ''where are the jobs?,'' let me ask another question: Where is the leadership?

We've got to make tough decisions. It's time that we stand up and say I'm tired of kicking the can down the road. I wasn't sent to Washington, D.C., to kick the can down the road. I was sent here to be a leader and to make tough decisions. And I can tell you, House Republicans are ready to be leaders and make tough decisions, but we have to have willing partners on the other side.

I know 2012 is just around the corner. I get it. I understand that. But 2011 is still now. America can't afford to forget that 2011 still exists and to just focus on the next election. We have to focus long term on the next generation. Let's get our budgets in gear. Let's have a real serious discussion. And for goodness sake, let's put politics aside and make sure that we are still the strongest country in the world.

□ 1040

IN RECOGNITION OF NCTC DIRECTOR MICHAEL E. LEITER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished efforts of the National Counterterrorism Center Director, Michael E. Leiter.

Following his exemplary service as the Assistant Director and Deputy General Counsel for the Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the U.S. regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction, Mr. Leiter continued his public service as the Deputy Chief of Staff in the Office of the Director of National Intelligence. He was very successful in organizing staffing and in establishing processes for this new but critical office.

As such, he was elected to become the Principal Deputy Director at the National Counterterrorism Center. Because of his superlative efforts, in June 2008, he was confirmed as the Director of NCTC where he has focused on counterterrorism, community development and mission execution. His focus has prepared the CT analysts of tomorrow to meet the challenges ahead, and his management style has encouraged information sharing and the free flow of ideas.

Director Leiter has always understood that results mattered and that a success rate of less than 100 percent meant lives lost. Some of the center's most noticeable accomplishments will remain largely secret; however, Director Leiter's strategic investments will pay dividends for many years to come. Under his leadership, the center vastly improved its processes for screening CT data and deployed a new database, better known as TIDE, that has yielded

easier management, improved identity resolution and faster, more efficient processes.

In the wake of the attempted downing of a passenger aircraft in December 2009, Director Leiter reallocated significant resources to develop the Pursuit Group, which is a team of highly skilled analysts that sifts through considerable amounts of data to identify desperate pieces of loose intelligence and to find linkages that identify terrorists, their networks and their plans before they can be executed. His leadership in the areas of radicalization, extremist messaging and in countering violent extremism is particularly noteworthy as well as his focus on cooperation and engagement with outside communities. This has laid a solid foundation for the continued success of these initiatives.

Director Leiter leaves the Federal Government for some well-deserved time with his family and friends, and I wish him well. However, it is my sincere hope that he continues to use his expertise in counterterrorism to keep America and its citizens safe.

ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, this past week, we were in our districts to visit with our constituents, to learn from them and to celebrate America's Independence Day. Much of my time was focused on the issue of energy and the need for energy independence because constituents are concerned with the high costs of energy and how these costs are impacting their businesses and lives.

Republicans believe in an all-of-the-above approach for energy independence. Republicans believe that energy diversity leads to energy security, and there were plenty of examples in the district for me to visit.

In Boone, students from Appalachian State University's Solar Homestead Team showed me the home they are preparing for the 2011 Solar Decathlon competition to be held on The Mall here in Washington, D.C., in September. The Solar Homestead team is advancing renewable energy systems through research on phase change, material energy storage, the integration of solar photovoltaic panels, and concentrating solar thermal systems for domestic hot water. While much money has been invested in this project by both the public and the private sectors, the hope is that the research will result in the ability to utilize alternative, renewable energy sources that will be able to provide low-cost energy homes for those in need.

Clyde and Pat Colwell have developed Carolina Heritage Vineyard in Elkin, North Carolina, an energy-efficient small business which is benefiting from a taxpayer-funded solar system. The Colwells are very educated people who are retired from their first careers. Clyde served in the U.S. Marine Corps, earned his Ph.D., and served as a teacher, principal and superintendent. Pat earned her MBA and retired from IBM. However, while their graduate degrees were helpful in general, both of them returned to Surry Community College to earn associate degrees in viticulture so they could pursue developing their organic wine business. They work full time in the vineyards and on the winemaking process, and bring many skills to the area and to others in the business.

The Gilbert Hemric family farm in Hamptonville, North Carolina, where Gilbert Hemric and his family work hard on their poultry, cattle and tobacco farm, is a microcosm of the problems that this administration has created. Mr. Hemric made it very clear to me that the high cost of energy and regulatory burdens are having a negative impact on his business. The Hemrics are paying more and more for feed and for fuel to run their equipment. Because fuel costs have almost doubled since President Obama came to office, the Hemrics have not replaced two of the 10 workers they had last year. They can't afford to replace them.

At Holland Transfer in Statesville, CEO Jeff Harvey told me that the skyrocketing price of fuel and regulatory burdens are counterproductive to job creation and the growth of his business. The Harvey Family practices Christian values throughout its business, and has established nonprofits that feed the needy. When possible, they hire homeless people, which enables the homeless to leave shelters, but all this great work for the community depends on his business performing at a level that will allow him to continue contributing to the community.

As I visited with constituents during the Independence Day work period, one thing was clear: that we need another independence movement—independence from Middle Eastern oil.

Unfortunately, rather than pursuing energy independence, the Obama administration keeps fostering an energy dependence policy at the cost of American jobs, higher prices at the pump and at the cost of endangering our national security by making us more dependent on unstable Middle Eastern governments.

House Republicans have responded by introducing and passing four bills to increase our domestic energy production and to create American jobs, but the Senate has taken no action. Liberal Democrats are obstructing the opportunity for jobs for Americans, lower energy costs and a new era of independence.

It is time we declare independence from Middle Eastern oil and start using our own resources for the benefit of all Americans.

AMERICA'S FISCAL CRISIS

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, our country truly is facing a financial crisis. I guess the good news is that even Congress is beginning to ask a question that is part of that financial crisis, which is simply this:

How long can we continue to spend almost twice as much money as we bring in?

The unfortunate part is that we've waited so long to ask that question. I wish we'd asked it before we embarked upon the series of bailouts and stimulus bills that we have embarked upon over the last several years. I am happy that I'm one of only 17 Members of Congress who voted against each and every one of those, but I'm unhappy where it has brought us, which is the fear that we had: that this runaway spending would bring us to a point where we had to begin cutting the national defense capabilities of our country.

Today, we will vote on the Defense appropriations bill, H.R. 2219, which will reduce the President's budget for national defense by $8.9 billion. That's only a downpayment of the cuts that are going to come. The next cuts, we are told, could be $400 billion to $700 billion from our national defense. Before we do that, there are two crucial questions we need to ask.

The first one is: What is the risk assessment that the United States faces today?

Now, that should be answered by our Quadrennial Defense Review, but if you look at a bipartisan independent assessment of that Quadrennial Defense Review, you'll find out that we are a train wreck that is on its way to happening because that defense assessment has truly become no more than a reaffirmation of what we are already doing.

The second thing that we should be asking before we decide what we can cut is how much we are currently spending and what the risk will be if we make those cuts. Unfortunately, the Department of Defense hasn't provided us with the audited financial statements the law requires so that we know where we're spending those dollars and so that we know the true risk of making those cuts.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, let me just tell you that there is a way you can find out. Our commanders in the field provide us with the Quarterly Readiness Report to Congress, which is a classified document. Now, I know as chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee for the Armed Services Committee that I'm in the minority, and am probably going to vote against this bill today.

□ 1050

But, Mr. Speaker, I am also in the minority of the individuals who have read this classified report. And the one thing that I would encourage our Members to do before they cast their vote

today to begin down that series of cuts to our national defense is at least go in to our staff today and read the Quarterly Readiness Report to Congress that is a classified document. Our staff is ready to show you the document, to let you review that document. And, Mr. Speaker, I believe if you will just do that, it will be very difficult to then come on this floor and begin to start voting to cut and make the cuts we're going to make to national defense. Mr. Speaker, that's why today I can't support that bill and will be voting against it.

REMEMBERING FORMER CONGRESSMAN CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, this past week, the citizens of Ohio's Third Congressional District were met with the sad news that former Congressman Charles W. Whalen, Jr., passed away on Monday, June 27, at Sibley Hospital in Washington, D.C.

Born in Dayton, Ohio, on July 31, 1920, he was known throughout the community as ''Chuck.'' During World War II, he served as an Army first lieutenant in the China, India, and Burma theater. After earning a master's of business administration from Harvard University, he worked as a professor of economics at his alma mater, the University of Dayton. He later became chairman of the University of Dayton's Economic Department in 1962.

Before his election to Congress in 1966, Chuck was a three-term member of both the Ohio State Senate and the Ohio General Assembly. While serving in the State House, he wrote Ohio's first fair housing law.

While in Congress, Chuck retained his seat handily in every general election, even running unopposed for reelection in 1974. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, Chuck worked to move our military to an all-volunteer Army. The Nixon administration, in developing legislation on this issue, adopted many of his recommendations, and today the U.S. has an entirely all-volunteer active duty military force. In addition, he was focused on social reforms and supported the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964. He was also one of the most traveled Members of Congress and visited more than 150 countries, including every nation in Africa.

Chuck was highly regarded for his ability to speak publicly, having been a college debate champion at the University of Dayton, so it should be no surprise that in retirement he coauthored two books with his wife, a former journalist: ''The Longest Debate: A Legislative History of the 1964 Civil Rights Act,'' published in 1985, and ''The Fighting McCooks: America's Famous Fighting Family,'' published in 2006, focusing on two Ohio brothers and their 13 sons who served in the Union Army during the Civil War.

Not one to be contained by the academic or literary worlds, he was also an avid sports fan and reveled in debating sports trivia and stats. He was president of Oakwood High School's class of 1938, and he is remembered for possessing extensive knowledge of prewar aviation largely due to Dayton being his birthplace.

As a son of Ohio, Congressman Whalen made his final journey home and was buried in Calvary Cemetery in Dayton. Whalen is survived by his wife of 52 years, Barbara, and their six children—Charles, Daniel, Edward, Joseph, Anne, Mary—and their seven grandchildren.

Today we remember the life and work of Congressman Whalen and thank him for his service to both the Third District of Ohio and also our Nation.

LET THE STATES DECIDE

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is facing a fiscal crisis of unprecedented proportions. We have a $14 trillion national debt, a $1.65 trillion annual spending deficit, and we borrow 42 cents for every dollar we spend.

After years of borrowing and spending and bailouts by both political parties, now comes a national debate over raising the Nation's debt limit. Now look, I believe if you owe debts, pay debts. We must honor the full faith and credit of the United States of America. But I also believe that now is the moment to take decisive action to put our fiscal house in order and restore the full confidence of the American people in the fiscal integrity of our national government.

I believe our debt limit should not be raised without real and meaningful reforms in the way the Federal Government spends the people's money in the short term and the long term. In the short term, we need to cut spending now and implement statutory caps on how much money the Federal Government can spend going forward. But in the long term, the time has come for this Congress to send to the States a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution that will limit Federal spending and require this national government to live within our means.

While the debate, it seems, according to the newspapers today, has focused on spending cuts versus tax increases, the real answer is to cut spending now and to make any increase in the Nation's debt ceiling contingent on Congress sending to the States a balanced budget amendment that limits Federal spending to one-fifth of the American economy. In short, it's time to let the States decide.

Article V of the Constitution provides a process that requires any amendment to pass the House of Representatives and the Senate by a two-thirds vote, but ultimately any amendment to the Constitution is submitted to the States. The States decide whether to amend the national charter. If three-fourths of the States agree, the Constitution is so amended.

By demanding spending cuts today and sending a balanced budget amendment to the States, we will let the States decide. And I have every confidence that these United States will choose fiscal discipline and reform. Thirty-two of our 50 States operate under a balanced budget requirement in their State constitution, and 49 have some sort of balanced budget requirement. In Indiana, our State had a prohibition against assuming debt in our State constitution since 1851, and the Hoosier State has a balanced budget and even a surplus rainy day fund.

After years of fighting runaway Federal spending by both political parties here in Washington, D.C., I can tell you we need more accountability, we need more engagement of the States and the American people. And if you think about it, as Ronald Reagan said, it's important to remember that the States created the Federal Government; the Federal Government didn't create the States.

By engaging in a process where we demand serious and meaningful spending cuts today, capping spending going forward, but requiring that any increase in the debt ceiling be contingent on sending to the States a balanced budget amendment with real spending limits in it, we will build on the wisdom and the foundation of our Founders and our system of Federalism.

Mr. President, if you need more borrowing authority, let's cut spending now, let's cap spending tomorrow, and let's let the States decide whether we should permanently require that our national government live within our means. By enacting a balanced budget amendment that limits Federal spending and requires that our national government live out our own commitment of fiscal responsibility and reform, we will do right by this day, we will do right by our children and grandchildren, and we will do something worthy to be remembered in this time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

LIBYA OPERATION UNIFIED PROTECTOR

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I came down here today to talk about the Libya issue, the war that supposedly is not a war, but I wanted to start off by talking a little bit about

the rhetoric that's coming out of the White House and from the President.

I was watching the news this morning, and the President indicated that they were going to have these budget talks down at the White House today. And he said, and I quote, that the Republicans, in effect, have a gun to the head of the American people. That just isn't the kind of rhetoric that should be used right now when we're talking about the huge budget deficits we have. And if I were talking to the President, I would try to admonish him to not do that in the future.

And then, when we were talking about Libya, I think it was just about 4 or 5 days ago, he said that we in Congress are making Libya a cause celebre, indicating that it's not an important issue, and we're just trying to puff it up so that we can make political points.

□ 1100

The fact of the matter is it is a war. The President went to the Arab League, he went to the French, the English, he went to the United Nations, and NATO and decided that he was going to be involved in an attack on Libya and Muammar Qadhafi. But the one place he didn't come to to talk about this issue was the Congress of the United States—the House of Representatives and the Senate. The first place that a President ought to go if he thinks we ought to go into a conflict of any kind is the Congress.

The Constitution is very clear on the responsibilities of the President before he goes into a conflict. It has to be a threat to the United States, a threat to our interests, and it has to be approved by the Congress of the United States. The Congress of the United States is the only body that can declare war. He can't do that. He can manage a war. He is the Commander in Chief once we go into war, but he can't start a war unless it's in our national interest or there's a threat to the United States. That was clarified by the War Powers Act during the Nixon administration because there was some question about the latitude a President might have using the Constitution.

The Constitution was explained very carefully in the 1970s in the War Powers Act. Now, that's never been tested in the courts. Some people say it's unconstitutional. But the fact of the matter is it's the law of the Nation. The President cannot violate the law or the Constitution, and in our opinion, he's violated both.

Let me just tell you what's going on in this war that the President says is not a war.

We have flown almost 30 percent of the sorties. That means we have flown 3,475 flights into the combat area. We have dropped bombs and missiles 132 times on targets, and several times we've hit civilians.

Nobody likes Muammar Qadhafi. Nobody wants him in office. But the fact of the matter is, we've been involved in a war to get rid of him.

On May 22, the figure was that of the missiles that were fired, there were 246 missiles fired, and 228 were the United States' missiles—at $1.1 million per missile. And we're paying approximately 60 or 70 percent of the total cost of this conflict through NATO or directly from the taxpayers of the United States.

Now, the reason I came down here today is to say that we should not be in that conflict because it was not in our national interest and there was no threat to the United States and it was a violation of the Constitution and the War Powers Act.

The President said he had to do it because it was a humanitarian issue. If it was a humanitarian issue and we really needed to go in there, he should have come to Congress. The previous President, President Bush, did go to Congress on Afghanistan and Iraq to get approval before he did it, but President Obama decided to do this unilaterally. So we are in a war now, and it's costing the taxpayers close to a billion dollars in a war that we should not be in.

He said it was for humanitarian purposes. If that's the case, we ought to be in a war in the Ivory Coast. Right now in the Sudan, there are thousands and thousands of people being executed and killed. And if that's the case, we ought to be in the Sudan. In Syria, we all know what's going on in Syria right now. If that's the case, we ought to be in Syria. There are wars of opportunity every place.

I just like to end, Mr. Speaker, by saying this: The President should always come to the Congress if it's in our national interest or a threat to this country before he goes to war. It's constitutionally required.

DEBT CRISIS

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

Mr. WOODALL. I came down to the floor today to talk about the fiscal crisis that we're having in America. There are those when I open the front page of the paper, Mr. Speaker, and I read the headline, it talks about having a debt limit vote crisis in this country. I went back, I looked, and apparently we've raised the debt limit over 70 times with a vote right here in this body. Apparently having a vote isn't particularly a complicated thing to do.

What we're having is a debt crisis. I think that's an important distinction. I was talking to a freshman colleague of mine yesterday about that. Understand that we can have the vote, Mr. Speaker. It's within the House's authority to bring a vote to raise the debt limit tomorrow. In fact, we brought that vote to the House already: Should we raise the debt ceiling or should we not? Mr. Speaker, we defeated it. We defeated it by a wide margin here in this body.

What we have is a debt crisis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it were just existing debt, perhaps we could work out a way to finance that, but it's not. It's continued borrowing each and every day to the tune of 42 cents of every dollar that we spend. In other words, if we paid for Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest on the national debt, those other mandatory spending programs, just those, Mr. Speaker, we've already spent every nickel in Federal revenue.

That means every nickel that we spend for education, every nickel that we spend for transportation, every nickel that we spend on national defense, on homeland security, on the environment, on the courts, every other nickel we borrow, with absolutely no plan, Mr. Speaker, for changing that going forward.

If the President were here today, Mr. Speaker, I would say we do not have a debt limit vote crisis. We have a debt crisis, and there is only one body in this town that has put together a budget that will address it. I am proud to say as a freshman in this Congress, as a freshman in this House, it was the U.S. House of Representatives that took on that responsibility, Mr. Speaker.

It's been 799 days since the United States Senate last passed a budget. Hear that. Three years ago since the Senate last passed a budget. Not a balanced budget, mind you, Mr. Speaker, but a budget at all.

These are serious challenges that require serious people to offer serious solutions, and the only one that has been offered in this town, Mr. Speaker, came from this body. I encourage the President to go back and take one more look at that, because when we come down to game day, come down to the crisis—understand what we're talking about when we talk about a crisis, we passed the debt limit back in May, Mr. Speaker, as you know. We've just been shuffling the books in this town because that's what Washington does so well: raiding this fund to pay that, raiding this fund to pay this, over and over and over again. Apparently the games just run out on August 2.

Mr. Speaker, the games cannot continue. The games must stop, and they must stop here, and we must lead as we have always led in this body.

We do not have a debt limit vote crisis. We have a debt crisis that is driven by our addiction to borrowing and spending. The borrowing and spending stops here, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you for your leadership on that.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) at noon.

PRAYER

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

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

In these most important days and debates here in the people's House, we beg You to send Your Spirit of wisdom as the Members struggle to do the work that has been entrusted to them. Inspire them to work together with charity, and join their efforts to accomplish what our Nation needs to live into a prosperous and secure future.

In this week in the wake of celebrating the great blessings bestowed upon our Republic, please bless those men and women who serve our Nation in uniform wherever they may be. Give them the protection of Your loving embrace, and grant them the trust to know they have our eternal gratitude.

Please keep all the Members of this Congress and all who work for the people's House in good health, that they might faithfully fulfill the great responsibility given them by the people of this great Nation.

Bless us this day and every day. May all that is done here this day be for Your greater honor and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BACA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

TRIBUTE TO DAISY OUTDOOR PRODUCTS

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Daisy Outdoor Products, a Rogers, Arkansas, company celebrating its 125th anniversary.

Daisy moved to Rogers from Plymouth, Michigan, in 1958. Since that move, Daisy's impact on the northwest Arkansas economy has been substantial—not only in providing jobs, but the incredible recognition this famous brand brings to our region.

As the world's oldest and largest BB gun manufacturer, Daisy has a storied history. Its contributions to the shooting sports, the United States military, and the character of young men and women nationwide is noteworthy. And who can forget Ralphie in the famous movie ''A Christmas Story'' and his coveted Red Ryder, the most famous BB gun ever produced?

Mr. Speaker, 125 years in business is a significant milestone by any measurement. It is a tribute to the vision, commitment, and hard work of the company leadership and the employees of Daisy.

Congratulations, Daisy. I'm proud of you, and our Nation is proud of you.

COMMEMORATING CAPE VERDEAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the rich history of Cape Verde as we mark Cape Verdean Independence Day.

This week, we honor the people of Cape Verde and those individuals of proud Cape Verdean descent here in America and around the world who are celebrating 35 years of independence. In doing so, we honor the many milestones and important Cape Verdean leaders like Amilcar Cabral, who fought for the liberation of Cape Verde. We also honor the lives, work, and rich history of Cape Verdean Americans throughout our country and particularly in my home State of Rhode Island.

Cape Verdeans have made significant contributions in the areas of art and culture, business, and public service. Cape Verdeans have brought jag to local restaurants and added zuca to the music enjoyed by our community.

Rhode Islanders of Cape Verdean descent, like speaker of the house Gordon Fox, have been prominent leaders in Rhode Island politics.

I would also like to take a moment to pay tribute to the late George Lima. Mr. Lima served during World War II as a Tuskegee airman, the first group of black fighter and bomber pilots in the history of what was then the Army Air Forces. He then served our State honorably as a State representative and as head of the Rhode Island NAACP.

Cape Verdeans are generous, skilled, proud, caring members of our community, and I am honored to celebrate Cape Verdean independence with them this week.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN: A NUCLEAR DISASTER

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the President says he supports nuclear power development, but his actions have sadly stopped construction at Yucca Mountain after more than $10 billion of ratepayer money has already been invested, killing jobs in Nevada.

Utility companies across the country have been mandated by the Federal Government to collect over $33 billion for the Nuclear Waste Fund to build Yucca Repository. The Federal Government promised citizens of South Carolina and Georgia that nuclear material being stored at Savannah River Site would be sent to Yucca for permanent disposal. Now, this high-level waste will sit at SRS, and as reported by The Post and Courier, at more than 106 other sites across the country. The Post and Courier has editorialized that the President's position is ''breathtakingly irresponsible.''

I agree with Brian Tucker, president of the North Augusta Chamber of Commerce, that the administration should quit playing political games and follow through on promises to be guided by science and not by politics.

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

PROTECTING MEDICARE

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, when former President Harry Truman and his wife, Bess, were officially enrolled as the first Medicare beneficiaries on July 1, 1966, only 50 percent of America's seniors could afford private health insurance.

The high risks associated with covering America's over-65 population made seniors basically uninsurable. That all changed 45 years ago last week when Medicare was established as a guaranteed benefit, providing a basic level of care for seniors regardless of income or illness.

From the beginning, Medicare has proven resilient, adapting to rapid changes in medicine and surviving in wartime and peace, economic boom times and in recession. Despite some alarmist claims, Medicare has faced more difficult financial challenges in the past than the ones it faces today. Preserving Medicare's guaranteed benefits for future generations is our solemn duty, and we must stop the push for vouchers, which will ruin America's middle class.

On the 45th anniversary of this landmark program, we must rededicate ourselves to protecting Medicare as a guaranteed benefit for tomorrow's seniors, not butchering it with a voucher

program or using it as an ATM for the top 2 percents.

Happy birthday, Medicare. If we stay true to our values, you will have many happy returns.

PROTECTING AMERICAN JOBS AND SECURING AMERICA'S ENERGY FUTURE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the administration's war on coal led the Office of Surface Mining and Reclamation to try and change a rule that would redefine what is considered a stream as it pertains to mining operations.

I am pleased than an amendment I offered during the debate over the budget continuing resolution has been included in the Interior appropriations bill in an effort to stop this irresponsible regulatory overreach.

No one is surprised that the Obama administration is continuing the war on coal, but this is also a war on jobs. And the coal industry employs thousands of people in eastern and southeastern Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, we all want a cleaner environment, but we need to make sure that the policies being enacted are common sense and do not come at the expense of jobs and our economy. Stopping the Obama administration from rewriting the stream buffer zone rule will be a victory for jobs and a defeat to a radical agenda that is seeking to outlaw coal entirely. We can and we must enact smart policies that clean up our environment while protecting American jobs.

□ 1210

MEDICARE

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, as the deadline nears for Americans to raise its debt limit, the American people have sent a clear message to all of us:

They will not stand for a budget that is balanced on the backs of seniors and the middle class.

The American people know that it is wrong to privatize Medicare with a new voucher program, to cut guaranteed health benefits for seniors and to sacrifice Medicaid services for the poor and disabled.

It's not too late for us to compromise on a balanced approach. Yes, we can trim spending with intelligent cuts, but we must end tax breaks for the ultra rich. I state: We must end tax breaks for the ultra rich and corporations that shift jobs overseas.

No new taxes equals no new jobs. No taxes—no jobs.

We have an historic opportunity in front of us. Let's stop the partisan bickering and work together on a plan that strengthens the middle class, lowers our deficit and creates new jobs here at home.

THE DEBT CEILING REDUCTION ACT

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have overspent and we are overextended. Now we have to get out of debt.

For the last 20 years, we have been increasing the debt ceiling and allowing Washington to spend more and more of the taxpayers' money. This method of madness hasn't worked, and today, our economy is suffering because of it.

Yesterday, I introduced a unique bill that would lower the debt ceiling to $13 trillion. This proposal would force Washington to make the spending cuts that we so desperately need to pay down the debt.

State and local governments, businesses and families understand, when you've maxed out your credit card, you can't just give yourself a credit increase. Instead, you have to cut spending and pay down your bills. The Federal Government is the only entity that does not understand this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2409, the Debt Ceiling Reduction Act, because we need to turn this country in a completely different direction.

MAKING AMERICANS SAFER HERE AT HOME

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have a proposal that will help us save tax dollars, pay down our debt, and better protect the American people.

Instead of spending billions and billions of dollars to secure Afghanistan at the rate that we are—and we've spent over a half a trillion of our precious tax dollars in Afghanistan over the last 10 years—I propose to redirect a small share of our tax dollars back to the U.S. and to use our money to hire and equip more police officers, more firefighters, more emergency medical providers, because one of the most effective ways to help protect the American people from a terrorist attack is to make Americans safer right here at home.

THE REPUBLICANS' ALL-OF-THE-ABOVE ENERGY STRATEGY

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on June 22, President Obama released 30 million barrels of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve—just over a day's worth of oil. The administration continues to play politics rather than develop a comprehensive national energy plan, which will lay the path for future economic growth, help lower unemployment and improve our stagnant economy. This country's economy was built on inexpensive and abundant energy.

Folks are frustrated now. A fellow stopped me the other day, and said, Doc, it's a sad day when a guy can't buy a gallon of gas and a gallon of milk for $10.

And it's true. People don't want half measures that don't address their problems. They want solutions. They want to work. They want to provide for their families.

It is way past time to ease this pain at the pump. The President has shown no interest in the Republicans' all-of-the-above energy strategy that encourages oil and natural gas development in places like ANWR and the Outer Continental Shelf. With national unemployment stubbornly above 9 percent, the American people expect us to work together to lower the cost of energy, reduce our dependency on foreign oil and create American jobs.

OPPOSING THE PRIVATIZATION OF AMTRAK

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the privatization of Amtrak, which would threaten reliable, dependable, and accessible passenger rail service throughout the United States. I travel home every weekend on Amtrak to my district in New Jersey, and its service is an essential part of our region's economic vitality.

Under the plan to privatize Amtrak, the essential service they provide to millions of passengers could be lost, and nearly 20,000 Amtrak jobs could be eliminated. State-owned infrastructure that Amtrak currently maintains could be turned over to the already deficit-burdened States to maintain. It is likely that station stops will be cut and that commuter rail services will bear increased costs. Additionally, freight railroads that currently use Amtrak-supported lines may face logistical problems if Amtrak becomes privatized.

Under the proposal to privatize Amtrak, many important labor provisions will be eliminated. Future railroad employees will be exempt from disability, pension, retirement, and unemployment benefits. By removing future employees from these benefit systems, current and retired employees will be negatively affected, and railroads will face increased taxes to maintain the solvency of these systems.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the privatization of Amtrak.

THE CUT, CAP AND BALANCE PLEDGE

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, while marching in parades and town festivals all over my district during the 4th of July weekend, I spoke with concerned parents, job creators, seniors, and folks who have been out of work for a long time. The one message I heard loud and clear from all of them: Reduce government spending so that businesses can create jobs again.

That's why I signed onto the Cut, Cap and Balance Pledge, which calls for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I know the idea that the government should have to actually balance its budget every year is strange to some here in Washington, especially to entrenched bureaucrats and the special interest groups that fill this city. Imagine if the Federal Government had to run a budget like we do in our homes.

It's time for the Federal Government to live within its means, and it's time for us to reduce spending so that businesses will have the confidence to create jobs again.

Cut, cap and balance. Let's make sure we put America back on the path to prosperity, not on the path to unemployment and bankruptcy.

CURRENCY REFORM FOR FAIR TRADE ACT

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, for so long we've been hearing about our debt. We've also been hearing about who owns our debt, and of course, the name ''China'' comes up. That is why we need to have the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act come to this floor, because that is the only way—the only way—we are going to address the currency manipulation by China and simply ask that they play by fair rules for fair trade.

Look at what this means for us. Let's understand that, by having the currency manipulated by them, they are having the benefit of 25 to 30 percent. That's what we're subsidizing them in terms of their exports. If we get the currency manipulation under control, this is what we could hope to accomplish:

Our budget deficit will be reduced to about $857 billion over the next 10 years. The trade deficit will be reduced by $138 billion. The GDP over the next 18 months will increase by $285 billion. This will support 1.6 million American jobs.

So as we are asking ''where are the jobs?'' look to currency manipulation.

FINANCIAL INDEPENDENCE FROM CHINA AND AMERICAN JOB CREATION

(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, on July 4th, we celebrated our political independence from Great Britain.

My constituents want to know when are we going to celebrate our financial independence from China, which funds much of our national debt. My constituents also want to know: Where are the jobs? Mr. Speaker, these two are connected because too much spending-driven debt leads to too few jobs.

Now, our President doesn't seem to get this. If his stimulus, his reckless spending, his small business tax increases, his class warfare rhetoric helped promote job creation, we would be the most highly employed society in the history of mankind; but instead, we are mired in the longest period of sustained high unemployment under his policies since the Great Depression.

House Republicans have a plan for America's job creators. In the trillion dollar deficits, make the Tax Code fairer, flatter, simpler. Stop the President's job-crushing tax increases, and end the dumb regulations that prevent jobs in America.

□ 1220

EVERYTHING MUST BE ON THE TABLE

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, Congress has a responsibility to level with the American people. We face a looming decision about extending the debt limit, not because we want to but because we have to reaffirm the obligation we have to pay our bills. The majority of us on the Democratic side voted to do that. That was not to incur new spending or new obligations; it was to meet obligations already incurred: $2.3 trillion for the Bush tax cuts; an Iraq war, $1 trillion on the credit card; Afghanistan on the credit card. If we're going to level with the American people, we have to acknowledge that we have to pay for things, whatever their intentions. The time is long overdue for us to accomplish this.

If we're going to be successful on the two things we must do—pay our bills, maintain our full faith and credit, and have a long-term fiscal plan—then everything must be on the table, and that has to include taxes as well as spending, and it must include the Pentagon.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an ideological battle to win. It's a practical problem to be solved.

FREEDOM TO INVEST ACT

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that our economy is struggling. With stagnant unemployment, over $14 trillion in debt, and soaring food and gas prices, America does face some challenging decisions.

In my home State of Illinois, the debt per person is over $4,400, and the State faces a $15 billion shortfall in next year's budget. These indeed are real problems that need to be addressed with commonsense solutions.

One solution is to encourage American companies to reinvest their earnings here at home. Currently, companies are holding an estimated $1.4 trillion in earnings overseas because the United States Tax Code encourages companies to keep their earnings outside of the country. We must encourage companies to reinvest their earnings here in America. Not only would these earnings stimulate the American economy, but the government would collect approximately $50 billion in immediate tax revenue. This money would help spur job creation, more growth, and investments here at home.

I would encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the bipartisan H.R. 1834, the Freedom to Invest Act, so that we can strengthen our economy with commonsense solutions.

GETTING AMERICA BACK ON TRACK

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say today that I was elected in November of last year for the 10th time here, and I am in my fourth district in that period of time. I have spoken to people all over Dallas County, Tarrant County, and Collin County, and unanimously they are seriously concerned about the lack of a true job plan from the Republican majority.

We must cut spending. We must ensure long-term fiscal health. But gridlock over spending cuts does not create jobs. We need a bipartisan compromise that focuses on fiscal responsibility while maintaining investments in our community that continue to create jobs and grow the economy.

To get Americans back to work, we must invest in science, education, research and innovation to create the jobs of the future, and we must focus on America's ability to build, construct and grow manufacturing across the country to remain globally competitive. Mr. Speaker, these efforts can and will spur job growth and ensure that our Nation can compete and be a leader in the global economy.

TIME TO GET OUR FISCAL HOUSE IN ORDER

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with grave concern over our country's economy and fiscal condition. For too long, Washington has borrowed money to finance government, and today our Nation's leaders continue to meet to discuss this looming crisis. We all know that this crisis is spending driven. It's not that government taxes too little; it's that government spends too much.

Mr. Speaker, the American people know that the policies of tax, borrow, and spend will not lead us to prosperity as a Nation. Taking more money from hardworking Americans and sending it to Washington is not the answer. Rather, it's time for Washington to roll up its sleeves, get to work, and live within its means, just like families and small businesses have to do all across this country. It's time to enact significant spending cuts, put in place caps on future spending, and pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to rebuild our Nation's economy and put Americans back to work together, we must put our own fiscal house in order first.

SUPPORT THE AMASH-KUCINICH AMENDMENT

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, in a short time, the House will have an opportunity to reclaim our constitutional authority on matters of war and peace by voting to stop the use of funds for the war in Libya.

An agreement has been reached through work that Mr. AMASH and I have done to create a bipartisan amendment which states: None of the funds made available by this act may be used for the use of military force against Libya.

The Amash-Kucinich amendment is cosponsored by a growing group of bipartisan activists, including, Representatives RON PAUL, LYNN WOOLSEY, WALTER JONES, JOHN CONYERS, DAN BURTON, BARBARA LEE, TED POE, and PETE STARK.

This could well be an historic moment where a bipartisan coalition rallies this Congress to defend the Constitution and to reset the balance that has been upset by the administration's claiming the war power.

Vote to end to the war in Libya. Support the bipartisan Amash-Kucinich amendment.

UNCERTAINTY IMPEDES JOB GROWTH

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the number one job for House Republicans is job growth. The number one impediment to job growth is uncertainty: uncertainty caused by a record-high debt—$14.3 trillion and growing—and the record-high taxes that are going to have to pay for it; uncertainty about the largest tax increase in the history of the Nation that the President pledges to support in just 19 months. Add to that the unknown cost of the government takeover of health care and the unknown price of Dodd-Frank and you've got a very uncertain private sector.

We cannot help the job seeker by punishing the job creator. They need us to work with them, not against them. If we follow the House Republican plan for America's job creators and stop spending money we don't have, certainty will be restored, our economy will grow, and jobs will be created.

THE PLIGHT OF SUDAN'S NUBA PEOPLE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, with a heavy heart, I turn our attention to the plight of Sudan's Nuba people, who are fleeing their homes in the tens of thousands as the Sudanese Armed Forces conduct a brutal military assault on their homeland.

There are widespread reports that Sudanese forces are bombing, shelling, and executing civilians in the oil-rich state of South Kordofan. The Sudanese Government has barred NGOs and the press and is restricting the movement of U.N. personnel in the area.

Mr. Speaker, as we welcome South Sudan into the community of nations this week, United Nations personnel must investigate reports of possible war crimes against the Nuba people by the Sudanese forces. We must not be intimidated by Omar al-Bashir's bullying, or we may find ourselves saying ''never again'' again.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GREG COOPER

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Greg Cooper.

Mr. Cooper recently lost his battle with cancer on May 26 of this year. He was a proud United States marine, and he served his country between 1963 and 1967, which included a tour in the Vietnam War.

Upon leaving the Marines, Greg was hired by the Santa Ana Police Department, where he held several very high-profile jobs and worked with the neat tactical units that we have. While serving his community as a Santa Ana police chief, he earned a bachelor's degree from California State University, Fullerton and a master's degree from the University of Southern California.

Leaving Santa Ana in 1992, he was appointed chief of police in Sanger, California, and in 1996 he relocated here to Washington, D.C., where he accepted a position with the Department of Justice to administer our COPS grant program. In 2002, Greg joined the Department of Homeland Security as FEMA's chief security officer, and he retired in 2008.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation and my community mourns the loss of a loyal friend, a respected leader, and a dedicated public servant.

□ 1230

REMEMBERING BISHOP J.O. PATTERSON, JR.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, while we were in recess on June 25, Memphis lost one of its great citizens, Bishop J.O. Patterson, Jr.

Bishop Patterson was the grandson of the founder of the Church of God in Christ, Bishop Charles Mason, and the cousin of the revered and late Bishop G. Patterson, who was the sixth bishop of the COGIC.

Bishop J.O. Patterson, Jr., was a public servant as well as a bishop and a revered citizen of Memphis. He was my friend. We served together in the Constitutional Convention of 1977. He served one term in the house, two terms in the State senate, 20 years in the city council, and was the first appointed African American mayor of the City of Memphis.

He was a leader in his church and he cared about his community. He cared about jazz and he cared about his fellow man. He was low key, sincere, down to earth, and a leader whom Memphis will miss.

He did much with the opportunities that he was given through his father and his family and his city in politics and in other areas. He was the jurisdictional bishop for the Tennessee headquarters, the head of the Pentecostal Temple Institutional Church of God in Christ and did much with the COGIC.

I will miss him and so will the City of Memphis and all of the Members and all of the saints.

REPORT ON H.R. 2434, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mrs. EMERSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–136) on the bill (H.R. 2434) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Pursuant to clause

1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2219.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 320 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2219.

□ 1233

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. WESTMORELAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 6, 2011, the bill had been read to page 161, line 12.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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 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.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is quite simple. It prohibits any funds in this bill from being used to conduct military operations in Libya, a place where I believe we are engaged in an illegal and certainly unauthorized conflict.

Mr. Chairman, I feel a little bit today like a lawyer with two very unpopular clients. One of them is Libya, and the other one is the United States Congress. But in this case, each one of them has an important point to make.

With respect to Libya, let me make it clear, I don't believe anybody in this Chamber supports Mr. Qadhafi, supports that regime, or wishes it well in any way. But Libya did not attack the United States of America. Libya did not attack any member of NATO. Libya has not allowed al Qaeda to operate with impunity out of its territory. A number of years ago, Libya turned over nuclear material to the United States.

Quite simply, however much we detest Mr. Qadhafi and his regime, we have no reason to be at war or conducting military operations in Libya. And, frankly, if we allow that situation to continue, I think we have to ask ourselves: Are we willing to attack any nation any time that we disagree with a regime that we don't like simply because the President chooses to do so?

More troubling than the attack on Libya, in my view, is the circumvention of this body, the United States Congress, and its warmaking authority under both the Constitution and the War Powers Act. Only Congress has the ability to authorize and fund military operations.

The administration consulted with NATO. The administration consulted with the United Nations. The administration consulted with the Arab League. It never, in any real sense, consulted with the Congress of the United States before beginning military operations in Libya.

Two weeks ago, this House made clear its opposition to the Libyan venture by refusing to authorize even the limited use of force. We should build on that by removing funding today.

Some may question whether or not this amendment is germane to this particular piece of legislation. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I worked very carefully with the Parliamentarian on the language, and, more importantly, it's modeled after the famous Boland amendment of 1983 to the Defense approps bill that year that was approved by this body 411–0.

Some may argue, like the administration, that we really aren't engaged in hostilities in Libya. That simply is laughable. Attorneys at both the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice of this administration believe that our activity requires congressional authorization under the War Powers Act.

We've flown over a thousand combat sorties over Libyan airspace. We've launched 228 Tomahawk missiles. We've launched over a hundred Predators. We're refueling and supporting NATO aircraft that are engaged in attacking Libya every single day. If that's not war on our side of this situation, I can assure you that people on the other side consider it war and certainly consider it hostile.

The reality is we should not be engaged in military action of this level unless it's authorized and funded by the Congress of the United States.

In Libya, the President has, quite simply, overreached. However, in Congress, we have so far allowed him to do so. We've not authorized this activity. There's not a single line in the Defense authorization bill or in this bill which actually funds this activity, and we ought to explicitly prohibit the President from concluding.

I think, like many in this body, this is a very important moment for the Congress of the United States. Whether or not we claim warmaking authority and exercise our power under the Constitution is really the issue here. You could be for the Libyan venture and still be able to support this legislation, or you could be against it.

At the end of the day, it's extraordinarily important that we stop the erosion of the warmaking authority and responsibility of the Congress of the United States, that we end this ill-advised adventure in Libya, and that we reassert the rightful place of this institution in conducting war and authorizing it and funding it.

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

□ 1240

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Before I begin, I want to say that I have great respect for Congressman COLE, who serves on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. He is one of our most thoughtful members.

The NATO-led mission to defeat Qadhafi and protect the people of Libya was undertaken in concert with a broad coalition of nations, including the Arab League, and it followed a resolution adopted in the United Nations Security Council authorizing ''all necessary measures.''

This amendment would end our involvement unilaterally. I believe this could materially harm our relationship with NATO, which is also playing a major role in this. We will undoubtedly require support in the future in our dealings with NATO, and we get support in Afghanistan today.

I do support a wider debate and greater oversight of the use and the costs of U.S. military forces engaged in the Libya operation, both in the defense and foreign affairs-related committees as well as here on the House floor. We should let the mission with our NATO allies continue so we can overthrow Qadhafi and protect the Libyan people.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The Constitution, Mr. Chairman, and the War Powers Act clearly say what the parameters are within which the President must act or follow: number one, a declaration of war; number two, a specific authorization; number three, a national emergency created by an attack

upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces.

None of these criteria were met by the President. He said he went in there because of humanitarian issues. He consulted, as we've said before on the floor, with France, England, the United Nations, NATO, and the Arab League. He had 2 or 3 weeks to do that, but he didn't have time to talk to the Congress of the United States, and he's gone in there and spent almost a billion dollars at a time when we just don't have the money.

Now if you're talking about humanitarian problems, in the Sudan, 2,300 Sudanese have been killed this year alone, and more than 500 people have died in the last 2 weeks. In Darfur, 450,000 to 480,000 have been displaced or killed. Just recently, and one of my colleagues talked about this a while ago, in the Nuba Mountains in the Sudan, they're killing people every single day. Horrible atrocities are taking place. Human rights violations. If you're talking about humanitarian issues, why wouldn't you go in there as well?

You look, also, at Syria right now. In Syria, there have been an awful lot of people killed. We all see that on television every night. There are wars of opportunity. If you go to Liberia, if you go and look back at the Khmer Rouge, we didn't get into those wars, and we're not getting into these wars right now because it's not in our national interest, and it's not a threat to the United States.

The President has taken us into a conflict. He said it's not a war, but it is a war. We've sent about 230 missiles in there at $1.1 million per to kill people. We've flown sortie after sortie over there dropping bombs on people, and the President says it's not a war. It is a war, it's the United States' war, and it's being covered by NATO.

We shouldn't be going to war unless this body and the other body say it's okay. It's in the Constitution. It's in the War Powers Act. We should not be there. Nobody likes Muammar Qadhafi. Nobody thinks he should be there. But we can't be going into wars of opportunity every place, especially at a time when we're fiscally broke. I think it's extremely important that legislation like that which the gentleman from Oklahoma just offered should be passed, and I hope we will pass it. There's a whole host of these amendments that are going to be read today and we're going to be voting on, and we need to send a very clear signal to the White House that this must never happen again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BUERKLE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Cole Amendment to H.R. 2219. Mr. COLE's amendment would restrict the use of funds for furnishing military equipment, military training or advice, and other military activities in Libya.

The President has failed to properly consult Congress on the engagement of hostilities in Libya. The President is also in violation of the War Powers Resolution because of the continued military action past the 90 days allowed under the War Powers Resolution. The Administration's attempt to excuse the continued U.S. military actions in Libya by saying that the hostilities do not reach the threshold set by the War Powers Resolution is disingenuous.

The power of the purse plays an important part in the U.S. government's system of checks and balances. This amendment today will prohibit the President from continuing to conduct military operations in Libya until he can justify the actions to the Congress. I strongly support the limitation of funding of current military activities with respect to Libya. The President should not have a blank check to conduct wars without the consultation and authorization of Congress.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

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

Mr. DICKS. I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the use of military force against Libya.

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

Mr. AMASH. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

First, I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for his tremendous leadership on this issue. There is a growing bipartisan support for this amendment. It's an amendment that gives us the opportunity to stop this unconstitutional war in Libya.

The United States has been at war against Libya for nearly 4 months. We have dropped bombs on Libyan buildings. We have flown sorties over Libyan airspace. It has been reported that we have even targeted Qadhafi himself.

We are at war. The Constitution vests Congress with the exclusive power to declare war, the President has not attempted to obtain Congress's authorization for the war, and yet at this moment, as we debate on the House floor, the war continues.

Instead of following the Constitution and seeking authorization, the President made strained arguments to justify the continued operation. At first, the operation was supposed to be ''limited,'' as though that undefined term serves as a constitutional escape clause. My constituents certainly would be surprised if Congress established a limited religion, or subjected them to limited cruel and unusual punishment, or quartered soldiers in their houses, but only for a limited time.

After that ''limited'' argument ran its course, the President turned to a U.N. Security Council resolution and an invitation from an organization of Arab states to justify our involvement. Those organizations were not around at the time the Constitution was written, much less are they listed in its text.

The administration now has retreated from its constitutional arguments in public and claims that at least the War Powers Resolution does not forbid the strikes because we're not involved in, quote, hostilities against Libya. Imagine that the shoe were on the other foot, that Libya was bombing us. Would we view the Libyan air force's bombing of our infrastructure as a hostile act? Of course we would.

Last week, a member of the other Chamber called the President's arguments, quote, cute. I would use a different term: embarrassing. It's embarrassing that the administration attempts to hide behind these transparently strained and flimsy arguments, especially when we're dealing with such a grave issue.

But do you know what would be more embarrassing? If this Congress did nothing. More embarrassing than the President's contortions of the law and disregard for the Constitution would be if Congress, with full knowledge that it was occurring, gave him a pass. In the face of an attack on the Constitution, in the face of an attack on this institution and our powers as a coequal branch, we must stand up and say stop. If we don't, we should be the ones who are embarrassed.

The Amash-Kucinich amendment prohibits funds from being used for military force against Libya. To be clear, I believe that Congress doesn't need to do anything to stop the President from ordering force against Libya; because the President has not received authorization, the use of force is already illegal. However, to reinforce our constitutional position, our amendment says that beginning at the start of the fiscal year, on October 1, the Armed Forces may not drop bombs on Libya or otherwise use military force. Unlike the bill we considered the week before last, our amendment does not implicitly authorize any actions against Libya. It simply says force may not be used because the President has not sought nor has he received authorization for force.

Please vote ''yes'' on the Amash-Kucinich amendment and defend our constitutional role in war powers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1250

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if this were a debate on policy, or a debate on philosophy, or a debate specifically on the War Powers Act, the

position that I would take would be somewhat different than I must take today. But as the manager of this bill, what I have to work with is the bill before the House and the amendment before the House.

Now, the amendment is simple. None of the funds made available by this act may be used for the use of military force against Libya. What I would say to the Chair is that there are no funds in this bill, in this act, for Libya. I was curious about that. And as chairman preparing to write this bill, in conjunction with Mr. DICKS, the ranking member, I wrote to the President on April 1, and I sent each of our Members a copy, asking the President specific questions about the scope of this activity, the expected cost, et cetera.

On June 22, the White House finally responded, and said that it will not plan to ask for a supplemental appropriations bill. And there is no money in this bill for Libya. The administration says that it will not ask for a supplemental bill to pay for Libya, that they will use funds in the base budget. I wonder from where the administration is going to take money out of the base budget. Now, as chairman of the subcommittee, this worries me. From where do they plan to take the money? That's only part of the argument. There is no money in this act for Libya to start with.

But, secondly, if this amendment should become effective, there are many things that we would not be able to do. We would not be able to fly or perform search and rescue missions of American forces who may be flying aerial activity and have planes go down. Early in the operation, we lost an F–15. Two American pilots went into Libya and safely rescued the pilot of that F–15. We wouldn't be able to do that under this amendment.

What we are providing today is surveillance, intelligence, and reconnaissance. We wouldn't be able to do that under this amendment. We wouldn't be able to provide aerial refueling to our coalition partners, and they are our partners and we have an agreement with those partners. We provide aerial refueling because most of them do not have the capacity to refuel their aircraft in the air. Under this amendment, we would not be able to provide aerial refueling. We couldn't even provide operational planning, sitting down and talking with our coalition partners about the plan for Libya.

So while this amendment would sound good if we were discussing philosophy and if we were determining a policy, the policy has already been established. And this amendment does not change the policy. It affects something in the bill that's not even in the bill. So there are no funds in this bill for Libya; and according to the letter from the White House, supplemental funds will not be requested. The administration will just pay for the operation out of existing funds. That remains a good question, and I say that again, I am really curious to know what base funds they intend to use to pay for this operation in Libya. I don't have the answer today. I am hoping that one day soon I may have that answer.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I rise in support of the Amash-Kucinich amendment.

The esteemed chair, my good friend, of the Defense Appropriations raises a question: Where are they getting the money? The money is not, as he points out, expressly in the bill.

Well, this legislation, the Amash-Kucinich amendment, isn't to delete funds that have already been appropriated. This is to forbid the administration, forbid the administration, from using funds that are appropriated in this act.

Now, there is no way that Congress could or would intervene to stop a search and rescue mission. And that's not relevant unless you're talking about that this Congress is finally going to search this defense budget, figure out where the President is getting the money, and rescue the American taxpayers from a wasteful war and rescue the Constitution from an illegal war. That is what makes it a search and rescue mission. But no search and rescue is prohibited by the Amash-Kucinich amendment.

I want to say that I am proud to have worked with Mr. AMASH to come together with this bipartisan agreement. And the support for it is growing. We have Mr. PAUL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BURTON, Ms. BARBARA LEE, Mr. POE, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. HONDA. The support is growing. And Members can call either Mr. AMASH's office or my office right now if they want to cosponsor.

This is our moment in Congress; this is our moment to reclaim the Constitution of the United States, which the Founders envisioned that under article I, section 8, we have the power to determine whether or not this Nation goes to war, not some rebel group in Benghazi. Because when you reduce it to its ultimate, a group of Benghazi rebels made the decision to go to war against its own government, and before you know it NATO joins in, we're pulled into it. The administration went to everyone except getting the approval of the United States Congress.

This is our moment to reclaim the Constitution. Will we rise to the occasion? This isn't only about this Congress right now. History will judge us whether or not we understood the imperative of article I, section 8. This is about the Constitution. Certainly it's about a billion dollars that would be spent by September unless we intervene, at a time of rising debt, at a time of tremendous pressure on the budget, at a time when local governments in our communities are cutting public services because they don't have the money. This administration determines they're going to take us into war, and they didn't even give so much as give this Congress an opportunity to have this debate before the decision was made. That was wrong.

I appreciate that we have been able to set aside any partisan disagreements that are part of the nature of this forum to understand that we have a higher calling here. And that higher calling is to defend this Constitution of the United States, which describes what our duties are when we come here. We take the oath to defend the Constitution. That's what we shall do today.

We shall rescue this Congress from the ignominy of having the rights that the people expect us to exercise on their behalf just trampled by an administration that doesn't think that we have any co-equal role in the government at all. This is our moment to stand up, Democrats and Republicans alike.

I am proud to work with Mr. AMASH in crafting this bipartisan Kucinich-Amash amendment.

This is our moment, Members. Let's not lose this opportunity to stand up and speak out on behalf of the United States Constitution, on behalf of the separation of powers, on behalf of the co-equality of our House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States. Let's show the Founders, and the spirit of the Founders is always with us in this place, let's demonstrate that we remember where we came from when this Constitution was set forth. Let's demonstrate that we have reached our moment where we stand up.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, for more than 3 months, our Nation has been amidst a quiet constitutional crisis that carries immense implications. My friend, the gentleman from Florida, is sadly mistaken to dismiss this as a meaningless philosophical discussion. This strikes at the very heart of our constitutional form of government.

□ 1300

On March 19, completely without congressional authorization, the President ordered an unprovoked attack against another country. In so doing, he crossed a very bright constitutional line placed there specifically to prevent so momentous and fatal a question as war being made by a single individual.

The American Founders were explicit on this point. For centuries, European monarchs had plunged their nations into bloody and debilitating wars on whim, and the Founders wanted to protect the American Republic from that fate.

James Madison explained why in this passage in a letter to Hamilton. He

said: ''In no part of the Constitution is more wisdom to be found than in the clause which confines the question of war or peace to the legislature, and not to the executive department. The trust and the temptation would be too great for any one man. War is, in fact, the true nurse of executive aggrandizement. In war a physical force is to be created and it is the executive will which is to direct it. In war, the public treasures are to be unlocked, and it is the executive hand which is to dispense them. In war, the honors and the emoluments of office are to be multiplied, and it is the executive patronage under which they are to be enjoyed. Those who are to conduct a war cannot, in the nature of things, be proper or safe judges whether a war ought to be commenced, continued, or concluded.''

The President has tried to justify this act in a variety of ways: that bombing another country is not really an act of war, that there wasn't time to consult Congress—though more than enough to consult the United Nations Security Council—or that it was a humanitarian act.

Mr. Chairman, never was there a greater provocation or clearer moral justification for war than the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. And never was there a more activist President than Franklin Roosevelt.

Yet within 24 hours of that attack, President Roosevelt appeared before a joint session of Congress in this very Hall. He clearly recognized that as Commander in Chief his authority only extended to ordering that ''all measures be taken for our defense.'' He recognized that under the Constitution, anything more, even in this most historic attack, required an act of Congress, which he sought and obtained.

The unprovoked attack on Libya was not authorized by this Congress, and it is accordingly unconstitutional and illegal. Indeed, 2 weeks ago, the House considered a resolution authorizing a war with Libya, and it rejected that measure by a nearly 3–1 margin. It then considered a second measure to authorize acts of war against Libya just short of actual combat, including refueling tankers on their way to targets. The identification and selection of targets, operational support, operational planning, it rejected that measure as well.

The precedent being established right now by the President's deliberate defiance of the Constitution and the clear will of Congress has profound implications for our Nation's future. If this act is allowed to stand unchallenged, it means that the checks and balances painstakingly built into the Constitution on the supreme question of war and peace have been rendered meaningless.

Weeks ago, the House voted to deny authorization for the use of funds for the war on Libya effective October 1. This amendment simply follows through on that decision in the actual appropriations act.

Frankly, we need to do much more than this. Clearly, one of the conditions for increasing the debt limit must be to ensure that no funds, either borrowed or raised, should be used to continue to support this illegal act.

And we need to remember that a war once started cannot always be turned off by an appropriations act. Once we have attacked another country without provocation, we have created an aggrieved belligerent that now has cause to pursue that war regardless of what the Congress later decides.

That's why this precedent is so dangerous. That's why the President's actions are so devastating to our very form of government, and that's why we need to speak clearly and unequivocally through measures like that offered by the gentlemen from Michigan and Ohio today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Amash-Kucinich amendment, and I am proud to be a cosponsor and at the same time call on other Members to join us on the floor right now for this important debate.

Mr. Chairman, I have been struck in recent days by the profound lack of seriousness in Washington when it comes to confronting this illegal war we are fighting in Libya. Last week at a news conference, the President dismissed congressional concerns about war powers authority and his Libya policy and, he said ''all kinds of noise about process.''

At the same time, the U.S. Senate essentially punted on the issue earlier this week, pulling the plug on an important debate that the country needs because a few Republican Senators complained that they canceled recess only to deal with the debt ceiling, and they were not going to discuss Libya.

But perhaps it was right here in the House that we have seen the most incoherence on Libya. Right before we adjourned almost 2 weeks ago, this body voted against authorizing the use of force in Libya; and then less than 2 hours later, the House voted to continue funding the war we had just refused to authorize.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has the ''power of the purse,'' and we must be prepared to use it. We must use this opportunity to send a powerful message. A vote of no confidence in this Libya policy will prove that we do not and will not write another check for a war that Americans don't want and a war that we did not authorize.

Hostilities with Libya—and, let's be frank, these are hostilities—have now been going on for more than 100 days with the cost climbing toward a billion dollars, and that doesn't even include the moral costs and the cost of civilian lives. The people's money is too important and too precious, especially during this time of fiscal austerity.

No one believes that cutting off Libya alone is enough to make meaningful progress on deficit reduction; but I think it's outrageous that we are talking about cuts in Social Security benefits, and those cuts are on the table while we are discussing the debt ceiling negotiations while we continue to throw money at not one, not two, but three wars.

A Brown University study concludes that when it's all said and done Iraq and Afghanistan will suck the Treasury dry to the tune of at least $3.7 trillion. Enough, already.

Mr. Chairman, the Pentagon is like that teenager. You keep giving the kid the keys to the car, and he keeps crashing it. It's time we cut him off.

We must draw the line, and we must draw it here. No more funding for Libya; no more continuance in Libyan hostilities. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the President says we have gone to war in the name of humanity. In other words, the President's little war in Libya is so that we can preserve humanity in Libya.

In the history of peoples, as the gentleman from California has pointed out, and the histories of countries, it has always been the king, the dictator, the tyrant, the chief, the leader that has sent that particular country to war.

So when our ancestors got together and they formed a new and perfect Union, they decided it would not be the leader, which we call the President, it would be the people that would decide if we went to war. They gave that power to the Congress of the United States and only Congress can declare war, not the President.

□ 1310

But this is the President's war; and the President, in my opinion, is in violation of the Constitution. He has led America to our third war. Whether or not the war powers resolution is constitutional or not, we can debate that. But he is in violation of it, too, because we're still engaged in war, whether you call it hostilities or not. Some say it's not hostile. Well, you be one of the recipients of one of those cruise missiles on the ground somewhere in Libya, and you might think that's a hostile environment towards you. But this country is spending money on a third war, and it is unconstitutional.

Our ancestors had comments about the leader, the king, leading us into war. The writer of the Constitution wrote a letter. James Madison said that ''the Constitution supposes what the history of all governments has always demonstrated, that it is the executive branch most interested in war and most prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the

question in this country of war in the legislative body.''

The first Commander in Chief, the first President of the United States, George Washington, said that ''the Constitution vests the power of declaring war with Congress, therefore no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they have deliberated upon the subject and Congress has authorized such a measure.''

It is our history, it is our heritage, it is our Constitution, and it is our principle that Congress must declare war, Congress must be the one to engage in war. And in my opinion, the President has violated that Constitution. He has violated the law of the land and the war powers resolution; and it's Congress' duty now, it is our turn and it is our responsibility to weigh in on this war and stop money from going to this war.

Where the President got the $700-plus million that has already been spent on this war, we don't know. We just want to make sure no more money is spent on this unconstitutional action.

Muammar Qadhafi is a tyrant. He's an outlaw. There are a lot of bad guys in the world, Mr. Chairman, and is it now the policy of the President to pick out the ones he does not like and start blowing up that country in the name of humanity? We don't know.

So Congress must resume, regain, its rightful authority and role and make sure that we do not fund the President's little war, or any other future wars, without congressional approval.

Mr. Chairman, instead of spending money blowing up Libya, we ought to spend that American taxpayer money in the United States building the United States and rebuilding America and not destroying somebody else's country and being involved in somebody else's civil war.

And that's just the way it is.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, we should not turn our backs on the Libyan people. I want to remind my colleagues that NATO's campaign in Libya has saved countless lives. Our actions and those of NATO were the only thing that stopped Qadhafi from committing unspeakable crimes against humanity. In fact, when the United States and NATO intervened, Qadhafi was on the footsteps of Misrata and threatening to kill without mercy. Qadhafi's forces were on the brink of Benghazi hours before NATO's operation began. Qadhafi literally said that he would kill people with ''no mercy, no pity.'' He said he would go ''house by house, room by room.'' Those are the words of a shameless, ruthless killer; and we had to do something, and I'm glad that we did.

Constituents of my district whose roots come from Libya have made it clear to me that they want me to stand together with humanity, stand together with vulnerable people. But let me be clear, this is not Iraq, and this will not be the Iraq war. We did not unilaterally declare war on another country. On the contrary, our actions were with the international community, sanctioned by the United Nations, the Arab League and, most importantly, the Libyan people themselves.

Our role is limited and constrained, no boots on the ground. We essentially are helping to supply and refuel and add surveillance. Do we want to signal to other murderous dictators while the people are standing up for democracy that they have a free hand to slaughter their public? I hope not.

I say listen to regular Libyans on the street today. They want more NATO involvement, not less. They want the United States to remain involved. If we pull out now, the NATO coalition could fall apart and tens of thousands of refugees fleeing Qadhafi's wrath would jeopardize the fragile democratic transitions in both Egypt and Tunisia. This issue has regional implications. It's not limited to Libya alone.

As my constituents know, and my legislative record reflects, I was adamantly against the Iraq war and I am adamantly in favor of a faster withdrawal from Afghanistan. In fact, I'm almost always against the use of the military option. Seldom is it the right course, in my opinion. But ''seldom'' doesn't mean ''always.'' Srebrenica, Darfur and Rwanda all warranted our engagement as Libya does today. We made it to the Balkans, but we didn't make it to Darfur or Rwanda, and literally millions of people died because of that.

But at the same time, I cannot turn a blind eye to the slaughter of innocent people. My hope is that the day may never come when I will ignore the cries of innocent people being murdered by a dictator or while we cozy up to a murderous dictator. I cannot turn my back on people demanding the same freedoms we enjoy in America.

I understand my colleagues' aversion to military conflict. I share it. I understand their fear of mission creep. I share that. But I also understand that when people are being murdered wholesale, being ethnically cleansed, being the targets of genocide, the world, including the United States, cannot and must not stand back and watch. For the sake of the Libyan people and all demanding freedom in the Middle East, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution authorizing the use of limited force.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, today I was planning to offer my own amendment which would hold the President accountable to the War Powers Act with regard to his operation in Libya. My intention was to expose the President's clear violation of this important law. However, I was concerned some wording could have raised a point of order. That being said, I'm proud to cosponsor Mr. KUCINICH's important amendment, which will completely cut off funds for this illegal war.

Mr. Chairman, on March 19, President Obama announced he had authorized U.S. military forces to conduct operations in Libya. Unfortunately, the President did this without receiving authorization from Congress even though he made sure to get the U.N.'s approval. By not being open and honest with Congress, he left Members in the dark and unsure of what our ultimate mission was. To this day, the President hasn't come to Congress to ask for formal approval.

Initially, when the President committed our military operations in Libya, he said it would be days, not months. Well, now we are definitely talking months because it is a little over a week we've been engaged in military operations in Libya for nearly 4 months. In an effort to escape his responsibility, to this day the President has refused to acknowledge that the U.S. is engaged in hostilities in Libya. That being said, those in the Pentagon seem to disagree with the President on this issue.

While the President has turned a blind eye to truth, the Department of Defense has decided to award imminent danger pay to servicemembers who fly over Libya and for those who serve on ships within 110 nautical miles of the shore. As of June 3, 93 percent of the cruise missiles, 66 percent of the personnel, 50 percent of the ships, and 50 percent of the planes used in NATO operations against Libya were by the United States of America.

Mr. Chair, firing a cruise missile at Libya qualifies as hostilities. In early June, it was estimated that Libya was already costing the American taxpayers over $700 million.

I have three sons that are currently in the military, and I will support our troops no matter where the President sends them. However, I cannot support Obama's decision to commit our military forces' operations without the required congressional authorization. That's why I cosponsored this amendment, the 2012 Department of Defense appropriations bill Kucinich amendment.

With that, I ask all my colleagues, all Members, to come down here on the House floor and to express support for this important amendment, to reclaim our Constitution, to reclaim the validity of this Congress as relates to committing troops to war.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. I encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1320

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. I believe this is an important debate in the House today as we, appropriately, exercise congressional oversight of the use of force and the costs associated with our engagement in Libya.

In my judgment, the President's initial commitment of U.S. air power and naval forces to support the international effort was appropriate, and certainly within his power as Commander in Chief. In March, the President clearly outlined the rationale for our involvement in this military action. Now if I were advising the President, I would have said send up a resolution and get approval from the House and the Senate. There is no question that would have been the preferred course of action.

The U.S. effort was undertaken in concert with a broad coalition of nations, and it followed a resolution adopted in the United Nations Security Council authorizing ''all necessary measures'' to protect Libyan civilians attempting to overthrow the oppressive regime of Muammar al Qadhafi. The Qadhafi government's response to the uprising, inspired by the ''Arab Spring'' movement, was to use force against civilians and opposition forces, and the brutal measures prompted the international outcry and the United Nations action. While the direct U.S. leadership of this effort lasted a brief time, U.S. forces remain engaged in the NATO operation.

When I hear many of my colleagues speak in favor of abandoning this cause, I believe it is important to reflect on the fundamental reason why we are concerned here. This is the same individual, Muammar al Qadhafi, who had been planning terrorist actions against United States citizens and others for decades. This is the same terrorist leader against whom President Ronald Reagan authorized a military strike in 1986—and he didn't ask Congress for approval—following the bombings in Berlin and definitive proof of Qadhafi's involvement in other terrorist activity. At that time, President Reagan publicly denounced Qadhafi as the ''Mad Dog of the Middle East'' who espoused the goal of world revolution.

Mr. Chairman, I can only wonder what Ronald Reagan would say today about those who would propose immediate withdrawal of U.S. assistance to the broad coalition of nations attempting to finish the job that President Reagan started.

Now, just to make it clear, the administration, when they sent up their report under the Boehner amendment, I believe, they did list out the military cost for the operation. Daily operations up to June 3 were $313.7 million; munitions, $398.3 million; global lift and sustain, $1.6 million. The subtotal for military operations was $713.6 million. And then the drawdown of DOD supplies, $1.3 million; humanitarian assistance, $1 million; for a total of $715.9 million.

Now munitions come out of the munition funds; daily operations come out of O&M funds for the Army and the Navy. The estimate by September 30, 2011, is that daily operations will total $618 million; munitions, $450 million; global lift and sustain, $10 million; for a total of $1.078 billion. Drawdown of DOD supplies would be $25 million and humanitarian assistance of $1 million, for a total of $1.104 billion. I think that is a pretty clear indication.

Now, our chairman is absolutely correct. They have not asked for a supplemental here. They are going to use existing funds that we have already appropriated to take care of this operation. And of course we would all like to see this thing resolved as quickly as possible, and a political settlement may be possible. But I think it would be wrong to undermine the President and our country and our involvement with NATO and with the U.N. and with our Arab allies on this subject.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the Amash-Kucinich amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, last month, the House voted against defunding the American military mission in Libya. That was the right decision, and it still is: along with our NATO allies, we intervened in Libya in response to Moammar Gadhafi's violent repression of his own people, and the explicit promise of worse to come. It's also important to remember that Gadhafi has more American blood on his hands than anyone other than Osama bin Laden. And we must remember that we intervened in response to calls from the Arab League, the United Nations, the European Union, and a unanimous NATO.

Our allies have taken the leading role in Libya, but it is crucial that America continue to support them. It's crucial because the campaign against Gadhafi has made significant progress, which would be dramatically set back by a sudden withdrawal of American support; because that sudden withdrawal of support could endanger civilian lives and stall democratic movements across the Middle East; and because it would represent a failure to keep faith with our NATO allies. As I said the last time this issue came to the floor: either we are in an alliance, or we are not. And if we are, that means supporting our allies in their time and place of need, so that they will continue to do the same for us—a principle that is especially important when civilian lives are at stake. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH).

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. LEE of California.

An amendment by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

An amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. POE of Texas.

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. LEE of California.

Amendment No. 41 by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

An amendment by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. POE of Texas.

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

An amendment by Mr. AMASH of Michigan.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for the second through the 11th vote. The final two votes will be 5-minute votes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 97, noes 322, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 502]

AYES—97

Amash
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Capuano
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Markey
Matsui
McGovern
Michaud
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Quigley
Rangel
Richardson
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez

Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Woolsey

NOES—322

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

NOT VOTING—12

Cantor
Cleaver
Conyers
Culberson
DeLauro
Giffords
Keating
Lewis (GA)
Miller, George
Payne
Pelosi
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1351

Messrs. CONNOLLY of Virginia, MILLER of North Carolina, SCOTT of South Carolina, and LYNCH changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, CROWLEY, and MURPHY of Connecticut changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 295, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 503]

AYES—133

Amash
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Quigley
Rangel
Richardson
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—295

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)

Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—3

Culberson
Giffords
Keating

□ 1357

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 251, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 504]

AYES—174

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

NOES—251

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

NOT VOTING—6

Coffman (CO)
Culberson
Giffords
Keating
Neugebauer
Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1400

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 504, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 297, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

AYES—131

Adams
Amash
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Campbell
Capuano
Chaffetz
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Cummings
DeFazio
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Hall
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kucinich
Labrador
Landry
Lankford
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Lummis
Lynch
Marchant
Markey
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Napolitano
Nugent
Olver
Pallone
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Sanchez, Loretta
Schilling
Schrader
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Slaughter
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Velázquez
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Welch
West

Westmoreland
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)

NOES—297

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Ellison
Ellmers
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tipton
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—3

Culberson
Giffords
Keating

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1404

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 114, noes 314, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

AYES—114

Amash
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McGovern
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schrader
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—314

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

Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—3

Culberson
Giffords
Keating

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1408

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 217, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 507]

AYES—210

Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Labrador
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
Meehan
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)

NOES—217

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chandler
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Myrick
Nadler
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Pitts
Platts
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stivers
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Watt
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Camp
Culberson
Giffords
Keating

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1411

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado changed his vote from to ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 507 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 145, noes 283, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 508]

AYES—145

Amash
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Campbell
Capps
Cardoza
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cummings
DeFazio
DeGette
DesJarlais
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garrett
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hurt
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Labrador
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lummis
Maloney
Matsui
McGovern
McIntyre
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Towns
Upton
Velázquez
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Woolsey

NOES—283

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—3

Culberson
Giffords
Keating

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1415

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 119, noes 306, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 509]

AYES—119

Amash
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutch
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gohmert
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kucinich
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McGovern
Mica
Michaud
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Paul
Payne
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Posey
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Towns
Velázquez
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—306

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Berman
Culberson
Giffords
Keating
King (IA)
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1419

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 140, noes 285, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 510]

AYES—140

Adams
Amash
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berman
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Campbell
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Chaffetz
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Coble
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cummings
DeFazio
DesJarlais
Deutch
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Hall
Harris
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hochul
Honda
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kucinich
Labrador
Landry
LaTourette
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lummis
Lynch
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
McNerney
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Napolitano
Nugent
Paul
Pearce
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Schilling
Scott (SC)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shuster
Slaughter
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stutzman
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Welch
West
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)

NOES—285

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gibbs
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tipton
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Culberson
Giffords
Keating
Markey
Smith (NJ)
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1422

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 201, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 511]

AYES—226

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Butterfield
Campbell
Cantor
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
DesJarlais
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kucinich
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Olver
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Smith (NJ)

Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Waxman
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

NOES—201

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Berkley
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Carson (IN)
Carter
Clyburn
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gerlach
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hall
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hinchey
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Moore
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Towns
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Webster
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson
Giffords
Keating
Markey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1427

Messrs. MCCARTHY of California and BURGESS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 260, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 512]

AYES—167

Ackerman
Akin
Alexander
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Gosar
Green, Al
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jones
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
Kingston
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moran
Neal
Noem
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Sutton
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden
Waters
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—260

Adams
Aderholt
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Holden
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson
Giffords
Issa
Keating

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1432

Messrs. LOBIONDO and MACK changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. GUTIERREZ and Ms. SUTTON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 201, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 513]

AYES—225

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bonner
Boustany
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cummings
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinchey
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kingston
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—201

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Butterfield
Canseco
Cantor
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grimm
Gutierrez
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nunes
Olson
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Polis
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Culberson
Giffords
Keating
McHenry
Scott, David

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1439

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 513, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 229, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 514]

AYES—199

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Baldwin
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Boustany
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Capito
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conyers
Costello
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinchey
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kingston
Kucinich
Labrador
Landry
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
McCaul
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Sanchez, Loretta
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tipton
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Waters
West
Westmoreland

Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)

NOES—229

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Fattah
Filner
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Herger
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neal
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott, David
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stark
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tonko
Turner
Van Hollen
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—3

Culberson
Giffords
Keating

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1446

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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.

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

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Chairman, each Member of this body has the duty to protect the separation of powers that was so wisely woven into our Constitution by our Founding Fathers and which forms the very foundation of how we govern this great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, an egregious ongoing breach of the separation of powers is taking place at this very hour; specifically, the usurpation of a power given only to Congress, that found in article I, section 8 of the Constitution: only Congress can declare war.

Known initially as Operation Odyssey Dawn and now as Operation Unified Protector, military intervention easily rising to the definition of war is being carried out in Libya. It is being carried out with the bravery, exceptional professionalism and commitment to victory that define our fellow Americans who serve in our Armed Forces. And before I address the mission itself, I first applaud their willingness to sacrifice so much for their fellow Americans.

Mr. Chairman, a careful review of the President's case for support of his actions in Libya leads me to this sobering but firm conclusion. The President's use of force in Libya is unwise and it is unconstitutional. The level of military resources being employed both in personnel and equipment, the amount of ordnance delivered, and the damage inflicted constitute acts of war. At the very minimum, they meet the definition of ''hostilities'' under the War Powers Resolution. Yet not one of the three criteria delineated in the War Powers Resolution that would justify his action has been met.

There has been no declaration of war. There has been no statutory authority issued. There has been no evidence that an attack on American forces was imminent or had occurred.

Now if a Tomahawk missile was launched into any American city, whether Los Angeles, Chicago, or even my home city of Virginia Beach, would that not meet our definition of hostilities? Absolutely, it would.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the pivotal issue: The military force being directed toward Libya easily triggers the definition of hostilities. The legal opinion upon which the administration stakes the legitimacy of its actions in Libya is thinner than the paper on which it is written. It is not based on law but something that he refers to as the ''national interest,'' a term that the President, in his wisdom, believes he can solely define himself. His Office of Legal Counsel concluded that: ''President Obama could rely on his constitutional power to safeguard the national interest by directing the anticipated military operations in Libya which were limited in their nature, scope, and duration''—listen carefully here—''without prior congressional authorization.''

□ 1450

Disregarding the legal opinions of the Pentagon's general counsel and the acting head of the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel, both of whom told the White House they believed that the military's operations in Libya amounted to ''hostilities,'' the President plowed ahead.

Mr. Chairman, a President's opinion of the War Powers Resolution does not negate its authority.

Though required by law, there was no check; there was no balance. Even the broadest interpretation of article I, section 8 cannot corral the interpretation held by the President of his unilateral right to engage U.S. forces in combat. It is irreconcilable with our Constitution. The President has taken America into a war in the midst of a financial crisis, in yet another Muslim nation, in pursuit of a military objective that is ambiguous and constantly morphing.

Though I disagree with the President's actions in Libya, I stand here today not motivated by partisanship. Now, if I woke up tomorrow morning and learned that the President had taken action to defend this great country from imminent danger and attack, I would be the first to stand next to him and affirm his action. If America should go to war, it must be done so in a very careful, deliberative manner and as a last measure.

It must be done so in a way that is fully consistent with our Constitution. That is not the case here.

My amendment is necessary because only by using the power of the purse can we end an unwise war and meet our duty, our high duty, to preserve the separation of powers. Now is the time to act.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. On March 19, 2011, coalition forces launched Operation Odyssey Dawn to enforce U.N. Security Council Resolution 1973 to protect the Libyan people from the brutal regime of Muammar al Qadhafi. Operation Odyssey Dawn ended on March 31, 2011, and transitioned to the NATO-led Operation Unified Protector, which continues today.

Operation Odyssey Dawn has ceased operations; therefore part of this amendment is no longer relevant. However, the NATO-led mission to defeat Qadhafi and to protect the people of Libya was undertaken in concert with a broad coalition of nations, including the Arab League, and it followed resolutions adopted in the United Nations Security Council, authorizing ''all necessary measures.''

This amendment would end our involvement unilaterally. I believe this could materially harm our relationship with NATO allies from whom we will undoubtedly require support in the future and who have been our partners since 1949. We should let the mission with our NATO allies continue so we can defeat Qadhafi and protect the Libyan people.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for ''Operation and Maintenance—Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites'' is hereby reduced and increased by $1,000,000.

Ms. NORTON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, more than 25 years ago, the Congress charged the Defense Department to identify and then to clean up and remediate properties which the department had owned or leased in order to test chemical munitions. Congress did so because these munitions had left hazardous substances related to the work of the department. There are more than 2,000 such sites in nearly every State, all the Territories and in the District of Columbia.

My concern is with those sites in congested residential parts of our country where there may be dense populations located by formerly used defense sites. A classic case and perhaps the most important—but I'm sure not the only one—was the World War I chemical weapons site for the United States of America. It happened to have been right here in Northwest Washington, DC, in a portion of what is now American University and its surrounding neighborhood known as Spring Valley.

The Army is making good on its duty to clean up these formerly used defense sites (FUDS), including the site in the District of Columbia, but we have no information on the health effects of these leftover chemical munitions. They have been found in people's back and front yards. They have been found, at least here, in people's gardens. Entire houses and garages, as it turns out, unknowingly were built on this debris. The site here in the District of Columbia was found by accident by a utility contractor digging into a trench. The neighborhood had no knowledge. The city had no knowledge of these leftover munitions. Again, I stress that there are surely other sites around the United States, and I cite this case as an example.

This land, in the District of Columbia at least, was used for the research and development and testing of chemical explosives, and it was able to be done in this city because there wasn't any local government, and there wasn't any home rule. I guess, since the city was administered by the Federal Government, they could simply make a munitions testing site in this city. Hundreds of pounds of chemical agents and explosives were developed and released throughout the environment. We have found in the Spring Valley section of the city arsine projectiles, mustard gas projectiles, lewisite projectiles, and other kinds of chemical toxic waste left over from undetonated ordnances.

When World War I was over, the Army simply used the site where they'd been doing the testing as a dumpsite. They buried these munitions right where they were testing. Now, that was the way in which you disposed of these munitions at the time. In the Spring Valley area that is a classic case, there are 1,200 private homes, 30 Embassies and foreign properties, Sibley Hospital, Wesley Seminary. There may be other metropolitan areas that have formerly used defense sites as well. Spring Valley may be the prime target because it is such a well-established neighborhood where chemical agents and munitions were once used.

□ 1500

The amendment requires the Secretary to allocate $1 million to study the human health effects of left-over munitions in congested residential areas. Just as the Department of Defense and the Army have acknowledged their obligation to clean up and remove hazardous substances, especially munitions that have been left behind through their testing, they also have the obligation to investigate whether there are any remaining health effects. That is all we are asking; that there be a study as to whether there are any remaining health effects at this former munitions site from World War I and other sites like it in congested residential areas.

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

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to acknowledge the gentlewoman's hard work to clean up this part of the District of Columbia.

Our bill provides $276.5 million in the Environment Restoration Account, formerly the Used Defense Site Account. The Department has the authority to provide funding to those projects that it deems of the highest priority and that pose the greatest risk to environmental and human health.

If the Department believes that funding such a study as the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia suggests is important, the Department has the ability to do so. For these reasons, we do oppose the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I also appreciate the gentlewoman's amendment, and I will work with you on seeing if we can talk to the military to use environmental restoration funds if your amendment doesn't succeed.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

The amendment was rejected.

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

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

Mr. PASCRELL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Chairman, to engage in a colloquy on the need for traumatic brain injury funding for post-acute guidelines for our returning troops.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that medical treatment guidelines for post-acute rehabilitation of moderate and severe TBI do not exist today. Recognizing this, Mr. PLATTS from Pennsylvania and Ms. GIFFORDS from Arizona included an amendment in the National Defense Authorization for fiscal year 2012 that would require the Department of Defense to implement post-acute treatment guidelines for traumatic brain injury. This provision was supported by

the cochairs of the Brain Injury Task Force—myself, Mr. PLATTS, bipartisan. It is my hope that the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences be able to begin the project as soon as possible. Over the years, the TBI Task Force has addressed many gaps for our servicemembers.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS).

Mr. PLATTS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As cochair of the Traumatic Brain Injury Task Force, I am honored to join with the gentleman from New Jersey in support of implementing post-acute treatment guidelines.

Before 2007, there were no funds in the budget for traumatic brain injury treatments, but with the dedicated efforts of Chairman YOUNG and other members of the Appropriations Committee, through their efforts we were not only able to provide funding, but more importantly, to sustain a significant level of funding over the past number of years.

As we continue to address new gaps for our servicemembers suffering TBIs, in this 2012 authorization bill that was passed in the committee and moving forward through the process we requested $1 million to fund these post-acute guidelines that the gentleman from New Jersey has referenced. It is our understanding that while TBI funding in the Defense appropriations bill is not separated by purpose, it is our understanding that the Department uses the overall funding for traumatic brain injury research for authorized purposes.

Is our understanding correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASCRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The gentleman is correct. In this bill, the committee has provided an additional $125 million for TBI research. It's above the fully funded budget request of $415 million. And it has been our long-standing policy that this increased funding is provided at the discretion of the Department. Historically, this subcommittee has provided increased funding for TBI research but refrained from directing how that money should be spent, allowing the Department to prioritize how best to use that funding for authorized purposes.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, may I also clarify that should the authorization bill pass with this provision on post-acute guidelines that the Department then has the needed amount of $1 million to really accomplish this objective which we have.

Mr. Chairman, I would request, as usual, your deepest cooperation. And no one has done more for our troops than you.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASCRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

I would say to the gentleman that he is correct; should the provision be carried on the final authorization bill, then the Department would have sufficient resources to fund the provisions should they decide to based on this appropriations bill.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I yield to my brother, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS).

Mr. PLATTS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to add my words of great thanks to Chairman YOUNG, who has been a great leader in doing right by our men and women in uniform in all fashion, and especially those who have suffered traumatic brain injury. As a Nation, we are indebted to you and your staff for your great leadership.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 7 of title 1, United States Code (the Defense of Marriage Act).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, what sets the United States apart from many other countries that have lots of resources are our values, and that we are a Nation of laws. We may not agree with all of our laws, but they are the laws of our land, and not even the President can decide which laws to enforce and which not to enforce. Yet this administration has said it will not enforce the Defense of Marriage Act.

The Department of Defense maintains that the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell does not directly challenge the Defense of Marriage Act, which protects the right of individual States to define marriage as the union between a man and a woman. In February, 2011, Attorney General Eric Holder announced that the Department of Justice would no longer defend the Defense of Marriage Act in Federal court. However, the House of Representatives has expressed its intent to continue legal defense of the statute along with other laws of our country.

My proposed amendment would reaffirm Congress' assertion that funds may not be used in contravention of section 7 of title I, United States Code, the Defense of Marriage Act. The Department of the Navy has already demonstrated how pressures to accommodate same-sex couples can quickly lead to policy changes that are ultimately contrary to previous assurances given with regard to the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell and in contravention of the Defense of Marriage Act.

On April 13, 2011, the Office of the Chief of Navy Chaplains, in a memo titled ''Revision of Chaplain Corps Tier 1 Training,'' directed that training be revised to accommodate same-sex marriages on military bases that are located in States where same-sex marriage is legal. The memo stated, ''This is a change to previous training that stated same-sex marriages are not authorized on Federal property.'' The memo further authorized the participation of a military chaplain in a same-sex civil marriage ''if it is conducted in accordance with the laws of a State which permits same-sex marriages or unions,'' and if the chaplain is otherwise certified to officiate. This calls into question the intent of the Department of Defense with regard to compliance with existing Federal law under the Defense of Marriage Act.

Congress should establish policy guidance on this issue that will cover numerous contingencies and unexpected situations in the future. It is irresponsible for the Department of Defense to dismiss all concerns about issues involving marriage status by pointing to the existence of the Defense of Marriage Act.

□ 1510

There's no contingency plan to address this issue should the Federal courts invalidate the Defense of Marriage Act. In fact, the administration is inviting that very policy. Federal court orders could suddenly overturn current policies of the Department of Defense, which is not likely to resist or oppose new directives that disregard the intent of the Defense of Marriage Act. Congress can and should enact a policy making it clear that Defense Department funds should not be used in ways that violate Federal laws, including the Defense of Marriage Act.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentlelady's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. Issues such as the Defense of Marriage Act represent policy questions that are not suited to appropriation bills. Indeed, this amendment does not address any specific program funding matter addressed in the bill now before the House.

To the extent that this amendment has any connection to the Department of Defense, I believe that such a policy issue is appropriately addressed within the domain of the House Armed Services Committee. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I move to strike the last word.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I won't be redundant. I'll just follow up on what my colleague Representative FOXX said in proposing this amendment for the two of us.

This is merely a move to make sure that legislation that has already passed, the Defense of Marriage Act and in the authorization bill dealing with the Department of Defense, coincides with the appropriation bill that we're talking about today.

There's been some confusion in the Department of Defense, in the facilities at these military bases, that there could be marriages between two men or two women. The Defense of Marriage Act and the authorization bill clearly state that that cannot happen and will not happen because it would be a violation of the Defense of Marriage Act which has passed this body.

And even though the administration has chosen not to be involved in this issue, I believe it's incumbent on the Congress to make this issue very clear so that we don't have confusion on these military bases when we talk about same sex marriages.

I think it is imperative that we make absolutely clear in both the appropriation bill and the authorization bill, as well as the Defense of Marriage Act, what the law is, what it's intended to do, so that it's very clear to the military so they don't have any difficulty in making decisions on this particular issue.

I want to thank my good friend and colleague, Representative VIRGINIA FOXX for introducing this amendment on behalf of the both of us.

She and her staff, especially Javier Sanchez, have thoroughly examined the confusing messages and conflicting protocols within the Department of Defense related to the implementation of the Defense of Marriage Act.

Why is this Amendment Needed?

(1) This amendment reinforces language that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 that passed the House on May 26, 2011.

Section 534 of the FY 2012 National Defense Authorization Act reaffirms the policy of the Defense of Marriage Act by stating that the word "marriage" included in any ruling, regulation, or interpretation of the Department of Defense (DoD) applicable to a service member or civilian employee of the Department of Defense shall mean only a legal union between one man and one woman.

And, Section 535 establishes that marriages performed on DoD installations or marriages involving the participation of DoD military or civilian personnel in an official capacity, to include chaplains, must comply with the Defense of Marriage Act.

This amendment does not impose a new restriction on the Department of Defense.

It is a straightforward in its purpose and text. It simply aligns the Department of Defense appropriations bill we are considering today with the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 that passed the House May 26, 2011.

The amendment ensures that defense dollars are not used to implement policy changes that violate the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA).

I believe that appropriations and authorization bills should be compatible, where possible, and by adopting the Foxx-Burton amendment, we will do just that for the Defense of Marriage Act.

This is the only opportunity we have to synchronize DoD funding to the DOMA policy provisions contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

(2) The amendment settles—once and for all—any confusion and/or misinformation within the DoD about the abilities of its personnel to perform same-sex marriages as well as the use of its facilities.

It is important that we pass this amendment, which is a straightforward statement reaffirming Congress' assertion that funds may not be used in contravention of section 7 of title 1, United States Code (Defense of Marriage Act).

The law ensures the States would not have to recognize same-sex marriages from other States, and that the Federal Government would recognize only the union of one man and one woman as marriage.

Offering up Federal facilities and Federal employees for the use in same-sex marriages violates DOMA, which is still the law of the land and binds our military.

(3) President Obama's Administration is on record that it will no longer defend DOMA thus leaving it up to Congress to defend against challenges to DOMA.

I am confident that activist lawyers and judges will begin challenging inconsistencies in marriage status for military personnel. For example, a same-sex couple who was married in a State where same-sex marriage is recognized sues because they are denied military family housing. The resolution of this kind of litigation would propel the courts into policy matters that Congerss should decide.

Bottom line.

This amendment—in conjunction with the Sections 534 and 535 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012—will allow Congerss to speak with one voice on the Defense of Marriage Act.

If Congress fails to speak clearly on this issue, we are certain to see more conflicting and confusing DOMA protocols emerging in the Department of Defense. And, it will be with the blessing of the White House.

Let's keep our Department of Defense focused on the missions at hand.

Congress can and should make it clear that Defense Department funds should not be used in ways that violate Federal laws, including the Defense of Marriage Act.

Support the Foxx-Burton Amendment. Let's leave the guesswork out of it.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, last year, Congress voted to repeal the counterproductive and unjust policy of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell."

But despite overwhelming evidence that repeal will strengthen our military, despite strong support for repeal among our troops and the American people, despite support for repeal from military leaders like the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and despite a Federal court order that the Government stop enforcing DADT immediately, Republicans are still pushing to keep this shameful policy in place.

Under DADT, 13,500 gay men and women were discharged simply because of who they were. These were troops who had served our country honorably and bravely; 1,000 of them filled what the military calls "critical occupations," such as engineering and interpretation of languages like Arabic and Farsi.

Our closest allies—countries like Britain, Canada, and Israel—know better than to throw that kind of service and expertise away.

Yet the amendment offered by Mr. HUELSKAMP would force our military to stop training its Chaplain Corps to prepare for the repeal of DADT. This amendment would substitute Congress's micromanagement for the judgment of our military leaders on training issues, and it is a transparent attempt to interfere with the repeal of DADT in any way possible.

The amendment offered by Ms. FOXX is in a similar vein. It would prohibit defense appropriations in contravention of the Defense of Marriage Act, or DOMA.

DOMA is discriminatory and should be ruled unconstitutional—but as long as it is law, it clearly applies to all Federal agencies, including the Defense Department.

That makes this amendment entirely unnecessary. Let's see it for what it is: Republicans' effort to change the subject from open service—an argument they've lost—to marriage equality—an argument they're still in the process of losing.

I urge my colleagues to oppose both amendments which put partisan belief in the exclusion of gays above the strength of our military.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I rise to engage Mr. DICKS in a colloquy regarding an important area of funding for the Department of Defense.

For more than a decade, the Department of Defense has funded programs to support established university programs that promote region-wide informal conferences and task forces on arms control, regional security, and related topics to the Middle East for Arab, Israeli, and other officials and experts.

These programs serve an important national security objective—fostering an alternative means of dialogue and engagement in an area of unparalleled significance to the United States. I know of one such program in Los Angeles, and I urge the Department to continue funding such programs.

I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member, for his thoughts on this issue.

Mr. DICKS. First of all, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

And I thank you, Mr. BERMAN, for your comments and agree that such programs that support university programs promoting Middle East conferences and task forces on arms control, regional security, and other issues

for Arab, Israeli, and other officials are important and beneficial. I hope the Department of Defense funds such programs accordingly, and I will work with the gentleman to ensure that that happens.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. MICHAUD

Mr. MICHAUD. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 2533a of title 10, United States Code (popularly known as the ''Berry Amendment'').

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlemen from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHAUD. I rise today to offer an amendment with Mr. KISSELL to ensure that no funds in this bill are spent in violation of the Berry Amendment.

The Berry Amendment requires DOD to procure certain categories of products from American manufacturers including food, clothing, fabrics, stainless steel, and certain tools. It was enacted to ensure that the United States troops wore military uniforms made in the U.S.A. and to ensure that U.S. troops were fed American-made food.

The Berry Amendment has been on the books for 70 years. Yet, in recent years, some in Congress have tried to weaken it. At a time of 9 percent unemployment and when employment in the U.S. manufacturing sector is on the decline, it is more important than ever for Congress to reiterate its support for existing law that promotes domestic procurement.

I urge my colleagues to support American manufacturing and to promote American food and uniforms for our troops by voting for the Michaud-Kissell Amendment.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KISSELL).

Mr. KISSELL. I would like to thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, for 70 years, as my colleague pointed out, the Berry Amendment has served this Nation well. It has given our fine military forces the best of American-made equipment and has guaranteed the American people the opportunity to make that equipment. It is a matter of national security. And it should not be a matter, as the intent of Congress has been clear for 70 years, it shouldn't be a matter of us standing up to reaffirm this amendment.

But as my colleague said, there have been efforts made to weaken the Berry Amendment, to get around the Berry Amendment, and we simply want to remind all folks involved that the Berry Amendment is the intent of Congress. It has been the law for 70 years. And we need to continue with the Berry Amendment that any funds that are being spent should be spent in total compliance with the Berry Amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to advise him that we're prepared to accept this amendment.

Mr. MICHAUD. I thank the chairman very much.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KISSELL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any United States commercial air carrier if that contract, memorandum of understanding, cooperative agreement, loan, or loan guarantee allows the air carrier to charge baggage fees to any member of the Armed Forces who is traveling on official military orders and is being deployed overseas or is returning from an overseas deployment.

□ 1520

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KISSELL. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple, to-the-point amendment.

We have heard recently about members of our armed services traveling on official military business being charged excess baggage fees by our commercial airlines here in the United States. This amendment would not make any funds available for entering into any contracts, memorandums of understanding, cooperative agreements, loans or loan guarantees with any United States commercial airlines where those contracts, memorandums of understanding, cooperative agreements, loans or loan guarantees would allow for excess baggage fees for any member of the armed services traveling on official military business.

Our folks, when they're traveling and protecting our Nation, shouldn't have to worry about this, and we as a Nation shouldn't have to pay extra fees beyond the millions upon millions of dollars that we already pay to these airlines. This just should be business as usual, and I encourage all my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Our troops and their families are being asked to make sacrifice after sacrifice after sacrifice. We should be at a point of trying to make things better for them, make things easier for them; and I would say that one of the things that we can do is to adopt the gentleman's amendment to at least give them some relief when they're coming back from the war that we sent them to without charging them extra money to get back home with their belongings.

I applaud the gentleman for offering this amendment, and I rise in strong support.

Mr. DICKS. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I, too, agree with the chairman. This is one of those situations where I think we have to step in and take action for our troops. This is a good amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KISSELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO

Ms. ESHOO. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with a corporation or other business entity that does not disclose its political expenditures.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the third time this year to call for transparency and disclosure in our system and throughout our government. This appropriations bill will spend hundreds of billions of taxpayer dollars next year; and a huge portion of it, a portion that's impossible to quantify, will go to contractors. Some are small, others rank among the world's largest companies. As we meet today, the workforce of contractors in Afghanistan is the same size as the workforce of the uniformed personnel there; and since 2005, we've spent approximately $12 billion on contractors in Afghanistan. Today, there are more private contractors than uniformed personnel in Iraq, and we've spent $112 billion on contractors in Iraq since 2005.

The Federal Government does business with thousands of contractors who receive billions of dollars in taxpayer

money. They should be required to disclose their political spending, and that's what my amendment will accomplish.

In 2002 when we voted to pass the historic McCain-Feingold campaign finance bill, most Republicans voted ''no,'' saying we needed disclosure, not soft money restrictions. They said we needed to put spending out in the open and let the voters assess it. Today, when the President proposes requiring contractors to simply disclose their spending, not to limit it, Republicans are up in arms. They say it will politicize the contracting process; but when contractors can spend money in elections, the contracting process is already politicized.

My amendment is modest and it's simple: It will bring this information out into the open and let the public decide for themselves. The public deserves to know what happens with their tax money.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a revolutionary idea. For the last 17 years, the SEC requires bond dealers to limit their campaign contributions to the officials in the cities that issue bonds. It requires them to disclose their contributions, providing the public with transparency. The rule was challenged and upheld in court, and my amendment really adheres to the same principle. To quote Senator MITCH MCCONNELL from 2003: ''Why would a little disclosure be better than a lot of disclosure?''

I agree with Senator MCCONNELL. With public dollars come public responsibilities. Disclosure would fulfill this responsibility. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' This amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to speak on the point of order? Seeing none, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination of whether certain political contributions were disclosed. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

Mr. MULVANEY. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by $17,192,000,000, not to be derived from amounts of appropriations made available by title IX.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MULVANEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

By way of brief summary, this amendment would freeze the base Department of Defense funding at 2011 levels. It is roughly a $17 billion reduction, or a 3 percent reduction over the bill that's currently before us. Again, it takes it back to the 2011 levels that we passed just recently in H.R. 1 during the continuing resolution debate.

This is not, Mr. Chairman, a new idea. It's not even my idea. The Domenici-Rivlin bipartisan deficit reduction plan also proposed exactly this—freezing base defense spending at 2011 levels.

□ 1530

During the budget debate, the one substantive bipartisan amendment that passed was an amendment that was a sense of the Committee that said that defense spending needed to be on the table as we look at spending reductions for 2012. And most importantly, the President's fiscal commission, the Simpson-Bowles Commission, also recommended exactly what this amendment does today, keeping defense spending at 2011 levels.

I happen to believe that at least, especially in this area, the Simpson-Bowles Commission is correct. And I want to read from the commission's report: ''Every aspect of the discretionary budget must be scrutinized. No agency can be off limits, and no program that spends too much or achieves too little can be spared. Any serious attempt,'' and I will say that again, ''any serious attempt to reduce the deficit will require deliberate, planned reductions in both domestic and defense spending.''

Personally, I like to think that I am serious about cutting our deficits. I hope that I am not alone. Many of us have gone around back home and told people how serious we are. But how can we look them in the eye and tell them that we are serious about cutting this deficit and about cutting spending and then come in and plus-up the base defense budget?

Admiral Mullen himself said that with the increasing defense budget, which is almost double over the last 10 years, it has not forced us, that's the Defense Department, to make the hard trades. It hasn't forced us to prioritize. It hasn't forced us to do the analysis.

We just received a Budget Committee memo today that said of the 92 major defense acquisition programs, 69 percent of them are over-budget. One in every five of them is over-budget by at least 50 percent. That is simply not right. It's not what our families are having to do. It's not what our States are having to do. It's not even what we have chosen to do in other areas of the budget. We have made hard decisions. We have made hard choices. The Defense Department needs to do exactly the same.

This amendment will not in any way limit our national defense capabilities. It will not put a single soldier at more risk. It simply holds defense spending exactly where we were 3 months ago when we approved the CR.

Having been here about 6 months, there is one thing that I have learned being a freshman. And for the folks who are here for the first time, the message is this: talk is cheap. Talk is especially cheap. It's very easy for us to go home and tell folks how important it is to cut spending, how serious we are about cutting spending. But nothing sends the message that we are really serious about it like cutting spending on something that is important to us. It's easy to cut things that we don't like. It is hard to cut things that are important to us. And defense spending is critically important to me and to the folks of this Nation and to the folks of South Carolina.

But if we're going to send a message that we are really serious about cutting spending, then everything needs to be on the table. And holding defense spending simply at 2011 levels and passing this amendment would help show everybody that we are really serious about fixing this difficulty.

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. This amendment follows the Lee amendment and the Garamendi amendment in cutting about $17.1 billion from the Overseas Contingency Operation Fund. I myself feel that we could be reducing our troop levels faster, but I don't think we should take the money out at this point until we have a better understanding of the pace of the withdrawal.

Now, we know the President's plan is 10,000 this year and another 23,000 next year. And so there will be some savings in the overseas contingency account as those troops come home. But I think it's too early to make a decision on that. Better left to do it in conference, where we can make a reasoned judgment and talk to the Pentagon and the Congressional Research Service so that we have a better idea of how much savings this will be. I feel that this is premature at this point. The other two amendments were soundly defeated, and I think the same fate will be here.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. Just for clarification, the amendment only makes the change to the base spending. It does not change anything in title 9. It does not change overseas contingencies in any way. It is simply the base portion

of the DOD budget. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. DICKS. That's even worse. I would doubly oppose the gentleman's amendment on that part of it. So let's defeat this amendment, as we defeated the others.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I rise in opposition to this amendment. I am one of the original budget cutters in this Congress. But I will not cut a defense budget to the point that it adversely affects our troops or adversely affects our country's readiness. And we could be getting close to that.

This year, Secretary Gates made his recommendation, which resulted in the President's budget request being $13 billion less than we had anticipated for national defense. In addition to that, this committee recommended, and this Congress will pass sometime today or tomorrow, a bill that is $9 billion less than the President requested. So we have cut and saved money everywhere we could without affecting readiness and without having an adverse effect on our troops.

If we start cutting too deep—and we were careful with this $9 billion reduction, very careful—we don't want to see that we have to cancel training for returning troops. We don't want to have to cancel Navy training exercises. We don't want to have to slow down or reduce Air Force flight training. We don't want to delay or cancel maintenance of aircraft, ships, and vehicles. We don't want to delay important safety and quality-of-life repairs to facilities and to military barracks. If we do those things, we are affecting our readiness. Training relates to readiness.

Training is a large part of the money in the base bill, not the overseas contingency operations account, but the base bill, which is what this amendment reduces. This amendment could be getting us very close to a dangerous situation where troops and readiness are affected. And there is just no way that I can even appear to support this amendment. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MS. BASS OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 1590 or 1591 of title 18, United States Code, or in contravention of the requirements of section 106(g) or (h) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7104(g) or (h)).

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

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment is simple. It prohibits the Defense Department from being used to engage in or facilitate human trafficking. Thousands of private contracting defense firms, including some of the industry's biggest names, such as DynCorp International and Halliburton subsidiary KBR, have been linked to trafficking-related incidents. Thousands of nationals from impoverished countries are lured by the promise of good jobs, but sometimes end up victims of scams that leave them virtual slaves, with no way to return home or seek legal recourse.

Despite this, allegations against Federal contractors engaged in illegal labor practices ranging from contract-worker smuggling to human trafficking in Iraq and Afghanistan continue to surface in the media.

A recent New Yorker article illustrates the urgent need for this amendment. The article tells the story of two women from Fiji who thought they were going to lucrative jobs in Dubai, but ended up, quoting the article, unwitting recruits for the Pentagon's invisible army of more than 70,000 cooks, cleaners, construction workers, beauticians, et cetera, from the world's poorest countries who service U.S. military contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

These two women were asked to deliver resumes, hand over passports, submit to medical tests, and they had to pay $500 to a recruiting firm. They were lured to Iraq under false pretenses and then told they would be making $700 a month. That was after they believed they were going to be making $3,800 a month, 10 times the normal salary in their home country.

□ 1540

What they didn't realize was that they were contracted to work 12 hours a day, 7 days a week. They were also victims of sexual harassment and assault.

After complaining, they were sent off base for making trouble and held for a month while their passports and ID badges were confiscated by the subcontracting company. The company that hired them was initially reprimanded but still operates in Fiji and still has a contract with the U.S. military.

Meanwhile, allegations against Federal contractors engaged in commercial sex and labor exploitation continue.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I rise in strong support of this amendment, which will prevent U.S. taxpayer dollars from being used to facilitate human trafficking and labor abuses on U.S. military bases.

As cochair of the bipartisan Congressional Caucus on Human Trafficking, I am particularly concerned that workers from South Asia and Africa are being trafficked to work on U.S. military bases and that U.S. taxpayer dollars are spent to unlawfully lure and transport them to work in extreme conditions.

It is Army policy to oppose all activities associated with human trafficking. This must include the supply chain that provides services to our servicemembers defending our country.

We must have strong oversight over our contracting system to ensure that it is free from human rights abuses, and this amendment works toward that end.

I urge my colleagues to join us in fighting human trafficking and support this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BASS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would just like to advise the gentlewoman that I consider this an extremely important amendment and I am happy to accept it.

Ms. BASS of California. Thank you.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BASS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. We will be glad to accept the amendment. We appreciate your hard work in this effort.

Ms. BASS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I would like to thank the gentlemen for accepting the amendment.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Bass-Maloney Amendment, which cuts funding to subcontractors in the U.S. Defense Department. This amendment would prevent funding from being used by subcontractors hired by the Defense Department who engage in unlawful activities of human trafficking and labor abuses on military bases.

At a time where we are going across the board looking for all the budget cuts we can find to help reduce the national debt, it only makes sense to eliminate funding to these nefarious individuals who are performing atrocious acts on our military soil and are not representing what this great country stands for. We as Americans cannot fund human trafficking nor can we allow labor abuse; these abuses are not what this country stands for and it's our job as lawmakers to do everything in our power to put an end to such crimes.

We can send a loud message with this amendment that the United States does not stand for such horrible crimes. So I join my

colleagues in support of the Bass-Maloney Amendment to H.R. 2219.

Ms. BASS of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUNYAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds in this Act may be used to procure air transportation from a commercial air carrier for a member of the Armed Forces who is traveling under orders to deploy to or return from an overseas contingency operation under terms that allow the carrier to charge the member fees for checked baggage other than for bags weighing more than 80 pounds or bags in excess of four per individual.

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

Mr. RUNYAN. I thank my colleague from New York (Mr. GRIMM) for his support on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Runyan-Grimm amendment which seeks excess baggage fees being charged to servicemembers deploying or returning from an overseas contingency operation.

This issue was brought to light early in June when a group of Army Reservists traveling back from Afghanistan were charged $200 each for checking a fourth bag, some of which contained U.S. Government equipment like an M4 rifle, a grenade launcher, and a 9-millimeter pistol. The soldiers posted a YouTube video, titled, ''Delta Airlines Welcomes Soldiers Home,'' expressing their frustrations for what they had experienced.

After serving our country in theater and enduring an 18-hour layover on their trip home, the warm welcome this group received was a $2,800 out-of-pocket expense. This is an unacceptable slap in the face, whether it was intentional or not. Applying these charges to those headed to or returning from the fight is an insult to them and their service to our Nation.

My amendment would make none of the funds available by this act to be used to pay any commercial air carrier if that airline charges excess baggage fees for the first four pieces of checked luggage that are 80 pounds or less per servicemember. This amendment is a reasonable compromise, whose primary purpose is taking care of our warfighters while not allowing the system to be abused.

Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines risk their lives to protect the freedoms we all enjoy. They take great personal sacrifices to defend our country. There is no doubt they should be provided with any reasonable accommodations while traveling on orders to or from theater of operations. Most importantly, they should not have to endure personal financial hardship as a result of traveling to and from overseas contingency operations. $200 is a large amount of money to pay out of pocket, especially for those who are enlisted.

It shouldn't take a YouTube video and bad publicity to convince any of us to do the right thing. With this amendment, we are sending a very strong message that our warfighters are individuals who are serving our country and not for an addition to a profit margin.

The amendment is endorsed by the VFW and the National Guard Association of the United States. I hope all my colleagues will stand with me in support of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines by voting in favor of this amendment.

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES, INC.,
Washington, DC., July 7, 2011.

Hon. JOHN RUNYAN,
House of Representatives, Longworth Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RUNYAN: We are writing to express our strong support for your recently proposed amendment to H.R. 2219, the FY12 Defense Appropriations bill to target and deny funds to commercial airlines who would charge excess baggage fees to servicemembers deploying and returning from overseas contingency operations. The National Guard Association of the United States represents over 45,000 members of the National Guard, their families and employers.

NGAUS believes in the fair treatment of our servicemembers, including our Guard and Reserve, when they deploy and return from overseas operations. The incident this past June where soldiers were charged excess baggage fees for equipment by an airline was outrageous. This amendment would appropriately target the program airlines participate in for supporting additional airlift capability for troops/baggage and equipment while denying funds made available in the bill to those airlines who violate tile program and charge baggage fees for the first four pieces of baggage (not exceeding 80 lbs and not including any carry-on baggage).

The National Guard Association of the United States strongly supports your efforts to correct unfair treatment by airlines in regards to our members of the National Guard and our Armed Forces deploying or coming home from overseas contingency operations.

Sincerely,

GUS HARGETT,
Major General, USA (Ret),
President, NGAUS.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the gentleman for the hard work that he has done on this amendment. I associate myself with his comments because I strongly agree with everything that he said, and I am happy to accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask that the Clerk read the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

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

Mr. SHERMAN. I had the Clerk read the amendment to show how short and how simple it is. It simply says that none of the money appropriated in this bill can be used to violate the War Powers Resolution, which is the law of the land found in title 50.

The War Powers Resolution simply states that a President may not deploy our troops into hostilities or our military forces into hostilities for more than 60 days if the President does not have congressional authorization. In the absence of such authorization, the President has 30 days to withdraw.

This is the exact same amendment that we considered 3 weeks ago on the MilCon appropriations bill. At that time it got the support of 60 percent of the Republicans and 61 percent of the Democrats, and I hope that those who voted for the bill or the amendment 3 weeks ago would vote the same way today. I hope to be able to persuade a few who voted the other way last time.

This amendment is important, even if we weren't engaged in Libya at all, because for the last several administrations, Presidents have been captured by the siren song of extremist lawyers who are part of the permanent executive branch. They tell the President that the President of the United States, acting alone, can deploy our troops into hostilities for unlimited duration, for any purpose, and, in any quantity, any assets can be deployed.

□ 1550

We are told that there are no limits on the President's power as Commander in Chief. Well, the War Powers Act says otherwise, and it is the law of the land. Now these extremist attorneys in the executive branch have gone a little further. They have added insult to injury by floating the idea that a resolution by NATO, the Arab League, or the United Nations can substitute for an authorization from both Houses of Congress, or they have said that briefing the leadership of Congress is a substitute for enacting an authorization. But even the most extremist attorneys in the executive branch admit we have the power of the purse, and we can prevent the funds provided by this appropriations bill from being used to violate the War Powers Act.

If we were to do otherwise, we would be abdicating our own responsibility, for if Congress habitually appropriates funds knowing that they will be used to violate the law of the land, then we would be complicit in undermining democracy and the rule of law here in the United States.

Now we on this side admire the President of the United States. But even if you would grant this President unlimited power to deploy unlimited forces for unlimited duration, if you ignore the War Powers Act today, you are granting that power to the next President. And those of us who are in good health will all live to see a President that we disagree with. And even if you agree with exactly what's happening in Libya, it is important that we draw a line and say that the conduct of our foreign policy must be consistent with U.S. law.

Now as a practical matter, this President has taken the extreme position that we are not engaged in hostilities in Libya. So what will be the practical effect of this amendment? First, I think he will reconsider that decision, because I think the lawyers behind it took refuge in the belief that the War Powers Act was somehow not binding on the administration. With this amendment, the War Powers Act is binding because we do have the constitutional right to limit the use of funds.

Furthermore, at a minimum, this amendment would prevent the President from deploying regular ground forces to Libya. Now I realize he doesn't intend to do that at this time. But, clearly, this President could not claim that armored divisions deployed in a war zone were not engaged in hostilities. So the minimum practical effect of this amendment is to limit Presidential power to what is going on now and not to introducing major combat operations.

Now, I support a limited effort to bring democracy and the rule of law to the people of Libya. That's not what this amendment is about. This amendment is about democracy and the rule of law here in the United States. I think that if we pass this amendment, and if we can get the Senate to do likewise, that the President will come to Congress and seek an authorization for what is going on in Libya. And at that time, Congress will be able to influence our policy. I think we would insist on a legal limitation to limit our efforts to just air forces and perhaps ground rescue operations. I believe that we would insist that we have the right to review that policy every 3 or 6 months. I believe that we would insist that the $33 billion of Qadhafi assets which have been frozen by the U.S. Treasury be used to finance this operation, instead of American taxpayer dollars. And I believe that we would insist that the rebels in Benghazi disassociate themselves from the al Qaeda operatives in their midst and from the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group.

But we can't insist on anything if we accept the view of extremist attorneys in the executive branch who view Congress as merely an advisory body. A review of the law and a review of the Constitution indicates that Congress has and should not be derelict in exercising a role in forming American foreign policy.

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The amendment prohibits the use of funds in this bill to breach the War Powers Act. However, the proponents hope this language will compel the administration to change our response to the crisis in Libya.

I oppose the amendment on two different grounds. First, the language of the amendment cannot possibly deliver what the proponents claim. Second, what the proponents hope to accomplish would harm the efforts of our allies, working against our national interests and benefiting Qadhafi.

The language can't deliver on the proponents' promises for two reasons. First, the amendment restricts the use of funds in this bill, but none of the $118.7 billion in the overseas contingency portion of the bill are designated for Libya. Second, the language merely requires compliance with the War Powers Act, but the heart of the proponents' difference with the President is a matter of interpretation about what constitutes compliance. The amendment takes us no closer to a resolution of that difference.

I would oppose the amendment even if the language could accomplish what the proponents hope for. To further restrict our role in Libya puts us on the wrong side of history and on the wrong side of the Arab Spring. It would hinder the efforts of our allies, if not making NATO's mission impossible and prolonging Qadhafi's tenuous hold on power.

To address the matter of Libya, I believe that language—similar to the language introduced in the other body by Senators KERRY and MCCAIN, is the appropriate course of action at this time—this language preserves the understanding between the administration and Congress that U.S. ground forces are not appropriate at this time, and it requires regular and detailed reports from the administration to the Congress.

Now I must say that I, too, agree that the President would always be better served, as President Bush did and President Clinton, to come to Congress to get approval of the authorization. But to unilaterally overturn an effort that includes NATO, the Arab League, and the United Nations saying that this horrific act would take place against the people of Libya, is just, I think, a big mistake, and it would undermine U.S. foreign policy that's been consistent since 1949 when NATO was established. So I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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 provide assistance to Pakistan.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which states, as you have just heard, no funds in this bill may go to Pakistan.

Pakistan is a country on which we have spent billions and billions of dollars. We've given them $18 billion just since 9/11—not to mention the many billions of dollars we gave to them during the Cold War. What has all that spending achieved for the people of the United States? Pakistan is now the best friend to America's worst enemies: radical Islam and, yes, an emerging and belligerent China. Wake up, America.

Was anyone really surprised to find Osama bin Laden was living in a luxurious mansion in plain view in a military-dominated Pakistani city? Let me admit that even I was surprised that the Pakistani Government was so bold, so open in its contempt of the people of the United States, as to arrest five of its citizens for helping us bring to justice Osama bin Laden, that terrorist radical fiend whose leadership led to the slaughter of 3,000 Americans on 9/11.

The Pakistan Intelligence Service, the ISI, is today, as it always has been, a friend of radical Islam and an enemy of Western democracy. With American acquiescence and Saudi financing, the Pakistani Government—read that the ISI—the Pakistani Government created the Taliban as Islamabad's vanguard for the conquest of Afghanistan. In the process, they set in place a fundamentalist anti-Western radical Islamic terrorist state.

Let's note that even after 9/11, after 3,000 of our citizens had been slaughtered, the ISI continued to covertly support radical Islamic terrorists, and they are still engaged in such hostile

acts, even as American lives are being lost even today.

□ 1600

In 2010, the London School of Economics published a report that found agents of the ISI—this is 2010, long after 9/11—were ''funding and training the Afghan Taliban.'' And to top things off, there is substantial reporting that has been done that suggests that Pakistani diplomats are lobbying the Afghan Government leaders, suggesting that they dump the United States and turn to China for a partnership and reconstruction.

This isn't shame on them; this is shame on us. Washington may be able to coerce and bribe Islamabad into doing us a favor now and then, but it is time to face reality. The goals and values of the United States and Pakistan are fundamentally at odds. Wake up, America. This bill would provide for another $1 billion to Pakistan. The Pakistani Government and Pakistan, they are not our friends. Why are we borrowing money from China to give to a government that has betrayed us time and time again?

Therefore, I urge adoption of my amendment to eliminate any funding in this appropriations bill from going to Pakistan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. The bill includes approximately $2.4 billion to support the Pakistani military. Of this amount, $1.1 billion is for the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund, and approximately $1.3 billion is provided through Coalition Support Funds.

The Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund provides for the training and equipping of Pakistani forces specifically to aid U.S. counterterrorism objectives. Coalition Support Funds are used to reimburse the Pakistani military for operations which generally support U.S. counterterrorism objectives.

In the wake of Osama bin Laden's killing by U.S. Special Forces, serious questions have arisen about Pakistan's reliability as a strategic partner, and I agree with the gentleman from California that this has raised serious questions here in the United States about the reliability of one of our partners. And also, there are questions about President Karzai in Afghanistan as well.

Now, the relationship with Pakistan has always been difficult. It reminds me a great deal, during World War II, of our relationship with the Soviet Union, Russia. That was a difficult relationship, but it was essential at that time. And it is essential at this point. This relationship has helped the U.S. make progress against terrorism, and the Pakistanis have allocated a significant part of their forces within their own borders to this mission, which we need to do more of on the federally administered tribal areas and in Quetta, where the Afghan Taliban leadership exists. And we need them to let us bring our Special Forces into Pakistan.

Now, a complete withdrawal of U.S. assistance would likely polarize Pakistan and exacerbate significant pro- and anti-American rifts within their military and their government generally. Aggravating this divide would be counterproductive to U.S. objectives in the region.

In addition to the counterterrorism activity, the fact of Pakistan's nuclear weapons capabilities provides ample reason for the United States to continue positive engagement, so I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Is any of the money that we have in this bill going to end up financing the ISI? Will any of that money end up in the hands of the ISI?

Mr. DICKS. I cannot say for certain. I don't think there is anything in this bill that I know of, any provision that provides funding directly to the ISI. Now, there may be. As the gentleman knows, there are other avenues in the intelligence world. But I don't know of anything specifically in this bill. And the ISI, I have just as much trouble with them as you do. But I don't think that we have anything specifically in the bill that funds them.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Is there any language in the bill that would prevent the money in this bill from going to the ISI?

Mr. DICKS. No, I don't think there is any prohibition in this bill.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. All right. Thank you very much.

Mr. DICKS. Thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the voice vote by which amendment No. 61 offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) was adopted be vacated to the end that the Chair put the question de novo.

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

If not, the earlier voice vote is vacated.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I would ask the subcommittee chairman, Mr. YOUNG, if he would enter into a colloquy regarding the Minuteman III Warm Line Solid Rocket Motor Sustainment program.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman would yield, I would be very happy to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. As the chairman is aware, the Air Force has proposed to terminate the Minuteman III Warm Line Solid Rocket Motor Sustainment program beginning in FY 2012. The Air Force has not presented this committee a viable plan to sustain this strategic weapon system beyond the year 2020 as these motors age out, and the program of record now requires the system to be deployed until 2030, which does leave a 10-year gap of vulnerability with no Minuteman III-specific industrial base to support this weapon system.

Would the chairman agree that it is vitally important that the Air Force undertake what is called a smart closeout of this program to include taking definite steps to preserve the essential tools, the uniquely skilled workforce, suppliers, equipment, and production facilities needed to continue to produce and support the readiness of Minuteman III motors through their current operational life cycle through at least 2030?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Utah for bringing this matter to our attention, and we do share his concern for the solid rocket motor industrial base.

We understand that the Air Force is considering their options, and we certainly intend that they use closeout funding from the Minuteman III mod line in a wise manner. We believe that they should seriously consider a smart closeout, as the gentleman from Utah described, and should also consider incorporating the essential elements from the Minuteman III production line into existing production lines for other defense solid rocket booster programs in order to preserve both military capabilities and to ensure the best use of taxpayer funds.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, do you also agree that all funds provided for Minuteman III modification in this bill may only be used to support the current Minuteman III system and that no funds have been either requested in the President's budget request or provided by this committee to begin a new start program for a future, currently unauthorized Minuteman III follow-on capability?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would respond that the purpose of the funding that we have provided for the Missile Modifications program is to support the operational capability of the Minuteman through 2030. This includes $34 million, as requested, for closeout of the warm line program. Development of any follow-on capability is still years away. And the gentleman is correct, a new start system would require authorization and appropriation by the Congress, which the Air Force has not requested and we have not provided. We intend that warm line funds be used in a manner that preserves the industrial base and does not diminish our future strategic capabilities.

I commend the gentleman for his leadership in this area and look forward to working with him further on this issue.

□ 1610

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his kindness and his answers.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOHMERT

Mr. GOHMERT. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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 obligated, expended, or used in any manner to support military operations, including NATO or United Nations operations, in Libya or in Libya's airspace.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, we have had a couple of amendments we've already voted on. In reviewing whether or not to withdraw my amendment, my concern comes on the review of Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, my dear friend, and the amendment that passed that he provided. His amendment says that none of the funds in the act may be used for supporting military activities of any group or individual not part of a country's Armed Forces. So it still could be used to supplement another country's Armed Forces through NATO or through the U.N.

We have here a case where people on both sides recognize that the President moved forward and put our military in harm's way to go after a man who until March 1 was recognized by the United Nations as being a leader in human rights. In fact, it had elected him in 2003 to be the chairman of the Human Rights Commission of the U.N. We also know from our office's inquiry of our own military that we comprise 65 percent of NATO's military. So it is not comforting to think that this President has already gone beyond seizing on loopholes and is just ignoring laws in order to do what he wants because the Arab League asked him—not Congress, not the population of the United States, but the Arab League and some in NATO.

It has not been established—and there are no indications it will be established—that the people who are going to replace Qadhafi will be better for us, for our national security or for our allies like Israel. So, if it's not good for this country's national security and if it's true as to what the gentleman Secretary Gates said, to whom the President recently awarded a Medal of Honor, that we have no national security interests in Libya, then we should not be committing our military in that direction.

Even though the U.N. may support action in Libya and even though they may buy into this Arab Spring, we are already seeing that Iran is excited because it looks like they're going to get additional puppets. We found out this week that the leader of Iraq, Maliki, is giving in to the request of the leader of Iran and is going against his promise to us and to the people of Camp Ashraf that they'll be safe and secure. Now he's saying he's going to disband the camp.

It is time to put America's national security and national interests first and not some whim of some President because someone outside the U.S. asked him. We know the Muslim Brotherhood, despite what some say, has been supporting terrorism. The evidence was clear in the Holy Land Foundation trial. We know that this administration has bent over backwards to appease such folks, so it is time for an amendment to make very clear, which this one does:

Mr. President, it doesn't matter whether you're going to try to use our military through NATO, our military through the U.N., our military head-up for a reconnaissance rescue. It doesn't matter. You're not going to use them.

For those who argue the War Powers is constitutional or is unconstitutional, I would humbly submit it does not matter. Even though the War Powers Act was passed as a curb against the President at the time, it is actually a gift to a President. This body has the power of the purse to cut off funding at any time it so desires, and the War Powers gave him a gift that said, Look, we'll give you days and days and days to come make your case before we cut you off.

That's a gift.

This President has shoved it back down our throats, and has said, I don't care what you think.

It is time to use the constitutional powers of this body and say, ''Enough.''

In the hopes that people will vote for this amendment, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I find it a little difficult to listen to the arguments about the War Powers Act, because I agree with those arguments.

First of all, in 1973, I think the Congress did give Presidents a gift of power not intended by the Constitution. The Constitution is very clear. It intends that war-making decisions would be made in conjunction with the Commander-in-Chief and the Congress, not the Commander-in-Chief by himself or herself and not the Congress alone, but while working together. That's not the way it has been happening lately. There hasn't been a real declaration of war under the Constitution since World War II, but we have fought in a lot of wars, and we have killed and wounded a lot of our kids.

That's not the argument, though. I agree with all of those points. I think that Congress has a serious responsibility to review the War Powers Act and to make it what we think it ought to be, and that is a partner relationship between the Congress and the executive branch.

Yet, while we hear these strong arguments about the War Powers Act and the separation of powers, these amendments don't really get the job done. If you want to cut off all funding for any activities in and around Libya, you would have to introduce a separate resolution that would simply say: No funds appropriated here or anywhere else can be used in the Libya operation.

In this particular bill, there is no money for Libya, and the President has made it very clear that he is not going to use any funds from the fiscal year 2012 appropriation for Libya. We'll see if that changes, but we have that in writing. We're already there. We're already in the area. We're already flying missions. If this amendment should be agreed to, here is what we would not be able to do:

We could not fly search and rescue missions for a downed pilot. We could not do ISR—Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance. We could not do aerial refueling for our coalition partners. We could not even be part of operational planning under this amendment.

As much as I agree with what the gentleman is trying to accomplish, I can't support this amendment, because of the effect that it really has. If it could amend the War Powers Act and make the President be a partner with Congress, I'd say, Amen. Let's do it quickly. I think the Congress ought to do that, and I think we ought to be serious about doing that; but on this particular amendment, I've got to oppose

it because this is what we're dealing with, not the emotional discussions about the War Powers Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I do not insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The brutal regime of Muammar al Qadhafi has caused an international outcry, and the people of Libya have asked for our help. The NATO-led mission to defeat Qadhafi and protect the people of Libya was undertaken in concert with a broad coalition of nations, including the Arab League, and it followed resolutions adopted in the United Nations Security Council, authorizing ''all necessary measures.''

□ 1620

The amendment would end our involvement unilaterally. I believe this could materially harm our relationship with our NATO allies from whom we will undoubtedly require support in the future, and our NATO alliance has been a vital and successful part of U.S. foreign policy dating back to its formation in 1949.

I do support a wider debate and greater oversight of the use and the cost of U.S. military forces engaged in the Libya operation, but I would point out that the administration did send up a detailed document that shows the money that has been spent thus far and what will be spent through the end of this fiscal year. We should let the mission with our NATO allies continue so we can replace Qadhafi and protect the Libyan people.

I urge all my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment. And I would just remind everyone that in 1986 President Reagan authorized a military strike following the bombings in Berlin and definitive proof of Qadhafi's involvement in other terrorist activities. At the time, President Reagan publicly denounced Qadhafi, the ''Mad Dog of the Middle East who espoused the goal of world revolution.''

Mr. Chairman, I can only wonder what Ronald Reagan would say today about those who would propose immediate withdrawal of U.S. assistance to the broad coalition of nations attempting to finish the job that President Ronald Reagan started.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum-Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on May 24, President Obama issued a Memorandum on Federal Fleet Performance, which requires all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternate fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel, by December 31, 2015. My amendment echoes the Presidential memorandum by prohibiting funds in the Defense Appropriations bill from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles except in accord with the President's memorandum. I have introduced similar amendments to the Homeland Security Appropriations bill and the Agriculture Appropriations bill and intend to do it with other appropriations bills. Both were accepted by the majority and passed by voice vote.

Our transportation sector is by far the biggest reason we send $600 billion per year to hostile nations to pay for oil at ever-increasing costs, but America doesn't need to be dependent on foreign sources of oil for transportation fuel. Alternative technologies exist today that, when implemented broadly, will allow any alternative fuel to be used in America's automotive fleet.

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America. According to GSA, there are over 660,000 vehicles in the Federal fleet, with almost 197,000 being used by the Department of Defense. By supporting a diverse array of vehicle technologies in our Federal fleet, we will encourage development of domestic energy resources—including biomass, natural gas, coal, agricultural waste, hydrogen and renewable electricity. Expanding the role these energy sources play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage over Americans held by foreign government-controlled oil companies and will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers from price spikes and shortages in the world oil markets.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment as both sides of the aisle have done in previous bills; and I want to mention on a similar note, I have worked in a bipartisan fashion with my colleagues, JOHN SHIMKUS, ROSCOE BARTLETT and STEVE ISRAEL, to open the bipartisan Open Fuel Standard Act, H.R. 1687.

Our bill would require 50 percent of new automobiles in 2014, 80 percent in 2016, and 95 percent in 2017 to be warranted to operate on nonpetroleum fuels in addition to or instead of petroleum-based fuels. Compliance possibilities include the full array of existing technologies, including flex fuel, natural gas, hydrogen, biodiesel, plug-in electric drive and fuel cell, and a catch-all for new technologies. I mention it because it's similar to this, and I really believe that our energy policies obviously can only be done on a bipartisan basis.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, again as we've done on all the other bills where I have introduced it, and the Open Fuel Standard as we work toward breaking our dependence on foreign oil.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I think the gentleman's amendment is a good amendment. I think we've seen this on other bills, and I am happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to accept the amendment, and I too think it's a good amendment and a good idea.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce the number of B–1 aircraft of the Armed Forces.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the B–1 bomber.

This is a very simple amendment. Basically, it just says it prevents any funds in this bill from being used to retire the B–1 bombers during the coming fiscal year.

Currently, as you know, about 163 planes are in our bomber fleet, which is about 3 percent of our total fleet. Currently, we are going through an analysis of what our bomber fleet is going

to look like in the future, and part of that is from the START Treaty. What we feel is appropriate is for us to not look at reductions in the bomber fleet on a piecemeal basis, but to look at it as a total picture once we have done the analysis and seen how many of the planes will not be needed for nuclear capability moving forward.

The B–1 is kind of an interesting plane. It doesn't get a lot of attention, but what it does is it works 24–7 and has in the theaters that we're involved in for a number of years. In fact, it has been our number one bomber of choice for a number of years and until recently was the only bomber seen in active duty.

I am pleased to be supported in this effort by Congressman THORNBERRY, who is vice chairman of the Armed Services Committee, as well as my colleague, Mr. CONAWAY.

At this time, I would like to yield to one of the cosponsors of this amendment, the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment that is offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The B–1 bomber is the workhorse of our long-range bomber fleet and has been flying missions over Iraq and Afghanistan for nearly a decade. More importantly, the B–1 bomber from the 28th Bomb Wing at Ellsworth Air Force Base in my home State of South Dakota just carried out air strike operations in Libya. In just under 2 days, Ellsworth generated aircraft loaded with conventional weapons that were able to strike targets halfway across the world.

Regardless of what one thinks about our involvement in Libya, one thing that one cannot dispute is the B–1's capability to respond globally and its vital importance to our bomber fleet. Mr. Chairman, with the next generation bomber development still a decade or more away, the administration's proposal to retire six B–1s is short sighted and it's premature. What's more, it can't be reversed. Retired planes aren't mothballed and put away for a period of time. They are sent to the bone yard and they are used for parts. Mr. Chairman, we propose that no B–1s be irreversibly retired this year because of questions regarding the future of our bomber force structure and the B–1's proven track record in theater as our workhorse.

I urge my colleagues to vote for a strong bomber fleet, a strong national defense, and I ask them to support this amendment.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentlelady from South Dakota just made a speech that I was about to make, so I would just simply say it's a good amendment, and I accept it.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the chairman, and I urge our colleagues to support a strong national defense and making sure that we have the appropriate number of bombers, and to vote in favor of the Neugebauer amendment.

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

□ 1630

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. I would just say to the gentleman that the B–2 bomber has been used also on several of these military operations that we've used, and the B–2 is a stealthy airplane. We only have 20. As a member of the committee, I offered the multiyear purchase agreement so we could buy the B–1s. And we had a unanimous vote, I think, in our committee on that. It was very bipartisan.

I agree with the gentleman that we don't have enough bombers. That's why I'm so strongly committed to the next-generation bomber. But as has been pointed out, that's going to be several years away. We tried to add some money this year to accelerate that because we do need a follow-on bomber.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I agree with the gentleman. And I think that our bomber fleet is extremely important, the B–1, the B–2, and obviously the B–52s. And as the gentleman knows, as we do not have a replacement bomber in the works at this particular point in time and until such time as we develop that, I think it's extremely important that we be strategic about what level we maintain our current fleet until we know what the replacement is going to be. And I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time, we only have 20 stealthy bombers. That's what some people don't understand. And the ability to penetrate China or the Soviet Union or wherever we might have to penetrate at some point, North Korea, we would be vulnerable with the B–52s and the B–1s to surface-to-air missiles.

So making sure that we get a high-quality stealthy airplane to follow the B–2 is a matter of national importance. I support the amendment.

I yield back my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in support of the B–1 bomber fleet. To echo what my colleague, Mr. NEUGEBAUER has said, I too believe that we should carefully examine the way we modify our bomber fleet for the future.

As part of the New Start Treaty, the U.S. and Russia will limit their nuclear capable delivery vehicles to a total of 700 deployed assets, including heavy bombers. At this time, we do not yet know what those cuts will look like. Preserving the size of our non-nuclear bomber fleet until we know the results of the New Start Treaty analysis is simply good policy.

My colleagues on the Armed Services Committee and I are very concerned that if we go down this path and prematurely reduce a portion of the fleet, that we will regret that decision.

Mr. Chair, I recognize that cuts need to be made. Every aspect of the budget needs to be thoroughly reviewed, but let's not make bad budgetary decisions without considering our mission capabilities first.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to address the ranking member of the House Appropriation's Committee on Defense, Mr. DICKS, and also the chair in a colloquy on the critical need to improve the recruitment, retention, and competitive compensation of the mental health professionals who can work with our Iraq and Afghanistan military servicemen and -women.

Since 2001, 2,103 military members have died by suicide. And one in five servicemembers currently suffer from post-traumatic stress and/or major depression. We must ensure that an adequate number of mental health professionals are available to treat our soldiers.

Mental health professionals must be retained by providing adequate pay and competitive benefits that are also available in the private sector. It is our duty and responsibility to our wounded warriors that we ensure their mental health services are secure and available when and where needed.

I am submitting for the RECORD an article from the Army Times dated April 7, 2011, regarding the Senate Appropriations Committee Defense Subcommittee meeting of April 6 and quoting Army Surgeon General Lieutenant General Schoomaker, who stressed the severe lack of mental health professionals in the military, and his concern about retention, especially in the rural areas. The article states, ''Congress has been pressing the military health system to add more psychiatric doctors, nurses and social workers for several years. That has prompted the services to add about 1,500 full-time mental health professionals since 2006—a 70 percent increase.''

The article further says, ''But demand has continued to outpace that growth. Active-duty troops and their families were referred to off-base civilian mental health care professionals nearly 4 million times in 2009, roughly double the number of off-base referrals in 2006, military data show.

''The dramatic increase in military suicides during the past several years has added urgency to congressional concerns. At the April 6 hearing, all three military surgeons general told lawmakers about efforts to improve training, recruiting and retention of mental health professionals.''

Senator MIKULSKI has suggested military training may be uniquely important because some civilian doctors and social workers have trouble understanding the troops' problems and mindset.

I am also submitting for the RECORD a witness statement of July 14, 2011, from the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, where the Deputy Director of Veterans Affairs and Rehabilitation Division, Jacob Gadd, expressed the challenges of hiring and retaining quality mental health specialists. Our servicemembers should not have to wait one more day for the help they deserve.

As cochair of the Congressional Mental Health Care Caucus, I have met with many key military leaders to learn what the most critical issues are in addressing mental health services for our military men and women. I've repeatedly been informed that there have been woefully inadequate numbers of mental health professionals available to care for our men and women.

Congress has a responsibility to see that our soldiers and veterans have the resources for quality care. Because this quality of care is dependent on the quantity of behavioral health specialists trained in war, PTS, we must successfully recruit and retain to work with our men and women who fight to ensure our precious daily freedoms.

The legislation before you today provides $32.3 billion for the defense health program and military family programs, with $125 million of this going towards research of traumatic brain injury and psychological health treatment, hopefully to also include hyperbaric treatment research.

We must insist on accountability that adequately trained behavioral health professionals are on hand when and where needed. I would like to work with the ranking member to obtain from the Department of Defense a detailed outline on their efforts for each military service—Army, Air Force, Navy, Marines, et cetera—to recruit, retain, and formulate the competitive salaries and benefits that will keep behavioral health specialists serving our men and women who have given so much to protect our freedoms.

We place them in harm's way. It is our duty and obligation to ensure the best care is given to them.

I yield to the ranking member.

Mr. DICKS. I will work with the gentlelady on the Defense Department's plan to ensure adequate mental health services for our servicemembers.

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

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mrs. NAPOLITANO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentlelady continue to yield?

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I would point out that the chairman of this committee, Mr. YOUNG, and his wife, Beverly, have been some of the strongest advocates for our Wounded Warriors and he has led the fight in our committee to increase the funding for traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder. So our committee has been very committed to this. It is one of our highest priorities.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I thank Mr. DICKS, the ranking member, for working with me on this critical issue and look forward to working soon enough on this.

[Apr. 7, 2011]

PANEL QUESTIONS ADEQUACY OF MENTAL HEALTH CARE

(By Andrew Tilghman)

The military's top doctors faced heated questions on Capitol Hill about whether there are enough mental health professionals to meet the soaring demand from troubled troops.

''Do you feel you have adequate mental health personnel?'' asked Sen. Barbara Mikulski, D–Md., at an April 6 hearing of the Senate Appropriations Committee's defense panel.

Lt. Gen. Eric Schoomaker, the Army surgeon general, acknowledged that the military would prefer to have more, but cited an overall lack of mental health professionals nationwide as a key challenge. ''I think the nation is facing problems. As a microcosm of the nation, we have problems,'' Schoomaker said.

Congress has been pressing the military health system to add more psychiatric doctors, nurses and social workers for several years. That has prompted the services to add about 1,500 full-time mental health professionals since 2006—a 70 percent increase.

But demand has continued to outpace that growth. Active-duty troops and their families were referred to off-base civilian mental health care professionals nearly 4 million times in 2009, roughly double the number of off-base referrals in 2006, military data show.

The dramatic increase in military suicides during the past several years has added urgency to congressional concerns. At the April 6 hearing, all three military surgeons general told lawmakers about efforts to improve training, recruiting and retention of mental health professionals.

Mikulski suggested military training may be uniquely important because some civilian doctors and social workers have trouble understanding troops' problems and mindset.

''From what I understand . . . often in the first hour of the first treatment, the military [patients] facing this problem walk out and tell the counselor, essentially, to go to hell because they don't feel they get it,'' she said.

Schoomaker downplayed issues with nonmilitary professionals.

''Frankly, I think . . . this warrior culture issue might be present in some cases but not universally. Our people do a good job with that,'' he said.

Sen. Patrick Leahy, D–Vt., was concerned about reservists who may not live near a military treatment facility and may have problems finding mental health care. Schoomaker agreed that reservists can face a significant challenge.

''We have residual problems . . . in reserve communities. You go home to a community where access to care is a problem for all care, but especially behavioral health,'' Schoomaker said.

That's also a problem for some active-duty posts in rural areas. ''In the desert of California, for example, it's hard to recruit and retain high-quality people,'' he said.

STATEMENT OF JACOB B. GADD, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, VETERANS AFFAIRS AND REHABILITATION DIVISION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON ''EXAMINING THE PROGRESS OF SUICIDE PREVENTION OUTREACH EFFORTS AT THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS'', JULY 14, 2010

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

Thank you for this opportunity to submit The American Legion's views on progress of the Suicide Prevention efforts at the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to the Subcommittee today. The American Legion commends the Subcommittee for holding a hearing today to discuss this timely and important issue.

Suicide among service members and veterans has always been a concern; it is the position of The American Legion that one suicide is one too many. However, since the war in Iraq and Afghanistan began, the numbers of service members and veterans who have committed suicide have steadily increased. As our service members are deployed across the world to protect and defend our freedoms, we as a nation cannot allow them to not receive the care and treatment they need when they return home. The tragic and ultimate result of failing to take care of our nation's heroes' mental health illnesses is suicide.

Turning first to VA's efforts in recent years with Mental Health Care, The American Legion has consistently lobbied for budgetary increases and program improvements to VA's Mental Health Programs. Despite recent unprecedented increases in the VA budget, demand for VA Mental Health services is still outpacing the resources and staff available as the number of service members and veterans afflicted with Post Traumatic Stress (PTS) and Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) continues to grow, this naturally leads to VA's increase in mental health patients.

In 2008, RAND's Center for Military Health Policy Research, an independent, nonprofit group, released a report on the psychological and cognitive needs of all servicemembers deployed in the past six years, titled, ''Invisible Wounds of War: Psychological and Cognitive Injuries, Their Consequences, and Services to Assist Recovery,'' which estimated that more than 300,000 (20 percent of the 1.6 million) Iraq and Afghanistan veterans are suffering from PTS or major depression and about 320,000 may have experienced TBI during deployment.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates 30,000–32,000 U.S. deaths from suicide per year among the population. VA's Office of Patient Care and Mental Health Services reported in April 2010 that approximately 20 percent of national suicides are veterans. The National Violent Death Reporting System reports 18 deaths per day by veterans and VA's Serious Mental Illness Treatment, Research and Evaluation Center reported about five deaths occur each day among VA patients. In a recent AP article, it was cited that there have been more suicides than service members killed in Afghanistan.

The Veterans Health Administration (VHA) has made improvements in recent years for Mental Health and transition between DoD and VA such as the Federal Recovery Coordinators, Polytrauma Rehabilitation System of Care, Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and Operation Iraqi Freedom

(OIF) case management teams, integrating mental health care providers into primary care within VA Medical Center Facilities and Community Based Outpatient Clinics (CBOCs), VA Readjustment (Vet) Centers hiring of Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) Counselors, establishing directives for TBI screening, clinical reminders and a new symptom and diagnostic code for TBI.

Regarding suicide prevention outreach efforts, VA founded the National Suicide Prevention Hotline, 1–800–273–TALK (8255) by collaborating with the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline where veterans are assisted by a dedicated call center at Canandaigua VA Medical Center in New York. The call center is staffed with trained VA crisis health care professionals to respond to calls on a 24/7 basis and facilitate appropriate treatment. VA reported in 2010 a total of 245,665 calls, 128,302 of which were identified as veterans. Of these veterans, 7,720 were rescues.

VA hired Local Suicide Prevention Coordinators at all of the 153 VA Medical Centers nationwide in an effort to provide local and immediate assistance during a crisis, compile local data for the national database and train hospital and local community on how to provide assistance. One of the primary responsibilities of the Local Suicide Prevention Coordinators is to track and monitor veterans who are placed on high risk of suicide (HRS). A safety plan for that individual veteran is created to ensure they are not allowed to fall through the cracks.

In 2009, VA instituted an online chat center for veterans to further reach those veterans who utilize online communications. The total number of VeteransChat contacts reported since September 2009 was 3,859 with 1471 mentioning suicide. VA has also had targeted outreach campaigns which included billboards, signage on buses and PSA's with actor Gary Sinise to encourage veterans to contact VA for assistance.

THE AMERICAN LEGION SUICIDE PREVENTION AND REFERRAL PROGRAMS

The American Legion has been at the forefront of helping to prevent military and veteran suicides in the community. The American Legion approved Resolution 51, The American Legion Develop a Suicide Prevention and Outreach Referral Program, at the 2009 National Convention. In addition, VA's National Suicide Prevention Coordinator Dr. Janet Kemp facilitated an Operation S.A.V.E. Training for our Veterans Affairs and Rehabilitation Commission members. VA&R Commission members and volunteers subsequently developed American Legion state, district and post training programs to provide referrals for veterans in distress with VA's National Suicide Prevention Hotline. The American Legion currently has over 60 posts with active Suicide Prevention and Referral Programs.

In December 2009, The American Legion took the lead in creating a Suicide Prevention Assistant Volunteer Coordinator position, under the auspices of VA's Voluntary Service Office. Each local suicide prevention office is encouraged to work with veteran service organizations and community organizations to connect veterans with VA's programs in their time of transition and need. The Suicide Prevention offices can increase their training of volunteers to distribute literature and facilitate training in order to further reach veterans in the community.

This year, The American Legion entered into a partnership with the Defense Centers of Excellence's Real Warrior Campaign to educate and encourage our members to help transitioning service members and veterans receive the mental health treatment they need. Additionally, during our 2010 National Convention we will have a panel to discuss prevention, screening, diagnosis and treatment of TBI with representatives from DoD, VA and the private sector.

CHALLENGES

Despite recent suicide prevention efforts, yet more needs to be done as the number of suicides continues to grow. The American Legion's System Worth Saving (SWS) program, which conducts site visits to VA Medical Center facilities annually, has found several challenges with the delivery of mental health care. VA has the goal to recruit psychologists from their current nationwide level of 3,000 to 10,000 to meet the demand for mental health services. However, VA Medical Center Facilities have expressed concerns with hiring and retaining quality mental health specialists and have had to rely on fee basis programs to manage their workload.

The American Legion applauds last year's action by Congress in passing Advance Appropriations for mandatory spending. However, problems exist in VA itself in allocating the funds from VA Central Office to the Veteran Integrated Service Networks (VISNs) and to the local facilities. This delay in funding creates challenges for the VA Medical Center Facility in receiving its budget to increase patient care services, hiring or to begin facility construction projects to expand mental health services. VA's 2011 budget provides approximately $5.2 billion for mental health programs which is an 8.5 percent, or $410 million, increase over FY 2010 budget authorization. The American Legion continues to be concerned about mental health funds being specifically used for their intent and that Congress continue to provide the additional funding needed to meet the growing demand for treatment.

Challenges in preventing suicide include maintaining confidentiality and overcoming the stigma attached to a service member or veteran receiving care. Additionally, the issue of a lack of interoperable medical records between DoD and VA, while being addressed by Virtual Lifetime Electronic Records (VLER), still exists. The American Legion has supported the VLER initiative and the timely and unfettered exchange of health records between DoD and VA. Unfortunately, DoD and VA still have not finalized both agencies ALTA and VISTA architecture systems since the project began in 2007, which limits DoD and VA's ability to track and monitor high risk suicide patients during their transition from military to civilian life. The American Legion recommends VA take the lead in developing a joint database with the DoD, the National Center for Health Statistics and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to track suicide national trends and statistics of military and veteran suicides.

The American Legion continues to be concerned about the delivery of health care to rural veterans. As mentioned, a nationwide shortage of behavioral health specialists, especially in remote areas where veterans have settled, reduces the effectiveness of VA's outreach. No matter where a veteran chooses to live, VA must continue to expand and bring needed medical services to the highly rural veteran population through telehealth and Virtual Reality Exposure Therapy (VRET). DoD and VA have piloted VRET at bases at Camp Pendleton, Camp Lejeune and the Iowa City VA Medical Center. VRET is an emerging treatment that exposes a patient to different computer simulations to help them overcome their phobias or stress. The younger generation of veterans identifies with computer technology and may be more apt to self-identify online rather than at a VA Medical Center or CBOC.

Both DoD and VA have acknowledged the lack of research on brain injuries and the difficulties diagnosing PTS and TBI because of the comorbidity of symptoms between the two. The Defense and Veterans Brain Injury Center (DVBIC) developed and continues to use a 4-question screening test for TB today. At the same time, Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York developed the Brain Injury Screening Questionnaire (BISQ), the only validated instrument by the Centers for Disease Control to assess the history of TBI, which has over 100 questions with 25 strong indicators for detecting TB. Mount Sinai has published data that suggest some of the symptoms, particularly those categorized as ''cognitive,'' when found in large numbers (i.e. 9 or greater), indicate the person is experiencing complaints similar to those of individuals with brain injuries. The American Legion wants to ensure that DoD and VA are working with the private sector to share best practices and improve on evidence-based research, screening, diagnosis and treatment protocols of the ''signature wounds'' of Iraq and Afghanistan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The American Legion has seven recommendations to improve Mental Health and Suicide Prevention efforts for VA and DoD:

(1) Congress should exercise oversight on VA and DoD programs to insure maximum efficiency and compliance with Congressional concerns for this important issue.

(2) Congress should appropriate additional funding for mental health research and to standardize DoD and VA screening, diagnosis and treatment programs.

(3) DoD and VA should expedite development of a Virtual Lifetime Medical Record for a single interoperable medical record to better track and flag veterans with mental health illnesses.

(4) Congress should allocate separate Mental Health funding for VA's Recruitment and Retention incentives for behavioral health specialists.

(5) Establish a Suicide Prevention Coordinator at each military installation and encourage DoD and VA to share best practices in research, screening and treatment protocols between agencies.

(6) Congress should provide additional funding for telehealth and virtual behavior health programs and providers and ensure access to these services are available on VA's web pages for MyHealthyVet, Mental Health and Suicide Prevention as well as new technologies such as Skype, Apple i-Phone Applications, Facebook and Twitter.

(7) DoD and VA should develop joint online suicide prevention service member and veteran training courses/modules on family, budget, pre, during and post deployment, financial, TBI, PTSD, Depression information.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, although VA has increased its efforts and support for suicide prevention programs, it must continue to reach into the community by working with Veteran Service Organizations such as The American Legion to improve outreach and increase awareness of these suicide prevention programs and services for our nation's veterans. The American Legion is committed to working with DoD and VA in providing assistance to those struggling with the wounds of war so that no more veterans need lose the fight and succumb to so tragic a self-inflicted end.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, this concludes my testimony.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended for assistance to the following entities:

(1) The Government of Iran.

(2) Hamas.

(3) Hizbullah.

(4) The Muslim Brotherhood.

□ 1640

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

Mr. GOSAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I ask for your support of my limiting amendment that would prohibit any military expenditure that would assist any entity that has a policy calling for the destruction of the State of Israel.

My amendment is specific and would prohibit this type of expenditure to any entity that has a policy calling for the destruction of the State of Israel. Most prominent, of course, is Iran. Just last month, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad reiterated his nation's policy calling for the complete elimination of Israel.

It is not just formally recognized states, however, we need to be concerned about. History has shown that entities we consider terrorist fringe groups sometimes, through force, manipulation and popular vote, take over the state apparatus. This happened in the Gaza Strip when Hamas, the Islamic Resistance Movement, won a plurality of legislative seats, 44 percent, in the 2006 election. The United States and Israel classify Hamas as a terrorist organization, but the United Nations, for example, does not. The Hamas Charter of 1988, never withdrawn or amended, states that ''Israel will exist and will continue to exist until Islam will obliterate it, just as it has obliterated others before it.'' This mirrors the Iranian policy, as that ''the reason for the Zionist regime's existence is questioned, and this regime is on its way to annihilation.''

In the last budget, according to the State Department, U.S. military aid to Egypt totals over $1.3 billion annually in funding referred to as Foreign Military Financing. Currently, questions exist about the Muslim Brotherhood, now a key player in Egypt and potentially in Libya with the rebel opposition, and its hostility to Jews and the State of Israel. It is quite possible that extremist groups who seek the destruction of Israel are taking over the state operations in Egypt and part of Libya. Time will tell.

My amendment would ensure that we do not use our money and military assistance to help any entity that will not recognize the right of Israel to exist and to exist peacefully. That includes the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt. No other nation on Earth except Israel has had to face systematic, ideological and persistent existential threats.

My amendment would prohibit military aid, assistance or funding to any nation, state or entity that espouses a policy that refuses to recognize Israel's right to peacefully exist. With the prospect of not receiving our money and assistance, the new Egyptian regime may take a more respectful approach to Israel. In this sense, my amendment takes a carrots approach.

I appreciate your support of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the gentleman's amendment. I also want to support his reasons for offering this amendment. I think they are very well taken. The amendment is a good amendment, and I strongly support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

Mr. WELCH. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Not more than $200,000,000 of the funds provided by title IX under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'' may be available for the Commander's Emergency Response Program, and the amount otherwise provided under such heading is hereby reduced by $200,000,000.

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

Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

One of the major decisions that this Congress has to make and for which we need a recommendation from the Appropriations Committee for the Defense Subcommittee is whether nation-building is a wise strategy, a sustainable strategy, an affordable strategy, and an effective strategy in Afghanistan. We had a debate on that policy. There was a bipartisan vote, with 204 Members suggesting it was time to call into question the wisdom, sustainability and effectiveness of nation-building.

One of the things that we have provided to our commanders in order for them to be able to do hearts-and-minds civic projects, roads, bridges, schools is a $400 million fund that they can use completely at their discretion. Now, this sounds like a good idea. If you're going to ask the military to win the hearts and minds, not just use military power to fight battles, then a discretionary fund can seemingly make some sense. The question, though, is, upon review, it turns out that these roads, these bridges, these canals, almost the moment they're turned over to the Afghan authorities, fall into disrepair, disuse and neglect. It's not surprising.

Number one, there is very little local government infrastructure in Afghanistan, and the fact that we build a road or a school doesn't necessarily mean there's a government or an authority there to be able to maintain it. So we build something, and the moment we turn the keys over, it falls into disuse and disrepair.

Second, the expenses of doing this are enormous. It may make sense to do these civic projects, to create some goodwill, but do you do them, Mr. Chairman, in the middle of a shooting war? Or is it better to do that before or after the war, when you have a chance for this implementation to occur?

Then, third, there's an immense amount of ripping off of this money from the American taxpayer. It gets lost. It gets picked up in graft that we all know about is too rampant in Afghanistan. According to a report in The Washington Post, half of this money, a minimum of $400 million, is gone missing, it's wasted, and it is coming out of our taxpayer pockets.

My amendment would cut in half the $400 million, reduce it to $200 million, basically taking away that $200 million that is being utterly wasted. This is a commonsense, practical way to save money by stopping a policy that may be good in theory but in practice is a failure.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 4, 2011]

U.S.-FUNDED INFRASTRUCTURE DETERIORATES ONCE UNDER AFGHAN CONTROL, REPORT SAYS

(By Josh Boak)

Roads, canals and schools built in Afghanistan as part of a special U.S. military program are crumbling under Afghan stewardship, despite steps imposed over the past year to ensure that reconstruction money is not being wasted, according to government reports and interviews with military and civilian personnel.

U.S. troops in Afghanistan have spent $2 billion over six years on 16,000 humanitarian projects through the Commander's Emergency Response Program, which gives a battalion-level commander the power to treat aid dollars as ammunition.

A report slated for release this month reveals that CERP projects can quickly slide into neglect after being transferred to Afghan control. The Afghans had problems maintaining about half of the 69 projects reviewed in eastern Laghman province, according to an audit by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction.

The spending in Afghanistan is part of the $5 billion provided to U.S. military commanders for projects in Iraq and Afghanistan since 2004. The new report is the latest to identify shortcomings and missteps in the program, whose ventures have included the Jadriyah Lake park in Iraq, planned as a water park but now barren two years after a U.S. military inauguration ceremony.

The dilapidated projects in Afghanistan could present a challenge to the U.S. strategy of shifting more responsibility to Afghans. Investing in infrastructure, notes President Obama's December review of the war, ''will give the Afghan government and people the tools to build and sustain a future of stability.''

''Sustainment is one of the biggest issues with our whole strategy,'' said a civilian official who shared details from a draft of the

report. ''The Afghans don't have the money or capacity to sustain much.'' The official spoke on the condition of anonymity because the Defense Department is preparing a response to the audit.

Photos in the report show washed-out roads, with cracks and potholes where improvised explosive devices can be hidden. Among the projects profiled is a re-dredged canal that filled with silt a month after opening.

Multiple reports by the Government Accountability Office have noted a lack of monitoring by the Pentagon. And because formal U.S. oversight stops after a project is turned over to Afghans, it is difficult to gauge how projects are maintained countrywide.

When asked whether the Afghans have trouble sustaining projects, the U.S. military issued a statement saying it does not have the information to provide an immediate answer.

Gen. David H. Petraeus, the top U.S. commander in Afghanistan, said in Senate testimony last year that CERP is ''the most responsive and effective means to address a local community's needs.'' He previously relied on the discretionary fund as the commanding general in Iraq, where $3.5 billion has been spent through the program. Over the past two years, Petraeus has pushed for stricter controls to stop any fraud and waste.

In response to ''insufficient management,'' CERP guidance for Afghanistan was revised in December 2009, according to a statement by the military. The new guidance emphasizes the need to meet with Afghan leaders when choosing what to fund. It does not, however, require U.S. troops to continue inspecting projects after they are placed under Afghan control.

Under the guidance, an Afghan governor, mayor or bureaucrat must sign a letter promising to fund maintenance and operations. But an October SIGAR audit of projects in Nangahar province found that only two of the 15 files examined contained a signed letter. Nor is there formal reporting to the national or provincial Afghan governments of what was spent and built, the audit said. That makes it difficult for Afghans to know what they are supposed to maintain.

The provincial and district governments that take over the projects do not have the money to sustain them because they cannot collect taxes and they depend on the national government for funding, said Army Maj. David Kaczmarek, the civil affairs officer for Task Force Bastogne in eastern Afghanistan.

To teach the local governments how to request additional funds from Kabul, Kaczmarek helped launch a program in the summer that uses CERP dollars for the operation and maintenance of some projects.

The U.S. military tracks CERP projects with poorly maintained computer databases. Before October 2009, the database did not consistently record the villages or districts where projects were undertaken, according to military and civilian personnel who spoke on the condition of anonymity because the master database is classified.

A civilian official who examined the contents of the database for a government assessment said the military cannot account for the spending without knowing the villages and districts that were project recipients.

''Let's say the project is not working,'' the official said. ''Why would we want to fund that project again the next year? Very little evaluation was done to decide what we fund next.''

The organizational problems have also frustrated attempts to study the effectiveness of the $2 billion spent on CERP. A paper co-written by Princeton University professor Jacob Shapiro found that CERP funding helped reduce violence in Iraq. Shapiro and his colleagues have struggled over the past nine months to conduct a similar study for Afghanistan because of the database.

''There's not a sense of how the program may or may not be working in Afghanistan,'' Shapiro said.

Army Lt. Col. Brian Stoll tried to clean up the database while serving in Kandahar last year. He champions CERP as a way to build confidence in the Afghan government, despite the mess he found.

Projects dating to 2006 had never been closed out, said Stoll, who updated the files while working 12-hour days to audit ongoing projects in southern Afghanistan.

We never got it all cleaned up,'' Stoll said. ''It was like a Hydra. You get part of it cleaned up and you find some more along the way.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment for a number of reasons, although I think he's made some good points, and certainly we want accountability to apply to this program as much as we want it to apply to anything. However, this is the same funding level as last year. The request was $425 million, and our commanders in the theater are telling us that that is even not high enough. So what we're doing with this amendment is actually cutting a level funding item from last year, cutting it in half.

Now, what does the CERP money do, the Commander's Emergency Response Program money? Let's say an IED explodes, or maybe there is a bomb that blows up a storefront in the middle of the street. A commander can go in there and hire local labor to clear out the entrance to that small business or whatever it is and get it done quickly without having to put U.S. Army personnel in danger to do it and can do it quickly and effectively and therefore leave our soldiers in the field, leave our soldiers where they can be most effective with their time and their training, and it does promote some goodwill on the streets with the people.

It has been said, well, all you're doing is renting a friend, and we're not going to be the first army that's fighting a war that rents friends, if you will. It really doesn't just rent a friend. It does create some long-term goodwill and does have an economic benefit of it. But the idea is to give the commander on the street some flexibility so that they can get the jobs done as the jobs arise and get them done quickly and turn them around.

CERP money actually has been an effective tool, and it's enormously popular with our commanders who are on the ground. I believe one of the problems we have in Afghanistan, one of the problems we've always had, is that too many decisions are being made down the street at the Pentagon and not in Baghdad, not in Kabul, not in Kandahar, where the commanders are closest to the war front.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 1650

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment, which would address another misguided Federal regulation. Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act prohibits Federal agencies from entering into contracts for the procurement of alternative fuels unless their lifecycle greenhouse gases emissions are less than or equal to emissions from an equivalent conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum sources. Simply stated, my amendment would stop the government from enforcing this ban on the Department of Defense.

The initial purpose of section 526 was to stifle the Defense Department's plans to buy and develop coal-based or coal-to-liquid jet fuels. This was based on the opinion of environmentalists that coal-based jet fuel produces more greenhouse gas emissions than traditional petroleum. I recently offered my similar amendment to both the MILCON VA and Ag appropriations bills, and they passed the House by voice vote each time.

My friend Mr. CONAWAY of Texas also had similar language added to the Defense authorization bill to exempt the Defense Department from this burdensome regulation. We must ensure that our military becomes more energy independent and that it can effectively and efficiently rely on domestic and more stable sources of fuel.

Our Nation's military should not be burdened with wasting its time studying fuel emissions when there is a simple fix, not restricting their fuel choices based on extreme environmental views, policies, and regulations

like section 526. In light of increasing competition with other countries for energy and fuel resources, and continued volatility and instability in the Middle East, it is more important than ever for our country to become more energy independent and to further develop and produce our domestic energy resources. Placing limits on Federal agencies', particularly the Defense Department, fuel choices is an unacceptable precedent to set in regard to America's energy policy and independence.

On July 9, 2008, the Pentagon, in a letter to Senator JAMES INHOFE stated: ''Such a decision would cause significant harm to the readiness of the Armed Forces because these fuels may be widely used and particularly important in certain geographic areas.''

In summary, not only have extreme environmental views and policies created and burdened American families and businesses, but they also cause ''significant harm in readiness to the Armed Forces.''

Mr. Chairman, section 526 makes our Nation more dependent on Middle Eastern oil. Stopping the impact of section 526 would help us promote American energy, improve the American economy, and create American jobs.

To everyone watching these proceedings today, I would say this: following my remarks, you will hear speakers from the other side of the aisle make several claims regarding the merits of section 526. When you hear these claims, please remember the following facts about section 526: it increases our reliance on Middle Eastern oil. It hurts our military readiness and our national security. It prevents the use of safe, clean, and efficient North American oil and gas. It increases the cost of American food and energy. It hurts American jobs and the American economy.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The Department of Defense alone is the largest single energy consumer in the world. Its leadership in this arena is critical to any credible approach to dealing with energy independence issues. Section 526 provides an opportunity for the Federal Government to play a substantial role in spurring the innovation needed to produce alternative fuels which will not further exacerbate global climate change.

This provision has spurred development of advanced biofuels. These fuels are being successfully tested and proven today on U.S. Navy jets at supersonic speeds. It's a testament to American ingenuity. Unfortunately, section 526 is under assault by those who disagree with advanced biofuels production. They'd like us to continue our dependence on the fuels of the past. That's the wrong path to take. It's unsustainable and won't lead to the energy security we need.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleague in asking to exempt the Department of Defense from section 526; 526 was added to the energy bill in a wrongheaded move to placate some notion that it would have some impact on global warming. It's wrong to require the Department of Defense in these times, where every single dollar is scarce and every single dollar should have a home, to require them to spend extra money beyond what they would normally spend for fuel for their planes.

This amendment would also allow the continued development of coal-to-liquid jet fuel, which would make this country much less dependent on foreign oil in terms of powering our jets and other engines. So 526, maybe it belongs in the Department of Energy bill, maybe it belongs somewhere else, but it does not belong in the Department of Defense spending bill because those dollars are scarce. They are going to get scarcer. And to require the Department of Defense to spend more money than they would have otherwise have spent on energy under this wrongheaded notion, in my view, is just simply bad policy.

So I rise in support of my colleague's amendment, and I urge the adoption of his amendment when it comes to a vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I support the gentleman's amendment, but I do want to understand one thing in terms of what it does to the military's options of purchasing domestic or even North American fuel. And the reason why I say that is, as I understand, the Department of Defense has three strategies in terms of energy, or using less energy. Number one is to increase the fight, decrease the fuel. Number three is increase the capacity. And then number two—and I am going in this order for a reason—is to increase the fuel options, the choices, to diversify the fuel sources. And it appears to me that 526 has inadvertently eliminated some of the options.

I would like to yield to my friend from Texas (Mr. FLORES) to explain that a little bit further, particularly with respect to domestic energy sources.

Mr. FLORES. Thank you for the chance to provide further weight to this amendment.

It's important to know that much of the oil that we import from the oil sands in Canada winds up being blended in several refined fuels throughout the United States. So if you took a literal reading of section 526, theoretically the military would not be able to use any of those fuels since the oil sands as a source is considered to be banned by section 526.

The oil from Canada from the oil sands is stable North American oil and gas. And it is in large part produced by Americans and creating American jobs. Section 526 would cut off this safe, friendly, stable source of fuel to this country. And my amendment does nothing to restrict the military from looking at all alternative sources of fuel. It allows them to go with biofuels, whatever alternative energy sources they need. It just takes away burdensome restrictions that are based on environmental views that aren't proven.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, what I am concerned about, with 84 million barrels of fuel produced every day, and America only having control of about 3 percent of that, yet consuming 25 percent, wherever we can use a friendly source of fuel is something that we need to keep open as an option.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1700

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for tax collection purposes by the Afghan Ministry of Finance.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the American taxpayer is spending $2 billion a week in Afghanistan. Among the expenditures are payment for projects that are rebuilding infrastructure in Afghanistan—roads, bridges, schools, in some cases hospitals.

The Washington Post recently reported that the Afghan Government is taxing American aid. We send the money there to build a road. We have to hire contractors in order to do that, and the Afghan Government is trying to tax that money for their own coffers.

So it's not enough that our taxpayers are spending billions of dollars on projects to rebuild their infrastructure. The Afghan Government is literally trying to reach into the pocket and

double dip and tax our taxpayers for our taxpayers' generosity in giving them money. Now, how does that make any sense at all?

Among the things that the Afghan officials are doing, after this was reported, is stepping up their efforts to grab that cash. They are doing things like threatening to detain contractors. If they don't pay up, take money that's assigned to build that road and put that money in the Afghan coffers, they, the Afghan officials, are threatening, Mr. Chairman, to detain our contractors. They are denying licenses to our contractors, again, in an effort to do what I could only call a shakedown.

Third, they are revoking visas for unpaid tax bills. We are spending a substantial amount of our money rebuilding their infrastructure. We should not be taxed, nor should we allow our taxpayers, essentially, to be stuck up by the Afghan officials.

This amendment, offered by my colleague from Washington, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, would end that practice.

So we believe this is overdue. There should be no tolerance for this double-dipping by the Afghan Government, and our amendment is an effort to crack down on that process.

I thank my colleague from Washington for joining me in the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI because it requires a new determination.

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

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination about the use of funds by a foreign government entity. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2, rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. We are working on making this amendment something that can be passed as a part of this bill, but I just want to speak in support of it and share part of the reason I am very honored to be working with the gentleman from Vermont on this.

Basically, we are in Afghanistan right now helping to rebuild, or in many cases build from scratch, infrastructure. And when we leave that country—and I do hope it will be soon—we will leave that infrastructure behind. Power grids, water systems, trained law enforcement are the building blocks of a functioning society.

We will spend or have spent hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars on improvements meant to better the lives of the people in Afghanistan.

The reason I supported this amendment is we don't need to also be paying taxes to the Afghan Government for the privilege of rebuilding that country, and that's why I cosponsored the amendment.

The Department of Defense funding should be focused on providing soldiers training in the field and on the front lines with the tools they need to protect themselves and defend our country. This amendment would uphold or, as it was offered, as we attempted, would uphold existing law and clarify existing agreements between the U.S. and Afghanistan, prohibiting Afghanistan from taxing U.S. subcontractors doing work in Afghanistan. So this ban on levying taxes would also apply to all subcontractors that may not have direct contracts with Afghanistan.

In other words, if a company is working on a project funded by the U.S. Department of Defense, whether that company is a prime contractor or a subcontractor, that company should not be subject to taxes from the Afghan Government.

It seems pretty simple. These are the contractors doing the work of rebuilding in Afghanistan, helping rebuild the infrastructure and hopefully allowing them to one day thrive independently.

So common sense and financial prudence says the U.S. should not be subject to taxation for the rebuilding efforts it is paying for. That was what we were getting at with this amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think that the point you have raised is a very valid point and something that is very good discussion matter.

Unfortunately, we believe that it is authorizing on an appropriation, as the Chair has confirmed, but that's probably the concern far more than the philosophical concern.

So I think that if you and the gentleman can work on some other language, make another run at it, I cannot speak for the real chairman of the committee, but I think that there are going to be a number of people who would have sympathies with you because I think you have raised a very valid point.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Very good. We will continue to work on this issue, and I thank you for hearing my point.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert 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.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, in April a draft executive order was circulated that would require all companies bidding on Federal contracts to disclose all Federal campaign contributions.

If enacted, this executive order would effectively politicize the Federal procurement process, in my opinion. Companies wouldn't merely be judged by the merits of their past performance, by the capability to do the job, but would also be obviously considered on the basis of who they gave money to or against.

This would clearly chill the constitutionally protected right to donate to political parties, candidates and causes of one's choice; and, I think, frankly, that's exactly what the executive order, proposed executive order, is intended to do.

My amendment would simply prohibit funds from this act being used to implement such an executive order.

It doesn't change existing Federal campaign contribution law in any way. It doesn't prevent the disclosure of campaign contributions. It simply says we won't spend money from this bill to require campaign contribution information to be submitted along with bids for Federal contracts.

This House has agreed to this concept on three previous occasions: once in the bill, once in an amendment to the Defense Authorization Act, and once in an amendment to the Defense Appropriations Act.

Finally, it's worth noting that Congress has rejected an effort to do exactly what this proposed executive order intends to do when it failed to pass the DISCLOSE Act in 2010.

Mr. Chairman, pay-to-play has no place in the Federal procurement contract, and we should try to keep politics out of the selection of vendors and businesses and contractors to go about doing Federal works. So I would urge the adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. Our system has been improved by having public disclosure of political contributions. The more the public knows about where the money is coming from, the better off the citizenry is.

The amendment is a legislative attempt to circumvent a draft executive order, which would provide for increased disclosure of the political contributions of government contractors, especially contributions given to third-party entities.

Opposition exists for this effort because some believe this additional information could be used nefariously to create some kind of enemies list, like during the Nixon administration.

□ 1710

They argue that companies should not disclose more information because people in power could misuse that information to retaliate against them. Using the opposition's logic, all campaign disclosures would be bad. Government contractors already disclose contributions and expenditures by their PACs and those who contribute to them. Contributions by the officers and directors of government contractors are also required to be disclosed.

These provisions are fine as they are written. The information is required to be provided already in law. And the executive order that the amendment would circumvent certainly enhances the quality of that information.

Disclosure is good because disclosure of campaign contributions to candidates is good. Disclosure of companies making these disclosures is good. And I just worry that we have a situation here where companies or major entities could make enormous contributions secretly, and that's what we are trying to avoid. And the President's executive order is an attempt to do that. We already know that the Boeings, the Lockheeds, the General Dynamics and the Northrop Grummans all make campaign contributions, and they are all disclosed. What's wrong with disclosure?

I urge a ''no'' on the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I accept the amendment because I believe that the things that Mr. DICKS is talking about in this amendment actually do move us in that direction.

I would like to yield to Mr. COLE and ask him to clarify that because I want it confirmed.

Mr. COLE. I would simply say to my good friend from Washington, who I respect frankly as much I do anybody in this Congress, the intent here is to make sure we never link political contributions with the awarding of government contracts. If we want to require additional disclosure, the Congress has it within its ability to do that, and indeed we considered something like this in 2010 and decided it was inappropriate. And that was a time when my friends on the other side of the aisle were in control of both Houses as well the Presidency.

So I understand the concerns, but I think this is an inappropriate way to address them. Number one, the executive order, frankly, is legislating through the back door. If we want to change the campaign contribution laws in the United States, that needs to be done here, not by executive fiat.

And, secondly, to link it with the contracting process is inevitably going to raise questions, create fears and doubt and I think without question chill political speech. So let's just simply keep contracting and the awarding of the contract by the Government of the United States separate from partisan political considerations and contributions. I think we would be better off.

I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I just listened with great curiosity to the comments that were made about the so-called intent of the legislation. I don't see my colleagues on the other side bringing forward legislation that you have the power to pass given the number of votes that you have for full disclosure.

So if you're opposed to a draft executive order, if you're opposed to my coming to the floor and blocking every time I offer an amendment for disclosure in transparency, change it. You were for it before you went against it, the Republicans were. That's what the record is. So I rise in opposition to Representative COLE's amendment which blocks disclosure of contractor political spending.

Now, this is not to create any kind of list. You can come up with all kinds of things about why you're against something and then try to label it. This is about disclosure. This is about sunshine. This is about disinfectant, and you're against it. I think that's a bad place to be. In fact, I think it's the wrong side of history.

The draft of the President's order would require disclosure requirements for contractors who do business with the Federal Government. Now, any business that does business with the Federal Government is paid with taxpayer dollars. Why shouldn't there be transparency, accountability, and disclosure relative to those dollars? This amendment, your amendment, would prohibit disclosure, which I think is the exact wrong thing to do.

We should oppose any amendment—we should oppose any amendment, Republican or Democrat—that's designed to keep the public less informed about what happens to their tax dollars. We know who supports this amendment. It's the American League of Lobbyists, the lobbyists for the lobbyists. Surprise, surprise.

They're trumpeting their opposition to the President's draft order. We should be fighting for the taxpayers, not for the uber-, superlobbyists. What are we here for? We are here for the public interest, for the people. And yet there is an amendment on the floor that would destroy any attempt at disclosure.

Again, I remember when the Republicans supported disclosure. When we wanted contribution limits, Republicans said, no, we need disclosure instead. Now that we are asking for disclosure, you're opposed to it. As I said, you were for it, now you're against it.

The American people were very clear on this late last year when there was a CBS/New York Times poll, and that poll found that 92 percent of Americans support requiring outside groups to disclose how much money they have raised, where it came from and how it was used.

Now we are going directly to taxpayer dollars, those that do business with the Federal Government. It's very simple to disclose. We should be listening to the American people, and I would ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

This is a bad amendment. It's not good for the country. It's not good for our system. I don't believe it's why the people sent us here. And of all things to be stomping on and trying to snuff out, disclosure should not be one of them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by $8,500,000,000, not to be derived from amounts of appropriations made available—

(1) by title I (''Military Personnel'');

(2) under the heading ''Defense Health Program'' in title VI (''Other Department of Defense Programs''); or

(3) by title IX (''Overseas Contingency Operations'').

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this is a dangerous amendment. It's kind of a test of whether or not Members of this body believe what they say. Fortunately, I think for all concerned, the oath we take at the beginning of the session does not carry over to specific statements. So the fact that I believe this will probably, unfortunately, show a great gap between what people say and what they vote will have no consequences other than the public knowing it.

We are at a time of austerity. We are at a time when the important programs, valid programs, are being cut back. And we were told by some, everything is on the table, there are no sacred cows, all those metaphors that are supposed to suggest that we will deal with everything. And then we get this appropriation from the Appropriations Committee for the military budget. At a time when we are cutting police officers on the streets of our cities, we are cutting back firefighters, we're cutting back maintenance of highways, of the construction of bridges to replace old bridges, when we are cutting in almost every capacity, the military budget gets a $17 billion increase for this fiscal year to the next.

A $17 billion increase for the military budget simply does not fit with this argument that we are putting everything on the table. Yes, they say they're putting everything on the table, but there is a little bit of a problem with the preposition here—not the proposition, the preposition.

□ 1720

The military budget is not on the table. The military is at the table, and it is eating everybody else's lunch. We are cutting area after area. For example, we have been told by some on the Republican side that we cannot afford to go to the aid of those of our fellow citizens who have been the victims of natural disasters who have suffered enormous physical and, therefore, also psychological damage from tornadoes and floods unless we find the cuts elsewhere. But if we were not increasing the military budget by $17 billion over this year, then there would be no need to do that and you would not have to worry about that aid.

Now, my colleagues, this is co-authored by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE). We are being very moderate here. We are not saying don't give the Pentagon any more money. This amendment reduces by 50 percent the increase for the Pentagon. We are accepting $8.5 billion more.

By the way, this, of course, does not affect the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. It just occurred to me, maybe this was said earlier, the budget for Afghanistan, which we refuse to cut, reluctantly, regrettably, was voted out by the committee before the President announced a 10,000 troop reduction. So we are overfunding Afghanistan unless you think the President was kidding when he said we are going to bring down 10,000 troops. We funded 10,000 troops for next year that won't be there in Afghanistan. And that is the problem.

We are saying to the Pentagon, You find it. Don't cut military personnel. Don't cut health, but perhaps some of the bases we maintain overseas, some of the subsidies we give to NATO. Lip service is paid here to an alliance in which they participate.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, I have to say it is true of the Obama administration and the members of the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, they are the enablers of one of the great welfare dependencies in the history of the world: the ability of wealthy European nations, 61 years after the foundation of NATO, to get subsidized by America so their military budgets can be a small percentage of ours as percentage of the GDP so they can provide more services, better rail, better health care, and earlier retirement for their own people.

This says to the Pentagon not that we are going to cut you. This gives them a greater than 1 percent increase at a time when everybody else is being cut. And it leaves it up to the Pentagon. Let's look at the bases that we have all over the world. Let's look at efficient procedures. Yes, there is inefficiency.

You cannot mandate efficiency from the outside when you simultaneously give the entity in question the ability to spend without limit. You will never get efficiency, Mr. Chairman, at the Pentagon if we don't begin to subject them to the same kind of fiscal discipline that everybody else gets. And it is undeniable that the Pentagon is a great exception here.

We are going to be telling American cities to continue to lay off cops, to continue to ignore important reconstruction projects that help with transportation. We are going to continue to cut back on firefighters. We are going to continue to quibble over financial disaster relief, but we will give the Pentagon, unless this amendment passes, an additional $17 billion that we cannot afford.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer a somewhat different perspective than my friend from Massachusetts does on the trend line of defense spending.

Looking at the long term, defense spending has actually, over time, come down pretty dramatically as a percent of our gross national product. In 1960, at the height of the Cold War, we spent about 9 percent of the GDP on defense. In 1980 in the great Reagan defense buildup, it was about 6 percent. It fell as low as 3.5 percent on the eve of 9/11. It is barely 5 percent, or in that range, today. So by historical standards, particularly since 1940, we do not spend a large percentage of the national wealth on defense.

By the way, the same thing is true of the Federal budget. In 1960, about 50 percent of the Federal budget was defense spending. It was about 33 percent in 1980. It is about 18 or 19 percent today. Certainly a lot of money, and that is certainly not the only way in which to judge military spending, but if looked at in terms of the size of the Federal budget or the wealth of the country, defense has been, comparatively speaking, a bargain compared to other parts of the budget.

I would also like to point out that, frankly, this Defense Subcommittee and the administration have worked to find additional economies. Secretary Gates made $78 billion in reductions over the next 5 years, and this budget itself is below what the President of the United States asked us to appropriate by $9 billion. In addition, the Secretary has laid out a path for an additional $400 billion worth of savings.

I think most Americans would be shocked to find out we are engaged in two or three wars, depending on how you want to count, with an Army that is almost 40 percent smaller than it was in 1982.

So I yield to no one in terms of trying to find savings in defense, but I think the record ought to be clear: As a percentage of our national wealth, as a percentage of the Federal budget, what we spend on defense has come down. And, frankly, we ought to remember that we are at war; we are in a dangerous situation. This is not the first place to cut, although cut we have. In my opinion, I think it is the last place that we ought to cut.

And the consequences of what my friend proposes, I think, would be terrific. We would be reducing and canceling training for returning troops, canceling Navy training exercises, reducing Air Force flight training, delaying or canceling maintenance of aircraft, ships, and vehicles, and delaying important safety and quality-of-life repairs.

This is not the time for us to embark on additional cuts on top of the restraints in spending that we have already done as a House. I would urge the rejection of my friend's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite numbers of words.

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

Mr. HOLT. I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

You know, all of Washington inside the Beltway is abuzz about how much we can save by cutting Federal spending. As the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) said, to us, this amendment is a test. Will we put every Federal agency's budget on the table in our quest to control spending and reduce debt, or are there privileged categories? Will we continue down the path of trying to balance the budget on the backs of the poor, the disabled, schoolchildren, and seniors?

The Pentagon spending bill before us, some $650 billion, nearly two-thirds of a trillion dollars, is about equal to all military spending of all the rest of the

world—all of our allies, all of our potential adversaries, and all of those countries that Americans rarely think about all put together.

The amendment that Mr. FRANK and I and some of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle are offering today is truly a modest proposal. It would simply cut the rate of increase in Pentagon spending. Instead of allowing a $17 billion increase over this year's level, it would cut that increase in half just to see if we are willing to do that.

Now, my colleague, Mr. COLE, puts this, I think, in the wrong context. I mean, we should talk about, sure, in 1960 it was a larger part of the budget. That is before we had Medicare, before we had a lot of programs. But when you ask yourself is our military structured to deal with the problems this country faces and to expect from other countries in the world their share of what must be done, the answer surely is this is an unsustainable size.

This amendment was born out of a series of discussions among Mr. FRANK and Mr. PAUL and Mr. JONES and some other Members and I have had over several months. Recently, we sent a joint letter that outlined our concerns about the state of our spending on national security. We point out not only the excessive, unquestioned overall size of military spending, but also that this is a result of the military that is indeed a remnant of the Cold War, to go back to Mr. COLE's comments. And it bears far more than our share of keeping the peace and is still structured to overwhelm the Soviet Union more than to deal with today's actual threats to our security.

To take one example that the cosponsors of this amendment may or may not agree with me on but we might ask: Why do we need a replacement for the B–2 bomber?

□ 1730

It was not the B–2 bomber or any bomber that killed Osama bin Laden. It was U.S. Special Operations. Buying new nuclear bombers would simply be a form, I think, of defense sector corporate welfare to protect against a threat that went away decades ago. I could cite multiple additional disconnects between our defense spending priorities and the actual threats we face.

One that comes to mind is Libya. As we note in our letter, it has been widely reported in the press that England and France have been pressing the United States to resume its earlier role in Libya because they've been unable to assume it themselves. The explanation is that only America has the capacity to respond.

Our point precisely.

We have allowed other nations in the world to grow into an overdependence on America's military and America's tax dollars and the expenditure of American money and lives far beyond what's appropriate for our share of world peacekeeping. All of us who support this amendment want to protect our country. That's precisely why we've offered our proposal and this amendment: To put ourselves on track for a better structured military.

Spending money on cold war-era weapons to wage undeclared wars of choice is clear evidence of misguided, needlessly expensive priorities. If the House cannot even pass an amendment that simply cuts the rate of increase in Pentagon spending, it will never pass amendments that actually make the kinds of cuts that are truly necessary to restructure our defense in order to meet the real threats we face and to achieve the budget savings that we must secure for our financial future.

I urge my colleagues to support this modest first step to rein in our out-of-control defense budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I rise in support of the Frank-Holt amendment.

This is a modest amendment. Quite frankly, I wish the cut were greater than the cut being proposed here, because I think everybody in this Chamber knows that there is a great deal of waste and abuse that exists within our military spending. We have no-bid defense contracts. We go right down that road of all the contracts that we've divvied out and how wasteful they've been, and we're still building and preserving weapons systems that are remnants of the cold war that even our Joint Chiefs of Staff don't want. So there is savings to be had within the military.

The other point I want to make is that, when we talk about national security and national strength, we ought to be talking about making sure that the people in this country can earn a decent living. National security should mean jobs. It should mean the strength of our infrastructure, the quality of our education system, which we are neglecting. My friends on the other side of the aisle want to balance the budget by cutting those very programs that, I think, provide our economic strength. When you go home to your districts, the first thing that people want to talk about is jobs. It is economic security.

Why aren't we doing more to create jobs? Why aren't we talking more about jobs here in the Capitol?

So I make those two points because I think this amendment is a modest amendment that moves us in the right direction and that moves this discussion in a better direction.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. First of all, what we are saying is they get an increase. So, if you vote against this amendment, apparently you believe that they are 101½ percent efficient at the current level, because you're giving them, we would say, a 101½ percent increase. You must believe it's a 103 percent increase, those who vote against this. People pay lip service where there are some inefficiencies, but you will not get at them unless there is some limit to the spending.

I particularly want to address the very odd notion that we should decide what we need to spend on the military today by using as a standard what the situation was 51 years ago. That's the problem. Fifty-one years ago, Germany was divided. The Communists controlled Czechoslovakia and Poland and Hungary and East Germany. Our Western allies were poor, and they were still recovering from 1945. The Soviet Union was very strong. That's precisely the problem. This budget out of the Appropriations Committee and from the administration, which is also incorrect on this, acts as if it were still 1960. The fact is that it is no longer appropriate for the rest of the world to expect us to put out so much of the burden. That's what the issue is.

The gentleman from Oklahoma said, oh, well, we'll have to cut this here and that there.

Why? Why don't we cut some of the money we spend in Europe, in Japan and in other wealthy and secure nations?

This amendment tells the Pentagon, You're only going to get half of the $17 billion increase on top of the $500 billion-plus you already get. You decide where to stop spending.

Well, are they able to stop spending overseas?

Foreign aid is very unpopular, I think unduly unpopular. I like to help poor children and to fight disease, but the biggest foreign aid program in the history of the world is the American military budget and its foreign aid for the un-needy, its foreign aid for the wealthy. You want to talk about percentages of the GDP that are in the budget. What about Germany? What about England? What about France? What about Italy? What about Denmark? What about the Netherlands? All are our great allies, and none spend as much as half a percentage as we do.

So what we now have here, apparently, the House is going to decide. When Members have said that the Pentagon should be subjected to fiscal discipline and that other needs will be taken into account and that the deficit is the greatest threat to national security—people have quoted Mike Mullen as saying that and Robert Gates as saying that—do the Members understand what it means? It means that you don't even cut the Pentagon, that you don't even level fund them, but you don't give them $17 billion additional. You give them $8.5 billion at a time when you are requiring cuts in very important programs.

I will reemphasize that this is a House which says we can't afford to go to the aid of our fellow citizens who have been devastated by disasters in

the southeastern part of the country and elsewhere unless we make offsetting cuts. Well, to the extent that you give the Pentagon an additional $17 billion, you exacerbate that dilemma, and you make it harder to find the funds necessary to go to the aid of the people in this area.

Yes, we want to keep the American people safe. I want to keep them safe from unsound bridges, from fires that can't be effectively combated, from food that isn't adequately tested, and from diseases. People are unsafe because we are cutting back on health research.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The notion that the only danger to the American people is a Soviet Union which collapsed 20 years ago or whatever it is we are protecting people from in Germany and other bases such as that ignores the need for better public safety here, better public health here, research on disease, protection against disaster. It's one thing to go to the aid of people after a disaster, but let's do a better job of building those structures that can help diminish it.

This is a central question: Are the Members of the House going to say, ''No, we didn't really mean it? No, the Pentagon is not subject to fiscal discipline''?

My friend from Oklahoma said, oh, no, there were cuts; there's $78 billion in cuts coming over the next 5 years. This is a $17 billion increase. How can that be a cut? It may be a cut from a $30 billion increase, and that $30 billion increase is a cut from a $200 billion increase, but it ain't a cut. It's a $17 billion increase, and we say let it only be an $8.5 billion increase.

So the question is not are we going to treat the Pentagon more generously with less discipline than any other entity. We've conceded that. We're only asking that you cut in half the extent to which you are going to tell American cities to lay off cops, that you're going to say that we don't have enough to provide disaster relief without making cuts elsewhere, that you're going to cut health research, that you're going to cut food inspection, that you're going to cut fire service, that you're going to cut the reconstruction of bridges in America.

Tens and tens of billions will be spent in Western Europe and on our allies that needed our help 61 years ago and 51 years ago but who don't need it today—in Japan and in other parts of the world where we're subsidizing their military budgets so they can spend more elsewhere.

By the way, let me close with this: We talk about competition and things that count—our ability to spend money on community colleges, to provide aid so that people can become scientists and engineers, our ability to develop technology. All of those things are hampered by the drain on resources we get from spending military dollars in precisely those countries with which we are competing. England and Germany and France and the Netherlands and Denmark and Japan can all spend more on their education and on their technology—on those areas where we are competitive in a friendly way because we allow them to keep their military budgets to a much lower percentage of GDP than ours, and that is the relevant measure.

□ 1740

So we again have a test: Are Members so caught up in the history—and again, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for helping make the point; 1960 is his reference point. Well, stay with the concerns of 1960 and use that as a reference point and things are not going to look very good in 2011.

I thank my colleague from Indiana for yielding.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I'm having a hard time believing what I'm hearing in this Chamber when it comes to national defense. You don't get a bookkeeper or an accountant to make some sleight-of-hand number to come up with a defense number. That's not how you do it. The way you do it is decide what is the threat; what is threatening America, what is threatening our allies overseas, what is threatening our troops or our businesses around the world? Decide what that threat is, and then decide how we're going to meet that threat. That's how you come up with a defense number.

Just imagine we are going back to the good old days of just slashing defense, gutting the victory fund, and the hangars were full of hangar queens—hangar queens being airplanes that can't fly because they don't have engines or they don't have parts. And in order to make one airplane fly, they had to cannibalize two or three others to get enough parts to make one airplane fly. Well, if you need three or four airplanes in the air but only one flies, somebody is in trouble. We don't want to go back to the days of a hangar queen, the ''hollow force'' so-called.

And what about the troops out in combat facing a vicious enemy, and they get to the point where they haven't really experienced what they are about to experience because we didn't get that far in our training because the training was curtailed? When you start cutting back the money, you start cutting back the training, you start cutting back the flying hours, you start cutting back the ability of that soldier to reach out and say, hey, I know exactly how to do this because I was trained properly. Don't cut the training, don't do it. Don't cut our readiness by cutting training. Don't cut our readiness by having hangars full of hangar queens that can't fly or by having garages full of vehicles that can't run because of a lack of spare parts.

This is just not good defense. You don't make your defense decisions based on some magical scheme or some solution that an accountant might come up with. You had better be very careful about what the threat is. We don't want any more Pearl Harbors; we don't want any more U.S. World Trades on 9/11; we don't want any more attacks on the Pentagon. We were not well enough prepared there with our intelligence. We need to make sure that we invest enough in intelligence to make sure that we stop those things before they happen.

Defense is not something to play games with. Defense is not something to stand up and say, hey, I'm a cost-cutter. All of us are cost-cutters in our own way; some of us just have different priorities for what costs ought to be cut.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important amendment. This subcommittee did a very good job in reducing and saving over $9 billion on this bill alone. This is a terrible amendment. I hope that we overwhelmingly defeat this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. II. None of the funds made available by this Act for international military education and training, foreign military financing, excess defense articles, assistance under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law (109–163; 119 Stat. 3456), issuance for direct commercial sales of military equipment, or peacekeeping operations for the countries of Chad, Yemen, Somalia, Sudan, Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Burma may be used to support any military training or operations that include child soldiers, as defined by the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of

2008, and except if such assistance is otherwise permitted under section 404 of the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–457; 22 U.S.C. 2370c–1).

Mr. FORTENBERRY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, in 2008, this body declared that the United States would not provide military assistance to countries found guilty of using child soldiers. With broad bipartisan support, we declared that this is an affront to human dignity and an affront to civilization itself, and we reaffirmed this policy earlier this year in the continuing resolution.

It is the policy of our Nation that children—all children, no matter where they are—belong on playgrounds and not battlegrounds, Mr. Chairman. But that policy is at risk, and this body has an important decision to make. Six governments were found guilty of using child soldiers in 2010—Burma, Chad, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Somalia, Sudan, and Yemen. As the law we passed provided, four were granted national security interest waivers last year in the hopes, Mr. Chairman, that they would take serious and aggressive strides toward ending this serious human rights violation. Somalia was also permitted to continue receiving peacekeeping assistance, effectively sanctioning only Burma, a country to which we provided no military assistance anyway.

Mr. Chairman, this administration has been heavily criticized for this decision. And it is no surprise that in the newly released 2011 child soldiers report, the same six countries were listed as violators once again. Mr. Chairman, we must ask, where is the progress? The 2011 report needs to stand as a challenge to President Obama, the administration, and this Congress as well. We are operating inconsistently, obligated by law and civilized order itself to combat this most serious human rights violation—especially prevalent in the world's ungoverned spaces—but we continue with military assistance, with inattentiveness to stopping the pernicious use of child soldiers.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment reaffirms current U.S. policy, lest we forget it. In the 2011 continuing resolution, we extended the Child Soldiers Prevention Act to cover peacekeeping operations, and my amendment is consistent with this. It also clarifies a point of law not mentioned in the Child Soldiers Prevention Act. Section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006 provides the Department of Defense the authority to train and equip foreign military forces. But according to its own terms and the State Department, section 1206 authorities may not be used to provide any type of equipment, supplies, or training that is otherwise prohibited by any other provision of law.

Mr. Chairman, children in these countries are being preyed upon, innocent lives are being lost, children are being thrown into psychological hell. Girl soldiers and some boys are being subjected to grotesque sexual slavery and violence. They are property. Their lives are not their own. They are battered, beaten, victimized, stripped of dignity, hope, and a future, made to do unfathomable things by the world's worst criminals.

Mr. Chairman, these criminals just aren't faceless rebels in the bush either. While there are plenty of those, we are talking now about governments that are guilty of this pernicious practice. And we need to make it clear: Are we going to tolerate this or not? William Wilberforce, the British statesman and unyielding abolitionist for whom our anti-human trafficking law is named, once said this: ''You may choose to look the other way, but you can never again say that you did not know.''

□ 1750

We must make it clear to these governments that we do now know and that we cannot look the other way, Mr. Chairman. With that, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to express support for this good amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. RIGELL of Virginia.

Amendment No. 61 by Ms. FOXX of North Carolina.

An amendment by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. SHERMAN of California.

An amendment by Mr. ROHRABACHER of California.

An amendment by Mr. GOHMERT of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 79 by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 249, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 515]

AYES—176

Adams
Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Baldwin
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Boustany
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Capito
Capuano
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cole
Conyers
Costello
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Guinta
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinchey
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kingston
Kucinich
Labrador
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Waters
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)

NOES—249

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)

Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neal
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schwartz
Scott, David
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Culberson
Giffords
Hinojosa
Payne
Schrader
Towns

□ 1818

Mrs. BONO MACK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Messrs. CRAVAACK, NEAL, AL GREEN of Texas, TIERNEY, CROWLEY, and BARLETTA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. MOORE, and Messrs. GARRETT of New Jersey, GONZALEZ, SHERMAN, GRIJALVA, HARRIS, GRAVES of Missouri, CONYERS, MILLER of Florida, SULLIVAN, and BILIRAKIS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 515, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MACK). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 175, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 516]

AYES—248

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

NOES—175

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

NOT VOTING—8

Cantor
Cardoza
Culberson
Gibbs
Giffords
Payne
Sullivan
Towns

□ 1822

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 135, noes 290, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 517]

AYES—135

Amash
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Buerkle
Burgess
Campbell
Capuano
Cardoza
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Coble
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
DeFazio
DeGette
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emerson
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garrett
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinchey
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Keating
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Landry
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Paul
Perlmutter
Peters
Pitts
Polis
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Slaughter
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walsh (IL)
Welch
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yoder

NOES—290

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Cicilline
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herger
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Conyers
Culberson
Giffords
Issa
Payne
Towns

□ 1827

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 316, noes 111, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 518]

AYES—316

Adams
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kingston
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunnelee
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard

Royce
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schilling
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—111

Ackerman
Aderholt
Altmire
Baca
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boren
Canseco
Cantor
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Chandler
Clyburn
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Engel
Eshoo
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Gohmert
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Herger
Higgins
Hochul
Hoyer
Israel
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Lamborn
Lance
Levin
Long
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Olver
Owens
Perlmutter
Peterson
Polis
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Reyes
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ruppersberger
Schiff
Schock
Scott, David
Shuler
Sires
Stivers
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Van Hollen
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Yoder

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson
Giffords
Payne
Towns

□ 1832

Mr. SMITH of Texas changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 89, noes 338, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 519]

AYES—89

Adams
Amash
Baldwin
Barletta
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Black
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Campbell
Cardoza
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cohen
Conyers
DeFazio
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emerson
Farenthold
Filner
Fincher
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grijalva
Guinta
Harris
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hochul
Honda
Hultgren
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Jordan
Keating
Kucinich
Landry
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
McClintock
Michaud
Mulvaney
Napolitano
Nugent
Pallone
Paul
Pearce
Petri
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Renacci
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Schilling
Schrader
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Simpson
Southerland
Stark
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Walsh (IL)
West
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

NOES—338

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson
Giffords
Payne
Towns

□ 1836

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOHMERT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 162, noes 265, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 520]

AYES—162

Adams
Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Boustany
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cole
Conyers
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Honda
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Jordan
Kingston
Kucinich
Labrador
Landry
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Noem
Nugent
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woodall
Woolsey
Young (AK)

NOES—265

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neal
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson
Giffords
Payne
Towns

□ 1840

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 257, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 521]

AYES—169

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Buerkle
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—257

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin

Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—5

Culberson
Giffords
Jackson Lee (TX)
Payne
Towns

□ 1843

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 256, noes 170, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 522]

AYES—256

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

NOES—170

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

NOT VOTING—5

Culberson
Giffords
Jackson Lee (TX)
Payne
Towns

□ 1847

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 244, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 523]

AYES—181

Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Goodlatte
Graves (GA)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono

Holt
Honda
Huizenga (MI)
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pelosi
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (IL)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder

NOES—244

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chandler
Cicilline
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Culberson
Giffords
Jackson Lee (TX)
Payne
Tiberi
Towns

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1851

Mr. CARSON of Indiana changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 523, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1309, FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 2011

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–138) on the resolution (H. Res. 340) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1309) to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risk, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

REAFFIRMING COMMITMENT TO NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT OF ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 268) reaffirming the United States commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 6, answered ''present'' 13, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

YEAS—407

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
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
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
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)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda

Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
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 (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—6

Amash
Blumenauer
Jones
Kucinich
Paul
Rahall

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—13

Carson (IN)
Edwards
Ellison
Johnson, E. B.
Lee (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
Moore
Moran
Pingree (ME)
Stark
Waters
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—5

Culberson
Giffords
Jackson Lee (TX)
Payne
Towns

□ 1910

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''present.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2417

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2417.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 320 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2219.

□ 1910

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. MACK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the bill had been read through page 161, line 12.

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

The ACTING Chair. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I rise to engage in a colloquy with my colleagues to ensure that our defense community has the resources necessary to carry out an important security mandate that this body passed this year.

Mr. Chairman, the Lord's Resistance Army has terrorized central Africa for 25 years. But last year, Congress and the administration took unprecedented steps to end the group's campaign of violence. This body passed broadly supported bipartisan legislation called the Lord's Resistance Army Disarmament and Northern Uganda Recovery Act requiring the administration to prepare and present to Congress a comprehensive strategy to bring LRA commanders to justice.

Mr. Chairman, with the administration's strategy released in November, we should move to implement an international strategy to help end the atrocities committed by the LRA, protect innocent civilians, and stabilize a region of Africa that is critical to the United States' national security interests.

Through over 20 years of civil war, this brutal insurgency has created a humanitarian crisis that has displaced over 1½ million people and resulted in the abduction of over 20,000 children in one of the world's most difficult ungoverned spaces.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who is continuing to take a lead role in this international effort, which I appreciate.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his support of this international imperative.

The LRA has terrorized civilians and abducted tens of thousands of children, many of whom have been forced into child soldiering or sex slavery. Its influence spans the border area of south Sudan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and the Central African Republic. It is the deadliest rebel group in Congo and has displaced hundreds of thousands of people across central Africa, including in south Sudan, where U.S. investments in peace and stability are critical as the region establishes independence this Saturday.

Mr. Chairman, we could have a decisive impact on seeing one of Africa's most longstanding human rights crises finally brought to an end by implementing the administration's plan.

I yield back to the gentleman from Nebraska in the hopes that we implement this strategy.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his leadership again.

My colleagues and I believe that resources invested in ending this conflict now will not only save innocent lives but will also help reduce the need for very expensive humanitarian aid and promote stability in one of Africa's most volatile regions.

With that said, I would like to yield to our chairman, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank the gentlemen, both, for their attention to this important issue. And I want to continue to work with them as we move this bill forward in the hopes that we can bring a swift end and successful end to this tragedy.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

Mr. DEFAZIO. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enforce section 376 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163).

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. My colleagues, in 1990 Congress passed a law that required

that all Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, must have auditable financial statements every year. Since that time, the Department of Defense has spent $10 trillion—$10,000 billion—and yet no audit has been conducted. In fact, there are numerous problems with accounting at DOD, and their financial management has been rated as ''high risk'' by the Government Accountability Office.

Unfortunately, the Pentagon, being incapable of being audited, sought an exemption from audits.

So in 2005, Congress passed a ban on completing an audit. It was contained in section 376 of the 2006 National Defense Authorization Act.

In 2009, Congress got tough and they said, ''Look, we've exempted you from audits. But let's have a goal—not a mandate—a goal of you doing an audit by 2017. Yet last September in a hearing Pentagon officials stated that meeting a deadline of 2017 for having their first ever audit of their books, and they will spend $4 trillion between now and 2017 without an audit, they said they would need more money, more money to be auditable. That's chutzpah. That's incredible.

So what we're attempting to do here tonight is to say that we're going to suspend the exemption. The DOD, it's time for them to get their books in order. There is nothing more important for our men and women in uniform than to know that every dollar, every precious tax dollar is being spent properly to give them the tools they need to defend our Nation. And the taxpayers of this country, concerned about our massive deficit and the concerns that are being expressed here in these deficit and debt talks downtown, the taxpayers need to know that we're not wasting money in the single largest annual account of the Federal budget which is not audited, the expenditures of the Pentagon.

In fiscal year 2010, half of DOD's contract awards were not competed. That's half. In 140 billion of them, there was no competition at all, and in 48 billion, there was one, one competitor. So we have a lot of work to do here.

In 2000, the Pentagon Inspector General found that of $7.6 trillion in accounting errors of entries, $2.3 trillion ''were not supported by adequate audit trails or sufficient evidence to determine their validity.'' We don't know where that $2.3 trillion went. Now, come on.

It's time to stop treating them with kid gloves. The Pentagon's a tough institution, the toughest Department of Defense in the world. And it's time for them to own up here and audit their books and trace every dollar. It's a new era. So I urge my colleagues to support this by defunding this special exemption. Then the Pentagon will be subject to audit over the next year, which could provide tremendous benefits to our men and women in uniform and certainly tremendous savings for the American taxpayers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I'm just not sure how this amendment accomplishes what the gentleman says since it prohibits enforcement of a section of a fiscal year 2006 bill, which only applied to that fiscal year. So I'm not opposed to the amendment; I just don't believe it does anything.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARRETT. I rise today in support of this amendment and one which I have also cosponsored with the gentleman.

This amendment, quite honestly, is common sense, in that it simply looks to add accountability in how the Pentagon spends our taxpayers' dollars. Now, the GAO released an independent audit that they performed in March that concluded that the cost of the Pentagon's largest programs has risen by $135 billion—that's over 9 percent—to $1.68 trillion by 2008. And as was pointed out, over half of that, or $70 billion of that, involves overruns. And what they say in their report appeared ''to be indicative of production problems and inefficiencies or flawed initial cost estimates.''

Since then, we have not had a complete audit by the Pentagon, and since then, overruns have only multiplied.

Just this past week, earlier in the week, I had the opportunity to serve in the Budget Committee, where we had the CBO come in. And we asked them point blank for some of the information that we would like to have with regard to these audits, that we would like the information from them so they could pinpoint some of the, as we always say on the floor, the waste, fraud, and abuse that goes on. But more specifically, where the inefficiencies are. And the answer we got from them was somewhat telling. They said they cannot supply this Congress with the information that we would like because they do not get the information themselves from the DOD. And that is the problem.

□ 1920

That is the problem. The Department of Defense is consistently overbudget in acquisition and equipment modernization. There are 92 major defense acquisition programs. Seventy-five percent of them are overbudget. Twenty percent of them are overbudget by more than 50 percent.

Mr. Chairman, this is something that needs to be addressed. This amendment will once again hold the Pentagon accountable, assuring that the taxpayer dollars are spent prudently, as intended. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I would like, at this time, to ask the chairman to participate in a colloquy with me.

I rise today to express my concern about our strategic ports. First, I want to thank the chairman for discussing this important issue with me. I think the chairman would agree that understanding and addressing vital infrastructure needs at our strategic seaports is of major importance.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would tell him that I do agree that assessing and correcting infrastructure problems at the Nation's strategic seaports, which are an integral part of our national defense readiness, is of vital importance.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Since 1958, the strategic seaport program has facilitated the movement of military forces securely through U.S. ports. Each strategic seaport has individual capabilities that provide the Department of Defense with the port facilities and services that are critical in maintaining the operational flexibility and redundancy needed to meet a wide range of national security missions and time lines. However, the existing infrastructure at many of the strategic ports may no longer be adequate to meet the needs of our military. I think the time has come to address these needs in both our authorization and appropriations process. That is why I worked with Chairman MCKEON to include language in the defense authorization bill that will require a study of the infrastructure needs of these strategic ports. Once that study has been conducted, I believe it is of vital importance that this committee provide the necessary funding to address the needs of these ports.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I also believe these ports to be critical to our defense, and I will be happy to work with the gentleman from Alaska to consider the appropriate measures and funding to address the infrastructure needs of our strategic seaports.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I want to thank the chairman for discussing this issue with me. I would just like to say to the chairman, I appreciate the fact that you recognize the importance of ports to move our products. I know that the ranking member does, also. I again thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BECERRA. I rise to engage in a colloquy with the chairman and ranking member on recruitment and outreach at the military service academies.

Mr. Chairman, some areas in the U.S. have been harder for the military academies to reach for recruitment purposes than others. To ease this problem, the Congress should work to ensure that the military academies have the ability to reach out to men and women from underrepresented rural and urban areas.

Past outreach efforts have been effective at the military academies. For example, in the U.S. Naval Academy's increased outreach efforts, we have seen results that show that some 19,145 applicants have come out for the class of 2015, an increase of 25 percent over the past 2 years. The Navy has been able to conduct recruitment blitzes in parts of the country that were traditionally underrepresented. In my home State of California, the Navy increased their applicants by 25 percent, from some 2,400 for the class of 2013 to over 3,000 for the class of 2015.

I believe it is important for the academies to have the resources to continue building upon this success. This critical investment would help America find the best and the brightest for our military and for America's future.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECERRA. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I agree with the gentleman that it is important that the military academies bring in the best young people from across the country, and the committee will work with him toward this objective.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the chairman.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECERRA. I yield to the ranking member.

Mr. DICKS. I agree with the chairman and stand ready to work with the gentleman—and I commend him for the work that he's been doing over the years—to reach out to all regions of the country to bring the best and brightest into the military academies.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the ranking member and the chairman, and I look forward to working with them.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk, designated as No. 1.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' is hereby reduced by $250,000,000.

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

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair.

This amendment would reduce the operations and maintenance defense-wide account by $250 million, the same amount appropriated by section 8122 of the bill. Section 8122 appropriates another $250 million in FY12 for the Secretary of Defense to use for the Office of Economic Adjustment, or to transfer to the Secretary of Education to make grants to public schools located on military bases for construction, renovation and repairs.

I will just summarize what's happening here. We have some schools that are on military bases. Now, some of the schools on military bases are run by the Department of Defense. That's not what we're speaking about here. The schools that we're talking about here, LEAs, Local Education Agencies, run them. In the FY11 budget, we appropriated $250 million of defense money—this is in the Defense bill—to go to schools that are the responsibility of Local Education Agencies.

Now, some of these schools are in disrepair. They're in bad shape. Nobody's questioning that. Education budgets are tight everywhere around the country. Ask your own States. Ask your local school districts. But we cannot continue to divert money from the Department of Defense simply because that's where money is and few people question it. I'm sure the gentleman will stand up here and say, hey, these schools are in bad shape; they're on military bases; we've got to fix them, and the Local Education Agencies have said these schools are in disrepair. But why are we taking money that should be going to the military, to the troops, to other purposes, and diverting it to local education or local schools that are the responsibility of Local Education Agencies?

I have here one of the contracts for one of these schools that is being discussed here. It says: The permittee or his designee shall, at his own cost and expense, protect, preserve, maintain, repair and keep in good order and condition these schools.

This is a Local Education Agency, not the Department of Defense. That shouldn't be the responsibility of the Department of Defense, and we're bleeding off $250 million.

I'm sure the gentleman will stand up and say this is needed, this isn't going to be a continual thing, we've just got to bring these schools up to repair. They'll say that the Department of Defense has said that these schools are in disrepair. They are. Nobody is questioning that. The question is: Where should this money come from? And if we have this kind of money to throw around for defense, then we ought to be cutting more defense funding.

This funding, if there's a problem, it should go through the Local Education Agencies, or convince the Federal Department of Education through Impact Aid to send money to these schools, but not the Department of Defense. That has been the practice, unfortunately, around here for quite a while now.

We say, all right, what account can we take money from, for earmarks or whatever else, that few people will question? It's defense spending. We take that off for education or research or whatever else, and pretty soon we're diverting a lot of money that should go to the troops to other purposes.

□ 1930

Like I said, nobody's questioning that these schools are in bad repair. Newsweek ran an article on June 27 that said 39 percent of the schools run by the public systems on Army installations fell in the failing or poor category. I don't question that. Nobody does. What's at question here is another $250 million.

As I said, we appropriated in the FY11 budget $250 million. So apparently this is going to become a standard practice now? And then you start to get the prospect of Members of Congress starting to submit their local bases, saying, hey, the schools there are bad, and we get into the old earmarking game by letter, or phone marking, or whatever else, because it will be the spoils system all over again as to who gets the defense money to actually fix these schools. So this would simply say this money, $250 million that has been requested for this purpose, shall not be spent.

The gentleman may stand up and say, hey, this is generally taken from the Department of Defense, or from the operations and maintenance, and so that's not specific enough. Believe me, the Secretary of Defense, if they have the choice to fund the troops or the schools, will fund the troops because the schools are under the responsibility of the local education agency. The Department of Defense may submit a list and say these schools are in disrepair, but it's not the responsibility of the Department of Defense to fund these schools.

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The gentleman was quite good at making the cases against this amendment, but I will have to reiterate some of the things. First of all, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. The bill provides an additional $250 million to improve or replace inadequate schools located on Department of Defense bases that are operated by Local Education Authorities and the Department of Education. Most of these are run by the local authorities.

The Army has identified 80 Local Education Authority-operated schools

within the continental United States that are inadequate because of poor conditions or a lack of capacity to accommodate the number of students enrolled. Initial funding in the fiscal year 2011 bill will address approximately 13 of these schools.

Nearly 42,000 school-aged dependents of U.S. service personnel are enrolled in schools on DOD bases that are owned and operated by either LEAs or the U.S. Department of Education. The recommendation is based on former Defense Secretary Robert Gates's remarks to military spouses at a May 8, 2010, town hall meeting at Fort Riley, Kansas. The Secretary then called me as chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee last year and said, Norm, we've got to do something about these schools. We have these young men and women serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the last thing we need to do is have them worried about their children because some of these schools, if there was a hurricane, if there was an earthquake, if there was a lahar from Mount Rainier, these schools could go down.

I have walked out there and seen these schools at Joint Base Lewis-McChord. And one of the conditions, if you are going to get money here, is that you must take over the school. The local school districts are going to have to take them over from this point forward. So we will get out of the responsibility, but we have to bring these schools up to code and standards and rebuild most of them. This list was developed by the Army, and then the Navy and Air Force and Marine Corps also were involved.

The former Secretary indicated that his plan to improve schools requires congressional approval. Caring for the dependents of U.S. service personnel is a vital contributor to military quality of life and represents a prudent investment in our Nation's future. I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

Let me also say in the military construction bill there was $463 million for schools that are owned by the Department of Defense. Many of these schools are overseas, in other countries; and yet we are putting $463 million into those schools. At the same time, the gentleman from Arizona wants to deny the young people of our country schools that they could go into. There is one in Arizona. The gentleman is running for the other body. I think he would be concerned about the school in Arizona that may not get funded if this amendment passes. And I hope the people of Arizona remember it, because the people of Washington State will certainly remember it. This is a bad amendment. We should defeat it.

Mr. FLAKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I will not yield.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to oppose the amendment and associate my remarks with those of the ranking member. We are talking about the dependents of the U.S. military. And when you visit military bases, some of these schools are deplorable. When we make a commitment to a young person in the military, and they are married and they have children, they ought to be able to go to schools on their military base that are of high standards.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman if he wishes.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should mention the gentleman from Washington mentioned that the Secretary of Defense said we have got to do something about these schools. I should note that this was not in the Defense request. If he thought something ought to be done, you would think that they would have put it in their request. They didn't. It wasn't in the authorization bill. There is a Department of Education program, a competitive program for this already. If we think that it should have more money, then it should.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. They don't have any money. The Department of Education can't fund this because the new majority is taking a lot of the money out of the Department of Education that they would use for this purpose, and they don't have the money. That's why the Secretary called us and said—and this is Fort Riley, Kansas, one of your side, a school in the district of a Republican Member—and he said we've got to do something.

We didn't say we will do this on a partisan basis. We said, hey, these men and women in these Stryker brigades are over in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the last thing we need to do is have them be worried about their children in these schools that could go down if we had an earthquake. And we have had all these natural disasters all over this country. And I just say to the gentleman this is the most ridiculous amendment I have heard of yet. And he has had some lulus. And I just hope we can defeat this amendment so the people of this country will know we care about our kids serving in the military and their families.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk, designated as No. 2.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. The amount otherwise provided by title IX for ''Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund'' is hereby reduced by $3,577,192,676.

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

Mr. FLAKE. This amendment is straightforward. It will simply reduce the amount appropriated to the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund by roughly $3.5 billion. We often hear in this body the Constitution grants the Congress the power of the purse, that the President's budget is not sacrosanct, and that Members should be able to guide Federal spending. I agree with that.

So I was quite surprised that the committee included in this bill an appropriation of $5 billion to the Overseas Contingency Operation Transfer Fund, but provided virtually no guidance on how it should be spent beyond requiring that any obligations be, quote, pursuant to the global war on terrorism. That's roughly 4 percent of the overall cost of the war spending portion of this bill.

I understand the funding could provide the Department of Defense with a little more flexibility as it moves ahead with operations in Afghanistan, while simultaneously withdrawing troops from Afghanistan and Iraq. I am sympathetic to the need to properly fund the war in a way that requires us to budget for it.

□ 1940

But this $5 billion with very few strings attached could also be used for just about anything, including, as a bargaining chip, for negotiations with the Senate, according to the CQ Today article, which ran on June 14.

I would submit that it's an expensive bargaining chip, and it's a very risky gamble, in my view. The President recently announced his intent to withdraw 10,000 U.S. troops from Afghanistan, which I think he will make the case for in the months ahead. And the Department of Defense has some flexibility as we move ahead in the months ahead.

So I think it's fair to reduce the amount appropriated in this fund to roughly $1.5 billion. That amounts to 1 percent of the war-related costs of the bill instead of 4 percent. Oversees Contingency Operations Transfer Funds have been requested in the past by the Department of Defense. I understand that. I think we all understand that, to give the Department of Defense some flexibility.

What I am saying here is, $5 billion is a little too much flexibility here. Let's

regain our prerogative here to direct this money, to have the power of the purse and simply not allow that amount, $5 billion. That would simply reduce it to $1.5 billion.

According to CQ Today, the Army requested about $2 billion for transportation expenses in Afghanistan. The House panel said that funding need was overstated because the Army was assuming all supplies are flown into that country, when only about 20 percent arrive by air.

I commend the committee for carefully drilling down on the requests submitted by the services and identifying places where funding is unjustified and unneeded. However, instead of pulling back all the money in what could become a slush fund, we should do better. We should take steps to simply make sure that money that doesn't have to be spent is not spent.

That's what this amendment does. I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the gentleman from Arizona's amendment, which would cut $3.6 billion from the Overseas Contingencies Operations budget.

The committee believes that the Army's fiscal year 2012 operation and maintenance requests for Overseas Contingencies Operations may be overstated due to unrealistic planning assumptions. However, due to the great deal of uncertainty of the justification for the Army's O&M budget request, the committee added an appropriations account, the Overseas Contingencies Operations Transfer Fund Account, and shifted $5 billion of funding from the Army into this account.

This account gives the Secretary of Defense flexibility to reprogram these funds for unforeseen requirements which emerged during 2012. For example, if redeployment from Afghanistan were to be accelerated—and some would suggest it should be—there will be a very significant increase in personnel and equipment transportation costs in fiscal year 2012.

Examples of requirements, which emerged during the year of budget execution in prior years, include funding for the MRAP vehicles, the mine resistant ambush protected vehicles, additional body armor that was needed, and other force protection things, joint, what we call joint urgent operational needs. And, of course, there are always spikes in fuel costs.

So for these and many other reasons, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment and urge others to do so as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for—

(1) deploying members of the Armed Forces on to the ground of Libya for the purposes of engaging in military operations unless the purpose of such deployment is limited solely to rescuing members of the United States Armed Forces;

(2) awarding a contract to a private security contractor to conduct any activity on the ground of Libya; or

(3) otherwise establishing or maintaining any presence of members of the Armed Forces or private security contractors on the ground of Libya unless the purpose of such deployment is limited solely to rescuing members of the United States Armed Forces.

Mr. CONYERS (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise with the assistance of my good friends, TOM MCCLINTOCK of California, LYNN WOOLSEY of California, and BARBARA LEE of California.

It is my Libyan amendment, again, which would prevent funds appropriated in this act from being used to deploy any type of ground troop presence for the purpose of pursuing military operations on Libyan territory.

This amendment would simply codify the policy endorsed by President Obama and the international community and thereby ensure that our involvement in Libya remains limited in scope.

An identical amendment passed this House on May 26 by a vote of 416–5 as part of the National Defense Authorization Act.

It's also the intent of this amendment, as it was in my earlier amendment, that funds would be allowed to be used to rescue members of the Armed Forces participating in the NATO no-fly zone operation.

The American people, obviously many of them, have grown weary of the open-ended military conflicts that place our troops in harm's way and add billions to our national debt. We simply cannot afford another Afghanistan or Iraq.

And so the time has come for Congress to once again exercise its constitutional authority to place boundaries on the use of our military forces overseas and clearly state that this conflict in Libya will not escalate into an expensive occupation that would strain our resources and harm our national security interests.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We would like to commend you for your amendment, and we would be willing to accept it.

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you, sir. I appreciate that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I move to strike the last word, Mr. Chairman.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my good friend from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) which I am very proud to be a cosponsor.

The war in Libya, which was not authored by this body or our Senate colleagues, has lingered for more than 100 days.

Mr. Chairman, despite the legal contortions coming from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, the dropping of bombs, the killing of civilians, and the use of drones in Libya most definitely constitutes hostilities. And it's our responsibility in the Congress to make sure that these hostilities do not escalate into a full-blown ground war with boots on the ground and the United States becoming an occupying force in Libya.

The President has assured us that this won't happen, and I believe that a ground war is not his intention. But it wouldn't be the first time, Mr. Chairman, in the history of the United States' warfare that there was a shift in military, with the military campaign beginning as one thing and ending up as quite another. So it's critical that we assert ourselves using the congressional authority to appropriate funds to say ''no'' to launching a third ground war.

Our authority rests on how we use the people's money. Today's amendment denies the use of our tax dollars to send troops into Libya.

The war in Libya is a war of choice, except it's one that Americans didn't choose. It's not one that their elected representatives here in the people's House and Senate chose either.

We must ensure it does not go any further. We must listen to our people—the people who sent us here, the people we work for—who are insisting that we set limits. They know that we can't afford another Libya becoming another Iraq or Afghanistan.

Are these the values that we celebrated over this patriotic holiday weekend? Permanent warfare that leads to mayhem, despair and instability without advancing our national interests? It's time we start embracing the principles of smart security—humanitarian aid and civilian support—instead of perpetual warfare.

Haven't we had enough? Haven't our troops proven their valor? Haven't military families proven their selflessness and sacrifice? Haven't the taxpayers parted with enough of their money?

Vote "yes" on the Conyers-McClintock-Woolsey-Lee amendment. Say no to ground troops in Libya.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. I would like to ask Subcommittee Chairman YOUNG if he would enter into a colloquy regarding the Department of Defense's future plans for data storage.

□ 1950

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would be pleased to enter into a colloquy on behalf of Chairman YOUNG with you, sir.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Thank you. As the chairman is aware and as you are aware, the Department of Defense has many cybersecurity goals and challenges. With the daily reports on cyberattacks and intrusions, I feel that Congress needs to express its concerns before there is a cyberevent that will impact and damage national security.

The Department of Defense is the world's largest target for cyberattacks. There are many aspects of cyberdefense infrastructure, but I would like to focus on one critical piece, the physical location of classified data. I'm very concerned that the Department of Defense will not weigh the physical storage of classified data sufficiently in their efforts to save money through the consolidation and modernization of the information technology infrastructure. In addition, I worry that unnecessarily storing classified data abroad could increase the risk that this information could be stolen, damaging national security and potentially harming our troops.

I would ask the chairman if he would be willing to work with me to ensure that the Department of Defense's future plans for data storage address these concerns and maintain the highest standards for protection for classified data. Keeping critical defense data under positive control and physically securing that data is just common sense for national security. Building and operating data centers here will create American jobs as well as make it easier to control access and make it harder for foreign operatives to steal things such as nuclear secrets, weapons systems designs, and battle plans.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Chairman YOUNG and the committee thank the gentleman from Illinois for bringing this matter to our attention, and we share his concern for the protection of all classified data. We believe the threat from cyberattacks is real and is growing. We commend the gentleman for his leadership in this area, and we will be happy to work with you and the ranking member to ensure that our troops and Nation maintain control of all classified data.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPINSKI. I yield to the ranking member.

Mr. DICKS. I think the gentleman from Illinois brings up a very important issue, and I too look forward to working with the gentleman to ensure that classified data is protected from misuse and theft. Cybersecurity may be the most important defense issue that we face in the coming years. The Department of Defense itself is hit 250,000 times per hour, which is unbelievable, but it's true. And so we need to work on this, and I'm glad the gentleman has taken an interest in this important subject.

Mr. LIPINSKI. I want to thank Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member DICKS for their commitment to the troops and national security, and I know Mr. DICKS is especially concerned about cybersecurity.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk, designated as No. 3.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by title IV of this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", by reducing the amount made available for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy", by reducing the amount made available for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force", by reducing the amount made available for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide", and by reducing the amount made available for "Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense", by $93,811,660, $177,989,500, $263,131,960, $193,248,650, and $1,912,920, respectively.

Mr. FLAKE (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered read.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FLAKE. The amendment would reduce each of the Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation accounts by 1 percent, or roughly $730 million below the currently appropriated $73 billion provided in this measure.

Amendments of this sort have been offered to other Defense-related measures recently, though they have attempted to cut amounts far greater than what I am proposing. During one of these debates, the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee made the point that "if you are going to reduce the defense budget, there ought to be a good reason." I agree. And I submit that both the severity of the fiscal situation we face and the consequences of inaction are compelling reasons to reduce the defense budget along with everything else.

The Appropriations Committee started a positive trend when, during the consideration of appropriations for fiscal year 2011, it reduced the RDT&E accounts below the levels that have been funded in recent years.

I applaud the committee for taking a serious look at these and other accounts and for acting accordingly, but I think we need to do better. We're going to have to get used to cutting defense budgets here if we're going to get our fiscal situation in order.

The defense budget accounts for roughly half of the discretionary spending that is considered during the regular appropriations process during the year. According to the Domenici-Rivlin Commission "Restoring America's Future," RDT&E budgets have increased from $49.2 billion in fiscal year 2001 to $80.2 billion in fiscal year 2010.

So you are seeing an amount of about 80 percent higher now than they were in just 2001. That is a 63 percent increase. I'm getting my math wrong here. That report also suggested reducing the RDT&E budget would "impose greater discipline in research investments."

In addition, Gordon Adams of the Stimson Center argues in an essay in Foreign Affairs magazine that the RDT&E budget should be reduced, saying that "it would be safe to cut it, too, by 19 percent between fiscal year 2012 and fiscal year 2018. Such a reduction would yield $87 billion in savings while keeping the United States' level of military R&D far above any other country."

I'm not attempting to or suggesting that we make cuts that deep in these accounts with this amendment. I recognize that they have already taken a sizeable hit in fiscal year 11. I also know that my colleagues will come to the floor and tout the values of these accounts. They'll talk about and highlight important successes we've achieved with weapons and other systems that wouldn't have been possible without these accounts. I recognize that.

But if we're all going to have to get used to voting for cuts in defense, cutting 1 percent of the $73 billion made available to RDT&E is far from Draconian and will not preclude any such future successes.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The allocation for the Defense bill has already been reduced

by $9 billion. Funding for the research and development title of the bill has been reduced from the 2011 level by nearly $2 billion. Further reductions risk harming critical technology development needed to keep current weapons relevant and needed to develop next generation weapons and technologies required to maintain the U.S. edge in military technologies.

The reduction would adversely affect many systems now in development, including the Joint Strike Fighter, where we certainly do not want to fall behind, advanced submarine development, the long-range strike program, missile defense program, further development of precision weapons systems and many others.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. The gentleman mentioned that this defense budget is cut $7 billion below?

Mr. DICKS. Nine billion below the President's request.

Mr. FLAKE. That's below the President's request, not below the budget——

Mr. DICKS. Last year we were $17 billion below last year, $9 billion this year. So we're making some serious cuts in this budget.

Mr. FLAKE. I just appreciate that this is not the most ridiculous amendment. I'm glad that threshold was reached.

Mr. DICKS. No. This one won't make the top 10.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. We're working the list up, so I will share it with the gentleman down in the gym.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you.

I invite the ranking member to enter into a colloquy with me on an important health issue for our military.

Taking more lives each year than breast, prostate, colon and pancreatic cancers combined, today's lung cancer death toll is beyond unacceptable. It is the leading cause of cancer death among men and women across every racial and ethnic group and has a very low 5-year survival rate of only 15 percent. And this situation can be attributed to both resource limitations in programs dedicated to lung cancer research and the absence of a coordinated and comprehensive plan to reduce lung cancer mortality in this Nation by focusing on the entire lung cancer screening, diagnosis, treatment, and care continuum.

Today, 80 percent of new lung cancer cases affect people who neither have smoked or those who have quit smoking, many of them decades ago.

□ 2000

This is true of smokers and nonsmokers, and those populations such as racial and ethnic minorities, women, and low-income Americans who are disproportionately affected by lung cancer. But it is especially the case for our brave men and women who defend this Nation and put themselves in harm's way to protect our freedom.

Veterans, whose service has put them at high risk for lung cancer, have lung cancer needs that have been and remain unmet. They also suffer from a higher incidence of lung cancer and mortality than nonveterans. Additionally, the rate of lung cancer is nearly twice as high among those in the military compared to the larger U.S. population.

As a physician, I know that success against lung cancer requires that we approach lung cancer comprehensively, just as we do other major illnesses. Prevention and wellness, coupled with early detection, treatment options, and research must be adequately funded and coordinated, just as we do for heart disease, breast cancer, HIV/AIDS, and others. That is why I introduced H.R. 1394, the Lung Cancer Mortality Reduction Act of 2011. We must coordinate activities that combat lung cancer in vulnerable populations, including our active military, and ensure that for them, as well as for others, that early detection, treatment, and research is adequately supported with benchmarks to gauge progress.

We owe it to our Nation's heroes to coordinate early screening, treatment, and care, and reduce lung cancer mortality among members of the Armed Forces and our veterans, whose exposure to carcinogens during active duty service is a known contributor to their increased lung cancer risk.

I would seek the help of the ranking member to pursue this work in the Defense Health Program within the Department of Defense.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I will work with the gentlelady on DOD lung cancer research. We have $10.2 million in the budget this year, and money for other forms of cancer and treatment efforts, in light of the serious problems facing military members. This is a very serious problem, and I am glad that you have called it to our attention, and I look forward to working with you on this important issue.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KINZINGER OF ILLINOIS

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to research, develop, manufacture, or procure a newly designed flight suit or integrated aircrew ensemble.

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

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, there is no bigger supporter, I don't think, in this body of the Air Force than me. I am an Air National Guard pilot. I have been an Air National Guard pilot for awhile now, and continue to be even during my service in Congress. But part of what we have to do in this body is we have to find areas of essential versus nonessential spending.

One of those areas I believe that is nonessential is $100 million that will be spent, if this amendment is not adopted, to develop a new flight suit, in essence. I think at a time when we are looking at supporting defense as best we can and finding out areas where we can prioritize and make that essential, I think it is important to stop the design of this flight suit and allow that money to be spent in other areas.

We have met with the folks that are developing this, that are looking at the idea of this new flight suit, and I am still convinced that the right thing to do at this time is to halt the development and manufacture of this.

So I would just stand and urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. First of all, the committee would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his service in the Air National Guard, and obviously his service in Congress. The gentleman from Illinois has made a compelling argument, and we are prepared to accept his amendment. However, we want to be clear that we will continue to study the issue as we support the continued advancement of the safety of all of our pilots. We just want to make that understood. It needs more study. We are in support of your amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. The amendment would prohibit DOD from developing or manufacturing a newly designed flight suit

for members of the Armed Forces. In November of 2010, the Air Force awarded a $99.4 million contract over 7 years to research, develop, and manufacture the flight suit. The November award ended a nearly 3-year competitive bidding process.

The Air Force requires that the new flight suit must protect airmen from flames, all kinds of weather, chemical attacks or radiation, and high gravity that can cause air members to black out. So I urge rejection of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. It is the policy of the United States to withdraw all United States Armed Forces and military contractors from Iraq by December 31, 2011, and no provision of any agreement between the United States and Iraq that amends the timeline for such withdrawal in a manner that obligates the United States to a security commitment to respond to internal or external threats against Iraq after such date shall be in force with respect to the United States unless the agreement is in the form of a treaty requiring the advice and consent of the Senate (or is intended to take that form in the case of an agreement under negotiation) or is specifically authorized by an Act of Congress enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Ms. LEE (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to consider the amendment as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Ms. LEE (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to consider the amendment as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, I am pleased that my colleagues, Representatives NADLER and WOOLSEY, are joining me in offering an amendment that make it the policy of the United States to withdraw all members of the United States Armed Forces and military contractors from Iraq by the end of this year.

More importantly, this amendment also clarifies that this timeline cannot be changed unless it is in the form of a treaty requiring the advice and consent of the Senate or unless authorized by an act of Congress.

We must ensure that 45,000 United States troops who remain in Iraq, and our military contractors, leave Iraq at the end of this year, as is stated in our Nation's Status of Forces Agreement with Iraq.

This is of concern because this week the President and some of his advisers are considering just how many troops they can leave behind. Senators and others are publicizing their opinions. Senator MCCAIN of Arizona has suggested 10,000 to 13,000 troops remain to serve for support in intelligence arenas, as air support, and as a peacekeeping force. Others may eventually call for even more to remain. At the same time, the Government of Iraq is feeling pressured on multiple sides to either ask us to stay or to ensure our departure. As one of the original founders of the Out of Iraq Caucus, along with Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS and Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY, our position has been clear all along—we opposed the war and the occupation from the start, and we have worked day in and day out to end it.

We believe that ending the occupation of Iraq means withdrawing all troops—and we mean all troops—and all military contractors out of Iraq. It would be unacceptable to have troops remaining in Iraq after December 31, 2011, unless of course there was a treaty or an act of Congress. Leaving troops would hurt U.S. national security interests by adding credence to insurgents' narrative about the U.S. being a permanent occupying force. America's interests in Iraq and the region will be best served by eliminating our military presence and making greater use of our Nation's assets, including diplomacy, reconciliation, commerce, development assistance, and humanitarian aid. And we have already said in policy that there shall be no permanent military bases in Iraq.

Iraqis must be responsible for the security of Iraq, which they have demonstrated more and more as we have been pulling out of their country. The American people have no interest in extending our presence in Iraq, and they are looking to Congress to ensure that we bring our troops home and focus the savings on the challenges facing our Nation today.

Furthermore, we need to ensure that if any security commitment is required, that such commitment be established by a treaty or an act of Congress.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2010

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

The Chair will rule.

The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California proposes to express a legislative sentiment of the House.

As such, the amendment constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the spending reduction amount), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any account of the Department of Defense (other than accounts excluded by subsection (b)) in excess of the amount made available for such account for fiscal year 2011, unless the financial statements of the Department for fiscal year 2011 are validated as ready for audit within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ACCOUNTS EXCLUDED.—The following accounts are excluded from the prohibition in subsection (a):

(1) Military personnel, reserve personnel, and National Guard personnel accounts of the Department of Defense.

(2) The Defense Health Program account.

(c) VALIDATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''validation'', with respect to the auditability of financial statements, means a determination, following an examination, that the financial statements comply with generally accepted accounting principles and applicable laws and regulations and reflect reliable internal controls.

(d) WAIVER.—The President may waive subsection (a) with respect to a component or program of the Department if the President certifies that applying the subsection to that component or program would harm national security or members of the Armed Forces who are in combat.

Ms. LEE (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, I join my esteemed colleague Ms. JAN SCHAKOWSKY from Illinois in offering an amendment that hits at the heart of the issue of fiscal responsibility.

This amendment would freeze Department of Defense programs at fiscal

year 2011 levels unless the financial statements of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2011 are ready to be audited in 6 months from the date of enactment. However, this amendment would exempt military personnel, Reserve and National Guard personnel accounts as well as the Defense Health Program account from this potential funding freeze. It also contains a waiver for any potential harm to national security or combat forces.

In these financial times, which are very difficult as we all know, more and more people are learning of the importance of keeping to a budget and of being able to track where every single penny goes of their paychecks, if they have paychecks. For too many Americans right now, survival boils down to appropriately spending and saving every dollar and every cent that they have and budgeting what little money they have left.

Sadly, the Department of Defense Inspector General and the Government Accountability Office have documented that the Defense Department cannot tell the American taxpayers how their money is being spent. That really is quite shocking. We cannot wait any longer for the books to be audited. This requirement first came down in 1990, and over the years, this requirement that they keep the books that can be checked over has been pushed back to 2017. Already the Department of Defense has stated that they need an extension.

How many times do we turn our backs on agencies in their spending money without being able to account for it? How many more stories of expensive ashtrays and overpriced hammers do we need to have before we begin to deal with this in an effective way?

The bloated Pentagon budget, filled with waste, fraud and abuse, must be able to be audited. The American people expect to know where our defense dollars are going. They pay for this Defense Department, and they expect Congress to be the watchdog of these agencies. In fact, I believe that it is critical that the Department of Defense not only be ready for an audit but be able to actually pass an audit.

Today, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, be fiscally responsible and hold the Pentagon accountable to get its financial books in order. We require that of the business sector, of the private sector. We require that of our own family budgets. Why in the world don't we require that of the Pentagon where so many of our hard-earned tax dollars are being spent? We should freeze their spending, freeze their budget, until we know what they're doing with their money. An audit is a very reasonable request, and I hope that the other side understands that this really is in the spirit of fiscal responsibility and in helping to ensure that the Pentagon's books are in order.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to speak on the point of order?

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language conferring authority.

The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. HUELSKAMP

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the curriculum of the Chaplain Corps Tier 1 DADT repeal training dated April 11, 2011.

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Chair, I rise this evening to ensure that America's military bases are not used to advance a narrow social agenda.

Earlier this year, the Navy chief of chaplains announced that military chaplains who desire to perform same-sex marriages would be allowed to do so following the repeal of the policy known as Don't Ask, Don't Tell. The directive said that chaplains could perform same-sex ceremonies in such States where such marriages and unions are legal. Apparently, the Navy has recently backed away from such instruction, but tepidly and weakly, and in a way that leaves the door open to the reinstatement of this policy.

This amendment I offer will prohibit the enforcement of the directive of allowing chaplains to perform same-sex marriages on Navy bases regardless of whatever a State's law is on gay marriage.

In thinking about what has made our military successful, two things come to my mind: conformity and uniformity. Men and women who join our military are to conform to the military's standards, not the other way around. Regardless of where a ship is docked or where a plane is parked, our servicemembers know what to anticipate and how to behave. Rules and expectations are the same everywhere, but with a policy that is flexible and changes based on the State, the military doesn't embrace its one-size-fits-all mentality that has made it so accomplished, disciplined and orderly. As the Navy and other military branches prepare for the repeal of this 1993 law, hours upon hours of sensitivity training have been presented to men and women in uniform. Such instruction has included warning that the failure to embrace alternative lifestyles could result in penalties for servicemembers.

What will happen to chaplains who decline to officiate over same-sex ceremonies? The directive states that chaplains ''may'' perform same-sex civil marriage ceremonies. I fear that chaplains who refuse to perform these ceremonies may find themselves under attack and their careers threatened.

Madam Chair, we must ensure the religious liberty of all military members, particularly that of chaplains. In my family, I've had a military chaplain who has served for more than approximately 4 decades, so this is particularly important to me, personally.

Regardless of how someone feels about the repeal of the policy known as Don't Ask, Don't Tell, I think we can all agree that instructing military chaplains that they can perform same-sex marriages goes above and beyond the instruction to repeal that particular law. In fact, this directive is not only an overreach of the repeal but is also a direct assault on the Defense of Marriage Act. It should be noted these two laws passed with bipartisan support and were signed into law by Democrat President Bill Clinton. Repealing Don't Ask, Don't Tell was supposed to be about allowing people in the military to serve openly, not about promoting same-sex marriage in contravention of the Defense of Marriage Act.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment in order to promote and ensure conformity and uniformity in the military culture, not the other way around; to promote the religious liberty of military chaplains; and to promote consistency with Federal laws on marriage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2020

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to any amendment that seeks to delay the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Some in the majority continue to try to legislate this issue even though the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell was approved with overwhelming bipartisan support in December.

As of last month, more than 1 million U.S. servicemembers—roughly half of our Armed Forces—have been trained on the new law allowing gays and lesbians to serve openly in the military. Our military leaders, lead by Admiral Mullen, have stated that they have

seen no adverse impact on the force and that training is going very well. The current expectation is that all members of the active and reserve military force will be trained by mid-August.

Last month, Secretary Gates indicated in an interview with the Associated Press that he sees no roadblocks to ending the ban on openly gay military service. Current Secretary Panetta said that he would work closely with the Joint Chiefs of Staff to assess whether the elements for certification in the law are met before approving the repeal.

Our servicemembers deserve the right to serve their country no matter their race, gender, or sexual orientation. Currently, gay and lesbian servicemembers are forced to live under the constant threat of being forced out of the military because of the misguided Don't Ask, Don't Tell. I urge my colleagues to reject any amendment that seeks to delay implementation.

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

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, this amendment strikes a very dangerous precedent for Congress to somehow micromanage the training processes of military chaplains.

We have military chaplains from diverse faith backgrounds. We have many faiths—in fact, the majority of faiths that, for instance, don't sanctify gay marriage. We have other faiths. The one that I happen to belong to—I am a member of a reformed Jewish faith—and there are many other Christian faiths, including the Episcopalian faith, which do sanction same-sex unions. Likewise, it's an important part of chaplain training that they're allowed to counsel against, for instance, homosexual acts or extramarital heterosexual acts. That's a part of chaplaincy training as well. For Congress to interfere with the military processes of chaplaincy training is absurd and unprecedented.

With regard to this particular training program, I would like to ask my friend from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), if I could just yield a moment to him, if he has read this particular training manual that he is seeking to defund here.

I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Yes, if the gentleman would restate his question.

Mr. POLIS. Has the gentleman from Kansas read the training manual that he is seeking to defund in this case?

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Chair, that is an excellent question.

We tried to obtain a copy of that from the Department of Defense today and they refused to provide a copy. What I do have is an online three-page summary of the manual.

Mr. POLIS. So, reclaiming my time, I think that the straight answer is no. In fact, our ranking member and others have been unable to get that from the Navy Liaison's Office.

Again, I think it's an offense to the military to second-guess their training for chaplains. No doubt those documents could eventually come our way—and should, for oversight activities—but for us to somehow defund the training of chaplains to implement Don't Ask, Don't Tell makes no sense.

Again, chaplains will be worried. For instance, Catholic chaplains will be worried to advise their followers that homosexuality is a sin if that is not included in the training. Those for whom homosexuality is not a sin will also likewise be worried about advising the troops. There will be a void, a huge void—to not train the spiritual advisors to members of our military about the implementation of Don't Ask, Don't Tell? I mean, why not try to not train any of the troops? I mean, again, whether you supported it or not, I think most of us believe that it was better that there was a training process than, let's say, a court has ordered—which has now happened absent a training process and instantaneous change.

With regard to the chaplaincy, to second-guess an internal military training document—again, which they have indicated that they will revise accordingly—is to show a huge lack of judgment of the men and women who run the military, an enormous lack of confidence in the institution of the chaplaincy, an offense to the chaplaincy of the military to somehow deign that Congress is expressing that they should not be trained regarding a major military policy, that they should somehow take the risk on their own, that they should worry about advising members of their faith with regard to, within their faith tradition, whether homosexuality is a sin or not, regarding members of their faith as to whether they can be married or not.

This is a diverse country religiously, and likewise the institution of our military reflects that diversity. And to somehow, again, second-guess a military training document that hasn't even been read by the prime sponsor of this amendment shows a tremendous lack of faith and is a very dangerous precedence for Congress in terms of interfering with the training procedures of the military.

We could, of course, as a body or as individual Members, go through every single training manual and find things we like, find things we don't like. But again, to micromanage the military to that extent, particularly in light of a policy change which has ramifications for the chaplaincy.

The chaplaincy is, by and large, where the rubber meets the road with regard to how individual members are being advised about their sexual orientation, about what behaviors are moral and what behaviors are immoral. And to somehow say that Congress will tell the chaplaincy not to train anybody on implementing this policy change leaves our soldiers in a spiritual lurch. It leaves our Christian soldiers in a spiritual lurch. It leaves our Jewish soldiers in a spiritual lurch, our Muslim soldiers in a spiritual lurch, all of those who take advantage of the good offices of the chaplaincy in the military, just as, of course, we have a chaplain in this fine institution, the United States Congress.

So, again, this is a change that perhaps many members of the chaplaincy were not in favor of—some were; it depends on their faith position, their own political opinions—but they need to be trained in accordance with military protocols, and this amendment would gut that. I strongly urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 2219.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor or subcontractor to an employee performing work under the contract for compensation if the compensation of the employee for a fiscal year exceeds the rate payable for level I of the Executive Schedule under section 5312 of title 5, United States Code, regardless of the contract funding source.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, the highest individual government salary funded by the American taxpayer is that of the President of the United States at a total of $400,000, or so I thought. The President is certainly the highest paid public servant, but it turns out that the leader of the free world isn't actually the highest paid executive on the taxpayers' payroll.

In fact, the highest Federal Government salaries by far can be earned by private sector executives who are paid up to $700,000 per year directly in taxpayer dollars. I do not mean executives who earn their multibillion-dollar incomes by selling often overpriced and

underperforming equipment to our men and women in uniform, though the customer is the Federal Government. Those salaries are paid through transactions in the private sector. No, I am talking about the Federal Government salaries paid directly by the Pentagon and other agencies to private contractor executives, direct salaries paid for 100 percent by taxpayer dollars.

You won't find these exorbitant pay rates on government income lists. They certainty aren't subject to the current Federal employee pay and hiring freeze.

□ 2030

In fact, that $700,000 maximum salary increases every year to reach even greater heights even as we contemplate cutting other areas of our budget to new lows, including that of our military service branches.

These salaries are being paid by a department that has not been able to pass a standard audit in its entire history. It cannot even tell us how many contractors are on its payroll.

Madam Chair, the salary of a typical Army private starts at a meager $20,000 per year. General Petraeus, a four-star general with 37 years of active service, the commander of the international coalition in Afghanistan and the next director of the CIA, earns a salary of approximately $180,000. The Secretary of Defense earns about $200,000. How then can we justify salaries of up to $700,000 for defense contractor executives?

I understand that there may be contractors who supply services to our Nation that our government cannot perform on its own. However, I am also absolutely certain that there is no one single private contractor whose value to our national security is twice that of the Commander in Chief of the United States military.

At a time when the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs is telling us that the Nation's debt is the number one threat facing America, we cannot continue using taxpayer dollars to pay lavish and unjustifiable private contractor salaries that are more than triple the pay of our military leadership.

My amendment simply states that funds in this bill will not be used to pay a Federal Government salary for any individual defense contractor that exceeds the salary of the Secretary of Defense. That salary is level 1 of the executive schedule, or about $200,000.

This is a very modest reform. It is not about limiting contracts or contract spending more broadly. It does not deal with outsourcing or insourcing. It does not, in fact, cap contractor pay, which may include private sector projects, profit sharing, or other earnings. It merely deals with the salary paid to contractors directly by the taxpayer, limiting the cost of that compensation in an effort to reduce the deficit and stop paying exorbitant Federal salaries to private sector employees.

I think this amendment forms a perfect complement to section 8050 of the underlying bill, which deals with limiting contractor bonuses. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this amendment and other modest simple reforms that can help us tackle the deficit.

With that, I thank you, Madam Chair.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to speak on the point of order?

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination of the amount of compensation of certain employees.

The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), our distinguished chairman.

I think we agree that it is vitally important to save money in the Joint Strike Fighter Program where it is possible to do so without negatively impacting performance or schedule. The Joint Program Office and the services which will use the Joint Strike Fighter are to be commended for any efforts to identify potential reductions in program costs. As an example, the Air Force is currently in the process of validating an earlier internal study of ejection seat options for its variant of the aircraft.

Would the chairman agree that if studies like this one make a sound business case that savings will result, then the Air Force's judgment about how its aircraft can be made more cost effectively equipped should be informed by that conclusion?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I agree with him that we should consider all options for cost savings. Should the Air Force present the committee with a study that indicates potential cost savings in the ejection seat without compromising the F–35's performance or schedule, we will certainly look hard at that.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the chairman and look forward to working with him on this and other matters in our oversight of the Joint Strike Fighter Program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to maintain an end strength level of members of the Armed Forces of the United States assigned to permanent duty in Europe in excess of 30,000 members, and the amounts otherwise provided by this Act for ''Military Personnel, Army'', ''Military Personnel, Navy'', ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', and ''Military Personnel, Air Force'' in title I of division A are hereby reduced by $433,966,500, $41,380,000, $6,700,000, and $330,915,000, respectively.

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

Mr. POLIS. Given the ongoing budget negotiations, we need to explore all options for reducing wasteful spending, and I think we have an easy one in front of us in this amendment.

Before we ask the American people to accept painful cuts or accept tax increases, we have an opportunity here to get defense spending under control in a way that does not jeopardize or harm our national security. If we're serious about deficit reduction, we need to do something about the defense budget, and we can do it in a responsible way that doesn't hurt our national security. My amendment would do that.

By reducing some of the 80,000 troops in Europe where they're no longer needed, we can save hundreds of millions of dollars. So what my amendment would do very simply is reduce the total number of troops stationed in Europe from 80,000 to 30,000, which is more than enough to continue to support our ongoing operations in Libya and Iraq and our responsibilities to NATO for those Members who support them. For those who don't, this is not a proxy for those battles. We don't want to cut the troop levels so low we can't support those operations.

It will allow the DOD to save money by closing those bases that are no longer needed. By pulling 50,000 troops out of Western Europe and closing bases, we can save money, reduce our redundant military force, and CBO has scored the savings of this amendment as over $800 million.

On top of the savings produced by reducing our troop level, my amendment would allow us to station troops in the U.S., instead of Europe, where it's 10 to 20 percent less expensive. It would allow the Pentagon to close bases across Europe that, frankly, are relics of World War II and the Cold War.

The U.S. taxpayer didn't sign up to indefinitely defend our wealthy Western European allies from a nonexistent

threat. These bases cost U.S. taxpayers millions upon millions of dollars. On top of that, they're often unpopular with the local people of the countries they are located in.

Our European allies are some of the richest countries in the world, so why are we subsidizing their defense spending? Our European allies have enjoyed a free ride on the American dime for too long. Today, our European allies spend an average of about 2 percent of GDP on defense, while America spends 4 to 5 percent. That means the average American spends $2,500 on defense; the average European, $500 on defense.

Now, if Europe feels they are under a military threat, first of all, I would like to hear whom it's from. It's not clear who's about to attack France or Germany. But if Europe does feel they're under a threat, they can afford to spend more on defense, and we can be confident that we can spend less on their defense. We cannot afford to subsidize the defense of France and Germany from an unknown and unidentified threat.

This amendment does not signal a weakening in our commitment to NATO. With modern technology, we can move troops and weapons quickly across the globe into theaters of operation. We retain sufficient presence in Europe with 30,000 troops for our joint training responsibilities under NATO. There is simply no need to have nearly 100,000 troops.

It's time to rethink our defense spending. We're not under threat by the Nazis. We're not under threat by the Soviets. Terrorism is a real threat. It's an amorphous threat that's not bound by nations or states, and, in fact, it does not have its main nexus in Western Europe. Maintaining bases in Europe is simply not a sane or rational response to this threat, nor is it fiscally responsible.

□ 2040

Even Donald Rumsfeld thinks it's time for a change of policy. In his recent book, he wrote: ''Of the quarter million troops deployed abroad in 2001, more than 100,000 were in Europe, the vast majority stationed in Germany to fend off an invitation by a Soviet Union that no longer existed.''

These cuts proposed in my amendment are part of the recommendations of the Sustainable Defense Task Force, a bipartisan project. The Sustainable Defense Task Force brought together defense experts from across the ideological spectrum and proposed commonsense recommendations for saving taxpayers' money without jeopardizing our national defense, and that's exactly what this is, common sense.

At a time when we must seriously consider cuts to wasteful government spending, we should not continue to subsidize the defense of wealthy European nations against a nonexistent Nazi threat, a nonexistent Soviet threat. Let's get serious here. We can start by reducing our military presence in Europe, which will save the American people hundreds of millions of dollars while protecting our national security interests.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The gentleman from Colorado offered a similar amendment to the 2012 national defense authorization bill earlier this year, and it failed by a vote of 96–323. He offered a similar amendment during consideration of H.R. 1 earlier this year, which failed by a vote of 74–351. The setting of our military end strengths is not something that should be done lightly. In fact, this is the sole jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services. They are responsible for setting military personnel end strengths, and the levels that would be set by this amendment are significantly below those in the House-passed 2012 National Defense Authorization Act.

For that and many other reasons, I am opposed to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to purchase non-combat vehicles for use outside of the United States if such vehicles are not substantially manufactured in the United States (as defined in the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Since 2003, the Defense Department reports that it has spent approximately $1.3 billion to buy non-combat vehicles from foreign vehicle manufacturers.

Now you may ask, why is that? We have a law on the books that's called the Buy American Act, and it generally requires that when we are buying items for use by the U.S. military and they are available here in the United States that they should be bought from U.S. companies. It makes a lot of sense. If we're going to be spending billions of dollars in taxpayer money, we should make sure that it goes to fund U.S. manufacturers and U.S. jobs.

But here's the problem. There are a number of loopholes, a growing number of exceptions to the Buy America law. The biggest is this one. One of the exceptions says that if you are buying a particular good for use outside of the United States, you don't have to comply with the Buy America clause at all. Well, that becomes a pretty enormous, truck-sized loophole when we are fighting two wars abroad, because much of what we are purchasing goes immediately to foreign companies.

So you have a situation where non-combat vehicles, light trucks, ambulances, buses, motorcycles, vehicles that are made by a multitude of American manufacturers, are now being bought overseas and our taxpayer dollars are going to foreign European and Asian vehicle manufacturers and into the pockets of foreign workers.

This is a much bigger problem than just this one category of spending. In fact, the DOD has spent about $36 billion in purchases from foreign companies for use outside of the United States. In fact, just this last year, there were about 38,000 waivers to the Buy America Act for a variety of exceptions, and over the last 4 years about 161,000 waivers to the Buy America Act. This is a very large problem, as we see growing numbers of exceptions to the act. This one, though, is the biggest.

And while I think we've got to pass comprehensive legislation to try to take on these growing waivers from the Buy America Act, this amendment, which I offer with my good friend Representative PETERS of Michigan, will simply restrict the purchase of these everyday non-combat vehicles to vehicles that are made by American workers. People in my State of Connecticut and around the country are out of work, and a $1.3 billion infusion, money that we're going to spend anyway, will help create jobs.

To be successful in the 21st century we can't continue to cede our manufacturing capacity to overseas workers. The Department of Defense is the world's largest purchaser of many types of products and we must do all that we can to make sure that we're putting this money, our taxpayers' money to work here at home while not doing any damage to the mission abroad. These non-combat vehicles could easily be manufactured by American plants, and it's high time that we put people back to work here in this country. I urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member seek to speak on the point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Chair, just to quickly point out that is a pretty bread-and-butter, vanilla restriction on funding, as I understand one of the objections is that this would change the duties of contracting officers who now don't apply the Buy America law. In fact, normal course of training requirements for contracting specialists already educate those specialists in how to apply the Buy America law whether or not they currently do it today.

I do believe for that reason that the amendment is germane.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to speak on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut proposes to change existing law, in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

As recorded in Deschler's Precedents, volume 8, chapter 26, section 52, even though a limitation or exception therefrom might refrain from explicitly assigning new duties to officers of the government, if it implicitly requires them to make investigations, compile evidence, or make judgments and determinations not otherwise required of them by law, then it assumes the character of legislation and is subject to a point of order under clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The proponent of a limitation assumes the burden of establishing that any duties imposed by the provision either are merely ministerial or are already required by law.

The Chair finds that limitation proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut does not simply impose a negative restriction on the funds in the bill. Instead, it requires the officials concerned to make a determination regarding whether a certain item to be acquired for use outside the United States is substantially manufactured in the United States, a matter with which they are not charged under existing law.

On these premises, the Chair concludes that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut proposes to change existing law.

Accordingly, the point of order is sustained.

□ 2050

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HERRERA BEUTLER

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract that allows the contractor to use amounts paid to the contractor under such contract to pay a tax to the Afghan Ministry of Finance.

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

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Madam Chair, we are in Afghanistan right now, helping to rebuild, or in many cases build from scratch, infrastructure. And when we leave that country, and I do hope we will be leaving soon, we will leave that infrastructure behind, power grids, water systems, trained law enforcement, the building blocks of a functioning society. We will spend billions of dollars on improvements meant to better the lives of the Afghan people. We don't need to also pay taxes to the Afghan Government for the privilege of building or rebuilding their country. And that's why I am happy to bring this amendment to the floor tonight for consideration.

The Department of Defense should be focused on providing soldiers in training, in the field, and on the front lines with the tools they need to protect themselves and defend our country. This amendment would uphold existing law and clarify existing agreements between the U.S. and Afghanistan prohibiting Afghanistan from taxing U.S. contractors doing this rebuilding work in Afghanistan.

Now, this ban on levying taxes would also apply to all subcontractors that may not have direct contracts with Afghanistan. In other words, if a company is working on a project funded by the U.S. Department of Defense, whether that company is a prime contractor or a subcontractor, that company should not be subject to taxes from the Afghani Government.

These are the contractors doing rebuilding work in Afghanistan, helping rebuild the Afghanis' infrastructure, and hopefully allowing them to one day thrive independently. Common sense and financial prudence says that the U.S. should not be subject to taxation for the rebuilding efforts it is paying for.

Hardworking Americans send their tax dollars to Washington so that soldiers on the front lines have the tools they need to protect themselves and our country, not fill the coffers of a foreign government. So I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would like to say, Madam Chairman, that the gentlewoman has worked long and hard to write this amendment in such a way to be acceptable to the Parliamentarian, and I am very happy to accept her amendment and ask for its support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. I am going to read this amendment: ''None of the funds made available by this act may be used to enter into a contract that allows the contractor to use amounts paid to the contractor under such contract to pay a tax to the Afghan Ministry of Finance.''

I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Washington State for being able to work so tirelessly to get this amendment perfected. It's very clear what her intent is, and we are prepared on our side to accept this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF GEORGIA

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The Secretary of Defense shall post on the public website of the Department of Defense the cost to each American taxpayer of each of the wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Chair, let me begin by thanking the ranking member, Mr. DICKS, and his staff for all of their hard work on this legislation. As always, they offer great assistance and guidance for all Members and staff, regardless of our differences on policy. Thank you all for all that you do.

Madam Chair, my amendment is very simple: It requires that the Department of Defense put on its Web site the costs of war to each American taxpayer. It is time for Americans to have a receipt for these 10 years of war. What has it cost us? How much cold, hard cash has been spent?

I have stood here time and time again and listened to debates about

how we don't have any money. There is no money for the elderly, no money for the sick, no money for the poor, no money for women, no money for children, no money for people who lost their jobs by no fault of their own. It just costs too much. No money for you, or you, or you.

But when it comes to war, war in Afghanistan, Iraq, and now Libya, there seems to be a bottomless pit of resources. And it is not fair; it is not right. We nickel and dime the people who need it most. But when it comes to war, there is a big fat blank check. We need to be honest with ourselves. We need to be honest with each other.

Across the country, there are Americans, hardworking, taxpaying citizens who oppose war. They oppose their hard-earned dollars being sent overseas to support 10 long years of war. But let me be clear, Madam Chair, they do not oppose paying their taxes. They are not anarchists or anti-government activists. But as conscientious objectors to war, these Americans want their taxes invested here at home.

They want to help provide food for the hungry, safe roads, and strong schools. They want Medicare and Social Security to exist for their parents, their children, and their grandchildren. They want their tax dollars to care for soldiers and their families when they return home. They want to see an end and a cure to cancer. They want a cure for AIDS. They want to see small businesses thrive and innovation become the engine of our economy. They want high-speed rail that rivals Europe and Asia. They want transit systems that are safe and get people where they need to go. They want government to work for them.

Even if you do not oppose war, don't you want to know what it costs you and your family? It's time, Madam Chair, it's time for the Department of Defense to be honest with the American people. This is not some wild, crazy, farfetched idea. It is simple, commonsense transparency and good government. This amendment takes a tiny, small step in the right direction.

Madam Chair, it is my hope and prayer that all of my colleagues will support this straightforward amendment.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

□ 2100

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I wish to speak.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I made my point, and I don't have another point to make.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction.

The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for July 6 and the balance of the week on account of family obligations.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 6 p.m. and July 8.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Friday, July 8, 2011, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2302. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Difenoconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0296; FRL-8876-4] received June 10, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2303. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticide Tolerances; Technical Amendments [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-1081; FRL-8875-4] received June 10, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2304. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report identifying, for each of the Armed Forces (other than the Coast Guard) and each Defense Agency, the percentage of funds that were expended during the preceding fiscal year for performance of depot-level maintenance and repair workloads by the public and private sectors, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2466(d)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2305. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding the certification of a restructured Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2306. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding the certification of a restrutured RQ-4A/B Unmanned Aircraft System Global Hawk Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2307. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement; Synchronized Predeployment and Operational Tracker (SPOT)(DFARS Case 2011-D030) (RIN: 0750-AH26) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2308. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies for fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2309. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Conservatorship and Receivership (RIN: 2590-AA23) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2310. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Land Disposal Restrictions: Revision of the Treatment Standards for Carbamate Wastes [EPA-HQ-RCRA-2008-0332; FRL-9318-4] (RIN: 2050-AG65) received June 10, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2311. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of California; Interstate Transport of Pollution; Significant Contribution to Nonattainment and Interference with Maintenance Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0046; FRL-9318-1] received June 10, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2312. 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; State of California; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan and Interstate Transport Plan; Interference with Visibility Requirement [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0131; FRL-9317-9] received June 10, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2313. A letter from the Legal Advisor/Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of the Commission's Rules Regarding Maritime Automatic Identification Systems

[WT Docket No.: 04-344] received June 13, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2314. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Structure and Practices of the Video Relay Service Program [CG Docket No.: 10-51] June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2315. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Export Control Reform Initiative: Strategic Trade Authorization License Exception [Docket No.: 100923470-1230-03] (RIN: 0694-AF03) received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2316. A letter from the Associate Director for PP&I, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Alphabetical Listing of Blocked Persons, Blocked Vessels, Specially Designated Nationals, Specially Designated Terrorists, Specially Designated Global Terrorists, Foreign Terrorist Organizations, and Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers; Alphabetical Listing of Vessels That Are The Property of Blocked Persons or Specially Designated Nationals; Alphabetical Listing of Persons Determined to be the Government of Iran, as Defined in the Iranian Transaction Regulations; received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2317. A letter from the Associate Director for PP&I, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Foreign Assets Control Regulations; Transaction Control Regulations (Regulations Prohibiting Transactions Involving the Shipment of Certain Merchandise Between Foreign Countries; received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2318. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the Department's report on United States contributions to the United Nations and United Nations affiliated agencies and related bodies for fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2319. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-79, ''Housing Production Trust Fund Dedicated Tax Appropriations Authorization Temporary Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2320. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-80, ''Housing Production Trust Fund Pollin Memorial Community Dedicated Tax Appropriations Authorization Temporary Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2321. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-82, ''Brewery Manufacturer's Tasting Permit Temporary Amendment Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2322. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-81, ''Unemployment Compensation Extended Benefits Continuation Temporary Amendment Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2323. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-90, ''Closing of Water Street, S.W., S.O. 10-15906, Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2324. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-89, ''Department of Forensic Sciences Establishment Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2325. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-91, ''Closing of Public Street adjacent to Square 4376 Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2326. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2327. A letter from the Inspector General, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting notification that the Commission will soon begin the audit of financial statements for the fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2328. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Board's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2329. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2330. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Commencement Bay, Tacoma, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0197] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2331. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Chelsea St. Bridge Demolition, Chelsea River, Chelsea, Massachusetts [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0420] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2332. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Limited Service Domestic Voyage Load Lines for River Barges on Lake Michigan [Docket No.: USCG-1998-4623] (RIN: 1625-AA17) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2333. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 28th Annual Humboldt Bay Festival, Fireworks Display, Eureka, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0167] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2334. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Severn River, Spa Creek and Annapolis Harbor, Annapolis [USCG-2011-0046] (1645-AA08) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2335. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; M.I.T.'s 150th Birthday Celebration Fireworks, Charles River, Boston, Massachusetts [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0375] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2336. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Navigation and Navigable Waters; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0257] (RIN: 1625-AB69) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2337. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Annual events requiring safety zones in the Captain of the Port Sault Saint Marie zone [Docket No.: USCG- 2011-0188] (RIN: 1625-AA00), 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:

Mrs. EMERSON: Committee on Appropriation. H.R. 2434. A bill making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California: Committee on House Administration. First Semiannual Report on the Activities of the Committee on House Administration for the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 340. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1309) to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risk, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–138). 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. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2433. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the employment and training of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' 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. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 2435. A bill to allow individuals to choose to opt out of the Medicare part A benefit and to allow individuals opting out of such benefit to be eligible for health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 2436. A bill to prohibit any reduction in the rate of dividends paid to the Secretary

of the Treasury on the senior preferred stock of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac purchased by the Secretary; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 2437. A bill to support evidence-based social and emotional learning programming; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2438. A bill to ensure that certain Federal employees cannot hide behind immunity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. GARRETT):

H.R. 2439. A bill to amend the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 to authorize the Federal Housing Finance Agency, as receiver of Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac, to revoke the charters of such enterprises or any limited-life regulated entity established under such receivership; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HURT (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. GARRETT):

H.R. 2440. A bill to protect the taxpayers of the United States by requiring Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to sell or dispose of the assets of such enterprises that are not critical to their missions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. GARRETT):

H.R. 2441. A bill to terminate the Housing Trust Fund and the requirement that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac make annual allocations for such Fund; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CRAVAACK:

H.R. 2442. A bill to eliminate Federal mandates for traffic sign retroreflectivity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2443. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on expensing certain depreciable assets for certain businesses that hire veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOREN (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 2444. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. HECK, and Mr. KELLY):

H.R. 2445. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide States and local educational agencies with maximum flexibility in using Federal funds provided under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 2446. A bill to clarify the treatment of homeowner warranties under current law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 2447. A bill to grant the congressional gold medal to the Montford Point Marines; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 2448. A bill to establish the St. Croix National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 2449. A bill to permit expungement of records of certain nonviolent criminal offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2450. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain high-intensity sweetener; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 2451. A bill to restore certain provisions of the Banking Act of 1933, commonly referred to as the ''Glass-Steagall Act'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TONKO, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 2452. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to complete a special resource study of the Hudson River Valley in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LONG, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut):

H.R. 2453. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Mark Twain; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 2454. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make residents of Puerto Rico with one child or two children eligible for the refundable portion of the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2455. A bill to prohibit any requirement of a budgetary offset for emergency disaster assistance during 2011 and 2012; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RIGELL (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 2456. A bill to establish the Fort Monroe National Historical Park in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALSH of Illinois (for himself, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WEST, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LONG, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 2457. A bill to restrict funds for the Palestinian Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina):

H.J. Res. 71. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve to 3 in the House of Representatives and 2 in the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution supporting the formation of a bipartisan Presidential Commission to study the establishment of a National Museum of the American People; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. REYES, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 339. A resolution expressing support for designation of September as National Childhood Obesity Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. TIBERI):

H. Res. 341. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of September as ''National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H. Res. 342. A resolution expressing support for the designation of July 30, 2011, as National Dance Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

74. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 68 urging the Congress to take such actions as are necessary to require that satellite television providers broadcast local television stations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

75. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 81

urging the Congress to take steps to designate Caddo Lake as a National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 2434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).''

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 2436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 (''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''), and 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 Mrs. BIGGERT:

H.R. 2437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art I, Sec 8

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 2439.

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. HURT:

H.R. 2440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1, clause 3, and clause 18.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 2441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 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''), 3 (''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''), and 18 (''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and power 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. CRAVAACK:

H.R. 2442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Amendment X of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 2444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 2445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BIGGERT:

H.R. 2446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 2447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 12–14, and Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 2448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 and Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 3 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 2451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 2452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)''

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 2453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 6, Section 8, Article 1, which states ''The Congress shall have the power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.''

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 2454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to lay and collect taxes and to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such powers as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2455.

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 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. RIGELL:

H.R. 2456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. WALSH of Illinois:

H.R. 2457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.J. Res. 71.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 5 of the Constitution states: The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 10: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 49: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 58: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. MACK.
H.R. 104: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 136: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. OLVER, and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 140: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 152: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 196: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 198: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 258: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 272: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 310: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 311: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 312: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 324: Mr. OWENS and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 329: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 363: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 374: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. RIVERA.
H.R. 420: Mr. MACK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 451: Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 452: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 469: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 483: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 527: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 530: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 574: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 576: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 583: Mr. HOLT, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 593: Mr. LATTA, Mr. CANSECO, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 615: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. MACK.
H.R. 645: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. MACK.
H.R. 674: Mr. TURNER, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MACK, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 687: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 691: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 692: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 693: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 718: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. POLIS, Ms. CHU, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 719: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 721: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 724: Mr. LOEBSACK and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 733: Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 735: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 745: Mr. PITTS and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 746: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 757: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 800: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 812: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 862: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 890: Ms. BASS of California.
H.R. 932: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 973: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 991: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 998: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1001: Mrs. BIGGERT and Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 1015: Mr. FILNER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. AUSTRIA, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1054: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1063: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 1066: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 1082: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
H.R. 1089: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1091: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 1103: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1106: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1126: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 1134: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 1161: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 1188: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1190: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1193: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1196: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 1200: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1219: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 1259: Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 1288: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
H.R. 1289: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1297: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1300: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1325: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1370: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1404: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. FARR, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 1416: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. CRAVAACK.
H.R. 1426: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 1457: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 1459: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 1463: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 1464: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 1465: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1475: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1479: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1483: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1485: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 1488: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1505: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 1529: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1543: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1558: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 1588: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 1614: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1621: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1633: Mr. HALL.
H.R. 1648: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1663: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1698: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 1723: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 1724: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1734: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1735: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1741: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 1744: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 1747: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1756: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1763: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 1764: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 1821: Mr. HIMES and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1829: Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 1855: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1856: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1865: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LONG, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. JONES, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 1903: Mr. POLIS and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1932: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 1968: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 1980: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 2000: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2002: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2010: Mr. MCKEON and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2018: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
H.R. 2028: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2030: Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2032: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. AKIN.
H.R. 2036: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 2040: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 2042: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2054: Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 2068: Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 2077: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 2079: Ms. BUERKLE.
H.R. 2085: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2092: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2099: Mr. RIVERA.
H.R. 2103: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2123: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2139: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. JENKINS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, and Mr. AUSTRIA.
H.R. 2164: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 2172: Mr. LANDRY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 2182: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 2190: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2194: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2195: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2198: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 2210: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2214: Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. HANNA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 2215: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H.R. 2233: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. MACK.
H.R. 2245: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 2250: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. PETRI, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 2257: Mr. BLACK and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2272: Ms. NORTON and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2284: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2298: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 2299: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2304: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 2307: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2311: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 2321: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 2325: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 2334: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2341: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FARR, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 2357: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2358: Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2369: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. WU, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HANABUSA, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SHULER, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. HECK, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2372: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 2377: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2387: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2389: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2401: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 2410: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2415: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2417: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. LATTA.
H.J. Res. 56: Mr. LANKFORD and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. BROOKS.
H. Res. 105: Mr. ISRAEL.
H. Res. 130: Mr. STARK.
H. Res. 134: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. POLIS.
H. Res. 201: Mr. PETERS.
H. Res. 254: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H. Res. 256: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. KILDEE.
H. Res. 268: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H. Res. 270: Mr. NUGENT.
H. Res. 298: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. COSTA.
H. Res. 304: Mr. OLVER, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H. Res. 315: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment, made in order as Amendment No. 1 for the rule to H.R. 1309, to be offered by Representative BIGGERT, or a designee, to H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 2417: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

15. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Miami, Florida, relative to Resolution 10-0221 urging the Congress to increase the percentage of Community Development Block Grant Funding allowed for public services from fifteen percent (15%) to twenty-five percent (25%); which was referred to the Committee on Financial Services.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MS. MCCOLLUM

AMENDMENT NO. 101: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by $124,800,000.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT NO. 102: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this act may be used to administer and enforce the wate-rate requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code, commonly known as the ''Davis Bacon Act.''

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT NO. 103: 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 obligated or expended for assistance to any entity that has adopted a founding charter, constitution, or policy calling for the destruction of the State of Israel.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. RUNYAN

AMENDMENT NO. 104: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds in this Act may be used to procure air transportation from a commercial air carrier for a member of the Armed Forces who is traveling under orders to deploy to or return from an overseas contingency operation under terms that allow the carrier to charge the member fees for checked baggage other than for bags weighing more than 80 pounds or bags in excess of four per individual.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. MULVANEY

AMENDMENT NO. 105: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by $17,192,000,000, not to be derived from amounts of appropriations made available by title IX.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. GOHMERT

AMENDMENT NO. 106: 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 obligated, expended, or used in any manner to support operations, including NATO or United Nations operations, in or involving Libya.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MS. NORTON

AMENDMENT NO. 107: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for ''Operation and Maintenance—Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites'' is hereby reduced and increased by $1,000,000.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. KISSELL

AMENDMENT NO. 108: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any United States commercial air carrier if that contract, memorandum of understanding, cooperative agreement, loan, or loan guarantee allows the air carrier to charge baggage fees to any member of the Armed Forces who is traveling on official military orders and is being deployed overseas or is returning from an overseas deployment.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. AMASH

AMENDMENT NO. 109: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the use of military force against Libya.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. KINZINGER OF ILLINOIS

AMENDMENT NO. 110: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to research, develop, manufacture, or procure a newly designed flight suit or integrated aircrew ensemble.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MS. LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 111: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. It is the policy of the United States to withdraw all United States Armed Forces and military contractors from Iraq by December 31, 2011, and no provision of any agreement between the United States and Iraq that amends the timeline for such withdrawal in a manner that obligates the United States to a security commitment to respond to internal or external threats against Iraq after such date shall be in force with respect to the United States unless the agreement is in the form of a treaty requiring the advice and consent of the Senate (or is intended to take that form in the case of an agreement under negotiation) or is specifically authorized by an Act of Congress enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MS. LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 112: At the end of the bill (before the spending reduction amount), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any account of the Department of Defense (other than accounts excluded by subsection (b)) in excess of the amount made available for such account for fiscal year 2011, unless the financial statements of the Department for fiscal year 2011 are validated as ready for audit within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ACCOUNTS EXCLUDED.—The following accounts are excluded from the prohibition in subsection (a):

(1) Military personnel, reserve personnel, and National Guard personnel accounts of the Department of Defense.

(2) The Defense Health Program account.

(c) VALIDATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''validation'', with respect to the auditability of financial statements, means a determination, following an examination, that the financial statements comply with generally accepted accounting principles and applicable laws and regulations and reflect reliable internal controls.

(d) WAIVER.—The President may waive subsection (a) with respect to a component or program of the Department if the President certifies that applying the subsection to that component or program would harm national security or members of the Armed Forces who are in combat.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. ENGEL

AMENDMENT NO. 113: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum-Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. GOHMERT

AMENDMENT NO. 114: 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 obligated, expended, or used in any manner to support military operations, including NATO or United Nations operations, in Libya or in Libya's airspace.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT NO. 115: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended for assistance to the following entities:

(1) Iran.

(2) Hamas.

(3) Hizbullah.

(4) The Muslin Brotherhood.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. WELCH

AMENDMENT NO. 116: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for tax collection purposes by the Afghan Ministry of Finance.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. WELCH

AMENDMENT NO. 117: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Not more than $200,000,000 of the funds provided by title IX under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'' may be available for the Commander's Emergency Response Program, and the amount otherwise provided under such heading is hereby reduced by $200,000,000.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. TONKO

AMENDMENT NO. 118: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor or subcontractor to an employee performing work under the contract for compensation if the compensation of the employee for a fiscal year exceeds the rate payable for level I of the Executive Schedule under section 5312 of title 5, United States Code, regardless of the contract funding source.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. LEWIS OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 119: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The Secretary of Defense shall post on the public website of the Department of Defense the cost to each American taxpayer of each of the wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. LAMBORN

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 23, line 4, strike ''expended:'' and all that follows through ''6864(a)).'', and insert ''expended.''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,304,636,000)''.

Page 24, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $289,420,000)''.

Page 24, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $476,993,000)''.

Page 28, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $820,488,000)''.

Page 28, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $100,000,000)''.

Page 29, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $160,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $6,000,000)''.

Page 32, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 32, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 52, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $68,400,000)''.

Page 53, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $11,700,000)''.

Page 53, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,700,000)''.

Page 54, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,350,000)''.

Page 54, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $250,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,250,437,000)''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,304,636,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,304,363,000)''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 25, line 18, strike ''2012,'' and all that follows through ''of the Treasury:'', and insert ''2012:''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 9: Page 24, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $289,420,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $289,420,000)''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 10: Page 24, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $476,993,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $476,993,000)''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 28, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $820,488,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $820,488,000)''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 28, line 23 after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $100,000,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $100,000,000)''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 13: Page 29, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $160,000,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $160,000,000)''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 14: Page 31, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $6,000,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $6,000,000)''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 15: Page 32, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 32, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 16: Page 52, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $68,400,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $68,400,000)''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Page 53, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $11,700,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $11,700,000)''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 18: Page 53, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,700,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,700,000)''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 19: Page 54, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,350,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,350,000)''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 20: Page 54, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $250,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $250,000)''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. LUETKEMEYER

AMENDMENT NO. 21: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the study of the

Missouri River Projects authorized in section 108 of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2009 (division C of Public Law 111–8).

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. LUETKEMEYER

AMENDMENT NO. 22: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to continue the study conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to section 5018(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 or to implement activities proposed by such study.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. FLEMING

AMENDMENT NO. 23: Page 29, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $160,000,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $160,000,000)''.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 7, 2011 No. 100

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TOM UDALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the Earth belongs to You. At creation, You brought order out of chaos and light out of darkness. We wait for You to renew our strength, enabling us to mount up with wings as eagles.

Today reinforce our Senators with the constant assurance of Your presence, renewing their energies and enlarging their vision. Lord, give them hearts that find peace in the knowledge that they are ultimately accountable to You alone. Redeem their failures, reward their integrity, and crown their day with the benediction of Your peace.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable TOM UDALL 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 assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 7, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM UDALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. UDALL thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will resume the motion to proceed to S. 1323, which is a bill to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in the resulting budget deficit, with the time until 10 a.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. At 10 a.m., there will be a vote on the motion to invoke cloture to proceed to S. 1323.

BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today the Senate will consider legislation calling on millionaires and billionaires to contribute to this country's effort to reduce our deficit. The poor, the middle class, children, and seniors have already been asked to make sacrifices to help get our fiscal house in order. This legislation would reaffirm the Senate's commitment to ensuring the extremely wealthy are asked to make similar sacrifices. This principle that all Americans should contribute their fair share as we work together to reduce the deficit is so common sense it should go without saying. Yet Republicans boast of their opposition of having the very affluent not pay their fair share. This is the simple, straightforward statement by my Republican colleagues. Listen to this:

. . . any agreement to reduce the budget deficit should require that those earning $1,000,000 or more per year make a more meaningful contribution to the deficit reduction effort.

My Republican colleagues reject that. Democrats believe all Americans, even those who can afford private jets and yachts, should contribute to the collective effort to reduce the deficit. The question is, Why aren't Republicans willing to do the same? They say it is because they are looking out for the people. That claim is ridiculous. This claim is without foundation, which is preposterous. Let's talk about the millionaires and billionaires Republicans are determined to protect above all else. Less than one-quarter of 1 percent of tax returns filed in the United States each year belong to the people making more than $1 million—25 percent of 1 percent, one-quarter percent of 1 percent. These same people are the 1 percent of Americans who control 50 percent of this country's wealth. We are speaking of the Warren Buffetts of the world. Warren Buffett is my friend. I have great respect and admiration for him, but he is extremely wealthy. What does Warren Buffett, who is the second or third richest man in the world, say about contributing his fair share? He welcomes it. In fact, Mr. Buffett criticized the system in which his secretary gives a greater share of her income to the government each year than a man worth more than $50 billion. Here he says: ''If you're the luckiest 1 percent of humanity, you owe it to the rest of humanity to think about the other 99 percent.''

That is what he said. That is what Warren Buffett said about contributing his fair share.

Since the late 1970s, incomes for the lucky 1 percent of America have risen by 281 percent. The last three decades have been very good to the very wealthy. President George W. Bush called these people the haves and have-mores. He also called them his base. Right now, the Republican Party is

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

putting what is good for this very small base ahead of what is very good for this great Nation.

The legislation before us asks only this: that each American be part of the solution rather than part of the problem. In poll after poll, Americans have endorsed this principle. They have said they believe we must address our deficit both by reducing spending and by ending tax breaks to the wealthiest citizens and corporations. We have heard them. Democrats have heard them. If Warren Buffett chooses to buy a private jet or a whole fleet of them, that is OK, but the American taxpayer should not give him a special tax break for buying his own jet airplane.

Our country is facing a crisis. We face mounting debt brought on by a decade of war and tax breaks for the wealthy. We face the prospect that Republicans will force us to default on our financial obligations for the first time in our Nation's history. Difficult choices must be made. Together, we should consider cutting programs to help real people in very real ways. Eliminating tax breaks for oil companies making record profits, corporations that ship jobs overseas, and the owners of private jets and yachts should be an easy part of this problem to solve. Yet Republicans walked away from the negotiating table when a solution was in sight because they said no to fairness. Democrats had already agreed to trillions in difficult cuts in order to prevent a default crisis and avert a worldwide depression. Then Republicans walked away from the table to help the 1 percent of Americans fortunate enough to not need any extra help.

How do Republicans explain that to their constituents back home? Very carefully. Why? Because as middle-class families struggle to make ends meet, my Republican colleagues are risking the financial future of this country and the world for the sake of people who can afford private jets and yachts. I cannot imagine that conversation. Asking millionaires and billionaires to contribute to solving this Nation's deficit crisis is not unreasonable. It is just plain common sense and simple fairness.

We are going to have a vote in just 20 minutes or so, and probably what my Republican colleagues will do is to vote to allow us to proceed. That would be great if there was some sense that they agreed with what we are trying to do; that is, that they want the millionaires and billionaires to contribute their fair share. But as we know, the rules will only allow us to move to the next step and actually be on the bill. So when we get on the bill, I would tell everyone here, if we can work on an agreement to have some fixed amendments and work on it, I would be happy to do that. It is how we used to do things around here.

But if this means a free-for-all and offering amendments on abortion and war fighting and all this kind of stuff, we can't do that. We need to devote these next few weeks to debate dealing with the deficit problems we have in this country, and they are significant.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, later this morning, we will have a vote whether to proceed to a nonbinding resolution on whether to raise taxes at a time when 14 million Americans are out of work. I oppose the resolution, but I will vote to move to it so we can finally have a real debate about the economic crisis we face. That is what we were supposed to be doing this week, and that is what we will do. This is an important debate to have as discussions continue over at the White House this morning in connection with the President's request to raise the debt ceiling.

Americans want to know where their elected representatives stand on these issues. Today we will have an opportunity to show them where we stand on entitlement reform, where we stand on government spending, where we stand on balancing the budget, where we stand on our unsustainable deficits and debt.

For too long, Democrats have tried to evade these questions. It has been 799 days since Democrats passed a budget. They have presented no plan to reduce our debt. So today is an opportunity to offer real ideas for addressing our debt and job crisis, to make our positions clear, and, for our part, Republicans intend to offer more than a vague, nonbinding resolution.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

SHARED SACRIFICE IN RESOLVING THE BUDGET DEFICIT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 1323, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the bill (S. 1323) to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 10 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, pending is S. 1323, which is the sense-of-the-Senate resolution. For those who follow the Senate, this is not a law. It will not be a law, if passed. It is merely an expression of sentiment by the Senate on an issue. It can be summarized very quickly with the sense-of-the-Senate clause, which reads:

It is the sense of the Senate that any agreement to reduce the budget deficit should require that those earning $1,000,000 or more per year make a more meaningful contribution to the deficit reduction effort.

Why are we even talking about this? Wouldn't everyone in America concede that everyone needs to make a sacrifice if we are going to make this country stronger? Those who can make a greater sacrifice, those who are well-off, with an income of $1 million or more each year, should do a little more. Why is that such a bold and controversial suggestion? Because, in fact, when we look at the actions taken by Congress over the last 10 years, we have found a political sentiment, primarily from the other side of the aisle—not exclusively, primarily—which says we cannot ask sacrifice of the wealthiest people in America.

I can tell those who are students of American history know when we have had a challenge in this Nation, particularly during wars when our very existence was being challenged, people stepped up from every income level in America and said: I am willing to fight for this country. I am willing to die for this country. I am willing to sacrifice for this country. So why would this be a matter to be debated on the floor of the Senate? Because, in fact, the policies of this country over the last 10 years have said that the wealthiest among us should be spared, time and again, from sacrifice when it comes to the future of our Nation.

That is just plain wrong. Those who are fortunate enough to be well-off, to have a strong income, to enjoy the blessings of liberty, to live in what I feel is the greatest Nation on Earth should be prepared to give back something.

I have spoken to some in our walk of life here in the Senate. We spend time with those who are well-off who finance our campaigns. That is a reality I am not happy with, but a reality. So many of them have said, for goodness sake, Senator, why do you even hesitate to ask me for more taxes? I am prepared to pay those taxes because I feel blessed to live in this country.

So the idea of raising taxes on the wealthiest among us won't change their lifestyle a bit but will help to solve some of our problems. If we don't change the tax cuts that were put in under President George W. Bush, people making $1 million-plus a year will get a $200,000 tax break—a $200,000 tax break—every year. In order to pay for

that tax break, some other Americans have to sacrifice. For example, it means about 33 seniors will have to pay $600 more a year for Medicare under one proposal in the House Republican budget so that we will generate enough money to give a tax break to a person who is a millionaire. Thirty-three seniors will pay $600 more a year so a millionaire can get a tax break. That is wrong. It is just plain wrong.

I believe we need to ask for shared sacrifice, and that is what this resolution says. Senator MCCONNELL, who was here a few moments ago, said this week:

> It's about making Washington make tough choices. It's about Washington taking the hit this time.

Well, the people who are taking the hit in America are not in Washington, they are all across this country. It is low and middle-income Americans who are taking a hit in the current economy. There are still almost 14 million Americans out of work and those who are working have seen the bulk of income growth go to the highest income categories. We have the greatest income disparity in the history of the United States since the Great Depression. Over the past 10 years, the median family income has declined by more than $2,500. What that means, whether it is New Mexico or Illinois, is that people who are working hard, going to work every single day, making sacrifices, fall further and further behind and live paycheck to paycheck. That is the reality of life for hard-working, middle-income Americans.

So those of us who come to the floor and say spare them—if you are going to spare anyone from further taxation, give them a helping hand—understand the reality of it so they can keep their heads above water, barely. So many Americans live paycheck to paycheck. It is the only way they survive, and that is the reality.

My colleague from Kentucky is right. In Washington we need to make the tough choices and we need to face them with a sense of consensus and compromise. An all-or-nothing approach to the budget isn't going to work. In about an hour and 15 minutes, I am going to be honored to represent, with Senator REID, our majority leader, the Senate Democrats in a meeting with President Obama. We will sit down in the Cabinet Room, as I have before, and we will talk about what we are going to do with this deficit crisis. I will say to the President and those assembled that we have plenty to work with. It was 6 or 7 months ago when the Bowles-Simpson commission, the President's commission on the deficit, gave us a blueprint and said: Here is a way to reach $4.5 trillion of deficit reduction in a fair way: Put everything on the table. Democrats, suck it up. Put entitlements on the table. Make sure that at the end of the day, these are still programs that serve the public, Social Security is still there making its promised payments. Make sure Medicare covers the health care of elderly Americans. Do it in a fiscally responsible way, but don't run away from it. Don't ignore the problems we face.

Similarly, the Bowles-Simpson commission said to those on the other side of the aisle: Be honest about revenue. We are facing the lowest Federal revenue against our gross domestic product we have seen in 60 years. Is it any wonder we are in deficit? Fifteen percent of our gross domestic product comes to the Federal Government revenue share and we spend 25 percent. So the 10-percent difference is our deficit. It is time to bring the spending down and the revenue up.

Critics will say we can't raise taxes in the midst of a recession. Well, we need to be careful, I agree. Raising taxes in the wrong places could hurt our recovery. Here are some places where it won't hurt, as this resolution says, at the highest income categories. These Americans can afford to pay a little more. They certainly don't need a tax break.

Secondly, take a look at the Tax Code. We have up to $1.2 trillion a year in tax spending, tax earmarks, credits and deductions that the special interest lobbyists put in the Tax Code. Many of them are absolutely indefensible, and we can't afford them anymore. If we are asking sacrifice across the board from America, we should ask sacrifice from those who are benefiting from these tax loopholes and tax benefits. We can do that. In fact, we may be able to do it if we follow Bowles-Simpson and at the same time reduce the marginal tax rates for all Americans. It can be done.

Let's take a hard look at the Tax Code and remember that 70 percent of Americans do not itemize, which means they do not take advantage of the Tax Code, except in a rare situation where they have a refundable tax credit. These people are not using the Tax Code. Those who use it are in higher income categories. They are using it, they are following the law, and they are avoiding their taxes.

Warren Buffett had a great quote which we should remember while we debate this. November 26, 2006:

> There's class warfare, all right, but it's my class, the rich class, that's making war, and we're winning.

Warren Buffett is a man of few words and is listened to carefully because of his wisdom in business and in life, and he hits the nail on the head. He said to me and to many others—and publicly—it is unconscionable that using our Tax Code today, he, Warren Buffett, pays a lower marginal tax rate than the secretaries in his office. That is absolutely wrong. Why should a hard-working person in a business, at a lower level, pay a higher marginal tax rate than the person owning the business, making millions of dollars each year? That is where the Tax Code is wrong, and that is where we can change it, save money, use it to reduce the deficit and reduce marginal income tax rates.

That is what this resolution is all about. It is nothing short of amazing we are debating the question of whether those who make $1 million or more each year should pony up and contribute more when it comes to deficit reduction.

The newspapers this morning talk about what may be included in any final agreement. I don't know what will be included. I hope there is an agreement. There is one thing I wish to make clear. I just left a meeting with people who do forecasting—Standard & Poor's, Moody's, Fitch, and the like. They talked about what is going to happen if we do not extend the debt ceiling. Let me lay my cards on the table. The debt ceiling vote every year is a political football. Those who are not in the President's party don't want to vote for it. Why should they, and go home and get slapped around for having voted to extend America's debt. In years gone by, there have been times I didn't vote for it but, in all honesty, I knew in the back of my mind it was going to pass.

Here is the reality: If we reach a stalemate on the debt ceiling now because the President's party doesn't control the Congress—certainly not the House and barely in the Senate—if we don't extend the debt ceiling, what is going to happen is very obvious. The full faith and credit of the United States is going to be called into question, and that has never happened. We have never in our history failed to extend the debt ceiling and to say we stand behind our debts and will make good on payments. If there is any question about that, we know what happens. It is the same thing that happens when a person defaults on their home mortgage. It becomes increasingly difficult to ever get another mortgage and if that person does, he or she faces higher interest rates than ever. That is what America will face if we don't extend the debt ceiling. So these people from these rating agencies came to us and said it will be disastrous if you allow the debt ceiling not to be extended on August 2. That is the reality of the world we live in.

So I would say, as we go into these important and difficult negotiations, as we move toward the moment when we are going to have, I hope, an agreement, let's make it very clear to the world that the United States understands its obligations, will pay its debts, and that we won't face the dire consequences of the opposite being true. That is the reality of what we face today.

I will say one last thing before I yield the floor.

As we structure this deficit rescue or deficit project, let's remember two things are essential. There are vulnerable people in the United States of America who, through no fault of their own, struggle each day to live. Some of them suffer from physical and mental disabilities. Some of them have been poor their entire lives and come from

poor families and have a difficult time and limited education. Some of them are elderly and in nursing homes. These people—the most vulnerable among us—need a helping hand. We have never failed to do that in modern times and we shouldn't in this time of trouble, time of deficit. We can keep our word to the poor among us that we are going to stand by them because we are caring people. We can do it by making certain the Medicaid Program, which provides health insurance for one-third of the children in America and which covers the medical costs of birth of more than 40 percent of children in America and literally provides for millions of seniors to be able to stay in nursing homes and in senior settings, these are the things we need to take care of in the midst of this deficit reduction.

I see my colleague from Tennessee on the Republican side has come to the floor, and there is time available on his side. I didn't know if anyone was coming. I am wrapping up, so I thank my colleague from Tennessee.

I will wrap up by saying we can take care to make sure the safety net is protected, and to make sure as well that we address all levels of spending in our government—every one of them—to make certain that whether it is the defense budget or the budget for programs not related to defense or whether it is entitlement programs, all of these need to be carefully scrutinized. We can cut spending in a responsible, bipartisan way and show we can bring our deficit down, strengthen this economy and, I think in the process, if we do it on a bipartisan basis, we are going to launch an economic recovery that inures to the benefit of all of us. If we don't and this ends up in finger pointing, I don't know who will take the fall for it. No one does. But the best thing we can do is to ignore the political aspect and deal with the reality of the challenge we face.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Illinois said and I congratulate him not necessarily for the specifics of what he said but for his general demeanor and attitude throughout this entire discussion about the deficit and the debt. He has been one of those Senators—there have been some on both sides of the aisle—who have made some difficult choices and some difficult decisions and recognizes that at a time when Washington is borrowing 40 cents of every dollar we spend, we have a serious problem and we have to look at our entire fiscal condition in order to solve the problem. The people of this country expect us to do that. So Senator DURBIN has, by his willingness to make some hard decisions, set a pretty good example for all of us in the Senate.

Today, my hope is the meeting the President has with our congressional leaders of both sides succeeds, because if they succeed, our country succeeds. The country expects us to do that. I hope they think big. I hope they swing for the fences and get a result and bring it back to us and let us consider it and hopefully enact it and get on to other business. The debt is a major long-term problem, not just for our grandchildren but for us today. We have a bigger issue facing us which is the fact that we have had persistent unemployment in an economy that is not growing, and that is hurting too many people. So the sooner we swing for the fences and get a result and get our debt under control and deal with it in a bipartisan way, the better for the country and the quicker we will be able to get on to the larger question of jobs.

Of course, economists have made clear to us getting the debt under control has a lot to do with jobs. When our total debt is as high as it is today—nearly 100 percent of our gross domestic product—that probably costs us 1 million jobs a year. We can't solve all of that in 1 day or 1 month, but we can take a big step in the right direction, and that is what our countrymen and women want us to do.

I am glad I was able to be here to hear part of the Senator's speech and I am glad I have a chance to commend him for his leadership on this vexing and important problem we need to deal with.

I thank the President, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if it meets with the approval of the Senator from Tennessee in leadership on the Republican side, I suggest we yield back all time, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

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. 93, S. 1323, a bill to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit.

Harry Reid, Richard J. Durbin, Charles E. Schumer, Frank R. Lautenberg, Al Franken, John D. Rockefeller IV, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Sherrod Brown, Bernard Sanders, John F. Kerry, Jeff Merkley, Debbie Stabenow, Daniel K. Akaka, Daniel K. Inouye, Patrick J. Leahy, Benjamin L. Cardin.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1323, a bill to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit, 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.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 74, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 106 Leg.]

YEAS—74

Akaka	Graham	Moran
Alexander	Grassley	Murkowski
Baucus	Hagan	Murray
Begich	Hoeven	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Hutchison	Pryor
Bingaman	Inouye	Reed
Blumenthal	Johanns	Reid
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Roberts
Brown (MA)	Kerry	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Kirk	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Kohl	Sessions
Carper	Kyl	Shaheen
Casey	Landrieu	Shelby
Coats	Lautenberg	Snowe
Cochran	Levin	Stabenow
Collins	Lieberman	Thune
Conrad	Lugar	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Corker	McCain	Vitter
Cornyn	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Webb
Feinstein	Menendez	Whitehouse
Franken	Merkley	Wyden
Gillibrand	Mikulski	

NAYS—22

Ayotte	Enzi	Paul
Barrasso	Hatch	Portman
Blunt	Heller	Risch
Boozman	Inhofe	Rubio
Chambliss	Isakson	Toomey
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Wicker
Crapo	Lee	
DeMint	Nelson (NE)	

NOT VOTING—4

Burr	Leahy
Harkin	Tester

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote, the yeas are 74, the nays are 22. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 6 p.m. today on the motion to proceed be equally divided between the two leaders or there designees; further, that at 2 p.m., Monday, July 11, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1323, with the time until 5:30 equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that at 5:30 p.m. the Senate proceed to vote on the adoption of the motion to proceed to S. 1323.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. There will be no more rollcall votes this week.

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 Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I will, Mr. President.

Mr. McCAIN. The Senator from Texas, I am just wondering if a view that she might have might be that we have been terribly overworked this week. I understand we cancelled our Fourth of July recess in order to get back here and get to work and do the people's business.

Is it correct that was the second vote that we have taken? One was an instruction of the Sergeant at Arms, and this one, another highly controversial issue that was taken up.

I guess my question to the Senator from Texas is, Has this week been a worthwhile expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Well, I will respond to the distinguished Senator from Arizona that the resolution that was just passed was to go to a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, which, of course, has no force of law. It is, indeed, our second vote this week.

I will say that there is one thing on the minds of the people today, one thing on the minds of the people of America today, and it is, What on Earth is Congress doing? What on Earth is the President doing? What are they doing to address the looming debt crisis? And we were called back in not to recess but so that we could do something meaningful.

When I saw the Senator from Arizona on the Senate floor, he was ready to talk about our international situation and the commitments that we are making certainly. Many people said: No, wait a minute. We have a debt crisis, and we can't wait until August 2 to fulfill it.

So I would just respond to the Senator from Arizona and say, when do the American people get the answer they deserve, which is that Congress and the President are working together, and we are being productive, and we have a budget resolution on the floor, and we are debating it and we are talking about our differences on taxes and spending? I don't think we can tax our way out of a recession. I don't think we can tax our way out of the budget deficit.

I would just ask the Senator from Arizona if he thinks that we can make meaningful progress staying in session and debating, and if, in fact, that might be an option in the future.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McCAIN. I see the distinguished majority leader waiting, so I will make my comments brief. I know that his agenda is very busy.

I would just say to my friend from Texas that I understand a lot of the inner mechanisms and hidden workings are going on behind the scenes. But when I go back and tell my constituents that we cancelled a week of recess and we had two votes—one to instruct the Sergeant at Arms and the other on a sense-of-the Senate resolution—I would have liked to have taken up other business that was rejected by Members on this side because they wanted to focus on the deficit. But if we are focusing on that, maybe we should have taken up some issues that directly affect the deficit, such as ethanol subsidies, such as some of the other tax breaks and loopholes and other issues that surround the whole bankruptcy of this country.

I see the majority leader is waiting, so I will yield to my friend from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I would just ask unanimous consent that following the majority leader I regain the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. The Senator from Texas will have the floor. I just have a brief comment.

I have known my friend, the senior Senator from Arizona, since 1982 when we were both elected to Congress. His record of public service speaks for itself. But I would say to him, and to everyone within the sound of my voice, we didn't vote on Libya, this important resolution that had been worked on so hard by the distinguished Senator from Arizona and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, because I was told we wouldn't get any votes from the Republicans because they wanted to focus on the deficit.

My friend also recognizes, as he said, that there is work going on behind the scenes, and that is true. There has been a lot of work this week that took place as a result of our being here that would not have taken place but for the fact that we are in session.

We know a lot of the work we accomplish here is not with votes. One reason we have not been having a lot of votes in recent months is because we can't get things on the Senate floor. We have been stopped by my Republican friends. There are meetings going on with the White House and with the Speaker, a multitude of meetings there, meetings going on between Members of the Senate and Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives. So I would say to everyone here it is good we were in session this week. I haven't heard a single person who is not in Congress complain about our being here. It is important we are here. As a result of that, we have been able to move down the road much further on the problems we have with the debt than we would have had we not been in session because there are all kinds of meetings going on around town dealing with how we do this.

We had a meeting right behind us today that started at 9 where we had the head of the Chamber of Commerce in. We had people from Moody's Financial Services. They were here to tell us what they are doing to focus on Republicans being able to help us get through this problem dealing with the debt.

We have to do something about the staggering debt that faces us, and what this resolution we voted on earlier today is all about is making sure there is equal sacrifice in our country; that is, we know we are going to have to make some cuts. We also recognize that we need to do something about equalizing revenue, and that is what is going on.

While what we do in the Senate every week isn't like solving a math problem—there is no perfection—that is the way the Founding Fathers set up this great government of ours. So we are going to continue to work in the next 4 weeks of this work period to solve some of the Nation's problems.

No. 1 on the list is doing something about our staggering debt.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I appreciate what the majority leader has said.

There is a lot going on, and there is the beginning, perhaps, of coming together, hopefully, with the President and the leadership of the House and the Senate. I just hope that we can establish why it is that there is such a divide on how we accomplish the issue of raising the debt ceiling with real reforms that will assure that we will not have to raise the debt ceiling again; that we will cut deficits so the debt will also be cut in this country. We cannot sustain the level of debt we have now. It is the highest we have ever had in the history of this country.

Mr. President, let's face it. We have two basic problems. We have this looming $14 trillion debt that is about to hit the ceiling, and we have to raise the ceiling. It would be irresponsible to do that without significant reforms that will assure that we are not going to hit it again. But the second problem we have is 9.1 percent unemployment.

So it is not like we are in a vacuum and we can just start taxing our small businesses, when small business has already had the looming hit of the health care plan that was passed that is going to cause every business in this country significant increases in their cost of doing business.

So when people are out there saying: Why is unemployment still so high? Why is hiring lagging? I think it is because businesses are trying to prepare for this big hit they are going to get in 2014 when the Obama health care plan takes full effect. They are trying to figure out if they are going to pay more for insurance or if they are going to take the fine and pay fines for every

employee who doesn't have insurance, which is going to cause chaos in this country. So they are trying to decide.

On top of that, people on the other side of the aisle in Washington, DC, keep talking about increasing taxes, and the President keeps talking about increasing taxes. So no wonder our employers are not saying: Oh, yes, let's just open the floodgates and bring people back to work. They don't know what to expect.

We must generate economic growth, not stifle it. We need businesses to feel confident in the future that they are going to be able to make a profit on top of all the added costs of new taxes and health care reform that is going to hit businesses the hardest.

So we don't have a tax problem in this country. We are not being taxed too little. This government is spending too much. That is the problem we are facing right now. That is why we have a $14 trillion debt. We have a $1.6 trillion shortfall between spending and revenue this year.

So I am reminded of what Ronald Reagan once said: We don't have a $1 trillion debt because we haven't taxed enough. We have a $1 trillion debt because we spend too much.

Let's look at the spending side of the equation. We cannot continue business as usual in Washington and fix this problem. When President Obama was sworn into office, the national debt was $10.6 trillion. It was too much then. I think we all agree. Now it is $14.3 trillion. We are weeks away from officially hitting that $14.3 trillion debt ceiling.

We have had a monumental addition to the unprecedented number of spending dollars that was the stimulus that passed in February of 2009. Today, the President's Council of Economic Advisers said that 2.4 million jobs were created at a cost of $666 billion. That is about three-quarters of the stimulus. That is a cost to taxpayers of $278,000 per job. That is just not reasonable. This is the kind of spending we cannot continue in this country.

I think they say they want to increase taxes, and I hear the President say we must increase taxes on the oil companies, increase taxes on corporate jets. I think if we are fair and across-the-board and we tax oil companies like we tax every business—sure. Let's even the playing field. If we are going to take away the business deductions every business gets in this country, then, sure, let's take them from every business, including oil. But it is not going to help the deficit because it is not enough to help the deficit.

They say they want to increase taxes in order to reduce the deficit, but what they really want is to increase taxes to permanently increase spending so the big government we have seen grow in the last 2 years, 2½ years will be permanent. That is why they want to increase taxes.

I say there is a way to fix this. First of all, we could pass a balanced budget amendment. A balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution would put us on a budget that we would have to meet like most States in this Nation and every business and every family. We would set the limits. I believe the appropriate limit would be that total Federal expenditures would be limited to 18 percent of the gross domestic product. Then Congress would also have to have caps on spending—about the same, 18 percent of gross domestic product. This would be a spending reform we could adopt that I believe the States would also agree to ratify that would give us a trajectory that would eliminate this deficit and the debt in this country, and we would be on a fiscally responsible path.

Second, if we are going to do this, we have to look at entitlements. That is the reality. We have a nearly bankrupt entitlement system that is ongoing regardless of what the revenue coming in is. The debt limit and the ongoing deficit reduction negotiations need to put entitlement reform on the table. Until yesterday they had refused to do it, but now it seems that perhaps some entitlement reform might be on the table. For instance, one that I have introduced a bill to correct is the Social Security system. Social Security will account for one-fifth of all Federal spending this year. The time for reform is now, and we can do it in a reasonable way.

The amount of Social Security benefits being paid out exceeds the revenue the Social Security payroll is collecting, and we are starting to draw down on the Social Security reserves. When the reserves run out in 2036, Social Security will only be able to pay out 77 percent of the benefits to current and future retirees. That is the law today. It would force a 23-percent cut in benefits. That is the law today.

The Social Security Board of Trustees reported earlier this year that one way to shore up Social Security's assets is to immediately and permanently increase the combined payroll tax on employees and employers from 12.4 to 14.5 percent—in other words, increase payroll taxes by one-sixth during our jobless economic nonrecovery. I do not think that is really feasible.

The trustees also noted that the shortfall could be eliminated by an immediate 13.8 percent cut in core benefits retirees are getting right now—an immediate $150-per-month cut in every Social Security benefit check right now. That was what the Social Security trustees suggested was a possibility. That is something I think we would unanimously, in this Senate, reject. No one is going to cut benefits $150 per month right now—nobody. Nobody would do it.

If we are going to address this, I have proposed a plan. Senator KYL and I introduced S. 1213, the Defend and Save Social Security Act. First, everyone knows we are living longer than when the Social Security Act passed. We have a higher quality of life. People want to work longer in most areas. So why not gradually raise the retirement age without impacting those who are about to retire?

Under my bill, anyone who is 58 years of age or older will see no change by the gradual increase of the retirement age. For everyone else, starting in 2016 the normal and early retirement age would increase by 3 months a year, so the normal retirement age would reach 67 by 2019, 68 by 2023, and 69 at 2027, and it stops there. Early retirement would be gradual—3 months a year, increased to 63 by 2019 and 64 by 2023, and it would stop.

Currently, Social Security recipients receive an annual cost-of-living adjustment, a COLA. Under my plan, the COLA would be computed as it is in current law but reduced 1 percent. So the average rate of inflation and COLA has been 2.2 percent every year of an increase. So if we have a 2.2-percent rate of inflation COLA, it would be a 1.2-percent increase in Social Security benefits. What I am saying is that a 1-percent decrease in the COLA is just a 1-percent decrease in the increase.

You would have the gradual raising of the age that would be much more in line with our actuarial table and the reality today, where people are living much longer, and you would also have a slight decrease in the increase in Social Security benefits according to inflation. If we have rampant inflation, then you would have the COLA, just 1 percent less. So if it is 2.2 percent inflation, then you would get a 1.2-percent COLA. Doing that saves the Social Security system, and it closes the 75-year gap. It does not raise taxes on anyone, and it does not cut a core benefit for anyone. That is the way we could fix Social Security right now.

What would that do for our deficit? Here is what it would do. It would achieve a $416 billion reduction over the next 10 years of our deficit and a $7.2 trillion savings by 2085. That means we are on the track. That means that over the next 75 years Social Security will be solid and secure without a tax increase on anyone and without a cut in core benefits to anyone, and no one who is 58 years of age or older will be affected by the adjustment in the retirement age.

We have a chance to do some things. I have gone out and said: Here is a proposal. My colleague, Senator CORKER, has proposed a limit, a cap on spending that is a reasonable limit. Other colleagues—Senator LEE, Senator PAUL, and Senator TOOMEY have suggested other ways to cut spending across the board, just a level goal. They are not cutting specific things, but they are cutting the discretionary spending at reasonable levels. Many Republicans are offering ways to cut back on spending. My colleague, Senator CORNYN from Texas, has put forward a cap on spending and a balanced budget amendment. There are proposals out there that are responsible ways to deal with this deficit that include entitlements and discretionary spending both.

It is time for the President of the United States to sit down at the table and understand that tax increases for kind of a photo-op PR are not going to fill the void. The public relations of cutting back on corporate jet benefits, whatever they are—I don't know what they are; I don't have one—but I think we would probably all agree, if you can afford a corporate jet or a private jet, fine. Whatever the President wants to do, we will do it, and it will do nothing to help the deficit. So why don't we do the meaningful things, which is make meaningful cuts in discretionary spending. Let's attack what everybody knows is the case; that is, Social Security is going bankrupt as we speak. If Congress and the President will speak responsibly about it, we can put that on a glidepath that is within the reasonable actuarial table estimate so that people will work longer, and very gradually increase it—starting in 2016, ending in 2027 at 69. That is gradual.

We cannot procrastinate. We cannot wait. We cannot hope the crisis will pass. And we cannot delay the inevitable. This is the Senate. We were elected to make the tough choices. It is time for us to do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN of Ohio). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

TRADE WITH SOUTH KOREA

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Senate's upcoming trade agenda and its impact on Pennsylvania workers and Pennsylvania jobs.

Like so many of our States, Pennsylvania has always played a critically important role in America's manufacturing and commercial heritage. The coal and waterways of our State helped make the Commonwealth legendary for steelmaking and helped turn the United States into an industrial powerhouse. During its heyday, 60 percent of the domestic steel production in the United States came from Pennsylvania.

During World War II, almost one-third of the Nation's steel came from Pennsylvania, which was a full 20 percent of global production at the time. The then-Governor of Pennsylvania, Arthur James, put it this way: ''Pennsylvania was truly the arsenal of democracy and the arsenal of America.''

Given its dominance in the steel industry, it is no surprise that the Commonwealth was sixth in the Nation in total war production during the Second World War, leading in shipbuilding and munitions production. More money was spent to expand production capacity in Pennsylvania than in any other State during the war.

We know at the time it did not stop there. It did not stop at the end of the war. After the war was over, these manufacturing facilities were used to make American products and fuel the growth of a thriving middle class.

Today, so many of these plants have gone away, due in part to our failed trade policies. Over the last 30 years, we have seen trade deficits soar, currency manipulation go unchecked, lavish subsidies by foreign governments go ignored, and exploitation of workers in other countries overlooked. That is why I am very concerned that today the Finance Committee is moving forward the pending agreements with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama. For the last several weeks, the Presiding Officer, Senator BROWN, and I have persistently asked the tough, critical questions about the impact of these agreements before they are considered. A review of the impact of past trade agreements offers very little comfort. In 1994, Congress passed the North American Free Trade Agreement. We know it as NAFTA. Since NAFTA's passage, U.S. Trade policies have steadily chipped away at Pennsylvania's manufacturing base.

It is a critical sector for our State and so many others. According to a recent study—and the chart on my left depicts it—from the Industrial Resource Centers, from 1997 to 2010, just 13 years, manufacturing went from 16.4 percent of our gross State product to 12.1 percent, a remarkable drop in just 13 years. What does that mean for the total number of jobs? In total, Pennsylvania lost nearly 300,000 manufacturing jobs. You can see it from the chart, starting in 1997, the drop to 12.1 percent in just those 13 years—300,000 jobs in 13 years.

Despite these alarming numbers and statistics, advocates for the trade deals, including the pending agreement with South Korea, promised significant economic benefits from exploding export potential to job creation. Proponents argue a significant net positive from these agreements every time they are considered. In reality, instead of creating opportunities for Pennsylvania, our trade policies did little more than offshore good-paying jobs, while giving our trading partners unlimited access to our markets.

So we must take the time now to ask the tough questions. Specifically, as a Senator from Pennsylvania, I must ask three basic questions about any trade deal. No. 1, will the agreement protect current Pennsylvania jobs and create new jobs in Pennsylvania and across America? No. 2, will the agreement help create a level playing field for American businesses and workers? No. 3, does the agreement provide new opportunities for American manufacturers to export?

I will focus on the South Korean Free Trade Agreement in the context of each question. First, will the agreement protect and create jobs in Pennsylvania and across the Nation? In these uncertain times, job creation must be our top priority. In Pennsylvania, the manufacturing sector is critical. Manufacturing remains the Commonwealth's largest source of good-paying jobs, with chemical primary metal products, fabricated metal products, food products, and machinery making up the top five manufacturing sectors supporting Pennsylvania families. These benefits extend beyond individual manufacturing businesses in our State—in fact, the economic benefits of a strong manufacturing sector experienced throughout Pennsylvania's economy. According to research commissioned by the Pennsylvania Industrial Resource Centers, every $1 increase in demand for products manufactured in our State leads to an increase in growth value of $2.52 across all industries. So one buck in activity can lead to $2.52 in value.

The manufacturing jobs that are created support middle-income families, and the creation of those jobs and the support they provided for those families in 2008 meant the following: The average annual compensation of a worker in the manufacturing sector was over $65,000. The average pay for the rest of the workforce was $10,000 less. Each good-paying job in this country allows for more money to flow back into the economy. Given the importance of manufacturing jobs in Pennsylvania, we must ask ourselves: Will the Korea trade agreement create jobs, especially in the manufacturing sector? I believe it will not create a substantial number of new jobs in this critical sector.

Looking back over the last 20 years, trade-related job expansion has been an unfulfilled promise for Pennsylvania and the Nation. We need to look no further than NAFTA. In 1993, when the agreement was signed, NAFTA promised to deliver hundreds of thousands of jobs across the United States. Leading economists at the time projected NAFTA would bring 170,000 new jobs in the near term alone. These gains were not realized. Instead, since NAFTA was signed into law through 2002, 525,094 workers were certified as displaced under NAFTA, according to the Department of Labor. I am sure that number has grown since that 2002 data point. Furthermore, when NAFTA was negotiated, leaders suggested that American exports would expand greatly to meet the new-found demands of the open Mexican market with all its new customers. The opposite has occurred.

In 1993, the United States had a small trade surplus. We had a surplus with Mexico. According to the official Census Bureau statistics, by 2010, 17 years later, we were running a trade deficit with Mexico of $66.4 billion. So a surplus in trade with Mexico became a huge deficit. Trade with Canada also saw a widening trade deficit from $10 billion in 1993 to $28 billion in 2010. So there a deficit got bigger; whereas, in the case of Mexico, it went from a surplus to a massive deficit of $66 billion. The impact of these policies is plainly seen in employment data. Pennsylvania has seen a dramatic decline in manufacturing employment since NAFTA was implemented, losing a total of over 300,000 jobs. With this rosy prediction of NAFTA in mind, a close

look at the government's projections of the South Korea agreement should be viewed with great skepticism. While the International Trade Commission predicts our bilateral trade with Korea will improve, the total U.S. trade deficit is predicted to get larger. While proponents of the agreement argue U.S. exports to Korea will increase, they are neglecting to tell the whole truth. Companies will simply shift from exporting to Korea, to creating current customers in other places, rather than increasing total exports.

The second question I ask is, Will this agreement help create a level playing field after enactment? I believe this agreement, South Korea agreement, will fail to create a level playing field for our workers and our companies. Modern trade agreements do more than cut tariffs. These agreements contain hundreds of provisions that make substantial changes to nontrade policies, and the Korea agreement is no exception. According to the group Public Citizen, these nontrade provisions limit the authority granted to elected representatives of the American people over product and food safety, financial regulations, health care and energy regulations, patent terms, and even our tax dollars that can be spent by the government. The agreement allows Korean exporters to take investment disputes out of courts and into unaccountable and secretive international tribunals through a process known as investor-to-state dispute system that is similar to NAFTA.

Additionally, the investment chapters were signed prior to the current financial crisis back in 2007. These specific chapters include rules that prohibit either country from imposing firewalls between the sorts of financial services one firm may offer to limit the spread of risk, for example. Important protections put in place after the financial crisis of 2007 and 2008 could potentially be challenged under the pending agreement. Even more troubling is the issue of Korea's currency. South Korean currency manipulation remains an unaddressed problem. As we have seen in China, an intentionally weakened currency leads to a fundamentally unbalanced trade relationship and brutal conditions for U.S. companies. In a June 17 report, the Economic Policy Institute calculated that if Asian currencies were strengthened to appropriate market-determined levels, if that were done, U.S. gross domestic product would increase by as much as $285.7 billion or 1.9 percent, creating up to 2.25 million U.S. jobs; that is, if Asian currencies were strengthened to those appropriate levels. Unfortunately, as with other NAFTA-style free-trade agreements, this South Korea agreement is silent on currency. This is unacceptable because South Korea devalued their currency twice, once in 1988, once in 1998. Both interventions devalued their currency by 50 percent or more. South Korea was one of the first countries cited as a currency manipulator by the Treasury Department in 1988. South Korea continues their long history of manipulating their currency. In fact, the most recent Treasury report to Congress on international economic and exchange rate policies, from May 27, 2011, noted that South Korea intervened ''heavily'' in its currency market during the financial crisis and has continued uninterrupted since. Treasury urged South Korea to ''adopt a greater degree of exchange rate flexibility and less intervention.'' Currency policy has played a central role in China's mercantilist trade policies and has cost the United States thousands of jobs. We should not be cutting tariffs for the country, with South Korea's heavy history on currency manipulation, without language to deal with protecting us in a competitive environment in the devaluations that they have undertaken before.

Additionally, several groups raised the possibility that the agreement could be used to weaken U.S. trade laws. The free trade agreement creates a bilateral commission on trade laws. While our Trade Representative argues that this will not change any existing U.S. trade laws, this avenue could be used by advocates of weaker enforcement in the future.

Finally, I turn to the last question. Does the agreement provide new opportunities for Pennsylvania manufacturers to export their goods? Similar to NAFTA, the benefits of the South Korea deal have been, in my judgment, overstated, while the risks have been largely ignored. Rather than opening a new market for Pennsylvania farmers and manufacturers, I am concerned that the benefits to the United States are minimal, at best. There are specific reasons this deal fails to deliver for Pennsylvania exporters. First, most of the benefits are based on an overly optimistic projection for agriculture. These projections, compiled by supporters of the agreement, assume that a cut in tariffs will immediately equal a growth in market share.

We know from past experience that Asian markets, including South Korea, have come up with a host of unjustified nontariff restrictions to keep U.S. beef out of their country. These barriers to free trade are likely to limit export potential and are largely unaddressed in the agreement. There are other troubling clauses dealing with the beef industry. The South Korea agreement will allow American beef packagers to use Canadian or Mexican cattle and then export the packaged Mexican or Canadian beef as ''American'' beef. This policy, while great for beef packagers, undercuts the U.S. ranchers. Given our difficulties in gaining a foothold in these markets, we should rely solely on U.S. cattle, which we know are safe.

Second, one of Pennsylvania's most important sectors—dairy—the competing European Union Free Trade Agreement with South Korea could inhibit our ability to compete in the South Korean market. The text of the European Union agreement specifies that certain types of cheese, including mozzarella, must come from specific regions. As a result, European exporters could challenge U.S. producers selling cheese in South Korea as ''mozzarella'' or ''parmesan.'' In this sense, the Europeans have negotiated a better agreement, giving European companies an advantage over American companies.

Another problem with the agreement is which goods qualify for the ''Made in South Korea'' designation—the sticker, so to speak—and are allowed to, therefore, enter the United States duty free. Under the rules of origin in annex 6–A of the agreement, 65 percent of the value of many goods, including automobiles shipped duty free to the United States can come from South Korea and still be considered ''Made in South Korea.''

This standard is lower than the European Union agreement. The European Union agreement has a 55-percent content standard where content can be foreign and, once again, places our companies at a comparative disadvantage in international competition. Just as the chart depicts, 35 percent Korea plus 65 percent China will equal ''Made in Korea.'' I don't think that is what the American people bargain for when they expect us to get trade policies right. In a sense, this opens the door—a back door—for products primarily made in places such as North Korea or China to enter the United States of America duty free. That is wrong. It should be changed. We should not broker an agreement that has that in it.

Let me conclude with the three questions I started with. First, will the agreement create a substantial number of new jobs? I am concerned it will not. In previous agreements such as NAFTA, if they are any indication, the U.S.-Korea agreement will lead to job losses, especially in the critical manufacturing sector.

Second, will the agreement help create a level playing field? It will not. The agreement fails to address critical issues such as currency manipulation that have already hurt American businesses and cost us jobs.

Third, does the agreement provide new opportunities for American manufacturers to export? Proponents have overstated the benefits. Certainly industries and firms are likely to benefit, while many others will not. What is clear is that in its failure to address nontariff barriers to trade, the agreement leaves American firms unprotected and on a playing field that is not level.

Instead of moving ahead with a broken model, we need to focus on the bigger picture—formulating a strategy that helps American manufacturers, that leads to job creation to help middle-income families, helping us create the jobs of the future.

To make real sustained progress, Washington needs to have a plan, a

strategy. We must develop and commit ourselves to a national manufacturing strategy that includes job-creating trade policies as well.

Recently I convened a roundtable in Pennsylvania with leaders of several southwestern Pennsylvania companies at the Universal Electric Corporation in Canonsburg, Washington County, to listen to their ideas and bring them to Washington, DC, to keep a focus on supporting manufacturing. I heard a number of common themes. First of all, we should develop a national strategy, as I mentioned, for manufacturing. Second, we should make the R&D tax credit permanent. Third, we should crack down—really crack down—on China's currency manipulation and other unfair trade policies so that Pennsylvania companies and their workers have at least a fair shot. Legislation I recently introduced gives us those tools to hold countries accountable for manipulating currencies.

We also need to extend trade adjustment assistance to help workers who have lost their jobs to overseas unfair foreign competition so they can build new skills and find new employment.

Finally, we need to invest in science, technology, engineering, and math, the so-called STEM discipline, which we know will create many jobs in the future.

Manufacturing is the heart and soul of Pennsylvania and our Nation's economy. Our future depends on developing policies that help our workers and our businesses compete in the global production of goods. Our workers and our businesses can outcompete anyone in the world—any country in the world. We just need to give them a fair shot. We need to give them a strategy. These agreements don't do that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President I would observe the current Presiding Officer has had the misfortune of being in the chair whenever I am coming down to speak, so I appreciate his patience.

Today, congressional leaders are meeting with the President of the United States to discuss what can be done to reduce the Nation's out-of-control deficit, to deal with our unsustainable debt, to get America back to work and help grow our economy. I congratulate the President for convening this meeting, which will probably be one of the last chances we will have to deal with this deadline of August 2 to deal with the debt limit—a situation wherein we have maxed out our Nation's credit card. Forty-three cents out of every dollar the Federal Government spends today is borrowed money, making the deficit worse and not better and making the debt worse and not better. This is the chance to kick the habit of out-of-control spending here in Washington.

I appreciate the fact the President has moved from his initial position wherein he advocated for Congress to simply raise the debt limit without putting Washington and Congress on a spending diet. I appreciate the fact he has moved in his position. I read today in the daily newspapers that he is putting a lot of things, including Social Security reform, on the table, together with other entitlements. I hope this represents a change of position, a change of attitude, and the President and our negotiators will seize this opportunity to do the kind of grand bargain that will put America back on to a more solid fiscal path. Every child born in the United States today—while being one of the luckiest people in the world being born in the United States of America, but at the same time being burdened—every child born today will be burdened with $46,000 for their share of the national debt. That is simply wrong and we all know it.

Unfortunately, there has been a lot of discussion about the White House and some of our Democratic colleagues wanting to raise taxes as part of this grand bargain. Indeed, I think that is the notion behind this sense-of-the-Senate resolution the majority leader has introduced, which is targeted at millionaires and billionaires. The sense-of-the-Senate resolution the majority leader wants us to vote on says it is the sense of the Senate that any agreement to reduce the budget deficit should require that those earning $1 million or more per year make a more meaningful contribution to deficit reduction.

Unfortunately, this is not real legislation. This won't change anything. This is a sense of the Senate. This is a resolution, which I think is a missed opportunity to actually deal with the issue rather than pretend as though we are treating it seriously.

When the White House proposes that working families and small businesses, among others, suffer a $400 billion tax increase over the next 10 years, it strikes me that in one sense this is like a diet where a person says, I am going to give up dessert. I am not going to eat dessert. But then that person binges on the buffet. In other words, it is not real. It is not going to work.

To put this in perspective, the Federal Government is currently borrowing $4 billion every day this year. So actually raising taxes in this amount—while this only amounts to 10 days of what Washington spends—raising taxes by $400 billion over 10 years, as we can see, won't make a serious dent in the deficit and the debt, and they are very serious job-killing proposals as well. It strikes me as common sense to say if we want more jobs, we make it easier to create jobs. If we want less jobs, we make it harder to create jobs by raising taxes, by excessive regulation, and other obstacles to job creation. The irony is that I am not confident our friends on the other side who propose tax increases as part of this grand bargain actually want to use that increased revenue to pay down the deficit and the debt. To the contrary, I fear what they want to do is continue spending at the current levels. So it is kind of a shell game, saying we are going to cut $2 trillion but we are going to raise taxes by $2 trillion. What does that mean? Unless that $2 trillion in additional revenue is used to pay down the debt, it means it is a wash and government and Washington continue business as usual. I don't think the American people want us to continue doing business as usual. I think they want us to listen to them and to mend our ways.

Let me give a context for how nonserious some of the proposals are, including out of the President of the United States. All of a sudden he focused last week on this depreciation schedule for corporate jets. Depreciation is a normal part of the Tax Code which says if one uses something in a business, one can basically write it down over time. It won't surprise us to find that if a person did that, if a person did what the President said—eliminate depreciation of corporate jets—it would generate about $3 billion in revenue to the Federal Treasury over 10 years—$3 billion over 10 years. But to get a sense of what a minuscule contribution that would make to solving the problem, consider what our annual deficit is. This is in 1 year. This is what $1.5 trillion looks like. It has 12 zeroes; a 1, a 5, and 11 zeroes after the 5. That is our annual deficit.

The President says to solve this annual deficit, we need to raise $3 billion in additional revenue from corporate jet owners. Obviously, it is a drop in the bucket. But it is even worse when we look at the debt. The deficit, of course, is the difference between what the Federal Government brings in and what it spends. Right now it is spending about $1.5 trillion more each year than it brings in, in revenue. That is the deficit. But the accumulation of those deficits represents the debt. This is how much red ink our Federal Government is spending—or where we find ourselves—and that is $14 trillion. This is the number the President wants us to raise—$14 trillion. That is like the max on a credit card. If a person is spending too much money, that person bumps up against the credit card limit. The President, in essence, rather than cutting back on spending and making sure we are paying our bills we already owe, wants to raise it so the Federal Government can spend more money.

As I mentioned, this $14 trillion in debt boils down to $46,000 for every man, woman, and child in the country. So when the President gives a press conference—and I can't remember how many times he mentions chartered jets—but he talks about $3 billion in revenue over 10 years, it is a drop in the bucket when dealing with a 1-year deficit, or a deficit each year, currently of $1.5 trillion, or a $14 trillion debt. So the fact is we cannot get there from here, even if we did what the President said. It is not serious. It is not honest. It is not candid in terms of

what we need to do to get our country back on a solid fiscal pathway.

So let's talk about Federal tax reform. There has been a lot of discussion about that, where we want to take the Tax Code with all of its multiple provisions and get it on the table and take a look at it to make sure it is, in my view, flatter, fairer, and simpler. But right now, the fact of that according to the Committee on Joint Taxation, 51 percent—that is a majority of American households—paid no income tax in 2009. Zero. Zip. Nada. No income tax was paid by 51 percent of the households in America in 2009. Actually, to show how out of whack things have gotten, 30 percent of American households actually made money from the tax system by way of refundable tax credits, the earned income tax credit, among others. So 51 percent of American households paid no income tax in 2009, but 30 percent actually made money under the current system. According to the Internal Revenue Service, the top 10 percent of wage earners in America paid 70 percent of total income taxes. The top 5 percent of income earners in America paid nearly 60 percent of income taxes, and the top 1 percent paid 38 percent of income taxes.

So what is the President talking about and what is the majority leader trying to—what point are they trying to make when they suggest we pass a sense-of-the-Senate resolution saying that millionaires should ''make a more meaningful contribution to the deficit reduction effort''? What is their point? Is their point that we ought to raise taxes on people who are already paying taxes? Is their point that we should expand the pool of people who do not pay any income tax or should we perhaps expand the pool of people who actually benefit from cash transfers, payments as a result of a refundable tax credit?

Well, I think it is pretty obvious we need tax reform. I am skeptical that we have time between now and Secretary Geithner's stated deadline of August 2 to do what we need to do and to repair and fix our broken tax system. But I think this helps put in context the frankly cynical suggestion that somehow we could solve the problem if we just go after the fat cats and the corporate jet owners. If we just make the millionaires and billionaires pay more money, it will all be all right. Well, I think the American people are smarter than that. When confronted with the facts, I think they can readily conclude and will readily conclude that the system is broken and needs to be fixed. We do not need a bunch of smoke and mirrors and phony arguments about class warfare. That is not going to solve the problem. We need to solve the problem.

Well, let's look at the President's economic record. I know there have been some press reports about that the President said we are making a comeback. I think he called this summer ''the summer of recovery,'' if I am not mistaken. But, in fact, we know the President's policies are actually making things worse.

All you need to do is look at the number of people who are unemployed in America. There were 12 million people unemployed on his inauguration day. Now it is almost 14 million. Almost 2 million more Americans are unemployed. Is that making things better? No. It is making things worse. And we know there are a lot of people who are taking minimum-wage jobs and other jobs not up to their full potential because they want to provide for their families, so we call those people underemployed. That would make that number even higher. When the President was inaugurated in January of 2009, the unemployment rate was 7.8 percent. Today, it is 9.1 percent. That is a 17-percent increase. In other words, unemployment is worse today than it was when the President was sworn in.

Gas prices. We all know what has happened to gas prices. They have gone through the roof. People are having to deny themselves other discretionary expenditures because they simply have to have the gasoline to be able to drive to work, drive the kids to school, or take care of their daily business. The fact is, when the President was sworn in, gasoline prices were $1.85. Well, wouldn't it be great if gas prices were $1.85 today? Instead, they average $3.58. That is almost a 100-percent increase in gasoline prices since President Obama put his hand on the Bible and was sworn in as President of the United States. It is a 94-percent increase.

Then we were talking about the Federal debt. The Federal debt when the President was sworn in—some people will tell you: Oh, it is all about President Bush and fighting two wars that were not paid for. It is about the Bush tax cuts and other things. Well, I agree there is bipartisan blame when it comes to our national debt, but we ought to link arms and work together to try to solve the problem rather than continue to make it worse. The Federal debt when President Obama was sworn in was $10.6 trillion. Today, it is $14.3 trillion. It is 35 percent worse. The debt has gone up by 35 percent since President Obama was sworn in.

I mentioned this factor earlier. As shown on this chart, this is what every American citizen owes in terms of their share of the national debt. When President Obama was sworn in, it was $34,000. Today, it is 46,000. So, congratulations, everyone within the sound of my voice owes $11,000 more to the national debt since President Obama became President of the United States.

Then there is health insurance. We have had a lot of debate about health insurance costs. We were told that if we just passed this giant health care bill, health insurance costs would go down, we would fix problems, and we would make sure more people had access to health care. Well, since President Obama became President, health insurance premiums have gone up by 19 percent—19 percent. Did he make it better or did he make it worse?

Well, we need to unburden the economy from higher taxes, excessive regulation, and all the sorts of obstacles that get in the way of small businesses—the primary job-creating engine in our economy—doing what they do best; that is, growing the economy, creating jobs. If our friends across the aisle want more tax revenue, well, the best way to get more revenue is to get more Americans back to work so they pay taxes rather than remain unemployed, losing their homes because they cannot pay their mortgages. That is how we ought to increase revenue, not by raising rates, not by some of these silly class-warfare arguments that seem to target unpopular sectors of the economy.

And, yes, we need to increase exports to create more jobs. We can do that by ratifying the outstanding trade agreements without adding unnecessary spending to them.

And, yes, when it comes to energy policy, the high price of gasoline—which has gone up 94 percent since President Obama became President of the United States—we can open more domestic energy reserves, more American natural resources, rather than continue to have to import it from places abroad that are not necessarily our friends or which may be in political turmoil or even war, such as Libya. So if we had a rational national energy policy where the EPA, rather than looking for excuses to deny us access to things such as the natural gas discoveries we have found in Texas and around the country—if we had a way to take advantage of and did, in fact, take advantage of more domestic energy production, it could help us put more Americans back to work and help us reduce our dependency on energy from abroad and help bring down this price to one that does not break the backs of the average working families.

I yield the floor and 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. CORNYN. 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. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have a correction. My staff told me I undercounted $14 trillion. I asked ahead of time, but we actually got the number wrong. The number I have on the chart is actually three zeros too few. So just to make sure the record is correct, that is 12 zeros after the ''14.'' That reflects our national debt. I would like to say I made the mistake and it was actually lower, but it actually is much higher, which I think reinforces my point.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, while the Senator is still here, I recall—Senator CORNYN is a member of the Budget

Committee and knowledgeable about these issues—that we have had one budget actually presented to the Senate, and that was the President's budget. It was scored by the Congressional Budget Office, which shows that under the President's budget, the debt of the United States would increase by $13 trillion in 10 years.

I do not know if the Senator is aware, but I would ask him is he aware of how much additional revenue would come to the government if the President's proposal on corporate jet taxation were to be imposed, and would that make a difference in the $13,000 trillion that would be added to the debt in the next 10 years?

Mr. CORNYN. Well, Mr. President, responding to my friend from Alabama, the number, I am advised, is roughly $3 billion in additional revenue to the Treasury, and that would be over 10 years. But, as you can see, it is a drop in the bucket when it comes to the deficit for 1 year, which is $1.5 trillion, and the national debt of $14 trillion.

I apologize, I am not used to dealing with numbers that big, which demonstrates that these numbers really have kind of lost their meaning here. I remember Everett Dirksen being quoted as saying: A million here, a million there, and pretty soon you are talking about real money.

The fact is we are not talking about millions, we are not talking about billions, we are talking about trillions. I think most people's minds have a very difficult time conceiving of how big a number that is.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to enter into a colloquy with my Republican colleagues for up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. If Senator CORNYN could join us, we would be pleased.

Mr. President, the debt situation we are in today is the most serious our Nation has ever faced. A lot of people do not understand it and do not understand how serious it is. Even after World War II, we had growth. We had the baby boomers just coming of age, we had more young people and fewer older people, and the situation was more positive than it is today, even though we had debt after the war. That is just a fact.

I have tried to look at the creation of a budget that would balance in 10 years, bring us into balance in 10 years. It is hard to do. It absolutely can be done. It takes some real effort, but it can be done. We can do it, and we have to do it. But President Obama, during his years as President, is on track to have four consecutive trillion-dollar deficits—the highest deficit we have had previously was the $450 billion deficit that President Bush had. We have had $1.2 trillion and $1.3 trillion.

This September 30, when the fiscal year ends, it is estimated to be $1.5 trillion for 2011. We take in $2.2 trillion, we are spending $3.7 trillion, and 40 cents of every dollar we spend this year is borrowed. It is an unsustainable course.

President Obama appointed a deficit commission. He appointed Erskine Bowles, a former Chief of Staff of President Clinton, as co-chair. He also chose Alan Simpson, a former Republican Senator. They submitted a statement to the Budget Committee that this country faces the most predictable economic crisis in its history. We have to act, they told us.

They were asked when could this crisis happen. Mr. Bowles said it could happen within 2 years—not for our children and grandchildren; he said 2 years, maybe a little sooner or maybe a little later. Alan Simpson popped up and said he thought it could be 1 year; in other words, some sort of economic crisis like we had in 2007 and 2008 or something that could put our economy in a tailspin. It is that serious. The debt trajectory path we are on is unsustainable.

Tomorrow, I have to say, will mark the 800th day this Senate has not had a budget. We are borrowing 40 cents out of every dollar we spend, and we have gone this long without a budget. There is no plan, apparently, to present one. The chairman of the Budget Committee, on which I am ranking Republican, tells us he has one, and he talked to his colleagues and they have agreed on it. But it remains secret.

The Congressional Budget Act explicitly says we should have a budget by April 15. It says the committee should report a budget resolution on April 1. Well, we have not had a markup. Apparently, there is no plan to have one. We are just going to wait and see if secret negotiations can produce something. That is not acceptable at a time in which the debt is the primary threat to the health, security, and welfare of our Nation, and there is no doubt about it.

Admiral Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said the greatest threat to our national security is our debt. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton made a very similar statement. They are exactly right. There is no dispute about it.

We have had nothing on the floor of the Senate except a resolution saying we should tax the rich—a sense of the Senate, that has no power, no binding authority, no numbers, not how much we are going to attack the rich.

We are in serious condition. I think the American people, if they understood how little has been done in this body this year on the most important issue facing this country, would be even more dissatisfied with the U.S. Congress than they are—more dissatisfied at least with the Senate. I knew the Senator from Missouri before, who is not new to Congress. He was a Republican whip in the House of Representatives. The House has passed a budget this year—an honest budget that changes the debt trajectory of America in a solid way, and it would put us on a new path for prosperity. Everybody doesn't have to agree with everything in it, but they met their responsibility by April 15.

It is great to be here with Senator BLUNT. We are so pleased to have him in the Senate. I ask him if he would share his thoughts at this time about this situation.

Mr. BLUNT. I will. I also asked the Senator about his view of this budget situation. The Presiding Officer and I were secretaries of state together some time ago and have known each other a long time. I am glad to have him in the chair as we have this discussion.

I don't think the House, until the last Congress, ever failed to pass a budget. I am not sure the Senate didn't always pass a budget until the last Congress, though there were times when the House and Senate could not agree. But at least each side had a plan.

There is an old adage that when you fail to plan, you plan to fail. It sure looks to me that is the trajectory we are on now. Members are more and more talking about maybe we will have another continuing resolution this year. That will be the appropriations process because we have no plan. Of course, as the Senator pointed out, as a person who knows as much about the budget process as anybody in Washington, we passed the April 1 deadline, then we passed a May 1 date, and then a June 1 date, and now we passed the July 1 date. We are up to that 800th day since the Senate passed a plan or had a plan of any kind. We are waiting for a plan to move forward with the work of just funding the government. Clearly, that is not acceptable.

We see the economy continuing to wait for some signs of certainty from the Federal Government, certainty about where our budget is going to be, certainty about our tax structure, certainty about regulations and utility bills. We are just not seeing that happen. In fact, things are getting progressively worse and worse. Gas prices have almost doubled now in the last 30 months. Unemployment is up 17 percent. In fact, there is no statistic I know of that is better than it was in January of 2009.

Has the Senate, in the past, until the last 3 years—has there ever been a time when the Senate didn't even attempt to have a budget?

Mr. SESSIONS. To my knowledge, at no time since I have been here did the Senate not attempt to pass a budget. In the last 2 years, even when our Democratic colleagues had 60 votes—the largest majority in recent memory in the Senate—they only attempted to bring a budget to the floor once. Last year a budget did go to committee. It was marked up by Senator CONRAD. It came to the floor, but the majority leader decided not to bring it up. This year, it seems that Senator CONRAD was told not to have a markup, not to even produce a budget in committee.

It seems to me to indicate a lack of willingness to lead because—would the Senator not agree?—a budget sets the priorities, demonstrates the vision for the future of the country and what we should spend, what we should tax, and how much debt we can afford to run up. Those are fundamental responsibilities. How would he evaluate the fact that tomorrow we are 800 days without a budget? What does that say about the leadership we have seen in the Senate?

Mr. BLUNT. It shows we have been 800 days without a budget, and basically 800 days without any structure or process of how we spend the people's money. It has been 800 days since the last time we could come up with an appropriations process, so maybe they will suggest we will modify that a little bit and move forward. But that clearly is not good enough. In that 800 days, as the Senator pointed out, we have gone to where we are—we have added 35 percent in a little over 800 days, in 2½ years, to the Federal deficit.

This is not defending anybody else's effort to make the revenue and the expenditures of the Federal Government balance, but we can't continue to spend more than we have. If we don't have a plan, a blueprint, or if we don't have a budget like families have to have—if we don't have a budget at the very least, and we are managing our money, we write checks until the money runs out, and we can't do much more than that.

We are at a point now that we are spending $3.7 trillion or $3.8 trillion and collecting $2.2 trillion. I am like Senator CORNYN on this topic—by the way, everybody else is too, including the Secretary of the Treasury. Nobody knows how much money this is, but we all know if someone is making $22,000 a year and spending $37,000 a year, and they have already borrowed more money than anybody should have ever lent them, they can't continue to do that.

There has to be a point where they say: We are going to have to get real. We are making $22,000, so we better start spending no more than $22,000, and that includes paying off the money that we have already borrowed when we were spending $37,000.

There are so many zeros and numbers that if any of us really understood how much money we are talking about and how long it will take to pay it back, we would all be more scared than we are. Certainly, the people we work for would be more scared than they are because we are doing irresponsible things, and as irresponsible as any of those things is not having a plan.

In all those years the Senator spent on the Budget Committee and his leadership there now, he knows if we don't have a plan—the appropriations process doesn't move forward unless we agree first how much money we are going to spend in that process. So, eventually, we just go back and say: Let's go back to last year and modify slightly the terrible job we did last year, and let's borrow that much more money again.

That is not acceptable.

Mr. SESSIONS. Before the Senator shares his thoughts about the appropriations process from his extensive experience in the leadership of the Congress, just briefly, I want to make sure the American people and our colleagues know what happened.

I see our newly elected colleague from Wisconsin, Senator RON JOHNSON. He won election, you could say, in an upset—a popular, big victory. He campaigned all over his State and talked about the issues we are talking about today.

As a new Member of the Senate, I would love to hear Senator JOHNSON's comments about where he thinks we are today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. First of all, I thank the Senator for his leadership. He has been talking loudly and clearly about the fact that we should not have recessed this week. I know President Obama tried to claim credit for that. It is because of the Senator's leadership and the members of the Republican conference in the Senate who said: No, we are bankrupting America and we need to stay here and start debating this issue.

Unfortunately, that is not what we have been doing this week. It is sad. One word I have used all the time now that I have come to Washington is ''unbelievable.'' It is simply unbelievable that tomorrow will mark 800 days that we haven't passed a budget.

My background is in business for the last 34 years. I have had to produce budgets on time. I have had people produce budgets for me on time. In business—even a small business—it is inconceivable that if you tell a colleague to make sure to have the budget on your desk by April 15 that it wouldn't be there; 99.9 percent of those accountants and controllers would have a budget on time, on April 15.

We are dealing with the United States of America. We are talking about our financial future, the fate of America. The Democrats in the Senate have failed to meet that obligation for 2 years in a row. That is simply unbelievable, and it is so incredibly irresponsible. Really, I think the Senate has been guilty of willful neglect. The phrase I have used is that the Senate has been ''fiddling'' while America is going broke. That is sad.

As the Senator pointed out as well, what does the financial future of America rest on? Some secret talks—talks between a few individuals going out behind closed doors far from the view of the American public rather than in an orderly process where a plan is presented that can be viewed by the American public, that can be debated openly the way our Founders envisioned on the floor of this Senate, this historic floor; instead of using the process that we should have been using, what is going to happen? Are we going to have a result, a negotiated settlement drop in our laps a couple days before this deadline date? Is that what is going to happen? Is that really how the financial fate of America is going to be decided?

I personally find that process disgusting. That is why I stood last Tuesday on the floor of the Senate and said unless we start seriously addressing this problem, the bankrupting of America, in the open, in the bright light of day, I was going to begin to object. I was going to begin to withhold my consent.

I was heartened by the support I got from my Republican colleagues because, let's face it, we understand how urgent the situation is. We understand how dire our financial situation is. We are willing to sit down and work with anybody who will seriously address the fact that we are driving America toward bankruptcy. But we need a willing partner, and up to this point in time I haven't seen one.

The fact that the only plan we have seen is the President's budget, 4.25 inches thick, 2,400 pages long—how many thousands of manhours did that document take to produce? It was so unserious it would have added more than $12 trillion to our Nation's debt in the next 10 years. It would have continued the bankrupting of America. It would have made us go broke. It was so unserious, it failed in the Senate by a vote of 0–97. Not one Democratic Senator found that bill serious enough to give it a vote. That is the only plan I have seen.

I woke up this morning to a couple of news reports, and there was more detail about what the administration might plan to do fed to reporters than fed to a Member of Congress.

I am sorry to be so blunt about this, but that is a disgusting process. The American people deserve far better. I guess today what I am standing here saying is, I want to see a plan, and I want to see a budget, and I want to see it to give us enough time so we can actually analyze it and debate it and pass the real structural reforms so that we can actually solve this problem. I am calling on the President and I am calling on the Democrats in this Senate to produce that plan so we can have an open debate on it. That is kind of how I am thinking.

Mr. BLUNT. I would like to say to both Senator SESSIONS and Senator JOHNSON, who were primary leaders in this idea that we shouldn't go home, that Republicans shouldn't vote to adjourn, that you were going to object to things that didn't relate to the business we need to do, and, of course, that is right.

As Senator JOHNSON was talking, I was thinking the other deadline, the other April 15 deadline, every American had better comply with that one. It is in the law just like the one that we are supposed to comply with.

What if everybody in America decided they were going to miss their

legal deadline as well? OK, we are not going to have a budget, and we are not going to pay our taxes. Of course, they would be in trouble. The Senate is not in trouble, but the country is in trouble because the Senate is not doing its job. Neither the House nor the Senate did their jobs in the last Congress, for the first time ever. So that is how we go now into 3 years of no budget, 3 years since we had a working document that we should have to work with. That is important.

What did we do this week? The disappointment to all three of us is we said we wanted to stay this week and deal with these issues, and what did we deal with? We started out by trying to deal with a Libya resolution that apparently wasn't important enough to deal with last Thursday when we were going to take a week to be working in our States, but we will debate the Libya resolution. Then when people on the Republican side said they thought we ought to be debating the reason we were supposed to stay, we still didn't do that. We have this amendment that I think was supposed to be a sense of the Senate, and is a sense of the Senate that millionaires aren't paying enough taxes.

We all understand the politics of that, just like we understand the politics of no accelerated depreciation for business airplanes. Whenever that was done, it was done to try to create more American jobs quicker by a little more demand. I think how that works is that plane is depreciated in 5 years instead of 7 to encourage people to go ahead and buy a plane and keep people who make planes at work. But what is that $3 billion over 10 years? We are borrowing $4 billion today, and we try to have this debate as if it is about $3 billion over 10 years. We are borrowing $4 billion today, and we want to have this false debate about who is not paying their share.

We are spending too much money is the problem. The problem is not that we are not taxing enough. We are spending almost 25 percent of the capacity of the country to produce goods and services. Until the beginning of 2009, for 40 years the average was 20.6; $1 out of $5 was going to the Federal Government, not $1 out of $4.

I was asked by some reporters yesterday: Why is this so different than other times when the debt limit has been increased? You mentioned one of them earlier. One of the differences is we have added 35 percent to the debt in about 30 months—35 percent to the debt in 30 months.

Another one is the Federal Government is suffocating the economy by spending too much money. There is no money left for people to borrow and take a risk and create a job and create an opportunity for somebody else.

On the millionaire tax, 1 percent of all the taxpayers pay 38 percent of all the taxes now. Maybe we ought to get to where 1 or 2 percent just pay all the taxes. We already have 47 percent of the individuals in the country paying no income tax.

By the way, you value what you pay for. If you don't pay any income tax, you don't care about the income tax as much as if you did. So there aren't as many people out there fighting excessive taxation because they have less of a stake in it. But 1 percent of the people in the country already pay 38 percent of the income taxes, and 10 percent pay 70 percent. Maybe we just ought to let that 10 percent pay 100 percent. I guess that would get all the millionaires and billionaires.

And, oh, I remember the tax. Do you remember the millionaires' tax, but only like 155 people would pay or something? It was the alternative minimum tax; 155 people were going to pay that millionaire tax, and now some huge percentage of all Americans pay it because, eventually, once we start down this path, everybody is impacted by higher tax rates.

The frustration of being here and not doing anything all week—we had one vote to compel the Members who didn't come, to come to the Senate, and another vote was cloture on a bill that doesn't matter. The frustration of your leadership and then that result is pretty incredible to me.

But thanks to both Senators for insisting for weeks before last week that we should stay and have a discussion, a debate, a vote on the things that matter. I am sorry that we didn't have that, particularly based on the intensity on the part of both Senators of insisting that we have that kind of debate this week, and we didn't have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I would like to pick up on Senator BLUNT's point about just how unserious this week has been.

Just in comparison to business, about 5 years ago I bought a business out of bankruptcy. I watched those business owners over the course of 2 or 3 years struggle to make a go of that business. You would not believe the number of hours those people, those hard-working Americans put in to save that business. It didn't work. They went into reorganization under the bankruptcy laws. I bought that business out of bankruptcy. I saw how incredibly hard my team worked to make that business survive, and it did survive. These are individuals putting in 16, 17, 18, 20 hours a day to make a product, to build a good life for themselves and their families, to provide employment, jobs.

This is the American spirit. That is the entrepreneurial spirit. That is what Americans do day in and day out, whether they own a business or whether they contribute their effort: their labor to make their business successful, the one they work for successful. That is what Americans do.

What has this President done? What has this Congress done? What has this Senate done?

In the last 6 months since I have been here, we passed six laws, six bills that have become law. Three of those had to do with the continuing resolutions of last year's business: funding the government for this year. Those were laws that should have been passed 1 year ago, but it was left over for us to do that.

We had two bills to extend the PATRIOT Act. If we take a look at how that was even done, it was last minute, rush-rush, very little time for debate. We couldn't even get amendments in there.

Then, of course, the other one is we kind of cleaned up a little bit a little part of the health care law that dealt with 1099s, which would have been a nightmare. It would have cost billions of dollars to comply with and not brought in any revenue. So we finally got that off the books, thankfully.

The other bills we have debated, we spent 16 weeks debating three bills. The total dollar amount of those bills is $20 billion. That is about ½ percent of what this Federal Government will spend this year. So we have spent 16 weeks debating ½ percent of our $3.6-trillion-a-year budget. That, in my mind, is the definition of being not serious.

Of course, we have said it has been 799—tomorrow it will be 800—days since we actually passed a budget. This week we spent 15 hours of debate. We call it a sense-of-the-Senate resolution? It should be called the nonsense of the Senate. That is what has been occurring this week, and it is a tragedy. It is a tragedy.

But, again, that is why I stood up and started to object. I will continue to do that until we actually start getting serious, until we actually see a plan, a budget that we can start debating.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, let me just note that we had a sense-of-the-Senate resolution on the floor, and we had a cloture vote on it that I think everybody voted to go to the bill. That is what the leader wanted to do. We go to the bill. But it is really nothing because if it passes it has no impact and makes no change whatsoever. It basically says we should tax the rich more.

Well, we can debate these issues, but I will just note that the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, OECD, which is an organization for the development of world businesses has concluded that the United States has the most progressive tax system in the world. We always thought the Europeans were more hostile to wealth and more socialistic than we were, but that is their analysis.

As Senator BLUNT said, how much more do we want them to pay? Maybe they should pay more. Let's debate it and let's talk about it. But that is not going to fix our problems.

Senator JOHNSON was a successful businessman, an accountant. I have seen his work. I am so glad he is on the Budget Committee. I guess he and Senator ENZI are the only accountants around here, and we are glad the Senator is here. I have seen his work.

He actually adds up numbers and makes spending charts. He showed me one this morning, trying to figure out a way to change America.

But my first question is—the Senator was a successful businessman and he had never been a politician before, so why did the Senator run?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Well, the reason I ran is because we are bankrupting the Nation. I love America. We love America. When I watch what is happening, and when I saw how broken Washington was, when I saw them pass the health care law, from my standpoint that was the straw that broke the camel's back.

Our first child, my daughter Carey, was born with a very serious congenital heart defect. Dedicated doctors and surgeons saved her life the first day. Then 8 months later, when her heart was the size of a plum, another dedicated surgical team of dedicated professionals totally reconstructed the upper chamber of her heart. Her heart operates backwards now. But she is 28 years old, and she is a nurse herself in a neonatal intensive care unit.

When I heard President Obama say these doctors, that they will take out a set of tonsils for a few extra bucks, I found that outrageous. Then when this Congress and this President signed the health care law, I know the result of that. It is designed to lead to a government takeover of our health care system.

All we have to do is take a look at Canada and Britain. We don't have to theorize what that is going to result in. It will lower the quality of care. It will result in rationing, and the medical innovation to save my daughter's life and millions of others—it really is America where medical miracles are created. I think that innovation is going to come to a grinding halt.

So that is just the quality aspect of the health care bill, but it is going to destroy our budget.

I wrote a piece with Douglas Holtz-Eakin, ex-CBO Director. Rather than $93 billion a year, when this bill kicks in, as it is designed to do, and a large percentage of Americans lose their health care employer coverage and get dumped into the exchanges, we are talking about a $½ trillion or maybe $900 billion.

I see we are running out of time, but that is why I ran, because we are bankrupting America.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senators have used 30 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that I be given 1 additional minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I just want to say we have in this colloquy Senator BLUNT, who was the second ranking Republican leader in the House and who has dealt with these issues for many years. We are so glad to have him in the Senate—and Senator JOHNSON, a new Senator, passionate and concerned about the future of America, both of them. I think the American people should be proud of the service they have rendered.

We have to change. I believe we can, and we are going to keep fighting toward that end.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I appreciate the Presiding Officer recognizing me. I kind of switched places with him earlier. I was in the chair and listened to some comments from a number of Senators on the other side of the aisle. I did not come to the floor to talk about this, but I just cannot help myself sometimes.

I heard these comparisons. When they talked about the economy, it all started January 20 of 2009, and they compared that day with today. What they left out of that picture is when Barack Obama became President, this economy was going like this. It was not like: He is President. Now things will get better. The 30 days after he was sworn in on January 20, 2009, we lost 700,000 jobs in this country. The next 30 days we lost somewhere in excess of, I believe, 600,000 jobs.

The point is, what happened for the first several months, almost before President Obama could take a breath, before Congress, the House and Senate, controlled by Democrats then, could actually put a program in place and put policies in place that would respond to this terrible economy bequeathed to them and to us by this sort of Republican economic policy. The Republican economic policy was tax cuts for the rich, two wars not paid for, a giveaway to the drug and insurance industry, a bailout to the drug and insurance industry in the name of Medicare privatization, privatization/deregulation of Wall Street, and tax cuts that went overwhelmingly to the richest Americans. That is what got us into this.

For them to say look at the number of jobs today, look at the number of jobs in January, 2009—they know that is a specious argument. They are disingenuous. They are not especially honest when they make that argument.

The fact is, we have seen in the last 14 months—and I wish it were better. I went to Barberton, OH, this week and was at a plant expansion with 30 jobs. It is not enough, I wish it were 300. It is an Alcoa plant. They are hiring people. They are paying OK wages. I wish they were paying better wages. I wish they could hire more people. But we are seeing progress.

In the last 14 months—they forgot to tell us this—we are seeing job growth every month, including manufacturing job growth, the lifeblood of the economy in my State. We are the third leading manufacturing State, only behind the States of Senator CORNYN and Senator BOXER and Senator FEINSTEIN in the number of manufacturing jobs and their output.

The point is, let's be honest when we have this discussion. We know our policies are not working as fast as we would like. But we know what their policies brought us—21 million private sector jobs created during the 8 years of Bill Clinton; then when they put in the Bush economic policies: tax cuts for the wealthy, twice; two wars, not paying for them; partial privatization of Medicare; deregulation of Wall Street—1 million private sector jobs created in 8 years; 21 million versus 1 million. Tell that story too.

I am not saying we have every answer—we don't—but we are making progress in spite of their saying no to everything we are trying to do.

We have to look at the future. The biggest problem we have in this country is the decline of the middle class and we have to address that. That is why I came to the floor, because even though we are in the midst of this budget debate as everyone is talking about, the focus has to stay on jobs creation. It has to be: How do we create jobs in this country?

One way not to create jobs is what Senator CASEY talked about an hour or so ago, and that would be three new trade agreements that too many people on both sides of the aisle want to foist on the American people.

This morning, the Senate Finance Committee and House Ways and Means Committee were both having what are called mock markups of free-trade deals with three countries: South Korea in Asia, Colombia and Panama in our hemisphere.

The Senate Finance committee is including trade adjustment assistance. The House does not even care to take care of workers who lose their jobs because of these trade agreements. They are expendable. They are a bunch of 50-year-olds who do not have much education and, if they lose their jobs, who cares? That is what they are saying in the House Ways and Means Committee. We will pass this legislation. When people lose their jobs, there is nothing we can do to help them. But there is, and we have had something called trade adjustment assistance for 50 years and it has been bipartisan, until this group of radicals who run the House of Representatives decided we don't want trade assistance adjustment anymore.

In the last decade alone, 6 million manufacturing jobs, 55,000 manufacturing plants have been lost.

Multinational companies are too easily setting up companies overseas and exporting products back into the U.S. market. Is there any time in world history where the most compelling business plan for a company is shut down what they do in their home country, move production far away to another country where they have lower wages, fewer regulations, a government that is not exactly free, make those products there, and sell them back to the home

country? This business plan that so many American companies follow is move production overseas where they can get cheap labor and weak regulations in a totalitarian government and then sell the products back to the home country. That is a business plan that far too many American companies have, obviously, followed.

Manufacturing now accounts for less than 10 percent of employment in our country. That is partly because of NAFTA, partly because of the CAFTA, partly because of the China permanent normal trade relations. They only accelerate our decline and the country pays for it today. The public has heard promises of job creation from trade deals before—every single time: NAFTA would create this many jobs, CAFTA would create this many jobs, PNTR would mean more prosperity and jobs for Americans.

The Korean deal is more of the same. The International Trade Commission projects the Korean Free Trade Agreement would increase the U.S. trade deficit. The Economic Policy Institute estimates the loss of at least 150,000 jobs from this agreement. The Korea pact has unusually low rules of origin, allowing manufactured goods containing up to 65 percent of components from China or any other country to obtain the benefits of the agreement.

What happens is a company in Seoul, South Korea—after this trade agreement would pass, if it does—would contract with the Chinese; 65 percent of the product would come from China, be sold into South Korea, South Korea puts its value added on it, sends it to the United States duty free, tariff free, even though 65 percent of it was made in China.

Pundits and the editorial boards say agreements such as these are no-brainers. They say trade adjustment assistance is just a payoff to workers for passing more job-killing trade agreements. The Washington Post editorial board—always a creative thinker of the future and wrong in their predictions on war, wrong in their predictions on trade, wrong in their predictions on labor law, but nonetheless the Washington Post editorial board called TAA a consolation prize.

Once again, they get it wrong. Not many editorial writers in the Washington Post, frankly, have lost their jobs in trade agreements. They don't seem all that interested in people in Steubenville and Lima and Zanesville who actually have lost their jobs because of these trade agreements which the Washington Post editorial board always supports.

We need to focus on retraining workers who are displaced because of past free-trade deals. But even this historically bipartisan program, as I said earlier, is suddenly becoming controversial. It was operated through numerous administrations, supported by Republicans and Democrats alike, and ensures workers who lose their jobs and financial security as a result of globalization have an opportunity to transition to new jobs in emerging sectors of the economy. It helps retrain workers for new opportunities.

In the 2010 fiscal year alone, more than 225,000 workers participated in the TAA program, receiving training for jobs employers are looking to fill. It is common sense. Senator CASEY stood on this floor—he in that row, I in this row—and asked repeatedly for his colleagues to extend this vital job training program. Under the rules of the Senate, one of them stands and objects, time and time again. We did get a 6-week extension, but since mid-February, this part of trade adjustment assistance is simply not available to so many people in New Mexico and in Ohio and in Pennsylvania and across the country.

Senator CASEY and I introduced the TAA bill last week that would extend TAA for 5 years. We paid for it. We know it is no panacea for bad trade agreements. It is not the price workers in my State want to pay while Congress passes more trade deals. We must stand for workers before even considering new trade agreements. We must focus on real job creation. A big part of that is standing against China's unfair currency regime that they have inflicted on this world trade regimen for a number of years.

With our trade deficit, also comes trading partners manipulating their currency to undermine our manufacturers. They have repeatedly found ways to circumvent trade laws to gain an unfair advantage. In 2010, our trade deficit was $634 billion. That means every single day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year—every single day we buy more than $1.5 billion more in goods than they sell internationally.

With China, our trade deficit was $273 billion. That means several hundred million dollars every day we purchase from China more than we sell to China, every single day.

President Bush once said that a $1 billion trade surplus or a $1 billion trade deficit translates into 13,000 jobs. Think about that. If we have a trade deficit of $1 billion, according to President Bush—these are not my numbers—both President Bushes, by and large, supported both of these trade agreements—by and large, we lost 13,000 jobs, mostly manufacturing, in Indiana and Ohio and New Mexico and around the country.

Do the math. If our trade deficit is $200 billion with China, we know what that means.

Ten years ago, our trade deficit in goods with China was $68 billion. These geniuses who come up with these trade agreements, supported by the editorial boards, supported by Harvard economists, supported by Presidents, supported by pundits who are in Washington and probably do not get outside of Washington much—we had a $68 billion trade deficit with China when the most effective corporate lobbyists in the history of the world came to this institution, came to the House and Senate, and sold a majority of House and Senate Members that PNTR with China was a good idea. We had a $68 billion trade deficit with China then. Now it is $273 billion. They told us: We are going to sell more goods. We are going to do better with our deals with China when we have this.

In the last couple minutes, I would point out Senator SNOWE and I proposed bipartisan currency reform for the Fair Trade Act to ensure our trade deficit is not further increased when countries such as China manipulate their currency to make their exports less expensive so they can break into our market and keep us out of their market. The legislation passed overwhelmingly in the House last year. Our bill would strengthen countervailing duty laws to consider undervalued currency as an unfair trade subsidy in determining duty rates.

When an Ohio industry such as coated paper in Hamilton, OH, or steel in Lorain or aluminum in Sidney, when they petition the International Trade Commission for relief against unfair subsidies, they can talk about—include in that petition—the charge of currency manipulation. The bill sends a signal to our trading partners we are not going to sit there while countries gain the unfair advantage over Americans workers and businesses. Before pursuing more free-trade agreements, lets focus on enforcement and focus on addressing currency manipulation. Let's level the playing field so we can fight back and stop this terrible hemorrhaging of American manufacturing jobs.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, today Congressional leadership on both sides of the aisle is meeting with the President to try to break the current impasse on the debt talks. As the President said in a press conference earlier this week: ''Right now, we've got a unique opportunity to do something big.'' I completely agree with that statement. I am glad and pleased that, finally, after months of concern and months of urging, we are dealing with this impending debt crisis.

Time is running out. The leadership is now meeting. We will be getting reports on what has come from this meeting. I was encouraged by initial reports today indicating the President has agreed to address the issue of entitlement spending as well as defining the amount of spending cuts that are necessary to put together a credible plan that move our country into a better financial position.

I have been discussing the necessity of a comprehensive solution to our problem ever since day one of this session and my return to the Senate, and I've indicated that the current process of spending way beyond our means simply cannot be maintained and sustained and that we have to address it—

not after 2012 but we need to address it now. So I am encouraged by the talks that are now going on, and that are beginning to incorporate the elements of a growing consensus, if not almost total consensus, that exists and is necessary for this initiative to be successful, for it to be deemed credible, and for it to avoid the potentially catastrophic consequences of defaulting on our debt and losing our credibility as the place to invest your money for the best safety you can get.

I don't have to go through the math again, but I will just briefly. Spending $3.7 trillion a year when you are only taking in $2.2 trillion a year is unsustainable and is driving us toward the cliff of bankruptcy—an inability to pay our debts. A big driver of that and the biggest driver of that debt is clearly the mandatory spending that comes with entitlements.

It is no secret that we have seen the baby boom generation move through the economy from birth now to retirement. The programs that were put in place and the promises that were made in terms of benefits to those beneficiaries are not going to be available if we don't address the pending bankruptcy of these programs. Those who have analyzed this have basically said: Look, you have to do something now to keep these programs from going broke in the future.

So all of those who say, don't touch my Medicare, don't touch my Social Security, don't do anything, they are essentially saying we are willing to ride it out for 2 or 3 more years and then see the whole thing collapse. Then there are those of us who are saying, let's do something sensible and rational now—not taking away any benefits from current beneficiaries, by the way, but doing something to preserve these programs in the future is absolutely essential. We are trying to save Social Security, we are trying to save Medicare, and we are trying to do the kinds of things that are necessary with our mandatory spending to address the total imbalance in place that is driving these programs into insolvency.

I would hope today that what we hear back from this meeting at the White House is a commitment to go forward with a comprehensive approach including necessary cuts, the elimination of duplications of programs, redundancies, fraud and abuse—things we simply cannot afford anymore—combined with addressing mandatory spending and entitlements in a responsible way, and the mandatory spending, putting the right enforcement mechanisms in place so we don't renege on our commitments, and also incorporating comprehensive tax reform.

For months, the focus has been on cutting spending and tax increases. I think another growing consensus is that without comprehensive tax reform, we are not going to be able to address and solve this problem. I believe the administration has also begun to recognize this and acknowledge that comprehensive tax reform is necessary.

Yesterday, Senator WYDEN and I sent a letter to President Obama and to the congressional leaders who are participating in today's debt ceiling talks urging them to include a timeline for comprehensive tax reform.

The bill Senator WYDEN and former Senator Gregg put together after 2 painstaking years of negotiations—which I have joined now in Senator Gregg's place after he retired from the Senate, after we made some modifications to the original bill—is a bipartisan effort to deal with comprehensive tax reform. We need to go after the 10,000 special breaks and interests and credits and exceptions that exist and take the savings from that to lower rates and make the private sector more competitive, which we know will bring about growth and ultimately jobs for the American people.

The President's Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform found that resolving the Nation's debt crisis demands comprehensive, structural change, including, they said, tax reform. There is no better way to raise revenue and reduce the deficit than by growing the economy and putting Americans back to work. If done right, tax reform will create those good-paying jobs and provide businesses and families with the certainty they need to plan for the future.

Any revenues raised by closing tax loopholes should be part of a comprehensive plan that reduces tax rates for American families and businesses and creates jobs. I want to repeat that. The whole purpose of this is to take those special interests and exemptions that have been incorporated into the Tax Code over a 15-, 20-year period of time, which now total 10,000 special exemptions, to take a selective portion of that and a significant portion of that and eliminate or reduce those to gain the revenues, allowing us to reduce tax rates on American families and on American businesses so that those businesses can be more competitive and those families will have more discretionary spending.

Our businesses currently rank 35 out of 36 in terms of the highest corporate tax rates imposed—some of the highest in the world. We compete around the world with those countries that are producing the same products, yet their tax rates are significantly lower than ours, and that puts us at a competitive disadvantage. We can make the best products in the world and we can outsell anybody in the world if we put our companies and our businesses on a level playing field. The whole structure and purpose behind the Wyden-Coats tax reform bill is to do just that—to put us on a competitive basis with our competitors by lowering rates and gaining the revenue to pay for our debt.

We know this won't be easy, and we know it requires Democrats and Republicans to work together to take on the special interests that currently benefit from the broken tax system. We know that right now that seems very difficult and very challenging, but it has been done before. We had tax reform in 1986 that stimulated the economy in ways no stimulus had ever done before. It brought in significant additional revenues to the Treasury and put Americans back to work.

This is a bipartisan bill—a Democrat from Oregon and a Republican from Indiana—have joined forces on this. We want to signal that this is something that can be done aside from political gotchas, aside from political gain for the 2012 election, and something we can work together on that will make a commitment to a substantial portion of the necessary action that needs to be taking place to deal with this pending debt crisis and deficit crisis that has to be resolved by August 2 or close to that. Some say it can't be done in the time that is left. Well, we are in extraordinary times, and I think we have to set aside the conventional thinking and work toward what can and must be done.

To the extent it can't be fully incorporated into the law, at the very least, I believe the package we are ultimately going to be voting on needs a rock-hard, firm commitment and instructions to the tax-writing committees that this must be done and presented to the Congress in this session so we can address it and so we eliminate the uncertainty on whether we are going to go forward. It needs an enforcement backup mechanism so that if Congress doesn't act in a timely manner, there will be an automatic process in place that presents this to us for a vote.

We have a unique opportunity to do something big, to quote the President again. I commend him for saying that, and I commend him for coming forward and saying we will get off this cut-only, tax-only stalemate by beginning to address this on a comprehensive basis and put in place those elements we all know are necessary to achieve success. It will require the House and the Senate and the White House to cast aside political posturing in the 2012 elections, to transcend the politics, to do what is necessary for the future of America, for the future of Americans, to do what is necessary to get our finances and our economy moving again and to get people back to work. We need to transcend that and do what is right for the future of our country.

I hope we have taken a positive step in that direction today. I look forward to participating, as I know all of us do, in that process and hopefully assuring the American people and assuring the world that America is not at a stalemate, that America can address a challenge—a big challenge—and we can come forward with a sensible solution that puts us on the path to prosperity and guarantees a better future for our children and grandchildren.

I yield the floor, and 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.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. 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. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I understand we are debating a specific resolution. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NASA

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize NASA's STS–135 mission. As the Presiding Officer knows, at approximately 11:30 a.m. tomorrow, Space Shuttle *Atlantis* is scheduled to lift off from the Kennedy Space Center in Florida with a crew of four on board. The 12-day mission will deliver supplies, logistics, and spare parts to the International Space Station. This will be the final mission of the space shuttle era that began just over 30 years ago.

A Senator from Colorado may not seem like the most likely person to come to the floor today to speak about the space shuttle, but NASA and space exploration actually have quite a bit to do with Colorado, and it is something I care deeply about.

Colorado has one of the three top aerospace economies in the country, with a hand in every aspect of space—government, commercial and academic, civil and military. We helped develop the space shuttle and many of the missions that flew on it, and we are playing a major role in the development of the shuttle's successors.

NASA has been a source of pride for all Americans from its very beginnings. We have cheered their triumphs and suffered with them during their tragedies. All the while, we have been inspired by their mission of exploration.

The shuttle era is no exception. Ever since the first launch in April of 1981, the names of the space shuttles—the *Columbia*, *Challenger*, *Discovery*, *Atlantis*, and *Endeavour*—have become familiar to even casual observers. This is a testament to the vehicle itself and those behind it.

I would like to acknowledge all of those who have flown on the shuttle, the thousands of unseen heroes at NASA who support them, and the contractors at too many companies to name who make it all possible. Flying the shuttle is a true team effort. Everyone who has been a part of that team should be proud of what they have accomplished.

I see my colleague from Florida across the Chamber, and I know he is also very aware that this has been a team effort across the board.

I know I would be remiss at this point if I didn't mention those who paid the ultimate price for their service. We will never forget the images of the horrible tragedies that befell the shuttle, one occurring merely seconds after leaving the pull of Earth's gravity, the other just minutes away from being home again. We will always remember the crews of the Space Shuttles *Challenger* and *Columbia*.

This milestone in the history of space flight forces us to reflect on what we have learned and where we are going. America is now in the unenviable position of having no U.S.-derived means of sending humans into space, including to vital assets like the International Space Station. For the near future, we will have to rely on our international partners, namely Russia. But that position will change. It must change, I would add. NASA is developing a successor to the shuttle based on important work done during the Constellation Program, and the burgeoning commercial sector is literally changing the way we access space as we speak. These complementary development tracks will build a more robust space exploration enterprise.

As the Presiding Officer knows, I have an interest in climbing mountains, as does he, and I have had the great good fortune to stand on the top of some of the world's highest mountains. I believe it is in our nature as humans to explore and understand the world around us, to keep stretching to achieve goals just beyond our grasp.

The shuttle has allowed us to reach farther than many ever dreamed possible. But the end of the shuttle era is by no means the end of exploration. At its heart, NASA is not about parts, it is about people. Even after the shuttle assumes its rightful place in history, legions of engineers, scientists, pilots, and other adventurers will carry its mission forward into the next phase of exploration. Keeping that spirit intact will be a fitting tribute to the space shuttle.

I wish the crew of STS–135 a smooth and productive journey and, above all, a safe return.

Before I yield the floor, I wish to add an additional note. In Colorado, of course, we have 54 mountains that are over 14,000 feet. We have countless peaks below that lofty elevation. But among the 100 highest peaks in Colorado, we have Columbia Point, which is named to commemorate the astronauts and the mission that ended tragically. We also have Challenger Point. Both peaks are in the top 100, both peaks are linked by a high ridge, and in the middle of that high ridge is Kit Carson Peak which is a 14,000-foot mountain. I have had the good fortune to stand on the summit of both of those peaks, most recently Columbia Peak in April, and the view is one that is worthy of us as Americans. As we go forward, let's remember the great successes of the shuttle program and build on them as we move forward as Americans exploring the world and exploring the universe.

I know my colleague from Florida shares those sentiments. I don't know that he is on the floor to speak on this particular topic, but I look forward to working with him, given the importance of the space industry and the space mission in the great State of Florida.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for up to 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Colorado, as I pick up where he left off on the space program.

Thirty years ago, the United States launched the first space shuttle mission from Kennedy Space Center in Florida.

It marked a new era of American leadership in space and showed, once again, that Americans would continue to be committed to being first in space and on the cutting edge of scientific progress to improve our lives.

It also showed what free people—committed to discovery, to innovation, to improving the lives of their fellow man—can accomplish.

President Ronald Reagan said it best when he kicked off the space station program in 1984 . . . ''We are first; we are the best; and we are so because we're free.''

Over these 30 years, we have been witness to many heroic triumphs in space that have served as a testament to America's unparalleled ingenuity and imagination.

Over time, the shuttle program would make household names out of some. Sally Ride became the first American woman to travel into space. One shuttle alum even serves with us in the Senate today—our colleague, BILL NELSON.

Of course, space exploration has always entailed risk-taking. It has always required putting one's life on the line. And because of this, the space shuttle program's history also gave us moments of great pain as we lost Christa McAuliffe and the *Challenger* crew in 1986, and the *Columbia* crew in 2003.

Each time these tragedies forced us to ask ourselves: Is space exploration worth it?

And thank God, time and time again, America answered with an emphatic: Yes.

Today, on this eve of the final space shuttle launch, we celebrate the shuttle program's remarkable feats, which exhibited many of the qualities that make America exceptional—courage, ingenuity, risk-taking, and an ability to accomplish what once seemed unthinkable.

Space exploration speaks volumes about America—who we are as a people and a nation.

When America was born 235 years ago, surely our Founding Fathers could not fathom that one day our people would fly among the stars. But the truth is, it has always been our destiny.

In the 19th century, it became our manifest destiny to explore and push westward until the American land stretched from sea to shining sea. And once we reached as far west as we could, Americans had no choice but to gaze up to the sky and settle on the stars as our next frontier.

Almost 42 years ago to the day, Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin and Mike Collins made that giant leap for mankind and left their indelible footprints on the Moon's surface and on human history. And on that night in July of 1969, the whole world witnessed the American miracle firsthand.

Even today, that moment serves as a poignant reminder about the limitless capacity that Americans possess in space and every aspect of our lives.

Even as we face a host of domestic and international challenges, America possesses a remarkable capacity to meet them by setting ambitious goals as President Kennedy did in his Moon speech, persevering in the face of setbacks and rising to the occasion to do what history demands of us.

Our space program inspired younger generations of Americans to pursue careers in the aerospace industry and other related fields. Satellite technologies developed and improved by NASA now connect the world in unprecedented ways, support our military's reconnaissance efforts, and facilitate travel through GPS devices.

For others, it got them hooked on math and science, and led them to other fields whose innovations make our lives better every day.

And then there were the lucky few who would actually go on to fly our space shuttles.

For the rest of us who did not pursue careers in science, math and engineering, our journeys into space have meant a lot—in different ways.

For many of us, Kennedy Space Center elicits memories as the place where imaginations are awakened and where dreams have been born.

And it is also where many children think fondly to their visits for field trips or space camps, and, in my case, of the time my parents took me there for my eighth birthday party before we moved to Las Vegas.

But these types of feelings did not just happen in America. The impact of our space program is a global phenomenon.

One needs to look no further than the various foreign currencies in the donation box at Washington's National Air and Space Museum to understand what our space program means not only for Florida and our country but for all of humanity.

This brings me to my other reason for speaking today.

When this final shuttle mission draws to a close, many Americans will be startled by the realization that we don't have an answer to the question: What is next for NASA?

NASA has no answer. President Obama has no answer. And as we transition to the next generation of space exploration, Florida's aerospace workers are left with only questions about their future.

We know that for the next few years, we will have to rely on the Russians to get to space.

Just a few weeks ago, that only cost $50 million an astronaut. Now the price tag is up to $63 million per astronaut. We can only imagine it will go higher.

Whereas America once led the way to the Moon, we now face the unacceptable prospect of limited options to simply get a human into orbit.

We know that our commercial space partners are working to fill some of the gap in our human spaceflight capabilities. But we need NASA to lead.

And, as I say this, I fully recognize that our Nation faces a debt crisis because politicians in both parties have spent recklessly for many decades. It will require Washington to finally live within its means and for leaders to make tough choices about what our Nation's priorities are. NASA is no exception. It will not be about spending more—it will be about spending wisely.

Tomorrow, Americans will proudly watch as Atlantis takes off for its last flight. It will be a poignant opportunity to recall the entire 30-year history of the shuttle program and all that has been achieved in 50 years of NASA's existence.

And it will be another opportunity to thank the thousands of men and women in Florida who have made this program possible and who take such pride in the shuttle and what it has accomplished.

For NASA, just like our Nation, is at its best when it is looking forward, not looking back.

Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair what my remaining time is?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In postcloture status, the Senator has 53 minutes remaining. So 8 minutes of the 15 minutes is remaining.

Mr. RUBIO. Fifty-three sounded like too much, even for a Senator.

I briefly wish to use the second half of my time to talk about the issue of the day and that is the issue that is being discussed here in town about the debt—an important issue. It is happening at a time when many Americans from all across the country are traveling here on their vacations to show their children and their families how government works—or maybe in the case of this issue, how government does not work—in any event, how our Republic is trying to work its way through this issue, an important one.

I know that a few moments ago there was a meeting at the White House that concluded, and we wait with great anticipation—I see my colleague, the Senator from Illinois, has arrived and perhaps he will update us here on the floor in a few moments. But we are all interested in this issue because it goes well beyond partisanship or party politics; it is about the future of our country.

I think there is growing consensus on some of the outlines of what it will take to solve this issue. I think it will take two things, because I have heard this terminology we use about a balanced approach. It will take two things. First, it will take reductions in spending and it will take cuts, but we cannot simply cut our way out of this process. We must also grow our way out of this process.

My point is there is no way we can simply reduce spending enough to get America out of the predicament it is facing. We must also grow our economy at the same time. And growing our economy leads us to the No. 1 issue facing our country. For America, for the government, for us here in Washington, the national debt is the No. 1 issue on our minds, and rightfully so. It is a serious issue. But for the rest of our country, the No. 1 issue is joblessness. It is the fact that people are struggling to find a job.

These people did everything that was asked of them. They went to school, got a degree, worked hard, and now they have lost their job and their homes. If they did find a job, maybe they are making half as much and working twice as long. So we have to grow our economy. The logic behind it is very straightforward. If we have more people working, we have more people paying into our tax system. If we have more people paying into our tax system, that is more money available for our government to pay down its debt.

So I want to focus on the growth aspect and what we can do to grow our economy and help job creators create jobs. Don't ask the politicians, ask the job creators. They will tell us there are two things standing in the way of job creation in America. No. 1 is a broken Tax Code that is uncertain, complicated, difficult to navigate and, in many instances, unaffordable for them. No. 2, it is runaway regulations. So any deal that deals with the debt in a serious way has to encompass growth policies that involve, in my mind, both regulatory reform and tax reform. I hope that is what they are working toward—tax reform. Because what we need in America is not more taxes, we need more taxpayers.

The other part of the deal, of course, is going to have to involve some spending reductions. That is why I proudly stood with my colleagues to point out three things we have to clearly do to bring it under control. The first is we have to reduce spending this year. Obviously, we can't solve the budget deficit and debt in 1 year, but we have to begin to address it this year, so meaningful cuts this year.

The second thing we need to do is a spending cap that limits the amount of money this government can spend in

the future or the growth in the amount of money the government can spend in the future. Our government should not grow faster than our economy.

Finally, we need some sort of balanced budget amendment.

To top it all off, we have to save Social Security and Medicare. I was encouraged this morning to read that the President is interested in this issue. It is important. It is not about balancing the budget on the backs of anyone. It is about saving Social Security and Medicare so that there will never have to be benefit reductions for current beneficiaries, and so that these programs exist for me when I retire and for my children when they retire, and so they will never grow insolvent.

With that, I yield the floor, and 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. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about our debt crisis, our short-term debt crisis and our long-term debt crisis. I come here today to discuss ways to address them and ways not to address them.

Our most immediate debt crisis is now upon us. In order to maintain the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government, Congress will have to vote to raise the debt ceiling within a matter of weeks. This is something Congress has done as a matter of course many times over the years as our national debt has grown.

Let us be clear about what exactly it means to raise the debt ceiling and why it is necessary. As a nation, we have accumulated $14.3 trillion in debt. This in and of itself is a very bad and dangerous thing. That means our national debt is currently 93 percent of our gross national product. Again, this is a very bad and dangerous thing. We have been in this situation before. Actually, it has been worse. After World War II, our national debt was at 121.7 percent of our gross national product. We certainly had something to show for it. We had won World War II.

Through the 1940s, 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, we worked our way to a point where our national debt fell to 32.5 percent of GDP in 1981. We did this through a combination of growth and some inflation. Our debt was in pretty good shape until we hit the 1980s, during which we quadrupled our national debt under Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush.

We have hashed over time and again who is to blame for the situation we find ourselves in. But let me leave that alone for the moment and get back to what it means to raise the debt ceiling. As I said, our debt currently stands at $14.3 trillion. I think we can agree on this: That number reflects past choices, not current ones.

The debt ceiling also stands at $14.3 trillion. We have to raise the debt ceiling because we as a nation have certain obligations we must meet. We have to pay for the wars we are currently engaged in. We have obligations to veterans who have served our Nation. We have obligations to have the dedicated men and women at FEMA who have been responding to the many floods and fires our Nation has been facing.

We have obligations to seniors who have paid into Social Security all their working lives and have a right to expect a check every month of their retirement.

We have obligations under Medicare, not just to seniors, who again have paid in, but to clinics and hospitals and health care providers and to those who supply medicine and medical equipment.

We have contractual obligations of all kinds to many different businesses, whether they are building roads or water towers or providing IT services to the VA or the Park Service or the Senate. I think almost everyone would agree it is good to have guards in our Federal prisons, except maybe the prisoners. The list of obligations goes on and on, and one of our most fundamental obligations is to pay principal and interest to bondholders who have invested in what has been for decades and decades considered the safest investment in the world: the U.S. Treasury bond.

Currently, we simply are not taking in enough revenues to meet all these obligations, so we must borrow more. Of course, we must pay interest on our debt, at an interest rate that is now actually quite low.

The surest way to increase the interest on our debt would be to default on our debt obligations. And make no mistake, that is exactly what will happen if we fail to raise the debt ceiling. Even an increase in interest rates of just 1 percent would add $1.3 trillion to our interest payments over the next decade. So, as you can see, defaulting on our debt to make a point about the seriousness of our current position would, to say the least, be counterproductive. Yet some of my colleagues are willing to do just that, and that is irresponsible.

As to the notion that bondholders could be paid while other obligations were postponed, Scott Elmendorf, Chair of the Congressional Budget Office, said:

> Defaulting on any government obligation is a dangerous gamble.

We are not absolutely certain what exactly will happen if we default, but we have a pretty good idea. We know it would roil the international financial markets, induce rating downgrades of our Treasury notes, create fundamental doubts about the creditworthiness of the United States, and force us to pay higher interest rates to induce people to buy our bonds. It would damage the dollar and the special role of Treasury securities in global markets for decades to come—a dangerous gamble, one we cannot afford to take.

Defaulting on our debt would also be, as David Brooks so aptly put it, a stain upon our national honor. Are we actually going to become a country that cannot be relied on to pay its debts?

Yet we have Members of the House and Members of this body threatening to vote against raising the debt ceiling unless the President and Democrats in Congress meet their demands on how to address the deficit going forward.

Are my friends suggesting we act like a deadbeat who buys a new car and then, some time down the line, decides: ''You know, I just don't feel like making the payments''?

I think these Members are doing an enormous disservice by holding our Nation's economy and, indeed, the entire global economy hostage to their demands. Because the U.S. Treasury bond has been the foundation of the world financial system, it is not an overstatement to say that defaulting on our debt at this fragile point in the global economic recovery could throw us into a worldwide depression.

I am hardly alone in this regard. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce shares my alarm. It is no small secret that the Wall Street backers of the Republican Party are beseeching their allies in Congress to come to their senses.

Yet Republican leaders know there are also those in their party who believe this is their chance. This is their opportunity to exact concessions from the White House and Democrats in Congress precisely because the situation is so fraught with peril. They know the President of the United States cannot play a game of chicken with the full faith and credit of the United States of America. And in a game of chicken, the irrational and irresponsible player holds a distinct strategic advantage over the rational and responsible player.

So we find ourselves in this place at this time.

What are the demands?

Well, Republican leaders here in the Senate are holding the debt ceiling hostage so they can end Medicare as we know it. Democrats are trying to protect Medicare and ensure its solvency, and the Affordable Care Act is already doing that. Not only does the Affordable Care Act provide more benefits to Medicare recipients, it also extends the solvency of Medicare by 7 years. That is the conclusion of the most recent report of the Medicare trustees.

Of course, the first big idea from our friends on the other side of the aisle this Congress was to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and they all voted to do that. So please understand that one of their first votes this Congress would

have had the effect of diminishing the solvency of Medicare, shrinking the solvency of Medicare by 7 years.

Not only that, but according to the Congressional Budget Office, the Affordable Care Act will reduce the debt over the next decade by $210 billion, and over the decade following that by more than $1 trillion. So rather than saving money by making our health care system stronger, making our delivery of care more efficient, and keeping our constituents healthy, Republicans voted to repeal the health reform law. So the big Republican contribution to the sustainability of Medicare and our national debt was to vote to shorten Medicare's life expectancy by 7 years and to add well over $1 trillion to the debt in the next two decades.

There is no doubt that the biggest threat to the sustainability of our long-term debt is the cost of health care. That is why so much of the Affordable Care Act is designed to address the cost of the delivery of medical care.

Let me give you a couple of examples. First, the value index. The value index will direct that health care providers be reimbursed by the value of the care they provide rather than by the volume—the quality of the care rather than the quantity of care. In Minnesota, for instance, we do health care a lot better than most other States. We provide higher quality care at a lower cost than almost any other State. There is room for improvement in Minnesota, of course. As a health care economist told me: In Minnesota, we get an A, but that is because we grade on a curve.

In Texas, they get reimbursed 50 percent more per patient in Medicare than we do in Minnesota and yet we have better outcomes.

Why? Well, we have a different health care culture in Minnesota. We tend to do more coordinated, fully integrated care. We tend to see patients as people who we want to keep healthy and out of the hospital. In Texas, patients are more often viewed as profit centers. There are some excellent, high-value centers of health care in Texas, such as Baylor University. Then, there are some egregiously low-value ones, like some in McAllen, TX. And, by and large, Texas doctors order more procedures than Minnesota doctors so they can bill for more procedures.

But the idea here isn't to pit Minnesota against Texas. The idea is to incentivize low-value States to do health care more like high-value States. Imagine if we could bring down the cost of health care in Texas by one-third. Imagine the savings to Medicare and Medicaid.

One more example. Senator LUGAR and I wrote a provision into the bill called the Diabetes Prevention Program. It is based on a CDC program piloted in Indianapolis and in St. Paul. They took folks that had been diagnosed with ''prediabetes'' and gave them 16 weeks of nutritional training and 16 weeks of physical exercise at the YMCA, all at a cost of only about $300 per person.

The number of people with prediabetes who later developed full-blown type 2 diabetes was reduced by almost 60 percent—60 percent! Caring for chronic disease is the most expensive piece of our health care system in this country. One of the most common chronic illnesses is diabetes. It costs our Nation $218 billion a year to treat diabetes.

A couple weeks after the Affordable Care Act passed, I brought the Under Secretary of Health and Human Services into my office to meet with diabetes experts from the CDC and with United Health Group, the country's largest insurance company. The goal of the meeting was to get HHS on board to bring the piloted Diabetes Prevention Program up to scale nationwide. The executive from United Health said she would definitely reimburse their policy holders for going through the 16-week program. She said, ''You know why? Because for every dollar we spend, we'll save four dollars.''

The value index and the Diabetes Prevention Program are but two of the many programs in the Affordable Care Act that have been written into the law. Jonathan Gruber, the MIT professor who helped put together the health reform system in Massachusetts when Mitt Romney was Governor there, has said of the Affordable Care Act, ''It's really hard to figure out how to bend the cost curve, but I can't think of a thing to try that they didn't try . . . You couldn't have done better than they are doing.''

Since then, in the House, Representative PAUL RYAN and the Republicans in Congress have taken an entirely different approach. Instead of putting in the long, hard hours of consulting with health care providers, health care economists, patient groups, hospitals, rural health groups, and medical researchers to actually try to build on protocols that have been proven to bring down the cost of delivering quality medicine, Representative RYAN decided just to slash the funding of Medicare, give the money left over to seniors, and let them fend for themselves to buy their own health care from insurance companies.

Now, we know there was no functional market for health insurance for folks 65 and over before Medicare and Medicaid started in 1965. It is doubtful that there would be one now. Under the Republican plan, seniors would essentially get a voucher for a significantly lower amount than their Medicare is worth now. Remember that the cost to Medicare for administering its program is less than 2 percent. Insurance companies, on the other hand, spend around 11 percent on administration. The CBO estimates that under the Ryan plan, out-of-pocket cost for health care for each senior will more than double to over $12,500 a year.

This is not Medicare as we know it. It is not Medicare. So, understand this: the Republican plan to end Medicare would make huge cuts in Medicare benefits and put insurance companies in charge of seniors' health care. This would double the out-of-pocket costs for seniors and toss aside all the new benefits offered by the Affordable Care Act.

There is no question which vision of Medicare holds more hope for seniors and which takes a scientific, evidence-based, best practices approach to addressing the long-range cost of delivering health care to all Americans.

And yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are telling us that they are willing to risk throwing the global economy into depression if Democrats don't act more responsibly on Medicare.

Well, ok. Here is an idea. Allow Medicare to negotiate with the pharmaceutical companies on drugs for Medicare Part D. The VA does it. And guess what. The VA pays an average of 48 percent less than Medicare does for the top 10 most prescribed drugs. Now the pharmaceutical industry tells us they need us to pay the higher price because they need the money for research. But, in fact, they spend more money on advertising and marketing than they do on research.

Almost every other developed country uses its size to negotiate with the pharmaceutical companies. Why does the American taxpayer have to be the chump who pays full price? I say we negotiate with the pharmaceutical companies and bring down the cost to Medicare by as much as $24 billion a year, or $240 billion over the next 10 years. That could go straight to paying off the debt. There. I got you a $240 billion cut to Medicare. Now can we please vote to raise the debt ceiling and avert a worldwide economic catastrophe?

If my friends on the other side are really serious about getting our deficit under control, couldn't we start by getting rid of a measly $2 billion a year in taxpayer subsidies to oil companies—the companies that are getting record profits because the price of oil is so high? Unfortunately, according to my Republican colleagues, this would be a tax hike.

In order for us to agree to balance the budget, everyone has to pay. Who is in a better position to give? Exxon or a little girl in Minnesota named Evelyn. You see, Evelyn was born with cystic fibrosis. When she was 10, her liver failed, and her own toxins started to poison her. But Medicaid helped her get the care she needed. That is what this is about. Exxon or Evelyn. Frankly, it makes me kind of sad.

So there are some more billions for deficit reduction. Get rid of the subsidies to the five biggest oil companies—$21 billion over the next 10 years. And you know what? If we are seriously going to address our debt crisis, we have to increase revenues.

Now under the Republican plan, the cuts to end Medicare as we know it and to slash Medicaid all go to pay for tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans. That's right. The Republican plan cuts taxes on the top marginal rates for millionaires and billionaires from 35 percent to 25 percent.

Now my Republican friends like to say that tax cuts always produce revenue increases. Besides the fact that that is simply not true, it also contradicts the other argument Republicans use for not raising taxes. Raising taxes, Republicans often argue, would just give the government more money to spend. According to that oft-repeated Republican argument, cutting taxes will lower revenue and ''starve the beast.''

Here is President Ronald Reagan making this exact point in 1981:

> There were always those who told us that taxes couldn't be cut until spending was reduced. Well, you know, we can lecture our children about extravagance until we run out of voice and breath. Or we can cure their extravagance by simply reducing their allowance.

In other words, cutting taxes cuts revenues and forces the children, in this case, the government, to cut spending.

So, at the heart of my friends' argument on why we must cut taxes are two completely contradictory, mutually exclusive arguments. On the one hand, according to my friends, lowering taxes always increases revenues and therefore brings down the deficit. On the other hand, they argue, lowering taxes decreases revenues. Which is it? Because you can't have it both ways.

I will try to provide some context for my friends. After President Reagan cut taxes in 1981, we immediately started amassing enormous deficits. They were so bad that President Reagan felt compelled to raise taxes in 1982 and then again in 1983. In fact, President Ronald Reagan, the supply-side icon, raised taxes 11 times. If President Reagan did that today, the Tea Party and, in fact, the entire Republican Party would run him out of town on a rail.

But, you see, President Reagan knew that to raise revenue, you have to either raise marginal tax rates, or get rid of tax loopholes for the wealthy and for big corporations. Which is what he did repeatedly.

Even so, our national debt nearly tripled during the Reagan Presidency. The national debt continued to grow rapidly during the George H. W. Bush administration. In fact, in 1993, he handed President Bill Clinton what at that point was the largest deficit in history.

So what did President Clinton do? Well, in his 1993 deficit reduction package, he added two new marginal tax rates at the top end—36 percent for those making over $180,000 and 39.6 percent for those making over $250,000. Every Republican voted against the package. They said that raising the top marginal tax rate would cause a recession. Former Speaker Newt Gingrich said:

> I believe this will lead to a recession next year. This is the Democrat machine's recession, and each one of them will be held personally accountable.

Senator Phil Gramm of Texas said:

> The Clinton plan is a one-way ticket to recession. This plan does not reduce the deficit. But it raises taxes and it puts people out of work.

Representative John Kasich, then ranking member of the House Budget Committee, said:

> This plan will not work. If it was to work, I'd have to become a Democrat.

Well, it worked. Not only did we have an unprecedented expansion of our economy for 8 years, creating more than 22 million new net jobs, but we balanced the budget and Bill Clinton handed George W. Bush a record surplus. I call that ''working.''

Now President Clinton, and especially the Democrats in Congress, paid a political price for the 1993 deficit reduction package. The Democrats went down to defeat in 1994, losing control of the House for the first time in 40 years. You could say that Democrats took a shellacking.

Nevertheless, between 1993 and 2001 the Nation created an unprecedented number of jobs benefiting every quartile of our economy, decreasing the number of Americans in poverty, increasing median income, and creating more millionaires than ever—to which my colleagues on the other side of the aisle might say, ''Sure, it worked in practice. But does it work in theory?''

President Clinton's deficit reduction plan not only reduced the deficit as planned, it eliminated it entirely and gave incoming President George W. Bush a record surplus. In fact, when President Bush took office, we were on track to completely pay off our national debt with $5 trillion of surpluses projected over the next 10 years. In other words, we would have zeroed out our national debt this year.

Five days after President Bush took office—again, after President Bush took office—Alan Greenspan testified to the Senate Budget Committee that we were in danger of paying off the national debt too quickly and entering uncharted territory in which the Federal Government would have too much money. The Federal Government, Greenspan warned, would have to put its excess money into private equities, thereby distorting and decreasing the efficiency of our markets.

President Bush told the country that a surplus meant that Americans were paying too much in taxes. This was our money, he told us, and so we all deserved a tax cut. Then after the economy went into recession, Bush told us that what we needed was another tax cut to stimulate the economy. So, in other words, ''when the economy is going strong, tax cuts are in order.'' And ''when the economy is weak, tax cuts are in order.'' Combine those with the aforementioned contradictory ''tax cuts reduce revenues forcing government to spend less of our money'' and ''tax cuts always increase revenues'' and you have an exquisitely incomprehensible economic theory.

But that exquisitely incomprehensible theory needed just one more element to make it downright dangerous. And that element would be provided by Vice President Richard Cheney.

By late 2002, the surplus President George W. Bush had inherited from Bill Clinton was turning once again into huge deficits. According to then-Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill, he tried to warn Vice President Cheney that budget deficits were growing at an alarming rate, posing a threat to the economy. Vice President Cheney cut O'Neill off, saying, ''You know, Paul, Reagan proved deficits don't matter.''

By the end of his Presidency, George W. Bush left President Obama a budget deficit projected at $1.2 trillion for fiscal year 2009. Meanwhile, President Bush had doubled our national debt.

What was to blame? Could it have had anything to do with the fact that for the first time in history we cut taxes while we were at war?

Well, not according to the Republican leader. In July of last year Senator MCCONNELL said: ''There's no evidence whatsoever that the Bush tax cuts actually diminished revenue.''

But adjusting for inflation, since the Bush tax cuts were enacted, revenues have fallen 17 percent. And that is not even taking into account growth in our population, which was 9 percent over this period. When you add the effect of population growth, revenues declined by about 24 percent per capita. I think this clearly constitutes evidence that the Bush tax cuts actually diminished revenue.

So it should be no surprise that reduced revenues are responsible for a lot of our deficit, as you can see here. This chart by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities is based on CBO data and shows that the Bush tax cuts were responsible for 25 percent of the deficit in 2010. And that is only going to grow. By 2019, the tax cuts will account for almost 60 percent of our deficit.

And the fact is that not only did the national debt double during the Bush administration, we also had a dismal record of job creation. And during the Bush years, for the first time since we started keeping records, median income fell in America. And more Americans fell into poverty. One in five children in America now lives in poverty. It is even higher in rural America.

There is one group that did very well during the Bush years, and continues to do very well: The extremely wealthy.

We now have in this country the greatest disparity in income and wealth that we have had since the 1920s.

So the one thing that there is no evidence whatsoever of is that cutting taxes on the wealthiest Americans can

create jobs and keep the deficit under control.

So why would we do it, when the evidence is so stark that the Bush tax cuts coincided with a huge spike in both the debt and unemployment?

Why not look back on what has worked in the past and learn from it?

As I said earlier, after World War II our debt as a percentage of GDP was, in fact, significantly larger than it is today. But what did we do? Well, we passed the G.I. bill so that our troops returning from the war could go to college.

Truman started the Marshall plan to help Europe get on its feet.

And it is not as if we had smooth sailing as far as Defense spending. We went to war in Korea, losing nearly 35,000 Americans. After that war ended, we found ourselves in an extended Cold War. We built the largest infrastructure project in our history, the Interstate Highway System—it added enormously to our economic development, because now we could transport our goods around the country so much more efficiently.

When the Soviets launched Sputnik into space, we jump-started our space program and our investment in science and math education. My brother and I were Sputnik kids. He was 11 and I was 6 when it was launched. My parents took us into our living room in Minnesota and told us that we had to study math and science in order to beat the Soviets. I thought that was a big burden to place on an 11-year-old and a 6-year-old. But we were obedient sons, and so we studied math and science. And wouldn't you know it, my parents were right. We beat the Soviets.

The space program created all kinds of dividends in technology and to our economic development. I watched a Senate debate last fall in which the Republican candidate said that government had never created a job. The debate, of course, was broadcast by satellite.

I think you get the idea. The fact is the investments we made in the 1940s, 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s in science and technology, in our State universities, in infrastructure that was the envy of the world brought our debt as a percentage of GDP from 121 percent in 1945 to 33 percent in 1980.

Erskine Bowles is right. We can't get out of our current debt crisis with growth alone. But I will tell you most certainly that we will not get out of it without growth.

And so we have to choose wisely in what we invest in, in when we invest, and in how we invest; and in what we cut, and when we cut, and how we cut—which we must do—and in how we increase revenues, when we increase revenues, and from whom we get those revenues.

Why not invest in retrofitting our buildings when we have so many in the building trades out of work, sitting on the sidelines, and knowing that we can recoup that investment in energy savings within 3 to 5 years? Let's find creative ways of financing that, such as PACE financing, which lets families get a loan from their local government and pay it back on their property taxes. This is how cities pay for streetlights and sidewalks. It adds value to homes; and when the family moves, the loan stays with the property. We should also create incentives for banks to lend to small businesses for retrofitting commercial buildings.

There is a company in Minnesota called McQuay that makes heating and air conditioning systems for commercial buildings. They are actually supplying the system for the new World Trade Center, and their systems are so energy efficient that they pay for themselves in 3 to 5 years through energy savings.

They have been taking out loans from banks since they are a large creditworthy company, but then they give out loans to customers who install their systems. It is a win-win, because they are selling more units and putting people back to work, and their customers are actually making money in the long run through energy savings. McQuay has a good model, and we should be figuring out how to encourage others to do the same thing.

Why not cut our Defense spending when $100 billion in cuts have been identified by our service chiefs at Secretary Gates' request, and when cost overruns on our weapons systems are absurdly high? The GAO recently revealed that when you add up the growth in costs of major Defense weapons systems over their original estimates, the total is over $402 billion.

Why not raise revenue by increasing taxes on the wealthiest in this Nation—those who have benefited the most from the economy in recent years—especially when we can look to the recent past and see that their tax cuts created virtually no jobs and contributed mightily to our deficit?

Only when the middle class is strong does our economy grow, because the middle class has always been the part of our society that creates demand. There are just not enough rich people to buy enough stuff. The middle class spends its money. But today, companies are sitting on trillions of dollars because there is just not enough demand. And that is because there is a lot of unemployment and because wages for the middle class have gone down over the last decade.

Creating a middle class is not an end unto itself. A strong middle class leads to strong consumer spending, and therefore to a strong economy and to national prosperity. The middle class is also where you get entrepreneurs and small businesses—it is the engine of our economy.

Why not invest in early childhood education when we know that the return on quality early childhood education is up to $16 for every $1 spent? We know that children who have had quality early childhood education are less likely to need special education, less likely to repeat grades, they have better health outcomes, and that the girls are less likely to get pregnant as teenagers. We know children who have quality early childhood education are more likely to graduate from high school, more likely to go to college, more likely to get a good job and pay taxes, and much less likely to go to prison.

My friends on the other side say that we must cut the deficit for our children's sake, and I agree. But why then are such a disproportionate amount of the cuts aimed at programs that help kids? As I said, one of every five children in America lives in poverty, and even more in rural areas.

But the Republicans want to cut Head Start and Early Head Start. We currently serve about 40 percent of children who qualify for Head Start and less than 4 percent of children who qualify for Early Head Start. Do we really want to cut that? Do we really want to cut Pell grants? The Republican budget slashes Medicaid. About 50 percent of the recipients of Medicaid are children. We know we are going to have to make shared sacrifices to get the budget under control, but do we really think that sick kids should make those sacrifices?

You know, immediately after this last election, Republican leadership said that their No. 1 priority was seeing to it that Barack Obama is a one-term President. They didn't say their No. 1 priority was getting Americans back to work, or educating our kids, or even balancing the budget.

Their No. 1 priority was winning the next election. But I don't think that is what Americans want. The American people want us to get to work to solve problems, to improve their lives. We don't have to agree on how to do that but they sent us here to work together. If the time between elections just becomes about jockeying for the next election, then what in the world is the point of getting elected in the first place? I thought we were here to work together constructively in the interest of the American people.

Now the Senate Republican leader is saying that raising any new revenues is off the table; that he will not vote to raise the debt ceiling if part of our compromise on the budget going forward involves any tax increase on anyone, no matter how wealthy they are, no matter what their income.

I ask all my colleagues, for the good of the country, to step back from the brink, to step back from brinksmanship on this debt ceiling. Let's not panic. We are going to be on this planet for a while. Let's have some confidence in ourselves to do this in a smart thoughtful way so that our children will say, ''Well, they might not have been the Greatest Generation, but they were a Pretty Good Generation.''

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. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VITTER. I ask unanimous consent that Senator KIRK and I speak in succession for up to 15 minutes and that the Democratic side then have two speakers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Illinois.

AHMED ABDULKADIR WARSAME

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, we have just learned that Ahmed Abdulkadir Warsame was arrested by the U.S. military in April. This news has just come to us, learning that this man who fought for no country and wore no uniform and under an international law is considered an enemy combatant and therefore not a prisoner of war or an American civilian criminal, has been taken to a U.S. criminal court to be granted full U.S. constitutional rights in a prosecution in the civilian courts of the United States, located in the Southern District of New York.

This man was taken outside American territory for attacks outside U.S. jurisdiction for acts against non-U.S. citizens. Yet he has been charged with a U.S. civilian crime and has been given the full rights of an American citizen or a nationalized individual. I think we have made a grievous mistake.

We have made a significant change just this week. We have violated the principles set forth by President Lincoln and President Roosevelt, who well used military commissions to handle enemy combatants and not providing them full U.S. constitutional rights for actions taken outside the United States against non-U.S. citizens in the war on terror.

I am very worried this foreign terrorist, who was taken abroad for attacks committed abroad, is now going to have the full constitutional right to confront his accuser and have all information used in his trial exposed. This means that, under the new policy, the United States may be forced to reveal intelligence information critical in the war on terror, especially against al Qaida, al Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, and Al-Shabaab, when otherwise a military commission could have kept that information confidential, leading to further success by the United States.

We should ask at what cost this prosecution will come. The previous proposal by the President, which he backed away from, was to bring the author of the 9/11 attack, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, to central New York, at a cost of an estimated $75 million to protect the court, the judge, the prosecutor, the jury, and their families. The President backed away from that Khalid Shaikh Mohammed decision, but apparently he has now made that decision again with regard to Ahmed Abdulkadir Warsame.

My question is this: What threat is now being posed to the people of New York? What threat is being posed to the Federal judge? What will the prosecutor fear for the rest of his or her life in participating in this unnecessary civilian prosecution—and especially for the jurors and their families who now will be subject to scrutiny throughout the jihadist world by al Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula and Al-Shabaab. Why is this unnecessary threat now going to be posed to these Americans?

That is why 39 Republicans and Democrats joined me in a letter to Attorney General Eric Holder, saying this decision was a mistake and should not be repeated; that we have now created undue attention to the people of New York by al Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, al Qaida itself, and Al-Shabaab.

Remember, following our successful attack against bin Laden, we now estimate that al Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula and Al-Shabaab are the most dangerous and heavily armed subsidiaries of al Qaida. Al-Shabaab alone has over 8,000 men under training and, as one intelligence expert said, some of them at the level of training equivalent to the U.S. Army Rangers.

How are we going to protect the judge in this case for the rest of his or her life? How are we going to protect the prosecutor for the rest of his or her life? How are we going to protect the jury and their families for the rest of their lives because of this mistake made by the Attorney General of the United States?

At what cost will this prosecution come? Will it be paid by the city of New York, already heavily strained in finances, a New York State famously short of funds, or the Federal Government, which is also short of money?

What happens if Ahmed Abdulkadir Warsame is found innocent? We already know many released terrorists have already returned to jihad, as he proudly indicates he surely will.

In the wake of the debate on deficits and debt on a famous criminal trial in New York, we may have overlooked a fundamental decision, a mistake made by the Attorney General of the United States. The 9/11 Commission taught us a critical lesson, that terrorism is not a law enforcement problem; it is an intelligence and military problem. Well-established principles under Roosevelt, Lincoln, Bush, and, yes, President Obama, using military commissions, should be used instead of subjecting the American people to the increased threats, the increased costs, and the terrible precedent we have just set in giving an international terrorist, for acts committed overseas against foreigners, full constitutional rights. I think it is a decision we will regret. Many of us may quote the 9/11 Commission report in its clear findings in highlighting the error that was made.

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise again to urge all of us, Democrats and Republicans, to come together and put serious deficit reduction proposals on the floor for full debate, an open amendment process, a constructive debate and votes and action. That is the way we can move forward and resolve this greatest threat we face as a country, out-of-control Washington spending and debt.

We are making a little bit of progress in that regard. After months and months of the distinguished majority leader putting every other issue under the Sun on the floor but spending and debt, we finally forced this central issue to come and be debated.

Last week, many of us banded together, conservatives who were pushing for this debate, and said: Enough is enough. We should cancel the July 4 recess, we should block it so we stay and debate the central issue. That is what we did, and we successfully did that. Unfortunately, the majority leader then proposed that we stay here—yes, because we had blocked the recess—but did not put the central issue on the floor and moved yet another topic. We said: No; we are staying to get to this debate, this important issue, the greatest challenge we face right now as a country, and we successfully defeated his move to another topic.

Finally, with this little bit of progress, we are on the floor at least talking about the right issue. But we don't yet have a strong, meaningful, underlying proposal to act on. We have a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. That is a good basis for debate, I suppose. But, of course, we need more than that. We need serious proposals to debate and amend and vote on and act on. That is the important next step.

When I made these remarks yesterday, the distinguished Senator from New York, Senator SCHUMER, was in the Chamber and suggested that Republicans, including myself, had not gotten behind a serious, credible proposal. Specifically, he said: Wait a minute. The Ryan budget, which you voted for, doesn't reduce the deficit at all. I said at the time that is incorrect, but I didn't have the numbers in front of me. In fact, I looked it up, and the Ryan budget does significantly reduce the deficit from $1.4 trillion this year to $391 billion at the end of 10 years. That is a major reduction.

As I said to the Senator from New York at the time, my preference even ahead of that is the Toomey budget, which we produced on the Republican side in the Senate. That reduces the deficit from $1.4 trillion right now to zero over 10 years. It balances the budget over 10 years—obviously, major progress.

Again, going back to the Ryan budget, which Senator SCHUMER brought up, it contains $6.2 trillion in spending reductions compared to spending in President Obama's budget. It adds

total deficits that are $4.4 trillion lower than that in the President's budget. It brings total Federal spending to below 20 percent of the economy. The President's budget is always above 23 percent in that figure. So it puts us on a path to balance. Again, the Toomey budget, my first choice, actually achieves that balance within the 10-year budget window.

In contrast to that, I have to say it is very unsettling that the distinguished majority leader and the majority in this Chamber have not even tried to meet our mandated budget responsibilities. Section 300 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which is the Federal law that controls the budget process, says that by April 15 of every year, a budget resolution is supposed to be passed. We are 83 days and counting past that deadline and no serious attempt to even try to meet that legal mandate has been made by the majority or by the distinguished majority leader. We have had a few budget votes, three Republican budget proposals, and President Obama's budget. The Obama budget got zero votes on the Senate floor. The majority, the majority leader produced no budget proposal. The Finance Committee, led by the majority, produced no budget proposal, not even trying to meet our responsibility, an actual legal mandate under the law.

Through the Chair, I would ask Senator SCHUMER: Where is your proposal? Where is your attempt? Yes, we have put forth specific proposals that dramatically cut the deficit. When is the majority going to even try? Again, 83 days and counting this year past that deadline. Of course, last year this body, under the same leadership, produced no budget. So we are 448 days and counting in total under the Budget Act. In that time, by the way, our debt has increased $3.2 trillion.

That is why we need serious proposals on this Senate floor to debate, to amend if necessary, to vote on, to act on. At least we are to the topic, but we need serious proposals before us to act on.

Again, I urge all of my colleagues to embrace a three-tier approach, cut and cap and balance: passing a budget resolution which we are mandated to do that includes immediate meaningful real cuts—that is cut; cap, structural budget reform to cap spending in every major category of the budget to ensure we stay on that path to a balanced budget; and balance, a requirement in the U.S. Constitution that we have a balanced Federal budget through the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I support that. All Republicans in this body have coauthored that. That is the third crucial tier of this three-tier approach: cut, cap, and balance.

I hope we get to consideration of those and other important proposals. I hope we not only have a debate around a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, I hope we have real meaningful proposals on the floor, an open amendment process, an open debate and votes and action on this most critical issue. I have endorsed specific proposals. I mentioned two of them. They dramatically reduce the deficit. I have coauthored the balanced budget constitutional amendment that enforces discipline, the straitjacket we need. I support the cap concept for the medium term to get us on that path. But we need to act on that on the floor in a bipartisan way. I urge that as the next necessary step.

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. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first I thank my good friend and colleague from Minnesota, Senator FRANKEN, for leading this debate here today, the subject of course being the potential of default by the U.S. Government, a subject many of us thought we would never have to discuss. I hope people who did not get a chance to see his speech—I am sorry, I had hoped to be here but we had the final vote on the free trade agreements in the Finance Committee, but I hope people will look at the speech. It is a very erudite, thoughtful, and compelling document. It is on a subject that deserves that kind of attention, which is the danger of default. In our entire history we have never defaulted on our debt. America has always kept its promises. But some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are threatening to make us the first generation of Americans that does not pay its debts, that does not keep its promise. Earlier this week the President said we should reach a deal within 2 weeks in order to avoid roiling the financial markets. We Democrats are working in good faith. We are committed to making sure our Nation does not fail in meeting its obligations. My colleagues and I on this side of the aisle are working diligently to find spending cuts, many of which come from programs we strongly believe help this country, in order to come to a final agreement. We are also identifying tax loopholes to close.

But I must ask, what exactly are my Republican colleagues doing? They are stalling, they are demagoging. They walked out on bipartisan budget negotiations and are continuing to insist that we cannot raise a single dollar in revenue, no matter how wasteful the tax breaks or how generous the subsidy. The shocking truth is that our Republican colleagues seem to be willing to tank the economy simply to help out the very most privileged, who are already doing well.

Let's face it, middle-class people, poor people, depend on government programs. But if you are wealthy you do not need government spending. You don't need help to send your kid to college. You don't need to go to a clinic to have your teeth looked at in case they are falling apart and you cannot afford high-priced, fancy dentists. But if you are wealthy, how do you get breaks? You look into the Tax Code and lobby Congress, whether you are a corporation or individual, to get those breaks. That is how the high-end folks benefit, in terms of this government.

To say all those are off limits is not class warfare, it is a simple fact of life. It is a fact of life that the well-to-do, whether they be corporate or individuals, benefit from tax expenditures, whereas middle-class and poorer people benefit from spending expenditures. Yet our Republican colleagues say one whole side is off limits. That is putting politics over the economy.

In fact, these actions seem to indicate they might be deliberately tanking, or want to deliberately tank, the economy to harm the President's reelection chances. That is a tough thought. I shudder to believe it. But when you look at the evidence, it leads in that direction.

These are not actions of leaders. Forcing the United States into default to score political points is playing with fire. You risk undermining the future credit of the United States and do enough damage to the global economy that it could cause another financial crisis not unlike the one we saw in 2008 from which we still have not recovered, all to score political points, all to help those, the one segment of society which, God bless them, has done very well in the last decade.

I also want to talk today about a subject that is often ignored in debates over the debt ceiling. These debates can seem very abstract and the potential consequences very remote. That is why my colleague from Minnesota decided to lead a debate in this regard. In fact, the consequences would affect every American who wants to take out a mortgage; every parent who needs to take out student loans to send their kids to college; every American with a credit card. It would even affect the price of gasoline and the price of food. The impact of a default will not just be felt on Wall Street or in the mythical world of bond markets, but in every town, every household in the Nation.

The consequences will not be short lived. The repercussions of a default will stay with us for years or even decades. J.P. Morgan estimates that even a technical default, the failure to pay interest on our debt for a few days, would result in the cost of U.S. treasuries increasing by 50 basis points.

What does that mean to the average household? Most households do not speak in terms of basis points. Mortgage rates are often set at 150 points above U.S. Treasury. That means 1.5 percent above U.S. treasuries. If the rate on treasuries goes up 50 basis points, it goes up another half percent. So the cost of a mortgage for a family with a 30-year fixed rate mortgage

worth $172,000, just that alone, that little few days where the United States does not pay its debt, costs $19,000 to that family.

The cost of interest on a credit card would also increase. A family carrying a modest balance, $3,300, would pay an estimated $250 more in interest every year.

In total, a default or even a near default could end up costing American households $10 billion in increased borrowing costs every year.

The same J.P. Morgan study tells us that a 50-percent increase in the cost of U.S. treasuries will decrease our GDP by 1 percent. Leading economists estimate a 1-percent contraction in the GDP would result in 640,000 jobs lost. These are jobs we cannot afford to lose.

In addition, the stock market would also go down significantly, costing all Americans who are investing for their retirement or saving to send a child to college. The typical American would lose $8,000 to $12,000 in his or her retirement account.

J.P. Morgan also estimates that the value of the dollar would decline 5 percent to 10 percent as a result of a default.

There are significant consequences for the future of the dollar if this happens. We should all be asking ourselves, what happens if the dollar ceases to be the global reserve currency? But even if my colleagues across the aisle do not want to consider that, they should certainly think about the impact of a depreciated dollar on their constituents. Higher borrowing costs to the government would also increase the deficit, exactly the opposite of what we are trying to do.

So when they cavalierly say ''let's default because we have a huge deficit,'' it is actually an internal contradiction. The defaulting will make the deficit worse. According to a J.P. Morgan analysis, the deficit would increase by $10 billion a year in the short term, $75 billion in the long term.

The worst part is this: All of these costs would be self-inflicted wounds. We are fully capable of paying our debt, as we always have. But some are threatening to intentionally default. To borrow a phrase from the President's economic adviser, Austan Goolsbee, ''This would be the first default in history caused entirely by insanity.''

Let me say this. Every American family has debt, just about. Most of us have mortgages. Let's say we have a mortgage on our house, we have a house and we are living in it. If all of a sudden we say to our bank I am not going to pay my mortgage unless you do A, B, and C—you have already signed to pay that mortgage—what happens? You are not living up to an agreement you made. Your house is foreclosed upon and you lose it.

The analogy is the same here. For the U.S. Government to default on purpose would be cutting off our nose to spite our face, and hurt the citizens of this country.

I say to my Republican colleague, how do you plan to explain this to your constituents? Do you think they will believe the political games are worth the increased costs? I sincerely doubt it. I want to say to my Republican colleagues, because so many of you have trifled with the idea of not paying our debts, if, God forbid, it happens—I hope it doesn't, for the good of the country, but if it does, you will bear the blame. Not a single Democrat I am aware of has said we want to default. Many Republicans have said they want to default. So you do not have to be Albert Einstein or a Ph.D. in biophysics to know who is risking default, who is trifling with default, and who would cause default if, God forbid, we cannot come to an agreement.

Many on our side have said we are willing, if it comes to it, to raise the debt ceiling if we cannot come to an agreement because the consequences are so horrible. Not the other side—no. They are leveraging the default as a means to assert their beliefs, sincerely held. That is so wrong. But the good news is that the American people, and certainly the people who are following this issue, realize that. As we get closer and closer to the day of August 2 they will know who is willing to risk default to achieve political goals. They will know it is not the people from our side of the aisle. They will know it is the people from the other side of the aisle, and that will make problems Newt Gingrich faced in 1995—I believe it was when he shut down the government—look like child's play. I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to rethink their position. The time has come for a little soul searching on the other side of the aisle. You must decide if you are willing to create another economic crisis to mollify an extreme wing of your party and score political points against the President. You must decide if you want to go down in history as the first generation of American leaders to renege on promises already made by Presidents and Congresses, Democratic and Republican alike. In the coming weeks my Republican friends will have to make a very serious decision. Are they going to get serious about working with us to find a bipartisan solution to our debt crisis or are they going to put partisan politics above the good of the country? Are they going to say it has to be our way, all the way, 100 percent, no revenues, or we are going to force the country to default? Or will they put the good of the country and compromise above narrow, ideological, often fear-driven politics?

In conclusion, I am an optimist. I believe my colleagues will come around and join us in finding a bipartisan way forward. I don't base that on anything that has been said. I wish I could. I base it on my innate optimism that Americans, at the end of the day, are practical, problem-solving people, not people who look for self-destructive solutions. I ask my colleagues to come around, join us in a bipartisan solution. We are willing to give some. You should be willing to give some, but I can tell you, my friends, time is running out. I can only hope, the American people can only hope, you don't wait too long.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I am on the floor this afternoon to talk about the issue not only of the day, the week, the month, the year, it is the issue about what to do about the deficit. Everyone around here knows that if we fail to raise the debt ceiling by the August 2 deadline, the United States will default on its loan payments. Defaulting could have catastrophic consequences on our economy as we attempt to recover from the worst economic recession since the Great Depression. Failing to raise the debt limit could send our economy into a tailspin with unthinkable results for the American people. With the stakes so high, we must ask ourselves: How did we get into this position? Or as my constituents back home in Alaska say: How did you get into this mess? Over the last decade, both sides of the aisle have played a role in this irresponsible spending that resulted in our current fiscal crisis. At the beginning of the last decade, we had a budget surplus—let me say that again—a budget surplus of $200 billion, with a projected surplus of $5 trillion for the next 10 years. By the time I took office in 2009, not only had our budget surplus disappeared, we faced a budget deficit of over $1 trillion.

The creditworthiness of the United States is in jeopardy. Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle oppose raising the debt ceiling, citing the need to rein in reckless spending. While I support broad deficit reduction measures, I strongly disagree with those who fail to recognize consequences of failing to raise the debt limit and defaulting on our financial obligations. Everyone around here knows what will happen if we do not. For the first time ever the creditworthiness of the United States would be put in jeopardy. I want to step back for a second and remind everyone Congress has enacted measures on the Federal debt limit 74 times. So they obviously understand what will happen if the American government defaults on its payments. The ceiling has been increased by both Democratic and Republican administrations and Congress. George W. Bush's first term in May of 2003 would increase the limit by $984 billion. In fact, Congress raised the debt ceiling seven times during his administration. The Senate Republicans provided the votes to raise the debt ceiling in 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2006. To keep a good credit rating is something the American people understand, and they are doing their very best during these hard times. I hear this all the time when we are back home.

While the American people understand that defaulting on our loans would only make matters worse, some Members of Congress insist on playing politics even during this economically uncertain time. If the U.S. Government defaults on its financial obligations, it would be the first time in history our credit would be downgraded. Let me repeat—never before have we let our creditworthiness be called into question. The consequences are large and somewhat unknown.

Let me take a little bit from what the Senator from New York talked about and expand on that, and that is: How does it affect the individual, the person working hard every day, paying their mortgage, driving to work, pumping gas in their car, going on a vacation, doing everyday things that Americans do in my State of Alaska, especially now they are out fishing, enjoying the summer. The kids are out of school, and the State fair is getting geared up in another month. What happens? Well, first off, if we default on our loans that are due, our obligations, some immediate things will probably happen.

First off, individuals who have credit cards will have their rates go up, because if you read the fine print of those great credit card bills we get every month, which are very small and very detailed, they talk about how the rate is structured. The rate is structured around what happens in the market. Obviously a lot of people today may have a good rate, 9 percent, 10 percent, but average is around 15 percent, 18 percent. That interest rate will go up. Home mortgage rates—if you have an adjustable rate mortgage, it will be adjusted up. If you are a small business person—as I have been, and am still today, my wife—there are many businesses that borrow on a 1-year, 2-year, 3-year loan, adjustable rate, maybe monthly, maybe it is an inventory loan because it is a seasonable business—all those rates will go up, assuming you can get a loan. When you drive your car and pump that gas and fill up your tank and you think prices are high now, oil commodities are traded in U.S. dollars. So the net effect is going to be that dollar is going to have less value, which means the price of the fuel will go up and what you pump into your car will increase.

Mr. President, 75 percent of world markets, transactions across this world are done in U.S. dollars. If you impact the creditworthiness of the country, the dollar has less credit behind it, which, of course, costs money, which means things we import such as fuel to operate our cars, energy to heat this building, to turn on these lights, go up. It has a real impact to individuals. It is not some global discussion here in the halls of Congress. It is not about just debt limit and GDP and all these other phrases that people kind of wonder what it means to them in their individual life, but it has a direct impact in their lives. What happens to their retirement funds? Their funds are invested in maybe U.S. Government securities. Well, they are going to see a change, a dramatic change. The American people, Alaskans, are already struggling. To add this additional burden because we are unable to sit down and work together and solve this problem in a cohesive, comprehensive way is irresponsible.

To my friends across the aisle, let me remind you of what President Reagan said in 1983 in a letter to then-Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker. He said it better than I think any of us could say, and this is directly from his letter:

> The full consequences of default—or even the serious prospect of default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and on the value of the dollar in exchange markets.
>
> The Nation can ill afford to allow such a result. The risk, the costs, the disruptions and incalculable damage lead me to but one conclusion: the Senate must pass this legislation before Congress adjourns.

It is amazing I can take a quote such as this from history and transplant it today and it is the same situation.

At the same time as we deal with this, I feel strongly we must pass a deficit reduction measure. I have supported the deficit commission, the debt commission, and their efforts. I didn't agree with it all, but I agreed the $4 trillion mark should be it. We should try to do our best. In order to solve this problem, this challenge—and we all have our sides where we are kind of hunkered down. Every time I go back home—and I was back home this last weekend for my short 48 hours. I spend more time on the plane than staying at home at times. But when I get home, people say very simply to me, it is a combination. We are going to have to reduce the spending. I don't object to that. We are going to have to create a more fair tax system, which I don't object to. Along with Senator WYDEN and Senator COATS, I have introduced tax legislation that does that, simplifies individual rates, focuses on a growth agenda with our tax policy. It gets rid of the loopholes, tax havens that people take advantage of who pay no taxes but enjoy the great bounties of our country.

We also have to invest. We have to invest in a growth agenda. That means investing in infrastructure, in education. Because as you reduce your budget, which I don't disagree with, and as we create a more fair, balanced tax system, we have to do one of the most principled things and that is to continue to help grow this economy and we have to invest in our infrastructure, and invest in a variety of things that grow our economy.

This is an opportunity for us to put our country on sound financial footing by passing a broad deficit reduction measure that includes cost savings and increased revenues. When it comes to protecting America's economic security and improving fiscal responsibility, the time to act is now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. I rise today to talk about some of the enormous challenges facing our economy, about Washington's failure to address those challenges and a way forward. Today there are nearly 23 million Americans looking for full-time jobs. This includes people among those 9 percent of Americans on the unemployment rolls, but also includes a lot of Americans who want to work but have given up looking for work or are scraping by on part-time jobs when they want a full-time job. What makes it more troubling is that, among the Americans being counted in that 9 percent, the average length of time on the unemployment rolls is now nearly 10 months. That is the longest ever recorded. These folks are looking for help, looking to us for leadership and looking for us to help get the economy back on track by creating a better environment for job creation and economic growth. As we have heard from the two previous speakers, the government faces serious, unprecedented budgetary challenges. Washington is borrowing nearly 40 cents of every dollar it spends. It looks as if we may have another record deficit this year, and we will have the highest debt ever. Government spending has gone from $25,000 per household to more than $31,000 per household in the last 4 years. The national debt has doubled over the 2008 levels—doubled since 2008. We have hit this $14.3 trillion debt limit, and if we do nothing about it, we are going to end up with an economic crisis much like Greece is facing today.

I just listened to the comments of my colleague from New York and my friend from Alaska, and they are talking about the fact that interest rates might go up unless we vote to extend the debt limit. I am talking to a lot of economists and thinking about the impact it will have on Ohio if we don't do something about the deficit and debt. When we extend the debt limit again, interest rates will go up. The value of the dollar will continue to go down. Inflation will go up.

The point is not that we want to go into default—I hope nobody does in this Chamber. Despite what my friend and colleague from New York said, there is no Republican interest in defaulting on the debt. No one wants to default on the debt. But it is just the same as when we have a credit card in our families. Once we max out on the credit card, before we try to get a higher line of credit, we ought to look at the underlying problem, otherwise we will fall right back into the same financial problems. That is what Republicans are saying.

It is this: If we do not deal with the underlying problem, which is this huge fiscal imbalance we just talked about—a $14.3 trillion debt that has doubled

since 2008—then we are going to find ourselves with a financial and economic problem that will result in a spike in interest rates and will result in this negative impact on all Americans via car loans, mortgages, and student loans.

So this is why it is so critical over the next few weeks as we work through this; That we deal with not just extending the debt limit—I guess that is a pretty easy thing to do, to just say let's go borrow more; we are already borrowing about 40 cents of every dollar—but we have to deal with the underlying problem.

So what are we doing in the Senate to deal with that underlying problem? Very little. This week we are debating a meaningless sense-of-the-Senate resolution. It is what is called a nonbinding resolution. It will not create a single job or reform a single part of our tax code. It will not save $1 of government spending. It does nothing to address the debt limit. It is a distraction, and that is why earlier today I voted against proceeding to it. Serious times demand serious work.

I was pleased when the Senate came together to cancel this week's scheduled recess because we should be here. We pledged to return to Washington and to confront these economic challenges we talked about and the budget problems we face. I supported doing that, but this has not been a serious effort.

By the way, the Senate has not even passed a basic budget for this year. There is no budget, which is highly unusual. It also never passed a budget last year. So instead of talking about nonbinding resolutions, we should be talking about a budget. We should have a budget on the floor. We should be debating it. The other side will have their issues, and we will have issues to talk about. None of us will necessarily agree with one another on the precise provisions of a budget, and that is fine. Let's have the debate and end up with a blueprint for our spending going forward.

President Obama talks about getting involved and showing true leadership but, to be honest, he hasn't stepped to the plate. The best example would be his own budget. He is required by law to submit one every year. He did submit a budget. That budget was voted on by this Senate. Because we didn't have our own budget, we voted on his budget. It was unanimously rejected 97 to 0 partly because, as Democrats will say, a few weeks after he submitted the budget, he gave a speech where he said: My budget wasn't really adequate to the task. So he rejected his own budget, in a sense, but he offered no alternatives, no specifics.

His own budget, by the way, was so unserious that it doubled the debt over the next decade, and that is why, again, it was voted down by this Senate.

What is our budget? What do we believe in? We should have that debate.

We need to know what the numbers are; and what vision the President has for the next 10 years. That is what the budget is supposed to do. And, of course, we need to know what he will do to help grow the economy. In my view, getting the budget under control is a matter of restraining spending, but it is also a matter of growing the economy. If we don't grow the economy—and that will increase revenues, by growing the economy—we will not be able to get out of this deep fiscal hole we are in with record deficits, record debt, and, again, an increasing negative impact on our economy.

The lack of a true debate is not from a lack of ideas, by the way. Senate Republicans have developed a commonsense jobs plan, much of which I think should be and can be bipartisan. It includes a lot of commonsense ideas. One is to reform the Tax Code. Senator BEGICH from Alaska talked about that earlier. That is to make sure that our Tax Code works better for our economy; that it is simpler, that it encourages investment and job creation. Economists across the board would agree that our current code is inefficient. We should do that as a body. That will help develop the economy and jobs and economic activity which will increase revenue.

We need to rein in regulations. When I am home talking to small businesses, the first thing they talk to me about is the latest Federal regulation. A new one out today from the Environmental Protection Agency which is affecting my home State of Ohio is going to cost jobs at a time when we need jobs desperately. These are very specific proposals. Maybe they are not proposals everyone can agree to. What are the other side's proposals? Let's debate this issue. Let's pass legislation that forces a cost-benefit analysis of regulations. Let's be sure the regulators are using the least burdensome and least costly alternatives.

These are commonsense ideas: creating a competitive workforce to make sure we are competitive for the 21st century. This is incredibly important. Expanding exports to create more jobs. On energy, being sure we have the ability to get away from our dangerous dependence on foreign oil by developing more resources right here in this country. These are all commonsense proposals we should work on because they relate to the very issue we should be talking about this week, which is how to deal with our budget imbalance.

The proposal, by the way, also caps government spending. It says we need to have a balance between revenues and expenditures, which is only common sense because until we get the fiscal house in order it is going to be very difficult to get our economy moving. It is like a wet blanket over the economy creating uncertainty and unpredictability.

On the budget, let's be clear. The long-term problem is from soaring spending, not falling revenues. This is from the Congressional Budget Office. It is a nonpartisan group. Their job is to give us the data to tell us what is going to happen with spending and with revenues. This is what they tell us.

Even if we keep current tax rates for everybody—in other words, don't get rid of the so-called Bush tax cuts—revenues are still expected to rebound above the historical average of 18 percent of the economy. If, in fact, the Bush tax cuts do not get extended, which is current law—right now they are expected to end at the end of next year—those tax revenues will be well above the historic average. Instead of 18 percent, they get up over the next several years to about 20 percent. Over the last 50 years, it has been about 18 percent. The deficit is rising not because of lack of revenue but because spending is now at 24.5 to 25 percent of our economy as compared to its historical level over the last 50 years of 20.3 percent of the economy.

What is going to happen? Well, CBO has it right there. It is projected to rise on the spending side to 26 percent of the economy over the next several years; then 30, then 40, then 50 percent of the economy on spending alone. We talked earlier about the fact that we have gone from $25,000 per household government spending to $31,000 per household in the last 4 years alone. That spending is projected to grow and grow. If we don't deal with that spending we will never be able to get the budget in balance. That is the top issue. Again, we have to face this before we extend the debt limit again. If we don't, there will be major economic problems.

Look at what Standard & Poor's and Moody's and Fitch—the so-called credit agencies—are telling us. They are saying: Yes, default would be a terrible thing. Let's not default. But they are also saying: If we don't deal with the fiscal imbalance, if we don't deal with the record deficits and debts, there will be major and negative impacts on the economy, and they will be in a position where they may downgrade our debt, which means higher interest rates.

Having tax rates chase spending is not the solution. It will not balance the budget. Moreover, it will not spur this sputtering economy to grow and to create the jobs we talk about today. It will not work to get us back to work. In fact, virtually all economic theories agree that tax increases harm economic growth. When we tax something, people do less of it. That is why we tax smoking. So if we want economic growth, the last thing we should do is to raise taxes on working, raise taxes on savings, raise taxes on investment. These are not the ways to get the economy moving again. Instead, we should be unleashing American entrepreneurs, not putting more taxes on them.

Some suggest we must choose between creating jobs and reining in government. My view is that the opposite is true. Reining in government can help create jobs. The less the government spends, the more money remains

in the private sector for families and entrepreneurs to spend. The less the government borrows, the more savings are available for businesses to borrow in order to expand, as well as for families to borrow for a new home, a new car, or a student loan. Think about it. The government borrowing all this money is like a big sponge soaking up our savings. Today, we are borrowing, again, more than 40 cents of every dollar the government spends. That is harming the economy. Reducing the deficit also reduces the risk of a debt-induced financial crisis that might otherwise dwarf what we have seen happening in Greece today.

But don't take my word for it. Lots of economists have looked at this. There is a great study out there that I encourage people to look at. It is done by the economists Ken Rogoff and Carman Reinhart. Rogoff and Reinhart do something very simple. They go around the world and look at different economies and determine what happens when their debt gets too big for their economy. Their view is that when the debt gets to 90 percent of the size of a nation's economy, it has a substantial negative impact on the economic growth and jobs in that country.

Their data suggests that when the debt gets to 90 percent of the economy, there is a 1-percent reduction in economic growth rates. So instead of our economy growing at 1.8 percent in the first quarter, it should have grown at 2.8 percent. What does that mean? That 1-percent growth would otherwise mean 1 million jobs.

So if we didn't have this huge debt—and right now it is about 93 percent of our economy; it will be at 100 percent of the economy this year—then we would have more jobs. If we look at what Rogoff and Reinhart have said, it means we would have about 1 million more jobs in this country. Could we use those jobs? Yes. We need them desperately.

So there is a connection between this overspending—and this huge gap we have between revenues and spending—and our ability to get this economy back on track.

Over 25 years, by the way, annual growth rates 1 percent lower would leave the economy nearly one-fourth smaller than it would otherwise be. Think about that: a 25-percent reduction in the size of the economy as a result of this debt.

In order to create jobs and growth, we have to balance the budget, and we have to reduce that debt that is now over 90 percent of our economy. There are two ways to reduce the debt's share of the economy: One is to make the debt smaller, and the other is to make the economy larger. We know raising taxes will shrink the economy. Instead, we have to keep tax rates low to create jobs and expand the economy, and we have to reform the Tax Code so it works better.

Again, economists across the spectrum will tell us we can have a better economy if we have a more sensible Tax Code. We must also responsibly reduce government spending, of course, to rein in the debt. Low tax rates and spending restraint will bring prosperity and alleviate this immoral avalanche of debt that we are otherwise leaving in the laps of our children and grandchildren.

I understand some of my colleagues have their own approaches to this—to jobs, to the economy, to the budget deficit. That is fine. Let's have the debate. There are numerous proposals in Congress to reduce spending, balance the budget, and reform entitlements. Instead of voting on political nonbinding resolutions as we have done this week in the Senate, let's have that debate. We have too many important issues. Let's stop fiddling while Rome burns.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, as we discuss the need to bring down the deficit, we should acknowledge a few basics. First is cannot achieve the deficit reduction we need with spending cuts to nondefense discretionary programs alone. They simply aren't large enough to make the difference we need, and the damage we would do to American families from drastic cuts in those programs is simply too great.

Second is that in light of those facts and in the interest of basic fairness, a balanced solution to deficit spending must include revenues as well as spending cuts. If we ask college students relying on Federal aid, workers in need of Federal job training, seniors in need of health care to sacrifice in the name of deficit reduction, so, too, should those who benefit from loopholes and handouts in the Tax Code, including loopholes that often benefit only highly profitable corporations, one of those huge loopholes that benefits corporations that dole out large stock option pay to their executives.

Current law provides an unwarranted tax subsidy to executive stock option compensation thereby increasing the tax burden on working families and increasing our deficit. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, closing this loophole would reduce the deficit by about $25 billion.

Today, under tax rules for reporting stock options, corporations report stock option expenses on their books when those stock options are granted but use another method to claim a different and a typically much higher expense on their tax returns when the stock options are exercised. The result is, corporations can claim larger tax deductions for options on their tax returns than the actual expense they show on their books for those same options.

Stock options are the only type of compensation where the Tax Code allows a corporation to deduct more than the expense shown on their books. For all other types of compensation—cash, stock, bonuses, and others—the tax return deduction equals the book expense. In fact, if corporations deducted on their tax returns more than their books showed as compensation, it could constitute tax fraud. The sole exception to that rule is stock options. It is an exception we can no longer afford.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair, held a hearing in June of 2007, when we examined the stock option tax gap in detail at nine companies. We found that those nine companies claimed tax deductions that were a combined $1 billion greater than the expenses shown on their books. Let me repeat, just nine companies, $1 billion in excess tax deductions.

We were shocked by that finding, and we asked the IRS to calculate the stock option tax gap for the country as a whole. Using actual data from tax returns, the IRS found that for the first full year in which data was available, U.S. companies claimed an excess of $61 billion in stock option tax deductions compared to their book expenses. Since then, IRS data shows that the stock option tax gap has persisted for 5 years. They looked at 2005 to 2009, which was the latest year for which data was available, with the size of the excess tax deductions varying from $11 billion to $52 billion per year. These excessive deductions mean billions of dollars in reduced taxes for corporations wealthy enough to provide substantial stock option compensation to their already well-paid executives and all at the expense of ordinary taxpayers and an increase in the deficit.

It is a tax loophole that is fueling excessive executive pay, increasing the pay gap between millionaires and the middle class, and enabling profitable corporations to avoid paying their fair share to reduce the deficit.

I will soon be reintroducing the same legislation I have introduced in past years to end this misalignment of the Tax Code.

The bill would cure the problem simply by requiring the corporate stock option tax deduction to equal the stock option expense shown on the corporate books. It would not affect the taxes paid by individuals who receive the stock options. It would not affect so-called incentive stock options which receive favored tax treatment under section 422 of the Tax Code and are often used by startup companies.

In addition, the bill would make stock options pay subject to the same $1 million cap on corporate tax deductions that applies to other forms of executive pay. Congress established that $1 million cap so that taxpayers would not have to subsidize enormous paychecks for executives. But the cap can't end that tax subsidy without including stock options. Even if included under the cap, stock options could still be awarded in excess of $1 million, but not at the expense of ordinary taxpayers.

I do not know of any Senator who does not want to reduce the budget deficit. I do not know of any Senator who believes it is wise to subsidize executive paychecks at the expense of working families. But as it now stands, the excessive corporate tax deduction for stock option pay widens the deficit while increasing the tax burden on ordinary taxpayers. By closing this tax gap, by ending the illogical treatment of corporate stock options in current law, we can reduce the budget deficit and bring much-needed fairness to the Tax Code.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed as in morning business for 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AHMED WARSAME

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the Department of Justice announced earlier this week that Ahmed Abdulkadir Warsame, an accused member of the terrorist group Al-Shabaab, has been indicted on charges of providing material support to Al-Shabaab and al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, conspiring to teach and demonstrate the making of explosives, possessing firearms and explosives in furtherance of crimes of violence, and other violations of Federal law. He will be tried for these offenses in Federal court in New York.

Warsame is a Somali national who was captured in the gulf region in late April and taken to a U.S. Navy vessel for detention and interrogation. The Department of Defense has stated that the interrogation was conducted by an interagency team comprised of U.S. military personnel, with assistance from the High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group. After the completion of this interrogation and a hiatus of several days, Warsame was turned over to a team of FBI officials for law enforcement questioning, and in that he waived his Miranda rights and continued to talk.

This case appears to be an example of our national security and law enforcement teams working together in the manner we would hope they would toward the twin objectives of collecting critical intelligence information and ensuring a successful criminal prosecution of the detainee.

Published reports indicate that Warsame was captured by American military forces on a boat in international waters between Yemen and Somalia after the United States acquired intelligence indicating that a significant terrorist figure was on board the vessel. Under these circumstances, it was appropriate for the military to detain and interrogate Warsame to obtain actionable intelligence. The United States is currently engaged in military operations pursuant to the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force. As the Supreme Court held 7 years ago in the case of Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, the capture and detention of both lawful and unlawful combatants is a ''fundamental and accepted . . . incident to war.'' I understand these interrogations were conducted in a manner fully consistent with the interrogation techniques authorized under the Army Field Manual on interrogations.

Once our national security team determined that the collection of actionable intelligence had been completed, a separate decision was made, on the basis of the specific facts of this case, as to the best forum in which to prosecute Warsame for his alleged crimes.

The indictment sets forth evidence that Warsame violated a number of Federal statutes, including sections of the Criminal Code prohibiting trafficking in explosives, use of dangerous weapons, acts of international terrorism, providing material support to foreign terrorist organizations, and receiving military-type training from foreign terrorist organizations—making him a candidate for prosecution in a Federal court with jurisdiction over such violations.

Warsame also appears to have engaged in acts of terrorism and material support to terrorism, both of which are crimes under the Military Commissions Act, if they are committed ''in the context of and associated with hostilities'' against the United States. What has not been resolved is whether Warsame meets the jurisdictional threshold in the Military Commissions Act of having acted in the context of hostilities against the United States and having engaged in or materially supported such hostilities.

The administration's national security team unanimously agreed that prosecution in Federal court was the better option and the one most likely to lead to a conviction under the facts of this case. Our Federal prosecutors and Federal courts have a proven track record in prosecuting terrorists. Two years ago, the Justice Department informed us that there were 208 inmates in Federal prisons who had been sentenced for crimes related to international terrorism and an additional 139 inmates who had been sentenced for crimes related to domestic terrorism. By contrast, prosecution of the Warsame case before a military commission would have raised a difficult jurisdictional issue that could have resulted in dismissal or even acquittal.

Critics of the decision to try Warsame in Federal court apparently would prefer that he be tried before a military commission, even though he might be less likely to be convicted there due to the jurisdictional issue. I disagree with that position. In my view, the most appropriate forum for trial should be determined, as it was here, on the basis of the nature of the offense, the nature of the evidence, and the likelihood of successful prosecution. The executive branch officials who made the determination in this case are in a much better position to weigh those factors and make that judgment than is the Congress.

By the way, the approach taken by the administration in this case is consistent with the bipartisan detainee provisions included in the National Defense Authorization Act, as reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee last month.

Those provisions would authorize military detention for enemy belligerents captured in the course of hostilities authorized by the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force. That authority appropriately encompasses the detention of an individual like Warsame, who is suspected of participation in such hostilities, until such time as the military has been able to interrogate the detainee and make an appropriate status determination. While we may not have enough evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Warsame participated in hostilities against the United States, we undoubtedly had sufficient evidence to hold him for the time required to interrogate him and obtain the intelligence that our military needs.

The provisions in the Senate Armed Services Committee-reported bill would also expressly authorize the transfer of such a detainee ''for trial by an alternative court or competent tribunal having lawful jurisdiction.'' Indeed, an amendment to delete this authority was defeated in committee by a bipartisan vote of 7 to 19. We decided, in other words, to leave it up to executive branch officials to determine on a case-by-case basis, as they did here, the most appropriate forum for prosecution, whether it be a Federal court or a military commission.

By contrast, the House version of the defense authorization bill includes a provision that would expressly prohibit the trial in Federal court of any alleged foreign terrorist who might be subject to trial by a military commission—even if he is arrested inside the United States. This provision may well be unconstitutional, given that article III of the U.S. Constitution expressly states that:

> The judicial power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority.

Under the plain language of this provision, Congress would appear to lack the authority to exclude the prosecution of violations of the laws of the United States in the Federal courts.

The effort to direct all terrorist cases to military commissions could also be highly counterproductive, providing jurisdictional arguments that defendants could use to seek the dismissal of charges against them. If the House language were adopted, a case in Federal court on a terrorism charge would be at risk of being dismissed on the grounds that it could only have been brought before a military commission, while at the same time, because of the limited jurisdiction of military commissions, the military commission might not have jurisdiction either. In such a case, it would be impossible to prosecute an alleged terrorist in any

forum. The critics of the Department of Justice decision should end their effort to score political points here. The stakes are too high, and if the critics get their way, we might not be able to try some terrorists at all—anywhere.

Some may contend that holding alleged terrorists in the United States for trial could needlessly subject Americans to retaliatory attacks by terrorist organizations. There is no basis for that argument. We have tried hundreds of alleged terrorists in our Federal courts over the last decade. We are currently holding many more—including the Christmas Day bomber, who is being held in my hometown of Detroit. So far as I know, none of these cases have led to retaliatory attacks by terrorist organizations. In any event, we know that al-Qaida and its allies are already seeking avenues to attack us on American soil and would do so if they could. Moving the location of a trial to Guantanamo or some other foreign location is unlikely to deter such an attack.

Last month, ADM William McRaven—the President's nominee to be commander of U.S. Special Operations Command—testified before our Armed Services Committee that a suspected enemy belligerent detained outside the war zones in Afghanistan and Iraq would likely be put on a naval vessel until ''we can prosecute that individual in a U.S. court or we can return him to a third party country.'' Admiral McRaven made it clear later in his testimony that such an individual could also be transferred for trial by a military commission. In other words, we have a choice. We should preserve that choice.

In summary, the Warsame case demonstrates that we do have the capacity to detain and interrogate suspected terrorists in military custody for the purpose of obtaining actionable intelligence, and then to transfer them to an appropriate forum for trial—whether it be a Federal court or a military commission. This case demonstrates that we do not have to sacrifice actionable intelligence for law enforcement purposes, and that we do not have to sacrifice criminal prosecution in order to collect intelligence information. And it demonstrates that we can pursue both of these objectives without being pushed to what Admiral McRaven described as the ''unenviable option'' of having to release the detainee.

The only ''unenviable'' outcome is the one that the critics of the Department of Justice decision would lead us to—prohibiting the criminal trial of suspected foreign terrorists in Federal court and requiring them to be tried by military commissions, even in cases like the Warsame case, where a jurisdictional problem might lead a military commission to dismiss the case.

The action of the administration in the Warsame case is sound. The prosecutorial discretion they exercised as to the best forum for the trial should be preserved and should not be interfered with by the Congress.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BINGAMAN). The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise, along with my fellow colleagues, to again address the need to reduce our deficit and our debt. The United States is the strongest country in the world—in the history of the world—but that will not be the case for long if we do not solve our deficit and our debt crisis. It is vital we solve it now for our generation, but it is vital we solve it for future generations as well.

The wealth, the economic activity of this country, is created by the private sector, by hard-working men and women, not by the government. The government creates the forum, the environment, if you will, that fosters or allows economic activity. But the key is, the government should not just allow economic activity, the government needs to create an environment that truly empowers, that promotes economic activity, that encourages private investment, that encourages entrepreneurship, business expansion and job growth, innovation—the very entrepreneurial activity that has built this country. That is the success of America, that is the strength of our country, that is how America has become the greatest economic powerhouse in the history of the world. That is why our people enjoy the highest standard of living.

But our current administration believes more government is the answer—more spending, more regulation, and more taxes. It is not the answer. That is the problem, and it is making the situation worse.

Let's go through just some of the economic statistics.

Today, we have 13.9 million—almost 14 million—people unemployed. The unemployment rate is over 9 percent. Gas prices, since the current administration took office, are up to more than $3.50 a gallon. That is almost a 100-percent increase in the cost of gasoline. Our Federal debt is closing in on $14.5 trillion. For every man, woman, and child in this country, that is almost $50,000 for every single person. We have 45 million people on food stamps today. Health insurance. In spite of the health insurance legislation, health insurance premiums are rising, and home values are going down.

Clearly, we need to get our economy going. We need to get people back to work. We need that economic growth and dynamism that has been the hallmark of this country.

Clearly, we need to reduce our deficit and our debt. The reality is, we can do it. We absolutely can do it, and we have done it before. But we need to begin with a comprehensive plan to reduce the deficit and the debt. Any agreement to raise the debt ceiling needs to include a comprehensive agreement to reduce the deficit and the debt.

By a comprehensive agreement, I mean something that includes a balanced budget amendment, reduction in spending, and living within our means on an ongoing basis. It means reforming entitlement programs to save them from bankruptcy, not only to protect our seniors today but to make sure those programs are solvent and there for future generations.

All these things and more can go into a comprehensive plan. But we need a comprehensive plan to reduce the deficit, to reduce the debt as part of the debt ceiling issue we need to deal with now—not put off but deal with now.

If we think about it, a balanced budget amendment makes sense. Forty-nine of the fifty States—49 out of 50 States—have either a constitutional or a statutory requirement that they balance their budget—not just this year but every year. States balance their budgets. Cities balance their budgets. Businesses balance their budgets. Families balance their budgets, live within their means. Our Federal Government needs to do the same. Our Federal Government needs that fiscal responsibility, needs that fiscal discipline.

Also, if we think about it, a balanced budget amendment gets everybody involved. It gets everybody involved in Congress. It takes a two-thirds majority in both the Senate and the House to pass a balanced budget amendment. Then what happens? It goes out to the States. It goes out to the 50 States, and three-fourths of the States must ratify that balanced budget amendment in order for it to be approved. So we not only have everybody at the Federal level working to live within our means and balance the budget, but we get all the States involved as well.

This is a challenging problem—no question about it—getting on top of these deficits and our long-term debt not only now but for the future as well. So let's have everyone involved. A balanced budget amendment will do just that.

Of course, at the same time, we have to reduce our spending both now and make sure we continue to live within our means going forward. The statistics are very clear. The statistics right now show that this year the Federal Government will take in about $2.2 trillion in revenue.

So our revenue is about $2.2 trillion, but our expenses are $3.7 trillion. That is about a $1.5 trillion deficit. This year, actually, it will be larger than that number. So you can see that is why our Federal debt now is closing in on $14.5 trillion. We are borrowing 40 cents of every dollar we spend—40 cents of every dollar we spend—and every single day our debt goes up $4 billion. That is simply unsustainable.

That is why any vote to increase the debt ceiling must include a comprehensive plan to reduce our deficit and our debt. No question, we need to control spending, but as we do that, at the same time, in order to truly solve the problem, we have to create, as I said at

the outset, a government environment that not only encourages government investment but empowers private investment across our Nation.

This next chart shows some of the challenges—barriers, if you will—to doing that. We need legal, tax, and regulatory certainty to encourage private investment. A probusiness, progrowth, projobs environment is one that creates legal, tax, and regulatory certainty to not only encourage but empower private investment.

One of the ways we do this is by reducing the regulatory burden. We have an incredible regulatory burden at the Federal level. We need to find ways to reduce that. That is what this chart shows.

Earlier this year, President Obama issued an Executive order that proposes to review regulations that may be outmoded, ineffective, insufficient, or excessively burdensome, and also to modify, streamline, or even repeal them. Just a week ago, he said again:

> What I have done—and this is unprecedented—is I have said to each agency, look at the regulations that are already on the books, and if they don't make sense, let's get rid of them.

That is what he said. I absolutely agree with that. Yet, over the past 2 years, the administration has issued 502 proposed or enacted regulations and is on pace this year to exceed $100 billion in total regulatory cost burdens to industry. That is a huge regulatory burden.

This chart shows the cost of major new regulations in billions of dollars over the last 30 years. As you can see, when the cost of regulation is low, the economy is strong, and when the cost of regulation is high, as it is now, the economy is weak; more important, job growth is weak. Look at 2010. In 2010, you see the highest regulatory burden, in adjusted dollars, in the last 30 years. How did our economy do in 2010?

Senator ROBERTS, my colleague from Kansas, myself, and others have taken the President up on his pledge to review these regulations. We have introduced the Regulatory Responsibility For Our Economy Act, a measure that would give teeth to the President's directive. Regulators will have to show the benefits of a new rule and show that the benefits outweigh its cost. They will have to show that it imposes the least burden on society and that it maximizes economic benefits. That is an approach which would not only encourage but truly empower private investment.

Let me give you another example of what I am talking about with the regulatory burden—again, trying to create that legal and tax certainty that stimulates the private investment we need to get this economy going, not more government spending. We are spending way beyond our means. What I mean is, more private investment that gets this economy going, gets people back to work, and generates revenue, which will help us, over time, reduce our debt.

When we talk about onerous regulations, a key area of the economy that is incredibly overburdened and where we see a prevention of investment because of the regulatory burden is the energy industry.

My next chart illustrates the long reach of the EPA and how it is sidelining and dampening job growth in the energy sector. It shows a long, complex obstacle course, if you will, of expensive standards and procedures and regulations that are not only being implemented now but will go on for the foreseeable future.

How would you like to be an energy company looking at investing and putting hundreds of millions, billions of dollars into new plants and investments, whether it is producing oil and gas, whether it is biofuels or biomass—you name it—how would you like to make those investments on behalf of your shareholders and have some idea what rate of return you are going to be able to get and what rules of the road you are going to have to follow?

This is just a small sampling of the regulations that are now coming into being and will continue to come into place for the foreseeable future. At a time of high oil prices, unrest in the Middle East, and sluggish economic growth, we are not only failing to provide Americans with affordable energy for their homes and vehicles, but we are actually discouraging the very investment that will make it happen, and this is just one small example.

To remedy that, we need new legislation. I know the occupant of the chair and others are working on a lot of new legislation that will streamline regulations and encourage investment.

I will give just a couple of examples. One of them I am working on with Senator JOE MANCHIN from West Virginia. He introduced it, and it is called the EPA Fair Play Act. It would prohibit rescinding properly approved 404 permits. When EPA approves a 404 permit for mining, it says you can't arbitrarily withdraw that permit. So a company that has invested millions or billions of dollars can't find itself high and dry after it has already gotten the proper permit.

Another example of legislation that we have introduced that would make a difference is Defending America's Affordable Energy and Jobs Act. The primary sponsor of that is Senator JOHN BARRASSO of Wyoming. This legislation ensures that Congress makes the call on regulating greenhouse gases, not the EPA through regulatory fiat.

Another example is the Gas Accessibility and Stabilization Act, which I am pleased to cosponsor with Senator ROY BLUNT of Missouri and others, which will simplify the complex rules and regulations that govern refining and distribution of fuel throughout the United States.

There are many other examples I could give as well.

The point is, with 14 million Americans out of work, we can no longer delay. It is not just regulations, it is legal, tax, and regulatory certainty that will empower investment by entrepreneurs and companies all over this great Nation.

We don't just have to talk about regulations. Let's talk about trade for a minute. Right now, we have three trade agreements pending: the United States-South Korea Free Trade Agreement, the free-trade agreement with Panama, and another one with Colombia. These agreements have been pending since 2007. The benefit of these agreements, for example, is that they would generate more than $13 billion a year in economic activity for this country and create up to 250,000 American jobs. If we fail to act, we will lose on the order of 380,000 jobs to the European Union and Canada, which have already approved their trade agreements. Why aren't we dealing with those trade agreements now, when we have 14 million people out of work, when we have an economy we need to get going, and when we have huge deficits and debt, increasing at the rate of $4 billion a day?

Well, the deadline on the debt limit is fast approaching. The time to act is now. The simple truth is this: We cannot continue to spend more, tax more, and regulate more. It is time to control our spending and create an environment that unleashes the entrepreneurial power and spirit of the American people. We can do it. In fact, we have done it before. We just need the will to act for ourselves today and for the benefit of future generations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me begin by referring to the front page of today's Washington Post. The headline is ''Obama: Social Security on table. Cuts offered in debt talks.''

Mr. President, I hope very much that headline is wrong because, in fact, Social Security, which is perhaps the most successful Federal program in the history of our country, has not contributed one penny to our deficit or our national debt. The idea of lumping Social Security and cuts in Social Security into a discussion about our deficit and our national debt is absolutely wrong and unfair to the tens of millions of seniors and people with disabilities who benefit from that program.

As you know and as the American people know, Social Security is independently funded through the payroll tax. Every worker and every employer contributes into that fund. Social Security, today, has a $2.6 trillion surplus that is projected, in fact, to grow to over $4 trillion by 2023.

We, of course, need a vigorous debate about how we deal with the deficit crisis and our national debt, but Social Security, independently funded, with a $2.6 trillion surplus, having not contributed one nickel to the national debt, should not be part of that debate.

I understand there are many people in the Senate—many of my Republican

colleagues—who do not like Social Security, who do not believe in Social Security because, essentially, they do not believe the government should be involved in retirement insurance for seniors or people with disabilities. I respect their point of view. I very strongly disagree with it.

The real problem they have is that Social Security is enormously popular. Poll after poll shows that the American people do not want to see Social Security cut, they do not want to see the retirement age raised, and they most certainly do not want to see Social Security privatized because, in fact, Social Security has succeeded. It has accomplished the goals of those people who founded that program in the 1930s. In the 1930s, about half of America's senior citizens lived in poverty. Today, that number, while it is too high, is down to 10 percent. More important, given the incredible instability in the economy we have seen for decades—especially in the last few years—where millions of people have lost some or all of the retirement savings they had invested in Wall Street, over the last 75 years, not one American has lost one dime he or she was entitled to in terms of Social Security benefits. That is a pretty good record—every American, getting every penny that was owed to him or her for 75 years. It is a program that has worked. It is a program that is working today. It is a program that can pay out every benefit owed to every eligible American for the next 25 years. It is a program that should not be cut.

But more to the point, in terms of President Obama, one of the problems we have as a nation is that it is no great secret that many of our people are losing faith in government, for a whole lot of reasons. But certainly one of the reasons is that politicians say one thing and they do something else. They campaign on a certain promise, they give a speech, everybody applauds, and 2 years later: Well, I guess I have to change my mind; I can't quite do this.

Let's be clear: When President Obama ran for the Presidency in 2008, he was a strong advocate of Social Security. He made it very clear to the American people he was not going to cut benefits. Let me quote from a speech the President gave—he was then-Senator Barack Obama—on September 6, 2008. This is what he said:

> John McCain's campaign has suggested that the best answer for the growing pressures on Social Security might be to cut cost-of-living adjustments or raise the retirement age. Let me be clear: I will not do either.

''I will not do either.'' Today's Washington Post: Obama: Social Security on table. Cuts offered in debt talks.

Mr. President, on April 16, 2008, candidate Obama said:

> The alternatives, like raising the retirement age, or cutting benefits, or raising the payroll tax on everybody, including people making less than $97,000 a year——

And that is now up to $106,000 a year——

> those are not good policy options.

On November 11, 2007, candidate Obama said:

> I believe that cutting [Social Security] benefits is not the right answer; and that raising the retirement age is not the best option.

The American people expect the President of the United States to keep his word.

Now, again, I am not privileged to the discussions that may be going on right this moment in the White House about some grand national debt negotiations. All I can tell you—and it may be accurate, it may not; the media has been wrong once or twice in history—is that according to today's Washington Post, the President is considering lowering cost-of-living adjustments for Social Security recipients, even though, by the way, Social Security recipients have not received a COLA in the last 2 years.

So let's be clear: Today, despite significant inflation on health care costs and prescription drugs, the fact that seniors have not received a COLA in 2 years, the fact veterans have not received a COLA in 2 years, apparently, the President, in negotiating with Republicans, is considering lowering COLAs in the future.

It is important to understand what that means. According to the Strengthen Social Security Campaign, which is a coalition of senior groups who are working hard to protect Social Security, changing the way Social Security cost-of-living adjustments are calculated—as the President may be considering—and again, I do not want to make a definitive statement. All I am doing is telling you what is on the Washington Post's front page today. Is it true? I can't say. But if it is true, this would cost senior citizens hundreds of dollars a year in lower benefits.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the adoption of the so-called ''Chained CPI''—and this is a different formulation. I happen to believe, and I have introduced legislation to this effect, the current COLAs for seniors are not accurate and are too low because they do not, in a realistic way, measure what seniors are purchasing, which, to a significant degree has to do with health care and prescription drugs. When you are old, you are not primarily buying laptop computers or big television sets. You are often spending a lot of your money on health care, prescription drugs, and those costs are going up. So I think today's COLA is too low and it does not reflect the real purchasing needs of seniors.

According to the CBO, if in fact the government adopted the so-called ''Chained-CPI''—which is a different formulation that is even lower than the current inadequate formulation—annual COLAs under this proposal would cut benefits by $112 billion over 10 years.

Here is the important point for individuals. The Social Security Administration Chief Actuary estimates the effects of this change would be that beneficiaries who retire at the age of 65 and receive average benefits would get $560 less a year at age 75 than they would under current law and get $1,000 less a year at age 85.

People are living longer. Many of our people, God bless them, reach 75, even reach 85. To say to somebody when they reach 85, and they don't have a whole lot of money, that as a result of these cuts they will get $1,000 a year less is totally, to my mind, unacceptable and not something that should be supported by the President or by any Member of the Senate.

The American people, despite what many of my Republican friends are saying, are pretty clear on some basic issues regarding how we address the serious problem of our national debt and our deficit. What the American people say in poll after poll after poll—and they say it to me on the streets in Burlington, VT, or any other place in Vermont that I go—is that we must have shared sacrifice; that at a time when poverty is increasing in this country, when we have the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world, when millions of workers are working longer hours for lower wages, when unemployment is sky high, when seniors have not received a COLA in 2 years, when young people are finding it hard to get any jobs at all, it is immoral and bad economics to do deficit reduction on the backs of those people—of working families, of children, of the elderly, of the sick, of the poor.

Overwhelmingly, the American people say that is wrong, especially at a time when the wealthiest people have never had it so good and when corporate profits are soaring.

Mr. President, you may have seen an article on the front page of the New York Times a few days ago. Last year CEOs of major corporations have seen a 23-percent increase in their compensation packages—23 percent. We are in the midst of a horrendous recession, where real wages for American workers are going down, but CEOs are doing great, Wall Street is doing great, corporate profits are soaring, and we have dozens of corporations that make huge profits and don't pay a nickel in taxes.

We have a military budget that is three times higher than it was in 1997. So the vast majority of the people say—and they say it in polls all over the place—we need to go forward with shared sacrifice. Not as the Republicans suggest—cutting programs for the most vulnerable people in this country, throwing millions of kids off Medicaid, ending Medicare as we know it now, and making it impossible for working class families to send their kids to college. That is not what the American people are saying.

A recent survey by Public Policy Polling in swing States asked the questions. When voters in Ohio—this is just

the other day this came out—were asked this spring if they would support or oppose cutting spending of Social Security to reduce the national debt, only 16 percent favored that approach compared to 80 percent who were opposed, with similar, identical results, or very close results in States such as Missouri, Montana, and Minnesota. That was just out in the papers yesterday. Meanwhile, strong majorities, including Republicans, favor increased revenue from the wealthiest Americans and most profitable corporations being a part of any deficit reduction package.

So let me conclude by saying that I hope very much President Obama does not reach any agreement with the Republicans which includes cuts in Social Security. Social Security has not contributed one nickel to our national debt. It is a successful program and widely supported by the American people who are benefiting from it every single day. More to the point, President Obama, when he campaigned for office, made it clear when he told the American people if he was elected President he would not be cutting Social Security, and the American people expect him to keep his word.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke about the matter of tax expenditures, and I would like to expand on that topic today. They are becoming a critical issue in negotiations over the debt ceiling.

First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to finish my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, Democrats say they want to eliminate tax expenditures. They refer to them as loopholes or spending through the Tax Code. This might be a good political argument, but it bears little relationship to the understanding of tax expenditures and tax law or tax policy.

Yesterday, I outlined a general definition of tax expenditures. They are most definitely not spending through the Tax Code, as President Obama so creatively put it, and they are most definitely not, by and large, loopholes. Rather, they were intentionally included in the Tax Code by Congress in order to realize certain policy goals.

Tax expenditures are an opportunity for families and businesses to keep more of their income. Unfortunately, rather than have a serious conversation about tax expenditures and tax policy, President Obama and his liberal allies are intent on setting new ground for juvenile public discourse.

Faced with a $14.3 trillion debt—and going up every day—Social Security and Medicare Programs that are set for bankruptcy—ruining America's seniors—and a legitimate fiscal crisis that poses a clear and present danger to the Nation's security and the security of America's families and businesses, President Obama is again talking about shared sacrifice. Well, I like the term. The only thing is, I would prefer to have shared prosperity because all we are going to get out of this administration is shared sacrifice, which means everybody is going to suffer. I would like to have shared prosperity where everybody is lifted.

The first time we really started hearing about this concept of shared sacrifice was in the debate over ObamaCare. For those who are unfamiliar with Washington-speak, this is what the President meant by shared sacrifice: I am going to raise taxes on families and businesses by over $½ trillion, and I am going to do it by shaking down businesses.

He made them an offer they couldn't refuse: Pay up now or pay up more later. So when we started hearing again about shared sacrifice, we knew what was coming: more proposals for tax increases. But I have to say I remain shocked at how ham-fisted most of these proposals are. They are nothing but a series of bad talking points that can be used for the President's reelection campaign. These talking points were tired by the end of the 1936 Presidential election.

I would not be surprised to see President Obama dust off Franklin Roosevelt's speeches and start railing against economic royalists by the end of the debt limit negotiations.

Sadly, the Senate's leadership has followed suit. After making a big to-do about keeping the Senate in session to address the fiscal crisis, we are spending this week debating a nonbinding resolution demanding higher taxes on millionaires. Really? The Democrats' solution to $14.3 trillion in debt is to attack corporate jets. Seriously? Three billion dollars over ten years. The last time they did that, they wound up with their tails between their legs in 1990, and in 1993 had to reverse the whole thing because it cost thousands of jobs.

I never underestimate liberals' lack of respect for the intelligence of the American people, but this is a new low. Do they think that ordinary Americans are so consumed with class hatred that they will respond like Pavlovian dogs to the criticism of corporate jets, and forget that it was programmatic liberalism, not bonus depreciation of corporate jets or tax benefits to energy companies, that got us into this debt crisis?

This is how the left perceives Republicans. They want to score some cheap points against Republicans by going after corporate jets, as though all Republicans love corporate jets. I would venture to say that an awful lot of corporate jets are owned by very wealthy Democrats. What are we going to get next week, a tax on monocles and top hats? Maybe we will spend next week debating a nonbinding resolution on the need to tax madras blazers for the good of the country.

Unfortunately, not all of the Democratic proposals are a laughing matter. They have been down this road in the past pushing tax increases on luxury items such as yachts. Today, the press ridiculed Republicans for ''defending the yachting class.'' There is no yachting class in this country, unless you count the Democratic party of Martha's Vineyard.

But there is a class of people who build yachts. This is what happened to those people the last time the Democrats engaged in class warfare of this kind. In the 1990 budget deal, a new luxury excise tax was created applying to yachts, aircraft, jewelry, and furs, first applying to the 1991 year. The similarities are eerie.

Faced with soaring deficits, Democrats insisted that revenues be part of the equation. And how did this work out? The tax was repealed in 1993 because, as the Democratic-controlled Senate Finance Committee report, as reported by the Budget Committee, explains:

> During the recent recession, the boat, aircraft, jewelry, and fur industries have suffered job losses and increased unemployment. The Committee believes that it is appropriate to eliminate the burden these taxes impose on the interest of fostering economic recovery in those and related industries.

Republicans are not defending the yachting class. They are defending the people whose jobs will be lost to Democratic class warfare.

Of course, the left cannot contain themselves to these targeted tax increases. Today we read in the paper that the President is eager to reform Social Security. Yet it appears he is only willing to do so if we let the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts expire, tax cuts which only last December the President acknowledged were necessary components of our economic recovery.

I would not be surprised to see the old Democratic hobby horse, an increase in the Social Security tax max, make an appearance in the Democrats' list of demands.

These are nonstarters, and everyone understands why. These broad-based tax increases would be a weight around our economic recovery.

But the issue of tax expenditures continues to cause confusion and must be addressed. Those who advocate limiting or eliminating these tax expenditures suggest that they are spending and loopholes that benefit wealthy individuals.

Yesterday, I offered a grown-up definition of what a tax expenditure is. Today, I wish to highlight what are in fact the top tax expenditures. What we will find is that the tax expenditures that would generate the largest amount of revenue are also those that are available to the middle class, enabling them to give to their churches and synagogues, and to save for a home, for college, and for retirement. To get at meaningful deficit reduction, Democrats would have to eliminate these expenditures. Is that what they want to do? That might be a good question at the President's next press conference. Maybe someone could give him

a copy of this chart right here, and ask which of these tax expenditures he is willing to eliminate in the interest of deficit reduction:

No. 1, exclusion for employer-provided health care. Is he going to get rid of that? That is 13 percent of all tax expenditures.

How about home mortgage interest deductions? Is he going to get rid of that? That is 9 percent.

How about preferential rates for dividends and capital gains? That is 8 percent.

Exclusion of Medicare benefits. Are they going to do away with that? That is 7 percent.

Net exclusion of defined benefit pension contributions and earnings. Are they going to attack our pensions? That is 6 percent.

And earned income tax credit. My gosh, that is 5 percent.

Deduction for State and local taxes, except real property. That is 5 percent.

No. 8, net exclusion of defined contribution/earnings. That is 4 percent.

How about No. 9, exclusion of capital gains at death? That is 4 percent.

And how about No. 10, deductions for charitable contributions? That is 4 percent.

I venture to say hardly any American is going to want to do away with all of those in the interest of getting more revenue so the Democrats can spend it back here.

Look at that chart. It is a list of the top 10 tax expenditures. Maybe someone can give him a copy of this chart and ask which of these tax expenditures he is willing to eliminate in the interest of deficit reduction. I encourage all my friends to look at this chart. It is a list of the top 10 tax expenditures.

With the rhetoric coming out of the White House, you might be surprised to learn that tax benefits for yachts and corporate jets are not in the top two. Not only do they not make the top 10, they don't even come close.

If you take the so-called savings that would come from the corporate jet tax approach of the President, it would take us 3,000 years to even reach the approximately $800 billion stimulus package. In the context of the President's trillion-dollar deficits, they are statistical noise.

So what are the big tax expenditures?

No. 1 is an issue from the ObamaCare debate. It is the exclusion for employer-provided health insurance. The exclusion of employer-provided health insurance from income is the single largest tax expenditure, representing 13 percent of tax expenditures.

Yesterday a Member of the other side's leadership pointed out that the largest tax expenditure is one for corporations. Boy, is he wrong. Here is what he said:

> The biggest single deduction is the employer's exclusion for health care premiums. So employers are able to exclude from income the amount of money they spend for health insurance for their employees. That's the biggest.

Well, that is an incorrect description of the law that they are arguing. Employers always have been allowed, and should be allowed, a deduction for the cost of benefits they provide to their employees. Employee compensation, including the provision of health insurance to one's employees, is a cost of doing business and thus properly deductible by the employer so as to accurately measure the income, or profit, of the employer. That has never been considered a tax expenditure. The exclusion at issue, which is a tax expenditure, refers to the employee's tax treatment, not the employer's tax treatment. That is, most compensation that an employee receives from his employer is includable as taxable income. One of the few exceptions to that general rule is that employees do not include in taxable income the value of employer-provided health insurance.

Coming in at No. 2 is the home mortgage interest deduction. This expenditure alone accounts for 9 percent of all tax expenditures.

The third largest? There we have the lower rate on capital gains and dividends. Do away with this expenditure, and the rate on capital gains and dividends will almost triple in about 18 months. Capital gains and dividends represent about 8 percent of all tax expenditures.

What is No. 4? Here we have an untaxed piece of Medicare benefits. Imagine that. I wonder how many folks on the other side realize this or even if the President does. When my friends on the other side categorically talk about cutting back tax expenditures as the yellow brick road to deficit reduction, I wonder if they know that hiding behind the curtain is an increase in the aftertax cost of Medicare.

Do my friends on the other side realize this? A few months ago, a liberal group ran an ad showing my friend, the chairman of the House Budget Committee, PAUL RYAN, pushing an old woman in a wheelchair over a cliff. His crime? Recommending policy changes that would prevent the inevitable bankruptcy of Medicare.

I am not going to hold my breath waiting for this same group to pull the fire alarm, because the Democrats' talk of eliminating tax expenditures might result in seniors getting hit with higher taxes on Medicare benefits. But this is what the President and the Democrats are talking about. If they are serious about using tax expenditures to reduce the deficit, these are the things that will have to be on the table. These are the big expenditures. This expenditure is real. You can look it up in the handy tax expenditure publication from the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation. It is significant, representing 7 percent of all tax expenditures, to the exclusion of Medicare benefits.

At No. 5 is the pre-tax treatment for defined benefit pension plan contributions and the inside buildup on the accounts. This is a tax benefit that reduces the cost for those workers who make the decision to save for retirement. This represents 6 percent of all tax expenditures.

What is No. 6? It is the refundable earned income tax credit, the EITC. When folks describe tax expenditures as spending through the Tax Code, this is one that could properly be labeled that way. Under congressional budget rules, this one, for the most part, scores as spending. That is not the case with the other tax expenditures on this list. Refundable tax credits score as spending because the government cuts a check to the taxpayer. With the other tax benefits on this list, the taxpayer is receiving a portion of the money back in the form of reduced taxes. There are some serious tax hikes there. This tax expenditure accounts for 5 percent of tax expenditures.

No. 7 is the deduction for State and local taxes. My friends on the other side need to be particularly careful with this one. So far, they would hit seniors, families who have health insurance through their employers, people with mortgages, and anyone who owns stocks and bonds. But with this, many Democrats risk alienating every last taxpayer in their States. Removing this deduction is going to hit high-tax States hard. If you are from a so-called blue State, it is likely that constituents are already heavily burdened with State and local taxes. Take away this and you will, in effect, drive up the marginal rate of your constituents who take their deduction by as much as 35 percent.

I am convinced that many of the inroads Democrats made between 2006 and 2008 were due to carefully crafted Trojan horse campaigns. Skillful operatives ran Democratic campaigns promising moderate tax and spending policies that would be respectful of families and businesses. But once that Trojan horse got inside the Capitol, and former Speaker PELOSI and President Obama took charge, frustrated liberals spilled out and started taxing anything that could move to pay for the largest expansion of government since Lyndon Johnson was in office.

Removing the deduction for State and local taxes might be the final act that restores purple America to its traditional red hue. At 5 percent of all tax expenditures, this would represent a massive tax increase, this net exclusion of defined benefit pension contribution. And that is No. 7, after State and local taxes, except for real property.

What is No. 8? This is the pre-tax treatment for the contributions workers make to their defined contribution plans and the inside buildup on the accounts. Many of us know of these retirement plans as 401(k) plans. At 4 percent of tax expenditures, this is a significant incentive to families to save for retirement.

No. 9 is a bit more obscure but no less critical for families. It is the tax expenditure for the step up in basis at

death. We all know the saying that nothing is as certain as death and taxes. Well, if this tax expenditure were eliminated, this step up in basis at death, this saying would take on an even darker meaning. Death could now be taxed twice. First, the decedent's estate might get hit with the death tax. Then the decedent's heirs would be taxed again on the gain embedded in any inherited asset should they decide to sell. This accounts for 4 percent of tax expenditures.

We close with No. 10, the tax expenditure and probably the most important one to my constituents in Utah. It is the tax benefit for donations to charities other than education and health care institutions.

When you make your weekly or yearly donation to your church, you can now deduct it for tax purposes. This charitable deduction represents 4 percent of all tax expenditures. The folks in my State all pay tithing—almost all of them. That is 10 percent of their gross income. I do it every year. I have to tell you, you would hit a lot of very charitable people and a lot of churches with the loss of that one, No. 10. Yet that is the smallest of the whole 10.

As the chart shows, these widespread everyday tax policies account for almost two-thirds of tax expenditures. We are not talking about yachts or corporate jets.

Now, I have already suggested it, but rolling back many of these expenditures would have an immediate adverse impact on American families and taxpayers.

It would also undercut longstanding Federal policies promoting saving, home ownership, and charitable giving.

Let's turn first to retirement security.

About half of Americans save for retirement. The overwhelming bipartisan consensus is that this number is way too low. Ideally, all American workers would be saving for retirement.

More savings means less financial stress on Social Security and Medicare. Most importantly, it means retirees can enjoy their retirement if they can rely on a nest egg. That is why there has been a bipartisan desire to incentivize retirement savings through worker participation in retirement plans.

A time-honored method has been to offer a tax benefit up front in the case of the traditional defined benefit plan, traditional defined contribution, or traditional IRA. The benefit remains untaxed during the individual's working years. It is only taxed when received in retirement. By contrast, Roth pension plans and IRAs provide a tax benefit on the back end, when a worker retires and begins drawing on the account.

Former Finance Committee Chairman William Roth captured the policy rationale best by noting the deliberate tax policy bias toward savings. Chairman Roth used to make the point with a rhetorical question. He would ask: ''Is there any bad saving?''

Of course, the answer is no.

One thing we know for sure. Curtail or eliminate the tax expenditure for retirement savings and the after-tax cost of savings will rise. Savers will react. It is true that some will continue to save. But it is also true they will have less to save if they choose to do so. For middle income taxpayers, it will probably mean lower savings rates.

Is that a good policy to put in place?

Consider this: According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, for 2009 over half of households paid no income tax. Forty-nine percent of Americans shouldered 100 percent of the income tax burden.

The half shouldering the income tax burden are also, generally speaking, the part of the population making sound personal decisions like saving for retirement. That behavior is good in both a micro and macro sense. In the micro sense workers are sacrificing current consumption for security and a better standard of living in the future. In a macro sense, the collective behavior of these citizens stabilizes our aging society.

To encourage this kind of sacrifice, our tax policy provides a tangible tax benefit. Take away that tax benefit and, as with raising taxes on anything else, you will get less of the behavior. Take away the tax benefit, and you will get less saving for retirement. Does that make any sense?

In order to avoid restraining the rapid growth in government spending, our friends on the other side would have us send the wrong policy signal to the half of our population that saves. They would add to the burden of those who are already shouldering the entire burden of funding the Federal Government. At the same time, by discouraging saving and personal responsibility we would further unleash the appetite of those who want us to spend more.

Take another look at the chart. Add up the tax expenditures from defined benefit plans and defined contribution plans. They account for 10 percent of tax expenditures. Over 5 years, the revenue from these expenditures amounts to almost $700 billion. On a per-year average basis, it is $140 billion. That is an annual policy shift of $140 billion in incentives for private savings to $140 billion in incentives for growing government spending.

Do we want a society where more saving is encouraged? Or do we want a society where dependency and more government spending are encouraged?

Do we want to look more like Switzerland or do we want to look like Greece?

The answer to this question is clear to the citizens of this country.

Unfortunately, not all of their representatives seem to have thought through the implications of going after tax expenditures.

To get at this from another angle, I would like to discuss the impact on taxpayers of cutting back some of these tax expenditures that come in the form of itemized deductions.

I am going to examine the effects of cutting back these itemized deductions by applying President Obama's budget proposal to cap itemized deductions at 28 percent.

It is clear that some in the White House are pushing this 28 percent cap hard in the negotiations over the debt limit.

As noted before, itemized deductions generally are considered tax expenditures. But itemized deductions impact a number of basic, longstanding features of American life. Itemized deductions include the home mortgage interest deduction, the charitable contribution deduction, and the State and local tax deduction. The President is proposing to chisel away at these itemized deductions, and we should carefully reflect on what that would mean.

President Obama has proposed repeatedly ''to limit the tax rate at which high-income taxpayers can take itemized deductions to 28 percent.'' It appears that this proposal is designed to lessen the benefit to higher income taxpayers of itemized deductions. The Joint Committee on Taxation says that this provision would mean the Federal Government would collect an additional $293 billion in taxes over 10 years.

True to form, this is just another version of the same soak-the-rich play that the left has been running for decades. From their perspective, it is unfair that higher income individuals get a more valuable tax benefit than lower income individuals? But this perspective mischaracterizes a critical issue. The 35 percent bracket was established by Congress with an understanding that itemized deductions would allow a significant tax benefit. Had Congress known that higher income taxpayers would be disallowed some of their itemized deductions—as the President now proposes—undoubtedly Congress would have set that bracket at lower than 35 percent.

So, taking away some of the benefit of itemized deductions for higher income taxpayers, while leaving the high-income tax rates at their current levels, upsets the balance struck by prior Congresses. Obviously, Congress is allowed to do this, but let's not pretend that these expenditures are loopholes or oversights by prior Congresses. The President and the Senate's Democratic leadership are free to do this if they choose, but they should at least come clean about what they are doing. They are significantly raising taxes on the people who are already shouldering the lion's share of the Federal income tax burden—98 percent of them, as a matter of fact.

Even aside from the staggering character of this tax increase—one that would clearly violate President Obama's campaign pledge not to raise taxes on middle class Americans the macroeconomic impact of this cap is negative at best.

President Obama's 28 percent cap would reduce the benefit from the home mortgage interest deduction. For 5 years now, our Nation has been experiencing a bursting of the real estate bubble. Current headlines indicate that this trend will continue for a time. Limiting the value of the home mortgage interest deduction would apply additional downward pressure on home prices—not only for high end homes, but for all homes. By repeatedly proposing to limit the benefit of the home mortgage interest deduction, is it the President's intent to further depress housing prices, or is this mere collateral damage from his desire to raise taxes.

But the damage from this cap does not stop at the housing market. President Obama's 28 percent cap would also reduce the benefit from the charitable contribution deduction. This would almost surely reduce the amount of contributions people would make to churches, synagogues, temples, soup kitchens, shelters, universities, and museums. Is that the President's intention? Does the President know that these revenues might never materialize because the elimination of this deduction will step up pressure for direct government assistance for the poor, for students, and for the arts?

Finally, this cap would reduce the benefit of the State and local tax deduction. I touched on this point earlier. High-tax States are able to soften the blow of their high taxes by pointing out to their citizens the Federal deductibility of such taxes. So, my colleagues from high-tax States might want to talk to their governors about the impact the President's proposed cap would have on State and local public finance.

I want to be clear about something. Our Tax Code is a colossal, awful mess. And tax expenditures must be a part of any conversation about tax reform. But I want to emphasize that the conversation about tax expenditures should happen in a conversation about broad based tax reform—reform that flattens the code while lowering rates.

The conversation about tax expenditures should be a sober one in the context of a meaningful discussion about tax policy. Unfortunately, the President has chosen instead to target tax expenditures willy nilly with little regard for the policy implications of these tax hikes.

Make no mistake, whatever the President wants to call it—reducing spending through the Tax Code, closing loopholes, or making people pay their fair share—these are tax increases plain and simple. And they are tax increases on the middle class.

There has been some criticism in recent days about Republicans for their commitment to a pledge many of them took against any net tax increase.

I have to admit I am at a loss here.

Conservative Republicans, convinced that taxes are already high enough, promise their taxpaying citizens that they will never support a net tax increase.

They gave their constituents their word, and are sticking to it.

Meanwhile, President Obama, who promised not to raise taxes on the middle class when running for office, vows to break this promise at every opportunity.

And yet it is the conservative Republicans who are somehow lacking integrity? Hardly.

I don't care how many blows I take from sophisticated Washingtonians and professional leftists for sticking by my pledge to the people of Utah. I will resist any effort by the President to include tax increases as part of the deal to increase the debt ceiling. I will do so for a number of reasons. First, our Tax Code needs a fundamental overhaul. It is a complicated mess that is lacking in fundamental fairness. Yet the President's proposal to reduce tax expenditures for deficit reduction, is a proposal to maintain a tax code that grows more burdensome by the day. The President's proposal essentially robs the government of the revenues that it might use later to flatten the Tax Code and lower rates.

More importantly, I oppose the President's proposed tax hikes as a matter of principle. Flattening the tax base without any offsetting rate reduction is a tax increase.

My friend, the ranking member on the Senate Budget Committee, Senator SESSIONS captured the point well in an interview the other day. I will quote Senator SESSIONS:

> We have to be honest and recognize that if you are going to eliminate systematically a host of deductions and keep the money or spend it for new programs, then you've raised taxes. . . . It just is unless we've changed the English language.

The campaign against tax expenditures is a campaign for a tax increase.

It is a tax increase that could send the wrong signal to those Americans who sacrifice current consumption and save for retirement. It could raise the bar for those Americans who want to experience the American dream of home ownership. It would mean the residents of high tax States would face even higher State and local taxes. And it could mean a cutback back in the volume of charitable giving.

This is shared sacrifice that the Nation cannot afford.

I prefer shared prosperity by cutting taxes and giving the small businesses and businesses the opportunity to use that money to hire people and get people working and get more people paying taxes. I think it is abysmal that the bottom 51 percent do not pay income taxes, and 23 million of them get refundable tax credits from the government that are far more than the payroll taxes they might have to pay, which are Social Security payments.

I listened to my colleague from Vermont saying we cannot do anything on Social Security, we cannot do this, cannot do that, the poor people are going to be hurt. Where are they going to be when Social Security is bankrupt? Where are they going to be when Medicare and Medicaid are bankrupt? The way we are going, that is where they are going to be.

We cannot keep spending like this, and we have to quit playing the phony game with tax expenditures.

All I can say is we have to get with it around here and we have to start working together as Democrats and Republicans in the best interests of the American people, and that is reforming this awful Tax Code, getting taxes down for everybody, and taking care of the poor but also expecting everybody to have some skin in the game—except the really poor—and help our country pull out of the mess we are in.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

SECOND OPINION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor, as I have week after week since the health care bill was signed into law, with a doctor's second opinion about the health care law because the President repeatedly made promises to the American people as the health care bill was being debated and even after the health care law was signed. He promised to improve, not hurt, the quality of medical care in this country.

We now know the President's health care law actually makes the problem of health care in this country worse. In fact, since this bill was signed into law, we have learned that it makes the cost of health care worse. We know it makes the American's ability to get health care worse and the ability of individuals to keep the care they like—it makes their ability to keep that care worse.

Today, I would like to first talk about the cost of care.

President Obama promised American families they would see their health insurance premiums go down because of the health care law, and he actually told them they would go down by over $2,000 per family. Well, now we know that is not the case. In fact, Americans have seen their premiums increase 19 percent since the time the President signed his health care bill into law.

I was looking at the front page of the Sheridan Press, Sheridan, WY, yesterday. Headline, front page:

Health care premium increase. County administrative director said the county's cost to provide health care coverage for its employees will increase by about $360,000 this year.

We are talking about 1 county—1 out of 23 counties in Wyoming, $360,000 for county employees.

You know, throughout this entire health care debate, the President promised the American people that if they liked their health care plan, his health care law would let them keep it—another broken promise. Employers all across the country have made it clear that the health care law's mandates are too expensive and threaten their ability to offer insurance to their employees.

A recent study by McKinsey & Company, which is a reputable national consulting firm, produced a report entitled ''How U.S. health care reform will affect employee benefits.'' They surveyed over 1,300 employers across diverse industries, geographies, and employer sizes. The results confirmed what Republicans and American workers and their families knew all along, and they knew it long before the President and Washington Democrats forced this health care law down their throats. Overall, the report says, 30 percent of employers will probably stop offering employer-sponsored coverage in the years after 2014 when the Obama health care law goes fully into effect. Among employers with a high awareness of the health care reform law and what is specifically in the law, then the proportion of those who will definitely or probably stop offering coverage jumps to 50 percent, and upward of 60 percent will pursue other options. So at least 30 percent of employers would actually gain economically from dropping coverage even if they completely compensated their employees for the change through other benefit offerings and higher salaries.

Apparently, the President's promise that ''if you like the health insurance you have today, you can keep it'' translates into ''you may very well lose your coverage.''

As former Congressional Budget Office Director Doug Holtz-Eakin's analysis confirms, if employers decided to drop coverage—which is in their economic best interest to do in many cases based on their economic evaluation—the cost of Federal insurance subsidies would skyrocket.

Remember, the White House and Democrats in Congress met behind closed doors. They acted swiftly and covertly to pass a law without regard for how its provisions would impact each and every American family.

Then the question is, Will Americans actually have the ability to get medical care they need from a doctor they want at a price they can afford? The President promised that his law would increase access to affordable care. Some groups tell a different story.

In April 2010, a month after the President signed his health care plan into law, the Association of American Medical Colleges estimated that based on graduation and training rates, this country would have a shortage of 150,000 doctors over the next 15 years. In May of the same year, the American Medical Association issued the results of its survey showing the impact of low payment rates and the threat of future payment cuts on Medicare patients' access to care. The AMA found that one in five physicians currently restricts the number of Medicare patients they see. The AMA study shows that nearly one-third of primary care physicians restrict the number of Medicare patients they take into their practice.

All any of the Members of the Senate need to do is, at home on the weekend, talk to someone in your community, someone who is on Medicare, someone who is trying to find a doctor, a doctor to care for them, and see how very difficult it is for someone on Medicare to find a doctor to care for them.

Well, later last year, the Association of American Medical Colleges related updated physician shortage estimates. The September 2010 study said that by 2015, doctor shortages will be actually 50 percent worse than originally projected. By 2020, there will be a shortage of 45,000 primary care physicians and a shortage of 46,000 surgeons and medical specialists.

So I find it ironic that we have a health care law that is passed that actually doesn't put money into training doctors to treat you but puts money in to hire IRS agents to investigate you. Absolutely astonishing.

These studies clearly demonstrate that the President's health care law will only make it harder for Americans to see their doctor. In fact, Washington only expanded the ability for folks to get government-approved, government-mandated, government-subsidized coverage. They did not expand the ability for the American people to get actual medical care. There is a huge difference between medical coverage and medical care. When you take over $500 billion away from our seniors on Medicare not to save Medicare but to start a brand new government program for someone else, well, that is a way to make the problem worse. When you force 16 million more people onto Medicaid, a program where half of the doctors in the country won't see those patients, that also makes the problem worse.

On the front page of yesterday's USA TODAY, Wednesday, July 6, the headline is ''Medicaid payments go under the knife.'' State cuts could add to shortage of doctors.

The second paragraph:

Some health care experts say the cuts, most of which went into effect July 1, or will later this month, could add to a shortage of physicians and other providers participating in Medicaid.

The article goes on:

Under the 2010 health care law, more than 16 million additional people will become eligible starting in 2014.

So already we have a situation where doctors are reluctant to take care of people on Medicaid. Yet the President's solution to the health care dilemma in this country is to put more people into a system that is already broken. We are giving individuals and families an insurance card but not really giving them access to the care that has been promised.

Adults are not the only ones waiting in lines to get into doctors offices as the lines get longer. In fact, children enrolled in Medicaid have a harder time accessing medical care than children who have private insurance. Yet that is the President's solution to the needs of this country.

On January 16 of this year, the New England Journal of Medicine published a study conducted in Cook County, IL. It is President Obama's hometown of Chicago. People were calling medical offices asking for appointments. They were asking for appointments for children with chronic conditions or acute conditions and telling the offices—these were kind of secret shoppers—the person had Medicaid or private insurance. What they found is 66 percent of the time when the researcher called for an appointment and they mentioned Medicaid, they were denied an appointment. But only 11 percent of the researchers calling for appointments who said they had private insurance—only 11 percent would not get an appointment. So there you have 66 percent denied if they had Medicaid and only 11 percent denied with private insurance. Those Medicaid patients who did get an appointment, well, they faced wait times twice as long as kids with private insurance—an average of about 6 weeks. As one caller was told when asked what kind of insurance the person had—when that person said Medicaid, the receptionist at the medical office said: Medicaid is not insurance. Yet that is what the President and the Democrats base their entire health care plan on—16 million more on Medicaid.

Here it is over a year after the law has been signed, and the President's health care law has made health care in America worse. Premiums are higher, and the lines at doctors offices are longer. It is more difficult to get a doctor to care for you. This is not what the President's health care law was supposed to do, and it is not what the President promised the American people last year. He promised that the health care law would make health care better for all Americans. Each week, we learn that the promises are coming up empty and health care in America under this health care law has been made worse.

That is why week after week I come to the Senate floor as we learn more things about the health care law that passed the Senate, passed the House, was signed by the President, and, in my opinion as a doctor who practiced medicine for 24 years, has actually been bad for patients, bad for providers

and nurses and doctors who take care of those patients, and bad for the taxpayers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I have two things I would like to talk about. First, I wish to deal with the resolution we have on the floor that we had a vote on today, which was this motion to proceed to S. 1323, a bill to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice and resolving the budget. I think it is important that we realize what is in this sense of the Senate. The findings the Congress makes here are very important, and I would like to read these three findings.

The Wall Street Journal reports that the median pay for chief financial officers of the S&P 500 companies increased 19 percent to $2.9 million last year. And then you compare that with the middle class over the last 10 years—the median family income has declined by more than $2,500. Mr. President, 20 percent of all income earned in the United States is earned by the top 1 percent of individuals. Over the past quarter century, four-fifths of the income gains accrued to the top 1 percent of individuals.

So we conclude in this sense of the Senate—it is the sense of the Senate that any agreement to reduce the budget deficit should require that those earning $1 million or more per year make a more meaningful contribution to the deficit reduction effort. And that is what we have been talking about today; that is what our leaders are doing—meeting at the White House with the President—is trying to come up with a budget deal and a resolution to this that involves shared sacrifice and involves putting us on a path to better budget responsibility, reducing the national budget deficit. Clearly part of this has to do with millionaires paying more of their fair share.

Now, we got 74 votes on the motion to proceed, but I heard many people say—many Senators walked on the floor and said: Well, I am voting for the motion to proceed, to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed, but I am not sure I support the bill. But I think the 74 votes show a little bit of bipartisanship in terms of a mix of revenue and expenditure cuts. That is the point I wanted to make on this resolution.

First of all, I hear things from the White House that worry me because what has been said when we talk about a package—and they are talking about the overall package—is they say: We are going to have a ratio of 1 to 3, meaning 75 percent cuts and only 25 percent revenue, so three-quarters in cuts and one-quarter in revenue.

Now, how does that compare to how we got out of deficit situations in the past? I think that is one of the most important things to look at because we were in a big hole in the 1980s. The Reagan administration took us down that road and President Clinton and President Bush 1 had to deal with that situation. What did they come up with? They came up with an agreement which was basically 55 percent revenue and 45 percent cuts. So it was about a 50–50 situation.

I urge the President to look at the budget. We have only been briefed in a very cursory way on the budget KENT CONRAD has prepared, but it comes in at about 50–50 in terms of revenue and cuts.

We have to realize we are at the lowest Federal revenue we have seen in 60 years and the highest Federal expenditures we have seen in 60 years. So we have to work at both sides of this. So that is where I hope the President comes in with some kind of proposal as he is negotiating this, and I look forward to him doing that.

NEW MEXICO WILDFIRES

The other topic I wish to speak about is the wildfires in New Mexico. I spent the last week in my State of New Mexico. I stayed there. I started to go to the plane, and I kept hearing the reports from my staff, and one of the most shocking was the entire community of Los Alamos—12,000 people—was evacuated because a forest fire was coming in their direction. As I kept getting the reports and the evacuation had started to take place, I thought: Well, the best thing to do is to not fly out but to go back to the community of Los Alamos and the surrounding communities and try to assist in any way I could.

I want to talk a little bit about that. I think there are some lessons to be learned in terms of budgets and deficits and how we should invest. But first I want to thank the Senators who helped me while I was gone. As the Presiding Officer, Senator FRANKEN, knows, we are assigned weekly duties in terms of presiding, and I was supposed to preside last week. So three of my colleagues, Senator DURBIN, Senator MERKLEY, and my cousin, Senator MARK UDALL, stepped up to help me with presiding time. I had an amendment that was on the floor when we were dealing with the rules package, and Senator HARKIN helped me with that proposal. So there was a real team effort within our Democratic caucus to help me to be able to work on the wildfire issue out in New Mexico and stay there and have my capable staff and the other Senators help out. I really thank everybody for that team effort.

The wildfires that are raging across New Mexico are not only in New Mexico. A number of States have been hit: Texas, Arizona, Florida, and my home State of New Mexico. Generally, what we see in this country is the fire season starts at the southern part and moves up to the north as we go through the summer season. In the Southwest, we have had an extraordinary fire season. I was just briefed by Secretary Vilsack when I was out there. He spoke in the southwest region about 1,600-plus fires burning 1.5 million acres. This is still very early in the fire season. We could see a lot more burning going on. Then, the thing that really hit me was the fact that we were told this is the driest recorded summer since the Forest Service has been keeping records. So it is pretty remarkable we are in this kind of situation where we have a drought and then we have fires that heat up.

This particular fire, for New Mexico—the name of it is called the Las Conchas fire right near Los Alamos. As we speak, it is more than 135,000 acres. It is almost three times as big as the previous fire situation we have seen.

What happens with these forest fires in our dry, arid region is we get extreme heat within the forest, and we get what are called crown fires, where the tops of the trees—these trees may be 30 to 50 to 100 feet tall, and the fires burn in the top of the crown. They can spread when there is a 40- or 50-mile-an-hour wind, as there was in some cases here. They can be in the crown of the trees and they can jump out a mile in advance with embers and create additional fire in front of it. As a result of the heat—very intensive heat; I think close to 1,000 degrees right in the heat of the fire—it makes the soil unable to absorb water any longer, which is something that creates a situation when we get our rainy season, which occurs right after the fire season, we can have serious flood situations. The soil will not absorb water, so when the rains come all of the soil on the surface washes off. It washes into the reservoirs. It can fill them up with silt. Some of those are used for recreation, for fishing; others are used for drinking water. For example, several of the communities in northern New Mexico get 40 percent, 50 percent of their drinking water from these reservoirs. So these kinds of forest fires can be absolutely devastating to communities.

But the one thing we were thankful for, because of the Federal firefighters, is the worst case scenarios didn't occur. One of the things that was expected—and I think many saw this covered on the national media—is this might get into the National Laboratory, the Los Alamos National Laboratory; that there was going to be radiation released and those kinds of things. In fact, we dodged a bullet there. It didn't go into Los Alamos National Laboratory. The labs and the residences were protected.

There was another fire burning nearby that threatened the Santa Fe watershed. The fire changed directions and because of the skillful firefighting it didn't get into the watershed. So we dodged a bullet. But many other areas—many other areas—were severely impacted, and many other groups were.

For example, New Mexico's Indian pueblos—we have 19 pueblos in New Mexico. Some of them were terribly impacted by this: the Nambe Pueblo, the Santa Clara Pueblo, San Ildefonso Pueblo, the Ohkay Pueblo, Owingeh

Pueblo, and many other pueblos. One of the most damaged pueblos was the Santa Clara Pueblo. The Governor is a gentleman by the name of Walter Dasheno. He and some of his counselors had come to a meeting. Eighty-five percent of this Indian reservation has been burned in the last two big fires. What they said when we were sitting in a room—and these are the elders from the pueblo who came to talk to us—they said: Our hearts are in a very sad state. The fire devastated our religious sites, our sacred sites. We had medicinal plants we would collect in this area. We can't do that any longer.

With great emotion these elders said: We are never going to see this forest in the same condition again. So, obviously, the loss was great at Santa Clara, but it was all across New Mexico, of those pueblos that I just named, and it is a very significant loss.

The first thing I wish to do in speaking today is to thank all the firefighters who were involved in this effort. I think we have fighting just this one fire 2,600 firefighters from all over the Nation—15 different States. It is incredibly tough work—difficult, tough, dirty work.

I met many of these firefighters out on the front where they were fighting the fire. Some of them would talk about how they had been away from their families for 2 weeks. They hadn't had a shower. They were sleeping in tents. It is a tremendously trying occupation, being a firefighter, but they believe in it. They show up every day, and they do an incredible job. They were supported by our National Guard which guarded the community of Los Alamos while the people were evacuated to make sure there wasn't any crime going on. The State police patrolled the roads to try to make sure they could keep order. Local law enforcement, local firefighters participated, the local fire departments.

So it was an incredible effort by our community pulling together. One of the most remarkable things is the expertise at the Federal level in Federal land management agencies and firefighters. These teams are headed up—typically, we will have a type 1 and a type 2 team, and the head of the team called the incident commander will probably have 20, 25, 30 years of experience in fighting fires every summer around the country. These are career people from the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, the Park Service, and a variety of other Federal agencies that step to the plate and help out when we get in these emergency situations.

As I said, they come from all over the country to work in the States that are impacted, and then as the fire season spreads north up to Colorado and Wyoming and Montana, those same firefighters move on to continue the battle up there.

One of the points I take from this, one of the things I learned from this—and I think President Lincoln said this very well: Government does for people what they can't do for themselves. Collectively, we pull together when we hit situations where if we have an individual who has a home in Los Alamos, there is not much he can do with a big forest fire coming in his direction. But we can organize as a governmental entity to say when we get big catastrophic fires such as this, we are going to have people who are competent, who are capable, and who have all of this experience in fighting fires who will come together and help out. That is something we need to protect.

When we think of debating budgets and deficits and all of that, there is a very important function that government serves out there, and we need to protect that safety net function, that collective function where we help each other. I think this firefighting is a great example of where government is needed and we could be devastated if we didn't have the expertise that the government has in terms of fighting fires.

The other thing I saw at these fires—and it was pretty remarkable. When I have been to tornado sites in New Mexico, when I have been to some of the flood situations, what stands out for me is how New Mexicans pull together in this situation—New Mexicans helping New Mexicans. The pueblos I talked about that were so impacted by the fires, they actually opened other sites on their reservations so the evacuees coming out of Los Alamos, the 12,000 people—several of these pueblos said: We are going to open our convention center and let them set up cots, and we are going to feed the people. We are going to do everything we can to help with this situation.

At the same time, their particular pueblo was being devastated by a forest fire. So there was an extraordinary outpouring of goodwill that New Mexicans have shown in this kind of emergency situation. It is remarkable to see in a time of need people pulling together and doing that in such a way that it brings tears to your eyes.

There was one individual I want to talk about. I was in talking to a group of people who were training for a charity that was going to help the evacuees—help them serve meals, help them set up cots, help them be organized. I got a question from the floor, and the individual said to me: I have lived in Los Alamos, and I had to come down here. I am an evacuee, but I found a friend who was able to put me up. I know there are other people who do not have that situation. So I am out here today training with the American Red Cross because I want to help the others, and I want to try to give back.

That is the spirit we have seen in New Mexico, that even if you were in need and had been driven from your home, you were still trying to help out. I think it is a pretty remarkable story.

One of the things we are going to have to do as we look across the country—and we see floods in the Midwest and wildfires in the Southwest and tornadoes—all of these things require a disaster relief bill, they require disaster relief funding for agencies that deal with fires and all these other natural disasters.

These things are very costly for local government. FEMA steps in and helps out with the Governor making a request. The Forest Service helps out. There are burn area rehabilitation teams that move in right after a fire to try to protect the erosion so there are not bad floods.

We have to try to do everything we can to make sure we maintain, once again, in this deficit situation, that kind of responsibility. The Federal Government has to help. Even within a deficit situation, we have to have a disaster relief kind of effort. The idea that we are going to somehow change the way we do disasters now, that we are going to take money away from Medicaid in order to put it into disasters, is I do not think a very good idea. So I think when we talk about how we do disaster relief, we need to remember we are all in this together, and when disasters hit, we need to help each other.

To show you the kind of pressure we are under in New Mexico, Secretary Vilsack, with the Forest Service, was out in New Mexico, and the one plea he made to the congressional delegation—because we were talking to him about watersheds that mean clean drinking water and that kind of situation—the Secretary said: I have a program that is called the Emergency Watershed Protection Program. It is for all over the country. It is for when we get into these kinds of wildfires, floods—whatever the situation is. He said: We have $9 million—$9 million—in the account. He said: Already, before your requests or any others have come in from New Mexico and other States—I know there are five fires down in Florida and fires in Texas and Arizona—we have $45 million in requests.

So there is $9 million in the account, $45 million in requests. What we are talking about, when we talk about watersheds, is drinking water not deteriorating and that kind of thing. So we need to remember there is a lot the Federal Government does in a shared way with local communities to protect those communities.

My final note, to talk a little bit about the biggest picture here. That is about climate change and global warming. We are seeing these wildfires, droughts, and floods as we have never seen before. I have seen Senators from all over the country talking about these disaster situations. The scientists tell us we are putting too much carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, we are warming the atmosphere. In the West—what the scientists tell us—it is going to be twice as hot in the West, the computer models show, than in other places in the country. While the climate scientists are very cautious with their modeling and what they say,

they say: You cannot point to any particular storm. I cannot say that particular fire that occurred in New Mexico—the Las Conchas fire—was caused by global warming or climate change.

They also tell us—and this is the part we need to listen to—the scientists tell us what we are going to see as a result of this is more severe weather events, meaning more severe: If you get into a drought situation, it is going to be a more severe drought, which is exactly what we are seeing in New Mexico right now. When you get floods, you are going to see a more severe flood. You are going to see more severe wildfires. These are all what we are seeing today in New Mexico. We are seeing them across the Nation. We have seen extreme floods in New Mexico, catastrophic forest fires.

We are seeing droughts we have not seen before. The Forest Service has been keeping records for 117 years, and they reported to us there is no record for how dry we are right now. This is the driest year we have ever had, which laid the groundwork for the wildfires we had with the wind and all the other things that occurred.

So we cannot put our heads in the sand in terms of climate change, in terms of global warming. We have to look at these things and realize we are contributing to them, and we need to put policies in place, solid policies that put us on a path to reducing that carbon dioxide pollution that is out there.

With that, I thank the Presiding Officer very much and thank the Senate for the time and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I stand before you today to discuss a problem that is of concern to 300 million Americans. It relates to our national debt, a debt that will soon cross the $15 trillion threshold.

We have been asked to raise the debt limit, extend the Nation's credit one more time. This we have the power to do but we have to ask ourselves the question: Should we exercise that power? Should we incur additional debt yet again without any plan moving forward to change fundamentally the way we spend money in Washington, DC?

Our current law requiring us to raise the debt limit periodically every time our existing line of credit dries up dates back to 1982. We have raised the debt limit since 1982 nearly 40 times. I fear if we do it again this time without any permanent binding plan in place, legal restrictions changing the way Congress spends money, we will be right back to the same trough a few months later. That is a problem because as we do this over time we inevitably put pressure on our financial system, pressure that will soon cause our economy dire circumstances, pressure that will in time result in excessive job losses, skyrocketing interest rates, and lots of other economic conditions that would be, to say the least, unpleasant.

It is for this reason that 100 Senators from around the country have canceled their plans they previously made to spend time with their constituents in their respective home States this week. That had been our plan, to spend time in our home States. We canceled those plans so we could come back here and have serious, earnest debate and discussion surrounding the best path forward toward moving in the direction of a balanced budget, toward figuring out what conditions, if any, would satisfy the American people who are understandably concerned about the prospect of yet another knee-jerk reflexive debt limit increase.

The American people understand the fact that if we choose to do nothing more than say: Well, if we are going to raise the debt limit by $2 trillion, let's make sure we cut $2 trillion from our anticipated spending—they understand that kind of promise is one that is not binding on the Congress if those spending cuts are stretched out over the course of 10 or 15 years or more, as has been discussed, because we here in Congress cannot bind the Congress that will be sworn into power in January of 2013 or January of 2015 or January of 2017. We cannot bind a future Congress. We can make suggestions they can follow, but we cannot bind them—unless, of course, we choose to do that, which has been done only 27 times in our Nation's history, which is, amend the Constitution. That will bind a future Congress. That, I believe, is what we have to do in order to change fundamentally the way we spend money in Washington, to make sure we are not headed back to the same trough a few months from now to do exactly the same thing, leading us closer and closer to the dire circumstances I described a few minutes ago.

While we have been here this week, convening during a week that was previously scheduled for a recess, we as a group of Senate Republicans have come together and offered a real meaningful solution. We have offered to raise the debt limit. We have introduced legislation today with 21 Republican cosponsors in the Senate which is a piece of legislation we are calling the Cut-Cap-Balance Act. Here is what it says. It says we will raise the debt limit. We will do so only under three circumstances, only after three very specific conditions precedent have been met.

The first two relate to immediate spending cuts to discretionary spending, and statutory spending caps making sure we start putting ourselves right now on a statutorily mandated glidepath toward a balanced budget.

The third step, which is by far the most important, involves passage out of both Houses of Congress by the requisite two-thirds margin a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution—one that would cap spending as a percentage of GDP, and one that would require a two-thirds supermajority in order to raise taxes. Upon each of those conditions being met, then the debt limit would be raised, but only then. We would not raise it without those conditions having been met. Because if we do not meet those conditions, we will not be able to look our constituents in the eye and say: We have done what needs to be done in order to make sure we get to where we need to be, in order to get to the point at which we will no longer be in a position of having to go back to the same trough every few months to go through the ceremony of raising the debt limit yet again.

We have to remember that every time we do this, we run an increased risk that we will start having to pay higher and higher yields on our Treasury instruments. Every time that happens, we incur more expenses that relate to our ability to remain current on our debt interest payments. Every time interest rates, yields on those debt instruments, go up by 1 percentage point, we have to spend an additional $150 billion a year in interest once our debt instruments catch up with the increased rate. That is a lot of money. That means if we were to return—let's say if interest rates were to go up 3 percent, we can soon find ourselves in a position in which we might be spending as much as $700 billion a year on interest. We are currently paying about $250 billion.

Mr. President, $700 billion a year is roughly what we spend on national defense. It is roughly what we spend on Social Security in an entire year. It is close to what we pay in Medicare and Medicaid combined at the Federal level in an entire year. So where is the difference going to come from when interest rates start to creep up? Even if they go up 3 percentage points, they would still be below their historical average. That money has to come from somewhere, and it will. It will end up coming from the various programs that Americans are most concerned about.

So whether you are a conservative, and you might be most concerned about that money coming from our defense budget or, on the other hand, if you are a liberal, and perhaps you are most concerned about it coming from entitlements, you ought to be concerned about our practice of perpetually raising the debt limit and engaging in perpetual deficit spending, especially when that deficit spending is now in excess of $1.5 trillion every single year.

This potentially threatens every Federal program out there. It also interferes with the ability of each American to find the prosperity he or she seeks, the ability of each American to live his or her life in the way he or she chooses. That is distressing. It interferes with the liberty of the individual, which is what we have been elected to protect.

I am very proud to be part of this 21-Senator coalition consisting of a group of Senators who are concerned enough about this issue that they are willing to say: We understand that we cannot just not raise the debt limit. There are enough people who are concerned enough in this country about not raising it. The abrupt halt in spending that

would bring about would create enough uncertainty and chaos that many are unwilling to face that prospect.

So recognizing that reality, we have taken the bull by the horns and we are willing to do one difficult thing. In order for us to raise the debt limit, we have to be willing to set things in motion in such a way that will solve the underlying problem and will create permanent structural spending reform within the Congress.

I wish to close by responding to an argument made recently by Timothy Geithner, the Secretary of the Treasury, to the effect that we in Congress are essentially mere surplus when it comes to the debt limit increase. He argued that, as I understand it, section 4 of the 14th amendment somehow independently authorizes the executive branch—perhaps the Treasury Secretary, perhaps just the President—to somehow raise the debt limit without consulting Congress, without an act of Congress in place.

That argument is not accurate. That argument is based on an improper reading of the 14th amendment. The language to which he refers reads, in part, as follows:

> The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, shall not be questioned.

Adopted in the immediate aftermath of the Civil War, this provision simply acknowledges the fact that we can't ignore our debt obligations, that when interest or principal comes due on our national debt, they have to be honored. You will notice that in the middle of it, set off by commas, is a phrase that says ''authorized by law.''

To create law in this country, you have to move something through Congress. That something has to be presented to the President for his signature or a veto. You cannot make a law in the U.S. Government without Congress. Article I, section 8, clause 2 makes that point clear by giving the authority to Congress to incur debt in the name of the United States.

So, necessarily, by definition and operation of the plain text of the Constitution, you cannot raise the debt limit without an act of Congress. If anything, section 4 of the 14th amendment simply makes clear that which I wish Secretary Geithner would acknowledge—and I hereby call upon him to acknowledge—which is that he has a legal and a moral obligation to make sure that if the debt limit is not increased, during whatever time it remains in limbo, during whatever time we face the debt limit-induced shortfall, it is his obligation to use the first tax revenues coming in the door to pay our debt obligations, pay the interest being accrued on our national debt. It is his obligation not only as a fiduciary or quasi-fiduciary but also the very provision of the Constitution, section 4 of the 14th amendment—the same provision he cites—binds his hands and requires him to make sure that interest gets paid and prohibits him from bringing about a default on our national debt, which is what he has been threatening on many occasions.

There is a way forward. The circumstances in which we now find ourselves are, to be sure, threatening, intimidating and daunting and they are circumstances that bring about substantial disagreement within this body and the other body that meets down the hall from us. But there are answers and solutions to which we can agree.

I believe the Cut-Cap-Balance Act provides the proper solution which can appeal to liberals and conservatives, Democrats and Republicans alike. I call on all within the sound of my voice to look at this legislation and jump on board and become part of the solution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

TALL STACKS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise to speak about a serious public health issue in Rhode Island and to commend the EPA for its actions to address it.

Rhode Island has the sixth highest rate of asthma in the country. According to our Department of Health, more than 25,000 Rhode Island children or 11 percent of children in our State—more than 1 in every 10 kids—suffer from asthma, and 82,000 adults in Rhode Island, which is also about 11 percent of our adult population, also suffer from this chronic disease.

From 2005 to 2009, asthma was the underlying cause or a contributing cause of death for 240 people in Rhode Island, including 4 children.

In 2009, there were 1,750 hospital discharges in Rhode Island for asthma cases. Those hospital stays cost about $8 million—in just that 1 year—in direct medical costs, not counting the costs associated with days of work and school missed or the medication for ongoing treatment.

On a clear summer day in Rhode Island, many of us have had the experience commuting to work and hearing a warning on drive time radio: Today is a bad air day in Rhode Island. Infants, senior citizens, and people with respiratory difficulties should stay indoors today.

In fact, yesterday was just such a day in Rhode Island. An air quality alert was issued by our State Department of Environmental Management, warning that ozone was expected to reach dangerous levels in the southern half of our State by afternoon. They recommended that all residents limit physical exertion and take refuge in air-conditioned environments for the better part of the day. In addition, Rhode Island's public transit operator, RIPTA, offered free bus rides all day long to keep people out of their cars.

These are real costs—costs paid in freedom, in reduced quality of life, in medical bills, in burdened public services to respond to the health risks of dirty air, and in more missed days of work and school.

There is still a lot to learn about the causes and cures of asthma. But we know air pollution triggers asthma attacks. We know air pollution is a preventable problem. Armed with this knowledge, Rhode Island has taken great strides to reduce air pollution.

In 2006, Rhode Island passed a law to prohibit cars and buses from idling with their engines on.

In 2007, Rhode Island passed a law to retrofit all State school buses with diesel pollution controls.

In 2010, Rhode Island began requiring heavy-duty vehicles used in federally funded construction projects to install diesel pollution controls, adhere to the State anti-idling law, and use only low-sulfur diesel fuel.

RIPTA has voluntarily retrofitted half its bus fleet with diesel pollution control equipment.

However, Rhode Island cannot solve its air pollution problem on its own. We could stop driving entirely and shut down every industry in our State, and we would still have problems with ground-level ozone and particulate matter pollution. Why is that? Because, as EPA has determined, most of the pollution that lands in Rhode Island is sent to us by other States. Much of that out-of-State pollution comes from virtually uncontrolled Midwestern coal-fired powerplants that are tied to excessively tall smokestacks that send pollution hundreds of miles away from the source.

Last month, at my request, the Government Accountability Office completed a report about tall smokestacks at coal powerplants. Here is what the report said: In 1970, the year the Clean Air Act was enacted, there were two tall stacks—stacks over 500 feet—in the United States. By 1985, this number of tall stacks had grown from 2 to more than 180. Utilities and industry literally built their way into compliance with the Clean Air Act.

The trend continued. As of December 31, 2010, at the end of last year, 284 tall stacks were operating at 172 coal powerplants in the United States. These tall smokestacks are associated with 64 percent of the coal generating capacity in our country. Most of the coal generating capacity in our country vents its pollution through tall smokestacks.

Most of the tall stacks—207 of them or nearly three-quarters of them—are between 500 and 699 feet tall; 63 of them are between 700 and 999 feet tall. The remaining 14 are over 1,000 feet tall. The tallest stack at a coal powerplant in the United States is 1,038 feet, which is at the Rockport Powerplant in Indiana. This graphic compares some of these stacks with some of the well-known landmarks in our country. Here is the Statue of Liberty, at 305 feet; the Washington Monument, at 555 feet; and here are stacks at 1,000 feet, 1,038, and 12,004 feet—the Empire State Building in New York and the Willis Tower in Chicago.

As I have noted in previous floor remarks, once a stack gets over 1,000 feet, it has to be actually marked on aviation maps as a hazard to avoid plane collisions.

What do I mean when I say the utilities built their way into compliance with these tall stacks? In the early days of the Clean Air Act, some States allowed pollution sources to build tall stacks instead of installing pollution controls. The concept was that pollution sent high enough into the atmosphere would be sent far away from the source and it would not contribute to the air pollution problem in that State and everybody would be happy.

The problem is, this air pollution causes problems downwind in other States. As the GAO report put it, ''Tall stacks generally disperse pollutants over greater distances than shorter stacks and provide pollutants greater time to react in the atmosphere to form ozone and particulate matter,'' which are the precursors to asthma. Yet public health policy has not yet caught up with this practice. Rhode Island pays the price.

Making matters worse, the GAO found that more than half the boilers attached to these tall stacks at the coal powerplants have no scrubber to control sulfur dioxide emissions—none. Approximately 85 percent of these boilers went into service before 1980, so they are antiquated and dirty and they run the pollution up the tall stack and it ends up being dumped on Rhode Island instead of cleaned up at the source. Nearly two-thirds of boilers connected to these tall stacks have no postcombustion controls for nitrogen oxide—controls that are vastly more effective than so-called low NO_X burners. Again, uncontrolled at the source, they dump the pollution up the tall stacks, export it elsewhere, and it is not their problem, but it then lands on Rhode Island.

Here is a graphic that shows more than 70 coal plants which have tall stacks at boilers that operate without scrubbers or postcombustion nitrogen oxide controls. These boilers are sending hundreds of thousands of tons of unabated pollution up very tall smokestacks, into the jetstream, and the jetstream delivers it downwind onto States such as Rhode Island.

As the GAO indicated:

> In the Mid-Atlantic United States, the wind generally blows from west to east during the day . . . ozone can travel hundreds of miles at night with the help of high-speed winds known as the low-level jet. This phenomenon typically occurs at night . . . due to the ground cooling quicker than the upper atmosphere, which can allow the low-level jet to form and transport ozone and particulate matter with its high winds.

The map shows a typical prevailing wind pattern in the spring. Notice how the prevailing winds send so much of the pollution up and over to Rhode Island and other States along the eastern seaboard. In fact, five of the States on this map—Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Illinois, and North Carolina—have been identified by EPA as contributing significantly to Rhode Island's pollution problems.

The electricity that comes from these uncontrolled powerplants, which don't stop the pollution at the start but instead jet it up into this low-level jet so it gets dumped in other States—the electricity coming from them might seem cheaper to consumers than electricity from a pollution-controlled powerplant. But that is not so. That would be wrong to consider or to conclude. The costs weren't cheaper. The costs just got shifted. They got shifted from the companies and the consumers in the polluting States to the lungs of children in Rhode Island and other downwind States. It is the lungs of children and adults and seniors in Rhode Island that are actually paying for that cheap electricity.

Happily, and at last, the EPA has begun to remedy this unfair and wrongful public health situation by requiring utilities in upwind States to control their pollution under the good neighbor provision of the Clean Air Act, because while a tall stack will send uncontrolled pollution farther than a short stack would, the most effective way to reduce pollution is to install pollution controls.

Prompted by petitions from our downwind States, the Bush EPA attempted to set pollution limits for States that contribute to unhealthy pollution levels outside their borders. However, on review, the DC Circuit Court of Appeals told them they had not gone far enough. So the EPA went back to the drawing board and crafted the cross-State air pollution rule that has been announced today, which will cap the pollution that can be produced in upwind States, such as Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Illinois, and North Carolina. Those caps were designed based on each State's contribution to pollution in States such as Rhode Island, and it will ratchet down whenever EPA tightens air quality standards based on the latest and best science.

As I said, that rule was finalized today. So I thank the EPA. I commend the EPA for finalizing that cross-State air pollution rule. I also urge EPA to update the national ozone air quality standard based on the recommendations from the CASAC—the Clean Air Science Advisory Committee. This will lead to further pollution reductions in States upwind of Rhode Island and further benefit Rhode Islanders.

These rules will bring us closer to the day when the coal powerplants on this chart start taking responsibility for their pollution and stop exporting that pollution into Rhode Island and other States, when they install pollution control equipment rather than sending their pollution to where it becomes someone else's problem, and to when Rhode Island children can play outdoors safely without the risk of an asthma attack. I am looking forward to that day, and I know the people of Rhode Island are too.

When you drive in and that morning radio tells you today is another bad air day and that children and seniors should stay indoors and can't play, can't take a walk, can't engage in anything that involves any exertion, it is frustrating when there is nothing you can do about it. The Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management could pass regulations until it was blue in the face. The Rhode Island General Assembly could write new laws all day long and it would make no difference because the bombardment of outside pollution on our State is what is driving these health problems. That is why EPA is so important. We would have no voice in this if it were not for a National Environmental Protection Agency that can look out for small States such as ours that are on the receiving end of this kind of a pollution dump from the uncontrolled coal-fired plants in the Midwest.

I thank very much the Presiding Officer, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. 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. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I would like to add a few words this afternoon about the ongoing negotiations on the Federal budget and on our rapidly approaching debt ceiling.

I think we all agree that the situation we face is one of enormous importance and complexity. I believe every responsible person also agrees a failure to act would have awful repercussions that would jeopardize or worsen our fragile and tentative economic recovery. So I think the responsible view is, it is imperative we act and it is also clear to do so will require every side to make concessions.

I rise this afternoon, however, because it is my strong belief that any agreement we reach must be based on real savings and must not be made at the expense of our most vulnerable citizens. That is why I am so concerned about reports that Social Security and Medicare have been raised as possible sources of deficit reduction. Cuts to Social Security and to Medicare benefits should not be on the table. Social Security is not the cause of the deficit, never has been the cause of the deficit, and beneficiaries of Social Security should not be made to shoulder the burden of deficit reduction.

Social Security is funded through the contributions of our Nation's workers and businesses. It has an enormous surplus and is projected to be fully solvent for another quarter century. So while I would agree with steps to strengthen Social Security, any changes should be considered independent of our effort to reduce the deficit, and we should not cut Social Security benefits.

I helped cofound the Senate defending Social Security caucus for this very reason. The solvency of the Social Security program can be extended significantly just by applying payroll

taxes to a greater portion of the earnings of millionaires and billionaires. What we have seen in this country is a huge shift of income going more and more to the uppermost economic reaches and less and less to the middle class. The middle class has actually lost income in the last decade. So the contributions to Social Security are lower because there is less income to draw it off of and the income that is above the $106,000 Social Security cap is where the explosion of income has been and they contribute not a nickel from that income to Social Security.

So there is a lot we can do to support Social Security, but what we should not do is give in to any of the calls to put our seniors' security at risk in the stock market by privatizing Social Security or increasing the retirement age so that a construction worker or a waitress who works on their feet all day long has to put in more years of service at that age—when their body, frankly, might not be up to it any longer—or to cut benefits through backdoor methods by lowering the cost-of-living adjustment.

The Rhode Island seniors I have heard from at my community dinners and senior centers around the State I have visited are very concerned what would happen if their benefits were cut.

Audrey, from Middletown, told me that after her husband died, she had many expenses but, as she said, ''no income except for his Social Security check which enabled me to go on living—simply but adequately without being a burden on my sons and losing my dignity as well.''

Two very important points Audrey makes. One is that Social Security is not just a benefit to Social Security recipients. It is a benefit to the children of Social Security recipients, on whom their parents might otherwise be a burden. It is an American value that senior citizens who have worked hard all their lives, who have played by the rules, who have built the America we now enjoy should be able to draw on so as not to lose their dignity at the end of their life.

That is a principle that is worth defending.

Ronald from Cumberland, RI, had been on Social Security for a number of years. He wrote to say: It seems that it's always the people who need the help the most who get cut from the Federal Government. Why is this? No Social Security cost of living adjustment for 2 years, yet prices for the basic needs still rise. In a country like the United States of America, this should not happen.

These people who are living on Social Security income are not living high off the hog, and they should not be the targets of our cost-cutting zeal.

The threat to the Medicare Program is just as real. Earlier this year, Republicans over in the House of Representatives passed a budget that would end the Medicare Program as we have come to know it for future generations. I can remember being at a senior center in North Providence, and a gentleman sitting at a table said to me: You know, I have helped build this country; I have fought in its wars; And I understand that the Republican proposal will protect Medicare for me; but I am not willing to let Medicare for my children be thrown under the bus. That would make me feel awful. It simply isn't right for me to stay on it and stand for the program to be taken apart and dismembered for everybody else.

That was a moving statement for me to hear, and we need to honor that.

Estimates suggest that the House Republicans' proposal would end up forcing a typical 65-year-old senior to pay, on average, $12,500 each year in out-of-pocket expenses starting in 2022. That is more than double what a senior is estimated to pay than if the current system of Medicare stayed in place.

In Rhode Island, the average senior only gets about $14,200 per year from Social Security to begin with. So if you are going to ask people who now have $14,200 a year, who aren't getting cost-of-living adjustments by 2022 to pay $12,500 for Medicare, that would be a massive exercise in poverty creation, and what Medicare and Social Security have done is lifted the burden of poverty from America's seniors. I think sometimes we are blind to what life might be like without them, when some of our colleagues so cavalierly suggest that we should do away with these programs, privatize them, or turn them over to the insurance industry.

The Republican budget would also reopen the Medicare prescription drug doughnut hole. We went through a lot of effort to close that doughnut hole in the Affordable Care Act. That doughnut hole will be gone in 10 years, thanks to the Affordable Care Act. The Republicans all voted against the Affordable Care Act. They all voted against closing the doughnut hole. And now in their budget on the other side they want to unwind that part of the bill and take away the protections we have provided for seniors in the doughnut hole. That would cost millions of dollars to seniors in Rhode Island starting next year if it were put into law. That is not something off in the future. That is right now, thousands of Rhode Island seniors having to cough up millions of dollars because of this Republican House budget plan. That is something I think we need to defend against. That is the wrong place to look.

It is especially the wrong place to look as we find our Republican colleagues fighting so hard to protect tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires. I have given the speech repeatedly already, so I won't dwell on it now. But when our Republican colleagues stand and say, We are against tax hikes, it is important for Americans to look behind the curtain and see who they are defending, because I will tell you, everybody in this Chamber, Republican and Democrat alike, believes that ordinary American families earning ordinary levels of income should be exempt from any tax hikes. That is not even on the table.

When our Republican colleagues talk about defending against tax hikes, they are talking about defending the oil industry from having subsidies they don't need and that taxpayers pay for taken away. They are talking about protecting the top 400 income earners in the country who, on average, pay Federal taxes, actually paid in—this isn't a theory, this isn't a rate; this is what they actually paid in, according to the IRS—18.2 percent. These are people who made on average more than $¼ billion, with a B—$1 billion with a B, in 1 year. And God bless them. What a wonderful thing it is to make more than $¼ billion in 1 year. But they pay taxes at lower rate than a truckdriver in Rhode Island does on average; the guy who wakes up every morning and gets into his clothes and puts on his boots and gets in the truck and goes out there and works all day, pays the same tax rate as the person earning over $¼ billion.

They can talk about tax hikes until they are blue in the face. It won't take away the fact that is the way it actually works in this country, and they are defending that and going after Audrey and the folks on Medicare in Rhode Island and Ronald from Cumberland. That is not right, and we need to argue about that and fight back.

We can never overlook what Medicare and Social Security have contributed to our Nation's prosperity. It is not just the benefit for the Medicare beneficiary, it is not just the benefit for the Social Security recipient. It is the freedom we all feel knowing we will have a dignified old age; that we won't be at the mercy of Wall Street, that we won't be at the mercy of a private insurance company; that we will have the efficient and effective services that Medicare and Social Security deliver. We can know that now and enjoy that. We have more freedom as Americans now because we can make bolder choices in our lives knowing that we don't have to defend ourselves against that kind of poverty and that kind of misery in our old age. Our children can make bolder choices in their lives knowing that they don't have to safeguard against a parent's illness ruining their own financial futures, ruining their family's financial futures.

Imagine how awful it must feel for a parent in that circumstance, if in your old age you become grievously ill and the only resource you have is to essentially wipe out your children who feel a moral obligation to take care of your medical expenses and put themselves into poverty and misery as a result of your illness. What an awful human tragedy that is for the people involved. And we don't experience that tragedy in America. We don't experience it because Medicare and Social Security are there.

The challenge before us is a formidable one, but I truly believe we can

reach an agreement on the deficit and the debt ceiling without compromising the security and the well-being of our seniors. I believe the Democratic Budget Committee's proposed budget is a good model for how we can actually do it, and I look forward to continuing this discussion. It is not necessary, in order to solve our immediate deficit problems and to get through this debt limit fight, to take our seniors and put Social Security and Medicare that they have relied on at risk; to take this country whose prosperity Social Security and Medicare do so much to support, and knock that down with a tax on Social Security and Medicare. It is not right, it is not necessary, and we should stand against it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THANKING SENATE PAGES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, I express my appreciation to you, presiding all these hours you have this afternoon, but I also wish to take just a minute and thank these pages. This is the first time since 1974 the Senate has been in session during a July 4 recess period—since 1974. These young pages had places to be with their families during the summer vacation period. They are juniors in high school. They have some plans, I am sure, that we interfered with. But regarding the work we have done this week, while there has not been a lot of time on the floor, there are a lot of things going on all over Washington. There have been meetings at the White House, there have been meetings with the Vice President, with the President, with the Speaker, and others, working on this very important issue.

When these eight pages in later years reflect back on the fact that they were here the first time since 1974 when we were in session over a July 4 recess period, they should reflect that we were here for important reasons. If we do what is right, we will rein in this debt the country has and protect the most needy of our country.

I apologize for keeping them here. They should not have had to be here this week, but they have stayed because they have an obligation as pages to be here and they accepted that. They have kept the Senate running smoothly. We need them. They are helpful to us. They didn't have to be asked; each one of these eight pages volunteered: Naomi Biden, Brynn DiNino, Claire Karsting, William Maas, Aliza Reisner, Morgan Wissel, Keira Harris, and Chaffee Duckers.

I appreciate very much their service and wish them the best in their educational endeavors in the years to come.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO BARRY MANILOW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for nearly 40 years, legendary singer and songwriter Barry Manilow has inspired and dazzled millions of people with his musical talents. He has sold more than 80 million records worldwide and has written countless iconic hits.

However, I come to the floor today not to discuss his talent but to recognize my friend for another one of his remarkable accomplishments—his ongoing efforts to help preserve music education in public schools in Nevada and across this country.

In recent years, significant budget cuts to public education have forced schools to eliminate a number of important programs. Sadly, music programs are often one of the first casualties. In response to this disturbing trend, Mr. Manilow started the Manilow Music Project, which helps public schools continue their music programs. The project donates instruments and materials to public schools and provides music scholarships to high school students to further their music education at the college level. Since 2008, the organization has donated hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of instruments and materials to secondary and high school music programs across the country.

A wonderful example of the impact of the Manilow Music Project occurred last year in Nevada. During one of Mr. Manilow's recent tours in Las Vegas, in exchange for donations of new or gently used musical instruments, he offered tickets to attend one of his concerts. The collected instruments, valued at more than $500,000, were then donated to fifteen schools in the Clark County School District, the school district that serves the Las Vegas Valley. This gift—the largest donation of its kind for Clark County—has provided more than 600 students with the opportunity to experience the joys of playing a musical instrument.

In addition to his donations to the district, Mr. Manilow has also helped foster music appreciation. He recently invited four different Clark County School District school choirs to perform in his holiday shows and provided show tickets valued at more than $30,000 for nearly 500 students and their parents or chaperones.

I would like to thank Barry for his dedication to the Las Vegas community and his efforts to keep music alive in Nevada's schools. I am so pleased that he has been able to share his love of music with thousands of aspiring musicians.

VA'S MENTOR—PROTÉGÉ PROGRAM

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the accomplishments of the 24 participants in the Department of Veterans Affairs' Mentor-Protégé Program who are working to help veteran small business owners. In these hard economic times, it is more important than ever to provide this critical support to our veteran entrepreneurs.

The goal of the Mentor-Protégé Program, which was started in 2010, is to bring together established companies with service-disabled and other veteran-owned businesses. Through these partnerships with established regional businesses, veteran business owners receive guidance on financial and organizational management, business planning and technical aid. They also develop long-term business relationships with their mentor partners.

Veterans hire veterans because they know what they are getting. Veterans are well trained, disciplined team players who can deliver results in challenging conditions. At a time when the Department of Labor reports almost 10 percent of all veterans are unemployed, and 27 percent of veterans between the ages of 20 and 24 are unemployed, it is imperative we do everything in our power to tackle this issue. The Mentor-Protégé program holds the promise of fostering an environment where veteran-owned businesses can succeed in helping to revitalize our economy while hiring veterans in the process. These veteran-owned small businesses are exactly what our Nation needs to continue on the road to economic recovery while getting our country's heroes the jobs they deserve.

While I am optimistic about the potential of the VA's Mentor-Protégé Program, I have heard from several companies participating in the program who have expressed concerns with delays in VA's verification process. I urge VA's Center for Veterans Enterprise to expedite the verification process so that these companies can get to work in repairing our economy as quickly as possible.

Businesses in Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Tennessee, Alabama, Texas, New Mexico, and California are serving as a model of just how successful a program of this nature can be. The names of the businesses that are participating in the program, both as mentors and protégés, are:

ASM Research, Inc. of Fairfax, VA, and Coley & Associates of San Antonio, TX, AUI Contractors, LLC of Fort Worth, TX, and Unified Services of Texas, of South Lake, TX, Bear Construction Company of Rolling Meadows, IL, and Opcon Inc. of Chicago, IL, Booz Allen Hamilton of McLean, VA,

and MBL Technologies, Inc., of Rockville, MD, Creative Computing Solutions, Inc. of Rockville, MD, and CPS Professional Services of Fairfax, VA, EMJ Corporation of Sacramento, CA, and 347 Group Construction of Roseville, CA, The George Solitt Construction Co. of Wood Dale, IL, and Industria, Inc. of Chicago, IL, The GRD Contractors, Inc. of Costa Mesa, CA, and Hubzone Corp. of Rancho Cucamonga, CA, Harris Corporation GCSD of Melbourne, FL, and Delta Corporation of Fulton, MD, Health Net Federal Services of Rancho Cordova, CA, and Three Wire Systems of Vienna, VA, ICF Incorporated of Fairfax, VA, and Nova Technology Solutions of Fairborn, OH, JOB Options, Inc. of San Diego, CA, and VETSUSA, LLC. of Falls Church, VA, Leopardo Companies, Inc. of Hoffman Estates, IL, and Segovia Group Corporation of San Antonio, TX, Lockheed Martin Corporation of Fairfax, VA, and Fulcrum Vets, LLC of Fairfax, VA, Marous Brothers Construction of Willoughby, OH, and Northstar Contracting, Inc. of North Olmstead, OH, McKesson Corporation of San Francisco, CA, and The Stay Safe Store of El Dorado Hills, CA, Metters Industries of McLean, VA, and Global Technology Solutions, LLC. of Corrales, NM, Northrup Grumman Corporation of Rockville, MD, and Heitech Services, Inc. of Landover, MD, Reva, Inc. of Newark, NJ, and M.E.R.I.T. Inc. of Newark, NJ, The Robins and Morton Group of Birmingham, AL, and Coburn Contractors of Montgomery, AL, Roy Anderson Corp. of Gulfport, MI, and the Bacik Group, LLC. of Columbus, GA, Sargent Electric Co. of Pittsburg, PA, and SGT LLC. Of Pittsburgh, PA, Secom Technical Services of Oak Ridge, TN, and Clauss Construction of Lakeside, CA, Simplex Grinnel of Columbia, MD, and Emergency Planning Management of Stafford, VA, Swinerton Government Services of Arvada, CO, and R.E.M. Engineering Company, Inc. of Pasadena, CA.

By fostering an environment where veteran entrepreneurs can grow their businesses, we affirm our commitment to those who have sacrificed so much. I encourage VA to strengthen the growing Mentor-Protégé Program and look forward to working with them to achieve their goals.

RESPONSIBLE ELECTRONICS RECYCLING ACT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise to make remarks on the introduction of the Responsible Electronics Recycling Act. I would like to thank Senators SHERROD BROWN and LISA MURKOWSKI for joining me in this bipartisan effort, as well as the House sponsors, Representatives GENE GREEN, MIKE THOMPSON, STEVEN LATOURETTE, and LEE TERRY.

Significant amounts of U.S. electronic waste are currently exported to developing countries that handle the waste in an unsafe manner. Much of this waste contains toxic materials, such as lead and mercury, and the workers who disassemble and process the electronics use crude, unsafe methods that can lead to health problems. This legislation would put an end to these dangerous practices. The Responsible Electronics Recycling Act would restrict the export of electronic waste, help boost the U.S. recycling industry, and support efforts to domestically recover rare earth materials found in electronics.

The United States is the only developed country that has not ratified the Basel Convention, which prohibits exports of hazardous waste to developing countries. Under the convention, much of the U.S. exportation of electronic waste to developing countries is illegal under the laws of the receiving countries but unfortunately, these laws are poorly enforced.

If we recycled these materials in the U.S., it would create recycling jobs for U.S. workers. Companies recycling in the U.S. often operate under capacity because they cannot compete with the cheaper option of exporting electronic waste to developing countries. We should be processing this waste using U.S. workers, and many companies stand at the ready to begin recycling additional electronic waste.

Moreover, the dumping of used electronics in the developing world can come back to haunt us. Some countries have active underground markets for U.S. hard drives, contributing to identity theft, as documented in a 2009 Frontline investigation. Business Week reported in 2010 that used computer chips from old personal computers are fraudulently re-marked in China as ''military grade'' chips and sold to U.S. military suppliers. Given the risks to our armed forces from defective equipment, I have also introduced the Combating Military Counterfeits Act to enhance the ability of prosecutors to keep counterfeit goods out of the military supply chain.

One of the benefits of recycling electronic waste domestically is the potential to recover rare elements in the process. Rare earth materials are vital to a number of manufacturing processes, including for products such as hybrid car batteries and solar panels, yet prices have skyrocketed as global supply has tightened. According to the Department of Energy, recycled content from electronics could be a valuable secondary source of rare earth materials, but additional research is required on recovery techniques and collection of electronic waste. This act would establish the Rare Earth Materials Recycling Research Initiative at the Department of Energy to coordinate research into the recovery of rare earth materials used in electronics.

The Responsible Electronics Recycling Act would also address the health, environmental, and national security concerns by amending the Solid Waste Disposal Act to prohibit the export of electronic waste to developing countries, with certain exceptions. These exceptions include legitimate exports of tested and working equipment, warranty returns, and recalls. There is also a de minimis exception to allow the export of materials that have so little toxicity they would not pose a risk to human health or the environment. Exporting under the exceptions would require a license and notice to the Environmental Protection Agency. Additional restrictions apply to exports for warranties or recalls, including written consent from the receiving country. The act creates a criminal penalty for knowingly exporting electronic waste, and provides the EPA the authority to inspect establishments handling electronic waste.

Twenty-five States, including Rhode Island, have passed electronic waste recycling laws. States such as Rhode Island already seek to ensure that their downstream recyclers do not export the electronic waste but instead responsibly recycle it here in the U.S. But States can only do so much and a federal law is needed to restrict these harmful exports.

We are pleased to have the support of a number of electronics manufacturers and retailers, including Hewlett Packard, Dell, Apple, Samsung, and Best Buy. We are also pleased to have the endorsement of 29 recyclers representing 74 recycling operations in 34 states. The breadth of our coalition is a testament to the consensus that the harmful export of these products must stop.

With more and more Americans relying on new technologies and generating a growing amount of electronic waste each year, we must take steps to properly dispose of this material. This legislation will crack down on the dumping of electronic waste on developing countries, protect American consumers from counterfeit schemes and identity theft, and support the growth of electronic waste recycling jobs in Rhode Island and across the country.

REMEMBERING JOHN MACKEY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, Baltimore lost one of its most beloved adopted sons last night, former Baltimore Colt tight end John Mackey. John revolutionized the position and was the second tight end to be enshrined in the National Football League's, NFL, Hall of Fame. He became the first president of the NFL Players Association, NFLPA, after the NFL merged with the old American Football League. He was a tenacious and effective advocate for the players, bargaining for higher salaries and better benefits. He organized a 3-day strike early in his tenure that generated an additional $11 million in pensions and benefits. Mackey also filed and won an antitrust lawsuit against the NFL which eliminated the so-called ''Rozelle Rule'' and ultimately paved the way for players' union to secure full free agency for its members.

For the last 10 years, he suffered from dementia and had to move into an assisted living facility that cost much more than his pension. So he and his beloved wife Sylvia led the fight to convince the NFLPA and the NFL to establish the ''88 Plan,'' named for his uniform number, which provides adult day care and nursing home care for retired players suffering from dementia or Alzheimer's disease. Even in death, John continues to give: Sylvia has announced that his brain will be donated to a Boston University School of Medicine study of brain damage in athletes. Researchers at the university's Center for the Study of Traumatic Encephalopathy are examining potential links between repeated concussions and chronic traumatic encephalopathy, CTE, a condition which mirrors symptoms of dementia and Alzheimer's disease.

John Mackey grew up in Roosevelt, NY. He was a man of strong convictions, a character trait he inherited from his father, who was a Baptist minister. John was offered an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy but turned it down to attend Syracuse University, where he studied economics, became an All-American football player, and roomed with Ernie Davis, who became the first African American to win the Heisman Trophy. The Colts drafted him in 1963 and he caught more touchdown passes and gained more yards as a rookie than the team's two wide receivers, Hall of Famer Raymond Berry and Jimmy Orr. John was big and strong, like other tight ends of his era, but he could run after catching a pass like no other tight end before him. As Hall of Fame coach Don Shula said, ''Mackey gave us a tight end who weighed 230, ran a 4.6 and could catch the bomb. It was a weapon other teams didn't have.''

John was a three-time All-NFL selection. He played in five Pro Bowls. In 1969, while still playing, he made the NFL's 50th anniversary team as pro football's all-time tight end. Over the course of his career, he caught 38 touchdown passes, 13 of which were for 50 yards or more, including an 89-yarder against the Los Angeles Rams in 1966. That particular touchdown pass was the longest of the 290 scoring passes in Hall of Fame legend Johnny Unitas's career. In a 10-year career, John caught 331 passes for 5,236 yards. Perhaps the biggest and most memorable play in John's career came in the 1971 Super Bowl, when he caught a pass from Unitas that had been deflected by two other players—Colts receiver Eddie Hinton and Dallas Cowboys defender Mike Renfro—and scored a touchdown on the 75-yard play. The Colts went on to win that game in dramatic fashion on Jim O'Brien's field goal with 5 seconds left in the game.

By the time John retired, he had already endeared himself to the people of Baltimore, but he wasn't finished. He was elected to the Hall of Fame in 1992, but he refused to accept his ceremonial ring in Indianapolis, where the Colts had moved in 1984. He said, ''I will do it in Baltimore. That is where I played.'' And so he received his Hall of Fame ring in Memorial Stadium, at half-time of an exhibition game between Miami and New Orleans.

I send my deepest condolences to John's wife Sylvia, to whom he was married for 47 years; his son John Kevin Mackey of Atlanta; two daughters Lisa Mackey Hazel of Bowie and Laura Mackey Nattans of Baltimore; and John and Sylvia's six grandchildren. John Mackey has been taken from us much too soon, but what a life he lived. He was one of the greatest collegiate and professional football players of all time. The Mackey Award is given annually to the best tight end in college. He is enshrined in the Hall of Fame. He led the NFLPA and then courageously led the fight for retired players which culminated in the ''88 Plan.'' His accomplishments and legacy will endure in the hearts and minds of his fellow players and Baltimore Colts fans and football fans forever.

EPA RULING

• Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, the Environmental Protection Agency took steps to make the air in Vermont cleaner by issuing the final cross-State air pollution rule.

In Vermont, we pride ourselves on our bucolic views, unspoiled waterways, and our connection to the land. Yet, all of this is threatened by pollution that is beyond our control, and coming from beyond our borders. Vermont has always been a dumping ground, so to speak, for emissions from coal-fired powerplants from other States. Toxic pollution, generated in other parts of the country, blows into Vermont and damages our State's scenic beauty, decreases the value of conservation investments, and damages our forests, lakes, rivers, and wetlands.

These powerplant emissions and air pollution are transported long distances and not only mars our landscapes and threatens our health, but it also costs downwind States and businesses billions of dollars annually. Our only defense against such activity is the Federal Clean Air Act. Today, with the implementation of the EPA's cross-State air pollution rule, powerplants will be required to install new pollution controls that reduce the amount of dangerous emissions crossing State lines and entering Vermont. This will level the playing field by requiring powerplants to make long overdue investments in proven, readily available pollution control technologies that are already in place at many powerplants.

The cross-State air pollution rule requires many fossil fuel-fired powerplants to slash emissions that cross State lines and contribute to ground-level ozone and fine particle pollution in other States. These pollutants contribute to smog and air pollution which causes tens of thousands of Americans to become sick each year. Those most susceptible to illnesses related to poor air quality are often our most vulnerable citizens. The elderly and children, especially those already suffering from respiratory disorders like asthma, are routinely forced to stay inside on poor air quality days.

Pollution is also responsible for thousands of new respiratory illnesses each year, adding more unnecessary costs to our health care system. In fact, the reductions contained in this rule would prevent 14,000 to 36,000 premature deaths each year, 23,000 nonfatal heart attacks, 21,000 cases of acute bronchitis, 240,000 cases of aggravated asthma, and 1.9 million missed school and work days. The total benefits of this rule are estimated to be $120–290 billion.

Some believe these benefits are not worth the costs to industry. However, the cross-State air pollution rule is projected to cost industry from $10–30 billion, a very modest amount compared to the financial benefits and deaths prevented by this rule. In addition, a utility-funded report recently contradicted arguments that the rule will threaten U.S. electricity reliability. The reason for this is that a majority of utilities have already taken steps to adapt to Federal rules. In fact, over half of the country's coal-fired powerplants have already installed sulfur dioxide scrubbers or plan to install them. Of those that had plans to retire units, they are doing so because they are inefficient and cannot compete in today's market, not because of these rules.

In the end, only about one-fourth of the Nation's powerplants need to take action. Are we going to let these plants, which have dragged their feet, refusing to install new technology that would prevent pollution and prevent deaths and serious illness, continue to poison our air on the public's dime?

No, instead we should encourage the use of cleaner technologies that will lead to healthier air, increased efficiency, and a boost in jobs. Overall, regulations under the Clean Air Act have dramatically reduced air pollution while creating jobs and spurring American innovation in new industries and technology. Reports show the creation of 1.5 million jobs over the next 5 years and increased global exports of domestically produced clean technologies. History has demonstrated that since 1970, every dollar spent on compliance with the Clean Air Act has led to $4–$8 in economic benefits. By 2020, the total benefits of the Clean Air Act will reach $2 trillion.

Coming from a State with no coal-fired powerplants that has been on the receiving end of these pollutants for far too long, I fully welcome the final cross-State air pollution rule because I know that it will improve the quality of life for Vermonters who are subject to the impacts, and costs, of pollution from far beyond our borders. This rule is good for Vermont. It is good for the

country. The Clean Air Act has been cleaning our air for over four decades, while continuing to grow our economy. The final cross-State air pollution rule that was published today will encourage innovation and cost-savings and help powerplants achieve their mission of providing clean, affordable, and reliable energy. I am happy to see the EPA use this tool, given to it by Congress, to protect the people and the environment of Vermont and the rest of the country from pollution generated by distant industries.●

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING DAVID GETCHES

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, today I recognize the important contributions of David Getches, who died earlier this week. He leaves behind not only a family to whom he was intensely devoted, but also an impressive legacy of public service, scholarship, mentorship, and friendship.

Having served as both chairman and ranking member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, I am particularly appreciative of his remarkable scholarship and public service in the areas of natural resources law and policy. He was a prolific writer on water, public land, and Indian law and policy, and there are no doubt many dog-eared copies of his books and articles on those subjects in our committee files. He was called on to testify as an expert in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, and his insight and creativity on those issues have had a positive impact on the legislation and oversight that are the responsibility of our committee and others.

While his resume of government service is notable—including special consultant to Department of the Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt and director of the Colorado Department of Natural Resources—it does not reflect the countless hours of knowledge and wisdom that David freely shared with government officials and staff who regularly sought his counsel.

David was a dedicated teacher of many thousands of students at the University of Colorado School of Law and a mentor to two of our committee staff who have worked on water and public lands issues. He was returning to the faculty this summer after serving 8 years as dean of the School of Law.

David Getches distinguished himself throughout his career. But what I understand set him apart, was that, at the same time, he distinguished himself as a father to his three children Liza, Catie, and Matthew and as a husband to his wife Ann. They have our deep sympathy as they endure this loss. He is greatly missed.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:05 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 515. An act to reauthorize the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 515. An act to reauthorize the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 1340. A bill to cut, cap, and balance the Federal budget.

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–2408. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a semiannual report relative to Reserve component equipment delivery; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2409. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the implementation of the discretionary special compensation provided in section 603 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2410. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act that occurred within the Department of the Air Force and was assigned case number 08–07; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2411. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the Secretary of the Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a joint report entitled ''Implementation Proposal for the National Action Plan for Demand Response''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2412. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the activities of the U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA), Department of Commerce, for fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2413. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''West Virginia Regulatory Program'' (Docket No. WV–117–FOR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 6, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2414. 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 ''Partial Exchange of Annuity Contracts'' (Rev. Proc. 2011–38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 6, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2415. 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 ''Notice: Suspension of Reporting Requirements Under Sections 6038D and 1298(f)'' (Notice 2011–55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 6, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2416. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–79 ''Housing Production Trust Fund Dedicated Tax Appropriations Authorization Temporary Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2417. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–80 ''Housing Production Trust Fund Pollin Memorial Community Dedicated Tax Appropriations Authorization Temporary Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2418. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–81 ''Unemployment Compensation Extended Benefits Continuation Temporary Amendment Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2419. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–82 ''Brewery Manufacturer's Tasting Permit Temporary Amendment Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2420. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–89 ''Department of Forensic Sciences Establishment Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2421. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–90 ''Closing of Water Street, S.W., S.O. 10–15906, Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2422. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–91 ''Closing of Public Street adjacent to Square 4376 Act of 2011''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2423. A communication from the Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Automotive Fuel Ratings Certification and Posting'' (RIN3084–AB14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2424. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Materials: Revision to the List of Hazardous Substances and Reportable Quantities'' (RIN2137–AE74) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2425. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of

a rule entitled ''Marketing Meteorological Evaluation Towers'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2010–1326)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2426. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to Framework Adjustment 45 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan and Sector Annual Catch Entitlements; Updated Annual Catch Limits for Sectors and the Common Pool for Fishing Year 2011'' (RIN0648–BA27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2427. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Limited Access for Guided Sport Charter Vessels in Alaska'' (RIN0648–BA99) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2428. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Alaska Plaice in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XA482) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2429. 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; Bombardier, Inc. Model CL–600–2C10 (Regional Jet Series 700, 701, and 702), Model CL–600–2D15 (Regional Jet Series 705), and Model CL–600–2D24 (Regional Jet Series 900) Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0159)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2430. 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 737–100, –200, –200C, –300, –400, and –500 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0028)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2431. 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 727, 727C, 727–100, 727–100C, 727–200, and 727–200F Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2010–1272)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2432. 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; Robinson Helicopter Company Model (Robinson) R22, R22 Alpha, R22 Beta, R22 Mariner, R44, and R44 II Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0588)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2433. 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; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. Model 205A, 205A–1, 205B, 212, 412, 412CF and 412EP Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0561)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2434. 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; Eurocopter France Model SA–365C, SA–365C1, SA–365C2, SA365N, SA–365N1, AS–365N2, AS 365 N3, and SA–366G1 Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0551)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2435. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the proposed transfer of major defense equipment from the Government of Norway to the Government of Chile with an original acquisition cost of more than $25,000,000; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2436. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Management and Administration and Designated Reporting Official, Office on National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Director for Supply Reduction, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 6, 2011; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–55. A resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Miami-Dade County of the State of Florida urging Congress to refrain from eliminating funding for federal programs under the Workforce Investment Act, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 275. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for enhanced safety and environmental protection in pipeline transportation, to provide for enhanced reliability in the transportation of the Nation's energy products by pipeline, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 112–30).

By Mrs. MURRAY, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

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.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1336. A bill to prevent immigration fraud and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 1337. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend existing elective tax treatment for Alaska Native Settlement Trusts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 1338. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 31, United States Code, to establish the Office of Regulatory Integrity within the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 1339. A bill to provide for the compilation and reporting of participation data relating to Federal rulemaking; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. HATCH, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 1340. A bill to cut, cap, and balance the Federal budget; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COATS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. JOHANNS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. RISCH):

S. Res. 226. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President does not have the authority to ignore the statutory debt limit by ordering the Secretary of the Treasury to continue issuing debt on the full faith and credit of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WEBB (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. LUGAR):

S. Res. 227. A resolution calling for the protection of the Mekong River Basin and increased United States support for delaying the construction of mainstream dams along the Mekong River; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WEBB, and Mr. WARNER):

S. Res. 228. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding coming together as a Nation and ceasing all work or other activity for a moment of remembrance beginning at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time on September 11, 2011, in honor of the 10th anniversary of the terrorist attacks committed against the United States on September 11, 2001; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BENNET, Mr.

BEGICH, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. BOXER, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 229. A resolution recognizing the heroic efforts of firefighters to contain numerous wildfires that have affected thousands of people throughout the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 201

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 201, a bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the C.C. Cragin Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes.

S. 312

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 312, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits.

S. 344

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 344, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) 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 Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) 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. 497

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the requirements of the visa waiver program and for other purposes.

S. 504

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 504, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 571

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 571, a bill to amend subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to provide education for homeless children and youths, and for other purposes.

S. 585

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 585, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants for the support of full-service community schools, and for other purposes.

S. 641

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 641, a bill to provide 100,000,000 people with first-time access to safe drinking water and sanitation on a sustainable basis within six years by improving the capacity of the United States Government to fully implement the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005.

S. 726

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 726, a bill to rescind $45 billion of unobligated discretionary appropriations, and for other purposes.

S. 769

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) 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. 834

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) 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. 853

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 853, a bill to provide for financial literacy education.

S. 929

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 929, a bill to establish a comprehensive literacy program.

S. 951

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) 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. 968

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 968, a bill to prevent online threats to economic creativity and theft of intellectual property, and for other purposes.

S. 973

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 973, a bill to create the National Endowment for the Oceans to promote the protection and conservation of the United States ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes ecosystems, and for other purposes.

S. 1025

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) 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. 1240

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1240, a bill to support the establishment and operation of Teachers Professional Development Institutes.

S. 1261

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1261, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to deny retirement benefits accrued by an individual as a Member of Congress if such individual is convicted of certain offenses.

S. 1280

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1280, a bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to require sexual assault risk-reduction and response training, and the development of sexual assault protocol and guidelines, the establishment of victims advocates, the establishment of a Sexual Assault Advisory Council, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1280, supra.

S. 1281

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1281, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing two or more levels stacked on top of one another.

S. 1297

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1297, a bill to preserve State and institutional authority relating to State authorization and the definition of credit hour.

S. 1301

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1301, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2012 to 2015 for the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, to enhance measures to combat trafficking in person, and for other purposes.

S. 1313

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1313, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1317

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1317, a bill to allow individuals to choose to opt out of the Medicare part A benefit.

S. 1323

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1323, a bill to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) 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. RES. 80

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) 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. 175

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 175, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to ongoing violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Georgia and the importance of a peaceful and just resolution to the conflict within Georgia's internationally recognized borders.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1336. A bill to prevent immigration fraud and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Immigration Fraud Prevention Act of 2011. This legislation would provide a much-needed tool for prosecutors to use to combat the exploitative actions of fraudulent lawyers and consultants who take advantage of individuals seeking immigration assistance.

The Immigration Fraud Prevention Act would punish fraud and misrepresentation in the context of immigration proceedings. The act would create a new Federal crime to penalize those who engage in schemes to defraud immigrants.

Specifically, the act would make it a Federal crime to knowingly and falsely represent that an individual is an attorney or accredited representative authorized to represent aliens in immigration proceedings; and to knowingly defraud or receive money or anything of value from any person by false or fraudulent pretences, representations, or promises.

Violations of these crimes would result in a fine, imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both.

The bill would also work to combat immigration fraud by increasing the awareness of notario fraud to immigrants.

The bill would require immigration courts to provide immigrants in removal proceedings with information about notario fraud.

The bill would require the Justice Department to compile and make available to the public a list of individuals and organizations that have been convicted of immigration fraud; and permit only people who have, within a 12-month period, represented immigrants pro bono appear on the Justice Department's list of pro bono legal services.

By enacting this bill, Congress would help prevent more victims like Mr. Ibarra, a Mexican national and father of four, who has resided in Los Angeles since 1988. Mr. Ibarra hired a so-called ''immigration specialist'' and paid him over $7,500. In his apartment, Mr. Ibarra keeps reams of documents that the immigration consultant claimed to have filed on his behalf but never did—as Mr. Ibarra subsequently learned from immigration authorities when he was placed into removal proceedings. I wish I could tell you that this kind of egregious behavior is uncommon, but sadly, that is not the case.

Last November, the San Francisco City Attorney filed a lawsuit against a former lawyer who ran an illicit immigration law practice. In the three decades in which the lawyer was licensed to practice law, he was reported on numerous occasions to the California bar for his unethical behavior that included collecting exorbitant fees; representing clients in a negligent manner; and misleading immigrants with assurances of favorable outcomes.

Eventually, the lawyer resigned from the legal profession and was prohibited from representing clients before the Board of Immigration Appeals. The terms of his resignation prevented him from practicing law or portraying himself as eligible to practice law. Instead of abiding by these terms, the lawyer proceeded to set up another law practice through which he defrauded over two hundred immigrants, depleting many of these victims of their entire life savings.

I am pleased that last month the Federal Government partnered with State prosecutors and immigration advocacy organizations to launch a nationwide campaign to combat these harmful schemes. The enactment of this bill would enhance the government's ability to achieve the goals of this national campaign by providing prosecutors with a tough new Federal criminal law that could be used to convict fraudulent-lawyers and consultants who prey on immigrants.

Mr. President, I urge support for the Immigration Fraud Prevention Act of 2011.

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. 1336

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 ''Immigration Fraud Prevention Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. MISREPRESENTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

''§ 1041. Misrepresentation

''Any person who knowingly and falsely represents that such person is, or holds himself or herself out as, an attorney, an accredited representative, or any person authorized to represent any other person before any court or agency of the United States in any removal proceeding or any other case or matter arising under the immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17)) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.''.

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 1040 the following:

''Sec. 1041. Misrepresentation.''.

SEC. 3. IMMIGRATION SCHEMES TO DEFRAUD ALIENS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

''§ 1352. Immigration schemes to defraud aliens

''Any person who, in connection with any matter arising under the immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17)) or any matter the offender claims or represents to arise under such immigration laws, knowingly executes a scheme or artifice to—

''(1) defraud any person; or

''(2) obtain or receive money or anything else of value from any person by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises,

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.''.

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Sec. 1352. Immigration schemes to defraud aliens.''.

SEC. 4. LISTS OF COUNSEL FOR ALIENS.

Section 239(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) CURRENT LISTS OF COUNSEL.—The Attorney General shall compile and update, not less frequently than quarterly, lists of persons who, during the most recent 12 months, have provided pro bono representation of aliens in proceedings under section 240 that—

''(A) include a description of who may represent the alien in the proceedings, including a notice that immigration consultants, visa consultants, and other unauthorized individuals may not provide such representation; and

''(B) shall be provided in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(E) and otherwise made generally available.''.

SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON REPRESENTATION.

Section 239(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) LIST OF PROHIBITIONS.—The Attorney General shall—

''(A) compile a list of specific individuals, organizations, and practices that the Attorney General has determined are prohibited in the provision of representation in immigration proceedings, including individuals who have been convicted for a violation of section 1041 or 1352 of title 18, United States Code;

''(B) update the list compiled pursuant to subparagraph (A) not less frequently than quarterly; and

''(C) make such list available to the general public.''.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 1338. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 31, United States Code, to establish the Office of Regulatory Integrity within the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise to speak about two bills that I am introducing today to address a serious and persistent threat to the integrity of our government: regulatory capture.

Over the last 50 years, Congress has tasked an alphabet soup of regulatory agencies to administer our laws through rule-making, adjudication, and enforcement. Protecting the proper functioning of these regulatory agencies has led me to the topic of regulatory capture. I held a hearing on the subject last year in the Senate Judiciary Committee and now am filing two bills that will make our government more resistant to the ever-growing power of special interests. I urge my colleagues to join me in passing these important good-government measures.

At bottom, regulatory capture is a threat to democratic government. ''We the People'' pass laws through a democratic and open process. Powerful interests then seek to ''capture'' the regulatory agencies that enforce those laws so that they can avoid their intended effect, turning laws passed to protect the public interest into regulations and enforcement practices that benefit limited private interests.

This concept of ''regulatory capture'' is well-established in regulatory and economic theory.

In 1913, Woodrow Wilson wrote this: ''If the government is to tell big business men how to run their business, then don't you see that big business men . . . must capture the government, in order not to be restrained too much by it?''

The first dean of the Woodrow Wilson School, Marver Bernstein, wrote that a regulatory commission will tend over time to ''become more concerned with the general health of the industry,'' and try ''to prevent changes which will adversely affect'' the industry. This, he said, ''is a problem of ethics and morality as well as administrative method''; ''a blow to democratic government and responsible political institutions.'' Ultimately he said it leads to ''surrender'': ''The commission finally becomes a captive of the regulated groups.''

Regulatory capture has been the subject of work by Nobel laureate George Stigler in his article ''The Theory of Economic Regulation.'' Students of administrative law know how well established the doctrine of ''regulatory capture'' or ''agency capture'' is in that field.

Last year, a senior fellow at the Cato Institute wrote in the Wall Street Journal about ''a striking example of regulatory capture.'' He described the phenomenon this way: ''Agencies tasked with protecting the public interest come to identify with the regulated industry and protect its interests against that of the public. The result: Government fails to protect the public.'' His example was the Minerals Management Service, in relation to the BP oil spill.

The failures of MMS in the lead up to the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, the cozy relationship between MMS officials and industry executives, and the shameful behavior of some MMS employees are archetypal symptoms of regulatory capture. But the report of the commission on the Gulf oil spill never mentioned ''regulatory capture.''

That is a pretty strong signal that regulatory capture isn't getting the attention it deserves.

When you think about the century-long academic and policy debate about regulatory capture, and when you look at the cost of recent disasters in areas regulated by the Minerals Management Service, the Mine Safety and Health Administration, and the Securities Exchange Commission, it seems pretty evident that Congress should be concerned not only about those prior incidents, but about addressing the threat of future regulatory capture. The experts I have spoken with in my home state of Rhode Island certainly understand that regulatory capture matters. They don't want a captured agency to allow the next oil spill or other man-made disaster to happen in our state, or for a financial agency to allow speculators to wipe out the savings of our citizens. Surely constituents of each of the members of this body would agree whole-heartedly.

That is why I am introducing two pieces of legislation today.

The first bill is called the Regulatory Capture Prevention Act. It would create an office within the Office of Management and Budget with the authority to investigate and report regulatory capture. The office would ensure that abuses were not overlooked, and sound the alarm if a regulatory agency were overwhelmed by a more sophisticated and better-resourced regulated industry. Scrutiny and publicity are powerful tools for protecting the integrity of our regulatory agencies. This bill would employ them to prevent powerful interests from coopting our laws.

The second bill is called the Regulatory Information Reporting Act. It would shed extra sunlight into regulatory agencies by requiring them to report to a public Web site the following: first, the name and affiliation of each party that comments on an agency regulation; second, whether that party affected the regulatory process; and finally, whether that party is an economic, noneconomic, or citizen interest. By centralizing this information for public and congressional scrutiny, the bill would create a simple dashboard for hints of regulatory capture in agency rulemaking.

As the Senate considers these bills, we should remember how much agreement exists about regulatory capture. During the hearing I chaired on regulatory capture last year, all of the witnesses, from across the ideological spectrum, agreed on each of the following 7 propositions. First, regulatory capture is a real phenomenon and a threat to the integrity of government. Second, regulated entities have a concentrated incentive to gain as much influence as possible over regulators, opposed by a diffuse public interest. Third, regulated industries ordinarily have substantial organizational and resource advantages in the regulatory process when compared to public interest groups. Fourth, some regulatory processes lend themselves to gaming by regulated entities seeking undue control over regulation. Fifth, regulatory capture by its nature happens in the dark—done as quietly as possible; no industry puts up a flag announcing its capture of a regulatory agency. Sixth, the potential damage from regulatory capture is enormous. Finally, effective congressional oversight is key to keeping regulators focused on the public interest.

With that as a starting point, I am hopeful that the Senate can agree on legislation to address this very real problem. Administrative law may not be the most glamorous subject, but I hope to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to eliminate regulatory capture.

This is so important because for as long as there are regulatory agencies, regulated industries, and money, there will be efforts at regulatory capture. We owe it to our country to do everything possible to defeat such efforts to capture our government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 226—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE PRESIDENT DOES NOT HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO IGNORE THE STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT BY ORDERING THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TO CONTINUE ISSUING DEBT ON THE FULL FAITH AND CREDIT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COATS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. JOHANNS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. RISCH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 226

Whereas clause 2 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States gives Congress the power ''[t]o borrow Money on the credit of the United States'';

Whereas the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States says, ''The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned.'';

Whereas Congress has historically limited the Federal debt, either by specifically authorizing the issuance of new debt instruments, or through imposing an aggregate limit on Federal debt;

Whereas the statutory debt limit was established by an Act of Congress and signed into law by the President in 1982; and

Whereas the debt subject to limit has been increased through an Act of Congress and Presidential signature 38 times since 1982: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the Sense of the Senate that the President does not have the authority to ignore the statutory debt limit by ordering the Secretary of the Treasury to continue issuing debt on the full faith and credit of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 227—CALLING FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MEKONG RIVER BASIN AND INCREASED UNITED STATES SUPPORT FOR DELAYING THE CONSTRUCTION OF MAINSTREAM DAMS ALONG THE MEKONG RIVER

Mr. WEBB (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. LUGAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 227

Whereas the Mekong River is the world's 12th longest river, originating on the Tibetan Plateau and flowing nearly 3,000 miles down through China into Burma, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam;

Whereas the Lower Mekong River in Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam is a source of fresh water, food, and economic opportunity for more than 60,000,000 people;

Whereas the Mekong River is second in biodiversity only to the Amazon River, with an estimated 1,500 different species of fish, of which at least a third migrate up the river and tributaries in their life cycle, including the majority of the commercial fish catch;

Whereas the Mekong River supports the world's two largest rice exporters, Thailand and Vietnam, as well as the world's largest inland fishery of 4,000,000 tons of freshwater fish per year, providing up to $9,000,000,000 annual income and approximately 80 percent of the animal protein consumed in the Lower Mekong Basin;

Whereas China is constructing a cascade of up to 15 dams along the mainstream of the Upper Mekong River, and Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam are planning to construct or finance the construction of up to 11 dams on the lower half of the river's mainstream;

Whereas scientific studies have cautioned that mainstream dam construction will negatively affect the river's water flow, fish population, and wildlife;

Whereas the Mekong River Commission is a river basin management organization including the governments of Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam that have signed the Agreement on the Cooperation for the Sustainable Development of the Mekong River Basin, done at Chiang Rai, Thailand, April 5, 1995, and agreed to cooperate on management of the river and ''development of the full potential of sustainable benefits to all riparian States'';

Whereas the members of the Commission have also agreed to ''make every effort to avoid, minimize and mitigate harmful effects that might occur to the environment, especially the water quantity and quality, the aquatic (eco-system) conditions, and ecological balance of the river system, from the development and use of the Mekong River Basin water resources or discharge of wastes and return flows'';

Whereas the Mekong River Commission sponsored a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the proposed series of mainstream dams along the Lower Mekong River, concluding that the decision to move forward with even one dam would result in permanent and irreversible changes to the river's productivity and regional environment;

Whereas such changes could threaten the region's food security, block fish migration routes, increase risks to aquatic biodiversity, reduce sediment flows, increase saline intrusion, reduce agricultural production, and destabilize the river channels and coastline along the Mekong Delta;

Whereas the United States has significant economic and strategic interests in the Mekong River subregion that may be jeopardized if the construction of mainstream dams places the region's stability at risk;

Whereas the Department of State initiated the Lower Mekong Initiative in July 2009 to engage Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam on water security issues, to build regional capacity, and to facilitate multilateral cooperation on effective water resources management;

Whereas funding for the Lower Mekong Initiative has primarily focused on the environment, health, and education, leaving the fourth pillar—infrastructure—largely unfunded;

Whereas attention to infrastructure development is a critical element of promoting the sustainable, coordinated construction of hydropower dams in the region;

Whereas, on September 22, 2010, Laos submitted for review to the Mekong River Commission the proposal for the Xayaburi Dam, the first of nine mainstream dams planned by Laos along the Lower Mekong River;

Whereas, on April 19, 2011, the Mekong River Commission's Joint Committee representatives met to discuss the Xayaburi project without reaching consensus on whether the project should proceed, but agreed during the meeting to table the decision and consider it at a later date at a higher, ministerial level; and

Whereas, on May 8, 2011, the Government of Laos agreed to temporarily suspend work on the Xayaburi dam and announced plans to conduct further environmental assessments on the project in response to regional concerns: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) calls on United States representatives at multilateral development banks to use the voice and vote of the United States to support strict adherence to international environmental standards for any financial assistance to hydropower dam projects on the mainstream of the Mekong River;

(2) encourages greater United States engagement with the Mekong River countries through the Lower Mekong Initiative and increased support for sustainable infrastructure and water security in Southeast Asia;

(3) calls on the United States Government in leading the Lower Mekong Initiative to devote greater attention to and funding for capacity building projects on infrastructure and to assist in identifying sustainable economic, water, and energy alternatives to mainstream hydropower dams on the Mekong River;

(4) applauds the decision of the Mekong River Commission to delay endorsement of the Xayaburi Dam;

(5) supports further delay of the construction of mainstream hydropower dams along the Mekong River until the studies by the Government of Laos have been completed and adequate planning and multilateral coordination can be guaranteed;

(6) encourages members of the Mekong River Commission to adhere to the prior consultation process for dam construction under the Commission's Procedures for Notification, Prior Consultation and Agreement;

(7) calls on all riparian states along the Mekong River, including China, to respect the rights of other river basin countries and take into account any objection or concerns regarding the construction of hydropower dams;

(8) calls on the Governments of Burma and China to improve cooperation with the Mekong River Commission and information sharing on water flows and engage in regional decision making processes on the development and use of the Mekong River; and

(9) supports assistance to the Lower Mekong River riparian states to gather data and analyze the impacts of proposed development along the river.

SENATE RESOLUTION 228—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING COMING TOGETHER AS A NATION AND CEASING ALL WORK OR OTHER ACTIVITY FOR A MOMENT OF REMEMBRANCE BEGINNING AT 1:00 PM EASTERN DAYLIGHT TIME ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2011, IN HONOR OF THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TERRORIST ATTACKS COMMITTED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WEBB, and Mr. WARNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 228

Whereas at 8:46 AM, on September 11, 2001, hijacked American Airlines Flight 11 crashed into the upper portion of the North Tower of the World Trade Center in New York City, New York;

Whereas 17 minutes later, at 9:03 AM, hijacked United Airlines Flight 175 crashed into the South Tower of the World Trade Center;

Whereas at 9:37 AM, the west wall of the Pentagon was hit by hijacked American Airlines Flight 77, the impact of which caused immediate and catastrophic damage to the headquarters of the Department of Defense;

Whereas at approximately 10:00 AM, the passengers and crew of hijacked United Airlines Flight 93 acted heroically to retake control of the airplane and thwart the taking of additional American lives by crashing the airliner in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, and, in doing so, gave their lives to save countless others;

Whereas nearly 3,000 innocent civilians were killed in the heinous attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas tens of thousands of individuals narrowly escaped the attacks at the Pentagon and World Trade Center and, as witnesses to this tragedy, are forever changed;

Whereas countless fire departments, police departments, first responders, governmental officials, workers, emergency medical personnel, and volunteers responded immediately and heroically to those horrific events;

Whereas the Fire Department of New York suffered 343 fatalities on September 11, 2001, the largest loss of life of any emergency response agency in United States history;

Whereas the Port Authority Police Department suffered 37 fatalities in the attacks, the largest loss of life of any police force in United States history in a single day;

Whereas the New York Police Department suffered 23 fatalities as a result of the terrorist attacks;

Whereas the impact of that day on public health continues through 2011, as nearly 90,000 people are at risk of or suffering from negative health effects as a result of the events of September 11, 2001, including 14,000 workers and 2,400 community residents who are sick, and tens of thousands of others whose health is being monitored;

Whereas 10 years later, the people of the United States and people around the world continue to mourn the tremendous loss of innocent life on that fateful day;

Whereas 10 years later, thousands of men and women in the United States Armed Forces remain in harm's way defending the United States against those who seek to threaten the United States;

Whereas on the 10th anniversary of this tragic day, the thoughts of the people of the United States are with all of the victims of the events of September 11, 2001 and their families;

Whereas the lives of Americans were changed forever on September 11, 2001, when events threatened the American way of life;

Whereas in 2009, Congress and the President joined together to designate September 11 as a National Day of Service and Remembrance under the Serve America Act (Public Law 111–13; 123 Stat. 1460);

Whereas in September 2009 and 2010, President Obama issued Proclamation 8413 (74 Fed. Reg. 47045) and Proclamation 8559 (75 Fed. Reg. 56463) proclaiming September 11, 2009, and September 11, 2010, respectively, as Patriot Day and National Day of Service and Remembrance; and

Whereas September 11 will never, and should never, be just another day in the hearts and minds of all people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes September 11, 2011, as a day of solemn commemoration of the events of September 11, 2001, and a day to come together as a Nation;

(2) offers its deepest and most sincere condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of the innocent victims of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks;

(3) honors the heroic service, actions, and sacrifices of first responders, law enforcement personnel, State and local officials, volunteers, and countless others who aided the innocent victims of those attacks and, in doing so, bravely risked and often gave their own lives;

(4) recognizes the valiant service, actions, and sacrifices of United States personnel, including members of the United States Armed Forces, the United States intelligence agencies, the United States diplomatic service, homeland security and law enforcement personnel, and their families, who have given so much, including their lives and well-being, to support the cause of freedom and defend the security of the United States;

(5) reaffirms that the people of the United States will never forget the challenges our country endured on and since September 11, 2001, and will work tirelessly to defeat those who attacked the United States; and

(6) on the 10th anniversary of this tragic day in United States history—

(A) calls upon all of the people and institutions of the United States to observe a moment of remembrance on September 11, 2011, including—

(i) media outlets;

(ii) houses of worship;

(iii) military organizations;

(iv) veterans organizations;

(v) airlines;

(vi) airports;

(vii) railroads;

(viii) sports teams;

(ix) the Federal Government;

(x) State and local governments;

(xi) police, fire, and other public institutions;

(xii) educational institutions;

(xiii) businesses; and

(xiv) other public and private institutions; and

(B) encourages the observance of the moment of remembrance to last for 1 minute beginning at 1:00 PM Eastern Daylight Time by, to the maximum extent practicable—

(i) ceasing all work or other activity; and

(ii) marking the moment in an appropriate manner, including by ringing bells, blowing whistles, or sounding sirens.

SENATE RESOLUTION 229—RECOGNIZING THE HEROIC EFFORTS OF FIREFIGHTERS TO CONTAIN NUMEROUS WILDFIRES THAT HAVE AFFECTED THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. BOXER, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 229

Whereas every State in the United States has been affected by wildfire in 2011;

Whereas firefighters and residents have had to contend with extreme and erratic fire behavior and rapid rates of fire spread;

Whereas, as of June 12, 2011, more than 32,189 wildfires have burned more than 4,700,000 acres of land, which represents more acres burned than in all of 2010 and approximately 600,000 more acres than the 50-year average of total acres burned in the United States in an entire year;

Whereas, as of June 12, 2011—

(1) the Southwestern States have reported more than 1,600 fires that have burned more than 1,700,000 acres;

(2) the Southern States have reported more than 27,000 fires that have burned more than 2,400,000 acres;

(3) the Northern and Central Rocky Mountain States have reported 818 fires that have burned more than 250,000 acres;

(4) the State of California and Great Basin Region have reported more than 7,200 fires that have burned more than 21,000 acres;

(5) the Northwestern States and Alaska have reported more than 400 fires that have burned more than 260,000 acres; and

(6) the Eastern States have reported more than 3,500 fires that have burned more than 41,000 acres;

Whereas, as of June 29, 2011, firefighters and personnel from the Federal, State, and county levels have responded overwhelmingly to battle wildfires throughout the United States, filling more than 95,600 requests for firefighter crew members; and

Whereas the brave men and women who answered the calls for assistance have worked to minimize the displacement of thousands of residents and to protect against loss of life and property: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the heroic efforts of firefighters to contain wildfires and protect lives, homes, natural resources, and rural economies throughout the United States;

(2) encourages the people and government officials of the United States to express their appreciation to the brave men and women serving in the firefighting services throughout the United States;

(3) encourages the people and communities of the United States to be diligent in preventing and preparing for wildfires; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to keep in their thoughts those who have experienced loss as a result of wildfire.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 524. Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1323, to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 525. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1323, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 526. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1323, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 524. Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1323, to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. __. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PROTECTING SMALL BUSINESS FROM ADDITIONAL TAX BURDENS.

It is the sense of the Senate that small businesses, as defined by the Small Business Administration, should be exempt from any net tax increase that is proposed or included in legislation that raises the statutory borrowing authority of the United States.

SA 525. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1323, to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ___—REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY SPENDING

SECTION ___1. SHORT TITLE AND PURPOSES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the ''Reduce Unnecessary Spending Act of 2011''.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to create an optional fast-track procedure the President may use when submitting rescission requests, which would lead to an up-or-down vote by Congress on the President's package of rescissions, without amendment.

SEC. ___2. RESCISSIONS OF FUNDING.

The Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by striking part C and inserting the following:

"PART C—EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED RESCISSIONS

"SEC. 1021. APPLICABILITY AND DISCLAIMER.

''The rules, procedures, requirements, and definitions in this part apply only to executive and legislative actions explicitly taken under this part. They do not apply to actions taken under part B or to other executive and legislative actions not taken under this part.

"SEC. 1022. DEFINITIONS.

''In this part:

''(1) The terms 'appropriations Act', 'budget authority', and 'new budget authority' have the same meanings as in section 3 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

''(2) The terms 'account', 'current year', 'CBO', and 'OMB' have the same meanings as in section 250 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 as in effect on September 30, 2002.

''(3) The term 'days of session' shall be calculated by excluding weekends and national holidays. Any day during which a chamber of Congress is not in session shall not be counted as a day of session of that chamber. Any day during which neither chamber is in session shall not be counted as a day of session of Congress.

''(4) The term 'entitlement law' means the statutory mandate or requirement of the United States to incur a financial obligation unless that obligation is explicitly conditioned on the appropriation in subsequent legislation of sufficient funds for that purpose, and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

''(5) The term 'funding' refers to new budget authority and obligation limits except to the extent that the funding is provided for entitlement law.

''(6) The term 'rescind' means to eliminate or reduce the amount of enacted funding.

''(7) The terms 'withhold' and 'withholding' apply to any executive action or inaction that precludes the obligation of funding at a time when it would otherwise have been available to an agency for obligation. The terms do not include administrative or preparatory actions undertaken prior to obligation in the normal course of implementing budget laws.

"SEC. 1023. TIMING AND PACKAGING OF RESCISSION REQUESTS.

''(a) TIMING.—If the President proposes that Congress rescind funding under the procedures in this part, OMB shall transmit a message to Congress containing the information specified in section 1024, and the message transmitting the proposal shall be sent to Congress not later than 45 calendar days after the date of enactment of the funding.

''(b) PACKAGING AND TRANSMITTAL OF REQUESTED RESCISSIONS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), for each piece of legislation that provides funding, the President shall request at most 1 package of rescissions and the rescissions in that package shall apply only to funding contained in that legislation. OMB shall deliver each message requesting a package of rescissions to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House is not in session. OMB shall make a copy of the transmittal message publicly available, and shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of the message and information on how it can be obtained.

''(c) SPECIAL PACKAGING RULES.—After enactment of—

''(1) a joint resolution making continuing appropriations;

''(2) a supplemental appropriations bill; or

''(3) an omnibus appropriations bill;

covering some or all of the activities customarily funded in more than 1 regular appropriations bill, the President may propose as many as 2 packages rescinding funding contained in that legislation, each within the 45-day period specified in subsection (a). OMB shall not include the same rescission in both packages, and, if the President requests the rescission of more than one discrete amount of funding under the jurisdiction of a single subcommittee, OMB shall include each of those discrete amounts in the same package.

"SEC. 1024. REQUESTS TO RESCIND FUNDING.

''For each request to rescind funding under this part, the transmittal message shall—

''(1) specify—

''(A) the dollar amount to be rescinded;

''(B) the agency, bureau, and account from which the rescission shall occur;

''(C) the program, project, or activity within the account (if applicable) from which the rescission shall occur;

''(D) the amount of funding, if any, that would remain for the account, program, project, or activity if the rescission request is enacted; and

''(E) the reasons the President requests the rescission;

''(2) designate each separate rescission request by number; and

''(3) include proposed legislative language to accomplish the requested rescissions which may not include—

''(A) any changes in existing law, other than the rescission of funding; or

''(B) any supplemental appropriations, transfers, or reprogrammings.

"SEC. 1025. GRANTS OF AND LIMITATIONS ON PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY.

''(a) PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY TO WITHHOLD FUNDING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and if the President proposes a rescission of funding under this part, OMB may, subject to the time limits provided in subsection (c), temporarily withhold that funding from obligation.

''(b) EXPEDITED PROCEDURES AVAILABLE ONLY ONCE PER BILL.—The President may not invoke the procedures of this part, or the authority to withhold funding granted by subsection (a), on more than 1 occasion for any Act providing funding.

''(c) TIME LIMITS.—OMB shall make available for obligation any funding withheld under subsection (a) on the earliest of—

''(1) the day on which the President determines that the continued withholding or reduction no longer advances the purpose of legislative consideration of the rescission request;

''(2) starting from the day on which OMB transmitted a message to Congress requesting the rescission of funding, 25 calendar days in which the House of Representatives has been in session or 25 calendar days in which the Senate has been in session, whichever occurs second; or

''(3) the last day after which the obligation of the funding in question can no longer be fully accomplished in a prudent manner before its expiration.

''(d) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Funds that are rescinded under this part shall be dedicated only to reducing the deficit or increasing the surplus.

''(2) ADJUSTMENT OF LEVELS IN THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET.—Not later than 5 days after the date of enactment of an approval bill as provided under this part, the chairs of the Committees on the Budget of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall revise allocations and aggregates and other appropriate levels under the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget to reflect the repeal or cancellation, and the applicable committees shall report revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b), as appropriate.

"SEC. 1026. CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF RESCISSION REQUESTS.

''(a) PREPARATION OF LEGISLATION TO CONSIDER A PACKAGE OF EXPEDITED RESCISSION REQUESTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the House of Representatives receives a package of expedited rescission requests, the Clerk shall prepare a House bill that only rescinds the amounts requested which shall read as follows:

'' 'There are enacted the rescissions numbered [insert number or numbers] as set forth in the Presidential message of [insert date] transmitted under part C of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 as amended.'

''(2) EXCLUSION PROCEDURE.—The Clerk shall include in the bill each numbered rescission request listed in the Presidential package in question, except that the Clerk shall omit a numbered rescission request if the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House, after consulting with the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate, CBO, GAO, and the House and Senate committees that have jurisdiction over the funding, determines that the numbered rescission does not refer to funding or includes matter not permitted under a request to rescind funding.

''(b) INTRODUCTION AND REFERRAL OF LEGISLATION TO ENACT A PACKAGE OF EXPEDITED

RESCISSIONS.—The majority leader or the minority leader of the House or Representatives, or a designee, shall (by request) introduce each bill prepared under subsection (a) not later than 4 days of session of the House after its transmittal, or, if no such bill is introduced within that period, any member of the House may introduce the required bill in the required form on the fifth or sixth day of session of the House after its transmittal. If such an expedited rescission bill is introduced in accordance with the preceding sentence, it shall be referred to the House committee of jurisdiction. A copy of the introduced House bill shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate, who shall provide it to the Senate committee of jurisdiction.

''(c) HOUSE REPORT AND CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION TO ENACT A PACKAGE OF EXPEDITED RESCISSIONS.—The House committee of jurisdiction shall report without amendment the bill referred to it under subsection (b) not more than 5 days of session of the House after the referral. The committee may order the bill reported favorably, unfavorably, or without recommendation. If the committee has not reported the bill by the end of the 5-day period, the committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the bill and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

''(d) HOUSE MOTION TO PROCEED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—After a bill to enact an expedited rescission package has been reported or the committee of jurisdiction has been discharged under subsection (c), it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the bill in the House. A Member who wishes to move to proceed to consideration of the bill shall announce that fact, and the motion to proceed shall be in order only during a time designated by the Speaker within the legislative schedule for the next calendar day of legislative session or the one immediately following it.

''(2) FAILURE TO SET TIME.—If the Speaker does not designate a time under paragraph (1), 3 or more calendar days of legislative session after the bill has been reported or discharged, it shall be in order for any Member to move to proceed to consider the bill.

''(3) PROCEDURE.—A motion to proceed under this subsection shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a prior motion to proceed with respect to that package of expedited rescissions. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to proceed, without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion to proceed has been disposed of shall not be in order.

''(4) REMOVAL FROM CALENDAR.—If 5 calendar days of legislative session have passed since the bill was reported or discharged under this subsection and no Member has made a motion to proceed, the bill shall be removed from the calendar.

''(e) HOUSE CONSIDERATION.—

''(1) CONSIDERED AS READ.—A bill consisting of a package of rescissions under this part shall be considered as read.

''(2) POINTS OF ORDER.—All points of order against the bill are waived, except that a point of order may be made that 1 or more numbered rescissions included in the bill would enact language containing matter not requested by the President or not permitted under this part as part of that package. If the Presiding Officer sustains such a point of order, the numbered rescission or rescissions that would enact such language are deemed to be automatically stripped from the bill and consideration proceeds on the bill as modified.

''(3) PREVIOUS QUESTION.—The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to its passage without intervening motion, except that 4 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent are allowed, as well as 1 motion to further limit debate on the bill.

''(4) MOTION TO RECONSIDER.—A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the bill shall not be in order.

''(f) SENATE CONSIDERATION.—

''(1) REFERRAL.—If the House of Representatives approves a House bill enacting a package of rescissions, that bill as passed by the House shall be sent to the Senate and referred to the Senate committee of jurisdiction.

''(2) COMMITTEE ACTION.—The committee of jurisdiction shall report without amendment the bill referred to it under this subsection not later than 3 days of session of the Senate after the referral. The committee may order the bill reported favorably, unfavorably, or without recommendation.

''(3) DISCHARGE.—If the committee has not reported the bill by the end of the 3-day period, the committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the bill and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

''(4) MOTION TO PROCEED.—On the following day and for 3 subsequent calendar days in which the Senate is in session, it shall be in order for any Senator to move to proceed to consider the bill in the Senate. Upon such a motion being made, it shall be deemed to have been agreed to and the motion to reconsider shall be deemed to have been laid on the table.

''(5) DEBATE.—Debate on the bill in the Senate under this subsection, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall not exceed 10 hours, equally divided and controlled in the usual form. Debate in the Senate on any debatable motion or appeal in connection with such a bill shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled in the usual form. A motion to further limit debate on such a bill is not debatable.

''(6) MOTIONS NOT IN ORDER.—A motion to amend such a bill or strike a provision from it is not in order. A motion to recommit such a bill is not in order.

''(g) SENATE POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order under this part for the Senate to consider a bill approved by the House enacting a package of rescissions under this part if any numbered rescission in the bill would enact matter not requested by the President or not permitted under this Act as part of that package. If a point of order under this subsection is sustained, the bill may not be considered under this part.''.

SEC. ___3. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—Section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by striking the matter for part C of title X and inserting the following:

''PART C—EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED RESCISSIONS

''Sec. 1021. Applicability and disclaimer.
''Sec. 1022. Definitions.
''Sec. 1023. Timing and packaging of rescission requests.
''Sec. 1024. Requests to rescind funding.
''Sec. 1025. Grants of and limitations on presidential authority.
''Sec. 1026. Congressional consideration of rescission requests.''.

(b) TEMPORARY WITHHOLDING.—Section 1013(c) of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by striking ''section 1012'' and inserting ''section 1012 or section 1025''.

(c) RULEMAKING.—

(1) 904(a).—Section 904(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by striking ''and 1017'' and inserting ''1017, and 1026''.

(2) 904(d)(1).—Section 904(d)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by striking ''1017'' and inserting ''1017 or 1026''.

SEC. ___4. AMENDMENTS TO PART A OF THE IMPOUNDMENT CONTROL ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part A of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by inserting at the end the following:

''SEC. 1002. SEVERABILITY.

''If the judicial branch of the United States finally determines that 1 or more of the provisions of parts B or C violate the Constitution of the United States, the remaining provisions of those parts shall continue in effect.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—Section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by inserting at the end of the matter for part A of title X the following:

''Sec. 1002. Severability.''.

SEC. ___5. EXPIRATION.

Part C of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (as amended by this Act) shall expire on December 31, 2015.

SA 526. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1323, to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—DEBT BUY-DOWN

SECTION 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Debt Buy-Down Act''.

SEC. 202. DESIGNATION OF AMOUNTS FOR REDUCTION OF PUBLIC DEBT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to returns and records) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

''PART IX—DESIGNATION FOR REDUCTION OF PUBLIC DEBT

''Sec. 6097. Designation.

''SEC. 6097. DESIGNATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Every individual with adjusted income tax liability for any taxable year may designate that a portion of such liability (not to exceed 10 percent thereof) shall be used to reduce the public debt.

''(b) MANNER AND TIME OF DESIGNATION.—A designation under subsection (a) may be made with respect to any taxable year only at the time of filing the return of tax imposed by chapter 1 for the taxable year. The designation shall be made on the first page of the return or on the page bearing the taxpayer's signature.

''(c) ADJUSTED INCOME TAX LIABILITY.—For purposes of this section, the adjusted income tax liability of an individual for any taxable year is the income tax liability of the individual for the taxable year determined under section 6096(b), reduced by any amount designated under section 6096(a).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts for such subchapter A is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''PART IX. DESIGNATION FOR REDUCTION OF PUBLIC DEBT''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 203. PUBLIC DEBT REDUCTION TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to trust fund code) is amended by adding at the end the following section:

''SEC. 9511. PUBLIC DEBT REDUCTION TRUST FUND.

''(a) CREATION OF TRUST FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United

States a trust fund to be known as the 'Public Debt Reduction Trust Fund', consisting of any amount appropriated or credited to the Trust Fund as provided in this section or section 9602(b).

''(b) TRANSFERS TO TRUST FUND.—There are hereby appropriated to the Public Debt Reduction Trust Fund amounts equivalent to the amounts designated under section 6097 (relating to designation for public debt reduction).

''(c) EXPENDITURES.—Amounts in the Public Debt Reduction Trust Fund shall be used by the Secretary for purposes of paying at maturity, or to redeem or buy before maturity, any obligation of the Federal Government included in the public debt (other than an obligation held by the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund or the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund). Any obligation which is paid, redeemed, or bought with amounts from the Public Debt Reduction Trust Fund shall be canceled and retired and may not be reissued.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 9511. Public Debt Reduction Trust Fund.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts received after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. TAXPAYER-GENERATED SEQUESTRATION OF FEDERAL SPENDING TO REDUCE THE PUBLIC DEBT.

(a) SEQUESTRATION TO REDUCE THE PUBLIC DEBT.—Part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after section 253 the following new section:

''SEC. 253A. SEQUESTRATION TO REDUCE THE PUBLIC DEBT.

''(a) SEQUESTRATION.—Notwithstanding sections 255 and 256, within 15 days after Congress adjourns to end a session, and on the same day as sequestration (if any) under sections 251, 252, and 253, and under section 5(b) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, but after any sequestration required by those sections, there shall be a sequestration equivalent to the estimated aggregate amount designated under section 6097 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for the last taxable year ending one year before the beginning of that session of Congress, as estimated by the Department of the Treasury on October 1 and as modified by the total of—

''(1) any amounts by which net discretionary spending is reduced by legislation below the discretionary spending limits enacted after the enactment of this section related to the fiscal year subject to the sequestration (or, in the absence of such limits, any net deficit change from the baseline amount calculated under section 257; and

''(2) the net deficit change that has resulted from all direct spending legislation enacted after the enactment of this section related to the fiscal year subject to the sequestration, as estimated by OMB.

If the reduction in spending under paragraphs (1) and (2) for a fiscal year is greater than the estimated aggregate amount designated under section 6097 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 respecting that fiscal year, then there shall be no sequestration under this section.

''(b) APPLICABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by paragraph (2), each account of the United States shall be reduced by a dollar amount calculated by multiplying the level of budgetary resources in that account at that time by the uniform percentage necessary to carry out subsection (a). All obligational authority reduced under this section shall be done in a manner that makes such reductions permanent.

''(2) EXEMPT ACCOUNTS.—No order issued under this part may—

''(A) reduce benefits payable to the old-age and survivors insurance program established under title II of the Social Security Act;

''(B) reduce retired or retainer pay payable to a member or former member of the uniformed services; or

''(C) reduce payments for net interest (all of major functional category 900).''.

(b) REPORTS.—Section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end of the table the following new item:

''October 1	Department of Treasury report to Congress estimating amount of income tax designated pursuant to section 6097 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.'';

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting '', and sequestration to reduce the public debt,'' after ''sequestration'';

(3) in subsection (c), by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6) and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

''(5) REPORTS ON SEQUESTRATION TO REDUCE THE PUBLIC DEBT.—The preview reports shall set forth for the budget year estimates for each of the following:

''(A) The aggregate amount designated under section 6097 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for the last taxable year ending before the budget year.

''(B) The amount of reductions required under section 253A and the deficit remaining after those reductions have been made.

''(C) The sequestration percentage necessary to achieve the required reduction in accounts under section 253A(b).''; and

(4) in subsection (f), by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) REPORTS ON SEQUESTRATION TO REDUCE THE PUBLIC DEBT.—The final reports shall contain all of the information contained in the public debt taxation designation report required on October 1.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 250(a) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 253 the following new item:

''Sec. 253A. Sequestration to reduce the public debt.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Notwithstanding section 275(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the expiration date set forth in that section shall not apply to the amendments made by this section. The amendments made by this section shall cease to have any effect after the first fiscal year during which there is no public debt.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in open session on Thursday, July 14, 2011, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Lessons From the Field: Learning From What Works for Employment for Persons with Disabilities.''

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Andrew Imparato at (202) 228–3453.

RECOGNIZING HEROIC EFFORTS OF FIREFIGHTERS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 229.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 229) recognizing the heroic efforts of firefighters to contain numerous wildfires that have affected thousands of people throughout the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate on this matter, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 229) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 229

Whereas every State in the United States has been affected by wildfire in 2011;

Whereas firefighters and residents have had to contend with extreme and erratic fire behavior and rapid rates of fire spread;

Whereas, as of June 12, 2011, more than 32,189 wildfires have burned more than 4,700,000 acres of land, which represents more acres burned than in all of 2010 and approximately 600,000 more acres than the 50-year average of total acres burned in the United States in an entire year;

Whereas, as of June 12, 2011—

(1) the Southwestern States have reported more than 1,600 fires that have burned more than 1,700,000 acres;

(2) the Southern States have reported more than 27,000 fires that have burned more than 2,400,000 acres;

(3) the Northern and Central Rocky Mountain States have reported 818 fires that have burned more than 250,000 acres;

(4) the State of California and Great Basin Region have reported more than 7,200 fires that have burned more than 21,000 acres;

(5) the Northwestern States and Alaska have reported more than 400 fires that have burned more than 260,000 acres; and

(6) the Eastern States have reported more than 3,500 fires that have burned more than 41,000 acres;

Whereas, as of June 29, 2011, firefighters and personnel from the Federal, State, and county levels have responded overwhelmingly to battle wildfires throughout the United States, filling more than 95,600 requests for firefighter crew members; and

Whereas the brave men and women who answered the calls for assistance have worked to minimize the displacement of thousands of residents and to protect against loss of life and property: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the heroic efforts of firefighters to contain wildfires and protect lives, homes, natural resources, and rural economies throughout the United States;

(2) encourages the people and government officials of the United States to express their appreciation to the brave men and women serving in the firefighting services throughout the United States;

(3) encourages the people and communities of the United States to be diligent in preventing and preparing for wildfires; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to keep in their thoughts those who have experienced loss as a result of wildfire.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1340

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told there is a bill at the desk due for a first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1340) to cut, cap, and balance the Federal budget.

Mr. REID. I now ask for a second reading in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, and I also object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 11, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, July 11, 2011; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 93, S. 1323, a bill to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit postcloture, under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be a rollcall vote on Monday at approximately 5:30 p.m. on the motion to proceed to S. 1323.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 11, 2011, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being objection, the Senate, at 5:51 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 11, 2011, at 2 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORABLE FRANK R. WOLF EGYPT TRIP REPORT

HON. FRANK R. WOLF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I submit a copy of my Egypt trip report.

PURPOSE

On June 26–28 I visited Egypt to meet with U.S. and host government officials and key civil society actors, specifically to address human rights and religious freedom concerns, especially during this critical time of transition.

MEETINGS

I met with U.S. Ambassador Margaret Scobey and received a modified country team brief from embassy staff. I spoke with U.S./Western print correspondents and saw Tahrir Square—site of recent pro-democracy protests.

I met with nearly a dozen Christian, Muslim, Baha'i, and youth activists, including a leading evangelical minister, Coptic youth leader and prominent Baha'i blogger.

I also discussed the country's transition with political activists, including 2005 presidential candidate and former political prisoner Ayman Nour, who is again seeking the presidency.

I discussed interfaith dialogue with Sheikh Al-Azhar Ahmed Al-Tayyeb, the leading scholar in Sunni Islam, and met with Muslim Brotherhood official Essam El-Errian to caution the group to respect religious freedom.

I worshiped in a Coptic Orthodox Church and visited St. Mary's Church in Imbaba (a Cairo suburb) which had been destroyed by radical Islamists on May 7. I also met with a woman who runs an orphanage and social services organization for the Christian ''zabaleen'' (trash collectors) in Cairo.

I met with Deputy Foreign Minister Wafaa Bassim and other representatives of the Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and raised concerns about human rights and the prospects of a transition to a true democracy.

In my meetings with Egyptian government officials, I mentioned that this year I had introduced bipartisan legislation, H.R. 440, (which now has 75 cosponsors) that would create a Special Envoy position at the State Department to focus specifically on the challenges faced by religious minorities in key countries in the Middle East, including Egypt. The legislation was introduced in January, prior to the political unrest in Egypt, but has arguably never been more needed. Ancient religious minority communities, among them Coptic Christians, are important moderating influences and are critical to the future of a democratic and pluralistic Egypt.

I met with representatives of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) including the National Democratic Institute (NDI) and International Republican Institute (IRI).

HUMAN RIGHTS AND RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Coptic Orthodox and other Christians told me that they feared sectarian violence in the current political vacuum, and were concerned about continued discrimination in government hiring and building churches. They said that they welcomed the Government of Egypt's announced intention to draft a Unified Places of Worship Law, but cautioned that the few details that had emerged thus far indicate that the draft needs much work before it genuinely puts mosques and churches on equal footing.

In my meetings with Baha'i leaders we discussed the community's continued difficulties in securing government documents like birth and marriage certificates. I intend to pursue this matter further with the Egyptian Government, pressing them to rescind the 1960 decree that closed Baha'i assemblies and seized their assets.

In my meetings with Christian and secular Muslim democracy activists, I was informed that Islamist elements in Egypt seek an Iran-like theocratic state. Some interlocutors worried that the Egyptian Army favors Muslim Brothers and Salafists. Many agreed that if Islamists were to win in the upcoming elections they would allow ''one man, one vote, one time,'' thereby making their electoral victory irreversible.

While meeting with senior representatives of the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) I sought to press them on their intentions. I raised concerned about the application of shariah law, especially as it relates to the rights of minorities, and made it clear that my concerns were shared by many in Washington. Freedom-loving people the world over should be very concerned if the MB comes to power in Egypt. We must not close our eyes to their stated plans.

DEMOCRATIC TRANSITION

Some Egyptian activists and most religious freedom advocates were pessimistic about the transition to date and prospects for a free, tolerant, and democratic government after elections.

Several of these activists stressed that the best way to counter Islamists in the short run is to first draft a constitution and delay elections until democratic parties have formed and become operational. One activist went so far as to say that he was 80 percent sure Egypt would become an Islamist state akin to Iran unless the current transition process and timeline is altered.

Activists also said that secular, pro-democracy parties need to take additional steps to get organized and build support across the sectarian divide. One human rights activist underscored the long-term importance of secular education and more interaction between Christian and Muslim youth.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the meetings I had and the insights I gained, I came away with a number of broad-based policy recommendations:

The U.S. Government should encourage the Egyptian Government to temporarily delay parliamentary elections, currently scheduled for September. Under the Mubarak regime free speech and freedom of assembly were curtailed, sectarian divisions were stoked and the press was restricted—some of these issues remain under the current transitional government and are not conducive to a healthy electoral process. In fact, at present, the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) and remnants of the former ruling party are best positioned for victory, in part because they are better organized and funded. We must recognize that elections are but a component of a true democracy and guard against the impulse to move too swiftly in a direction that would likely guarantee an MB victory.

When the elections are held, independent international election monitors must be present and must be granted unfettered access to polling stations, etc. In my meetings with the Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Affairs I stressed that the credibility of any future election, whenever it takes place, would hinge on the involvement and presence of international observers. The importance of independent monitors and observers was underscored during my meetings with NDI and IRI. Their insight and election expertise is invaluable.

The United States must seriously consider conditioning U.S. foreign assistance, specifically military assistance, to Egypt. Since the Camp David Peace Accords, Egypt has received over $60 billion in U.S. foreign assistance—the second largest overall recipient of such funding. Given the Mubarak regime's human rights and religious freedom abuses, I have long believed this assistance should be conditioned on improvements in these areas. I understand that Egypt is a proud country with a rich history. However, at this time of historic transition in Egypt and tight budgetary times at home, U.S. taxpayer dollars ought not be given to a government that will persecute its own people. Aid to Egypt should be conditioned upon the government respecting and upholding universally recognized human rights norms. This is especially important as Egypt moves toward crafting a new constitution. It is imperative that this constitution is fully secular and include, among other things, religious freedom protections. Ultimately, foreign assistance, especially of this magnitude, is a key leverage point and should be used accordingly, particularly with the Supreme Council of the Egyptian Armed Forces (SCAF).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the U.S. embassy personnel, outgoing Ambassador Margaret Scobey, Peter Shea, my control officer, and Liz Colton for their assistance in making this trip possible and for their dedicated service to their country.

I would also like to acknowledge the good work of the press in Egypt, some of whom I had the opportunity to meet. At a time of such monumental and rapid change they clearly had a read on the national pulse and their reporting of events in real time is critical.

I would also like to thank the many civil society representatives I met, but for security reasons have opted not to mention by name, who gave a candid and courageous assessment of the challenges facing their country.

CONCLUSION

The Egyptian people have endured much over the years. The State Department's annual human rights report released in April found the following:

The government limited citizens' right to change their government and extended a state of emergency that has been in place almost continuously since 1967. Security forces used unwarranted lethal force and tortured and abused prisoners and detainees, in most cases with impunity. Prison and detention center conditions were poor. Security forces arbitrarily arrested and detained individuals, in some cases for political purposes,

and kept them in prolonged pretrial detention. The executive branch exercised control over and pressured the judiciary. The government partially restricted freedom of expression. The government's respect for freedoms of assembly, association, and religion was poor, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) continued to face restrictions.

In the face of decades of human rights and religious freedom abuses under the Mubarak regime, successive U.S. administrations, including the Obama administration, failed to advocate for those whose voices were being silenced. Many pro-democracy activists and religious minorities that I spoke with while in Egypt felt abandoned by the West.

At this historic time of transition, we must not make that mistake again. While there is a palpable sense of anticipation and even hope about what the future might hold for the Egyptian people, the outcome is far from guaranteed.

There are reliable reports of human rights abuses and political repression following Mubarak's resignation. For example, a recently released Congressional Research Service report indicated that:

The SCAF has warned news organizations that it is illegal to criticize the military in the press. A military court sentenced a blogger (Maikel Nabil) to three years in prison for insulting the military. Others have criticized the SCAF over press reports that female detainees in military custody were subject to ''virginity tests'' by doctors.

Given the nature and extent of U.S. assistance to Egypt over the years, the U.S. military has developed good relations with the Egyptian military and we should leverage those ties as Egypt looks to transition from military to civilian rule. It will be critical for Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, among others, to engage with the SCAF.

Ultimately, I believe that the majority of Egyptians of all faiths want democracy. The question is will it be taken away from them after a single election?

Their yearning for true freedom and democracy must not be underestimated. We have a responsibility to stand with them and help them realize their aspirations.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN GARRARD

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an outstanding citizen of South Alabama who has dedicated his life to the service of his community and his fellow man. I am proud to inform this House that John Garrard of Atmore, Alabama, was recently honored with the Atmore Chamber of Commerce's Lifetime Achievement Award.

A resident of Atmore for over 60 years, Mr. Garrard has a long and distinguished record of public service. A World War II veteran of the U.S. Navy, Mr. Garrard graduated from Millsaps College with a degree in economics and business administration and a minor in secondary education. He soon put his education to good use back in his community.

He began his career as a teacher at Escambia County High School. Afterwards, he joined the First National Bank of Atmore, where he rose to the position of president and where he continues to serve on the board of directors.

Mr. Garrard has also served on the Atmore Public Library Board for 48 years, was a member of the Atmore Rotary Club for 30 years, and was a part of Fountain Prison Ministry for 15 years. Mr. Garrard was also named Atmore's Citizen of the Year in 1981.

Today, even in retirement, Mr. Garrard continues to serve his community as a member of the Atmore City Council. The extent of Mr. Garrard's commitments is considerable. It is because of the work of people like John Garrard that small towns throughout south Alabama, and around the country, are able to thrive and maintain a vibrant sense of community.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Escambia County and South Alabama, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Mr. John Garrard for his service, and applauding the example of civic engagement that he has set. His presence is surely felt throughout his community which has benefitted from his many contributions of time and talent. Through his life of service and dedication, he has definitely earned this award, and I am proud to join his many friends and family in saluting him for this most deserving honor.

REAFFIRMING COMMITMENT TO NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT OF ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 2011

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a proud co-sponsor and strong supporter of H. Res. 268, which reaffirms our national commitment to a settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians.

Madam Speaker, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has persisted for generations. It has claimed thousands of lives and has contributed to instability in the world's most volatile region. Few things would do more to advance the cause of world peace than the achievement of the two-state solution which recognizes Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state with secure borders and the right of the Palestinians to govern themselves in an autonomous state with the resources and factor endowments to enable the Palestinian people to live in dignity.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, a strong and vocal advocate for direct negotiations, has already accepted a two-state solution, only to be continually rebuffed by the Palestinians at every turn.

Madam Speaker, attempts by Palestinian leadership to circumvent direct negotiations with Israel and instead seek direct recognition from the United Nations and foreign governments is counter-productive and undermines the work that has been done over the last several decades to come to a peaceful and mutually beneficial resolution.

The unilateral declaration of statehood by the Palestinian Authority shows a disregard for and violation of the underlying principles of Middle East peace agreements, including the Oslo Accords, the Road Map, and most recently the Annapolis Conference.

Madam Speaker, a two-state solution is the only feasible resolution to this long-standing conflict. Therefore I strongly applaud the Administration for opposing international recognition of a Palestinian state that is not reached in direct negotiation with Israel.

I urge the President to direct the United States Ambassador to the U.N. to exercise our veto with respect to any resolution of the United Nations Security Council to the contrary and call upon Palestinian leaders to return to the negotiation table in a good faith effort to reach a mutually acceptable agreement to bring about the two-state solution, which is one and sure path to the just and lasting peace we all seek.

For these reasons, I strongly support H. Res. 268 and urge my colleagues to join me.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 500 on July 6, 2011, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

CONGRATULATING PHIL JOHNSON, ATMORE'S CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a distinguished citizen of South Alabama for his exemplary service to our region and his community. I am pleased to note that Phil Johnson was recently named Atmore, Alabama's 2010 Citizen of the Year.

If a leader is someone who is willing to give of himself in order to benefit society, then Phil Johnson certainly fits the definition of a leader. His stamp on Atmore and surrounding Escambia County is his legacy of developing local arts programs and inspiring a passion for the arts among our young people.

Ten years ago, Mr. Johnson played a leading role in founding the Greater Escambia Council for the Arts (GECA) and has been instrumental in raising awareness for the arts throughout his community.

Mr. Johnson has also performed in, directed, and produced an exceptional number of performances, and helped secure a theater in downtown Atmore.

Thanks to Mr. Johnson's vision and dedication, the residents of Atmore and Escambia County have enormous opportunities in the arts. From actors to playgoers to the young people who have become involved in the arts for the first time, many have benefited from Mr. Johnson's work and achievements.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the arts serve a vital role in our communities, and they can have an especially large impact in small towns like Atmore.

I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Mr. Johnson for his remarkable service, and to join the people of Atmore in recognizing the great difference he has made in that community.

HONORING GILBERT TREVIÑO

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the late Gilbert Treviño, a soldier and researcher who dedicated nearly 30 years of his life to the United States Marines both on the field and in the lab.

A Laredo native, Mr. Treviño moved to College Station in 1942 to attend Texas A&M University. His scholarly pursuits were placed on hold when the United States plunged into World War II. He joined the United States Marine Corps in 1944 and witnessed the perils of war at the Battle of Iwo Jima, a battle, on which he wrote in his 2006 memoir. After serving our country, Mr. Treviño returned to school in 1947 to complete a professional veterinary degree and later received a Master's at Texas A&M University and Ph.D. from Michigan State University.

Mr. Treviño met Chris, who would eventually become his wife, while he was working in Washington, DC. The couple was together just under a year when he received word he was to be stationed in Japan. The pair planned their wedding in just eight days and moved to Japan, where their two children were born.

Mr. Treviño served in Michigan, Maryland, and Kentucky as an advisor to the Surgeon General for the Department of Agriculture before returning to College Station to teach at his alma mater. He spent his career in classrooms and military research labs, where his scientific investigations contributed to a vaccine for rabies. Mr. Treviño's devotion to education provided a source of inspiration for the younger generations of his family; his children, Elisa and Steven, as well as his nieces and nephews, all took note of his accomplishments and many pursued postsecondary education as a result.

Mr. & Mrs. Treviño moved back to Laredo after he retired from the university in 1981 where he remained active in the Laredo veterans' community. He raised funds and accompanied the city's Gold Star mothers to Washington, DC to visit the Vietnam Memorial after its completion in 1982. When the Laredo Animal Clinic veterinarian was unavailable, Mr. Treviño happily performed examinations and conducted surgeries in his absence. He was a man of integrity and determination, and did whatever he could to help others.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored and privileged to have the opportunity to recognize the late Gilbert Treviño. He is no longer with us, but his contributions to his country, profession, and community will live on. Thank you.

RECOGNIZING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS JOSE WEEKS, RECIPIENT OF THE 2010 GRUBER AWARD

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sergeant 1st Class Jose Weeks of the 4th Brigade, 2nd Infantry Division for earning the 2010 Gruber Award as the best field artilleryman in the United States Army.

The Gruber Award was established in 2002 to recognize the outstanding individuals who represent excellence among field artillerymen.

Sergeant Jose Weeks dedicates himself to strengthening his unit by training them to be prepared for any situation. On July 14, 2010, when his convoy came under attack, an improvised explosive device struck the lead vehicle in his patrol. One of the soldiers in the patrol was severely injured by shrapnel. By the time the medic arrived, the soldiers inside the damaged vehicle had already begun emergency care and had applied a tourniquet to the wounded soldier's leg—a practice in which Weeks had repeatedly drilled his crew. Their rapid response saved the soldier's life and demonstrated Weeks's effectiveness as a trainer. Saving the life of another soldier through effective emergency training merits Weeks receiving the Gruber award.

Weeks's Battalion Commander, Lieutenant Colonel Terrence Braley, confirmed, "Sergeant First Class Weeks is an adaptable, flexible leader and a master artilleryman. . . . He can move from doing his core competencies to firing battery platoon sergeant . . . to conducting crew drills [to] IED patrol without skipping a beat."

Jose Weeks is an exemplary soldier who is highly deserving of this award. It is an honor to recognize him for his leadership and commitment to serving in the United States Army.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives please join me in congratulating Sergeant 1st Class Jose Weeks on receiving the Gruber Award as the best field artilleryman in the United States Army.

IN HONOR OF H.E. FATHER MIGUEL D'ESCOTO BROCKMANN'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ORDINATION TO THE PRIESTHOOD

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 50th anniversary of H.E. Father Miguel d'Escoto Brockmann's ordination to the priesthood. Father d'Escoto has dedicated his life and ministry to peace, social justice, and solidarity.

Father d'Escoto was born in 1933 in Los Angeles, California, but spent a majority of his childhood in Nicaragua. After returning to the United States, he began studying at the Catholic seminary at Maryknoll in 1953. In 1961, Father d'Escoto Brockmann was ordained a priest of the Maryknoll Missionaries. Father d'Escoto earned his Master's of Science from Columbia University's School of Journalism in 1962.

Father d'Escoto has focused his ministry on helping the poor and disadvantaged populations of the world. In 1963, Father d'Escoto founded the National Institute of Research and Population Action in Chile. Through this organization, he sought to empower impoverished populations living in slum neighborhoods through community action in defense of labor rights. In 1970, while serving as Maryknoll's Social Communications Department, Father d'Escoto founded Orbis Books, the publishing arm of Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers. Orbis quickly became a leader in religious publishing, offering works on spirituality, theology, and current affairs, often from a Third World perspective. In the aftermath of a 1972 earthquake that devastated the capital city of Managua, Nicaragua, Father Brockmann mobilized assistance for the victims and established the Nicaraguan Foundation for Integral Community Development.

As a veteran statesman and political leader, Father d'Escoto served as the Republic of Nicaragua's Minister for Foreign Affairs from July 1979 until April 1990. During his tenure, he played a key role in the Contadora and Esquipulas peace processes to end internal armed conflicts in Central America in the 1980s. He was later elected as President of the 63rd Session of the United Nations General Assembly, and served in this role from September 2008 to September 2009. Father d'Escoto is currently a member of the UN Human Rights Council Advisory Committee.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring the 50th anniversary of H.E. Father Miguel d'Escoto Brockmann's ordination to the priesthood and his significant contributions to the global community.

RECOGNITION OF THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOWN OF GREAT BARRINGTON, MASSACHUSETTS

HON. JOHN W. OLVER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 250th anniversary of the founding of the town of Great Barrington, Massachusetts, including the village of Housatonic. The town was incorporated by the colonial Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Sir Francis Bernard, on June 30, 1761. Nestled in the Berkshire Hills, Great Barrington features natural resources such as Monument Mountain, Lake Mansfield, and the scenic Housatonic River. It is the town that saw the first open resistance to British rule in 1774, Henry Knox's cannon caravan passing through to Fort Ticonderoga in 1776, and provided a distinguished roster of military personnel to every major conflict in which America has participated.

Great Barrington has also been the home of poet and journalist William Cullen Bryant, inventor William Stanley—who first lit the streets of Great Barrington—and inventor Marcus Rogers. Elizabeth Freeman, who successfully sued for her freedom from slavery in 1781, Laura Ingersoll Secord, the Canadian heroine of the War of 1812, Anson Jones, the last president of the Republic of Texas and James Weldon Johnson, the co-writer of the Negro National Anthem all resided in Great Barrington. W.E.B. Dubois, distinguished writer, editor, sociologist and activist, graduated from Searles High School in Great Barrington as valedictorian before embarking upon a lifetime of achievement that included the founding of the Niagara Movement, the precursor to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored Persons. The citizens of Great Barrington stand as an example of what hard work and resolve can accomplish.

The town of Great Barrington is also the center of many historical, commercial and cultural resources, including the Mason Library in Great Barrington and Ramsdell Library in Housatonic, the Mahaiwe Performing Arts Center, the Captain Truman Wheeler House, the Dwight-Henderson House, and the famed Newsboy Statue. With its scenic natural resources, Great Barrington has become the summer vacation destination of thousands and continues to be a vibrant and charming community.

On the occasion of the 250th anniversary of the town of Great Barrington, Massachusetts, I congratulate its citizens and praise their dedication and perseverance throughout the town's history. I look forward with enthusiastic support as we continue to work together for a prosperous future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 499 on July 6, 2011, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

ON THE OCCASION OF THE TWENTY-NINTH ANNUAL METRO DETROIT YOUTH DAY

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to rise today to recognize the organizers, supporters and participants of the twenty-ninth annual Metro Detroit Youth Day.

While Metro Detroit Youth Day has many leaders, organizers, participants and supporters which make it possible, one man, Mr. Ed Deeb, stands at the foundation of this great youth empowering event. When asked by the Mayor of Detroit to rise to the challenge of overcoming divisions to create a stronger community, Ed answered, rallying the business community to work with Detroit youth to overcome the divide between business and youth. From this work, Youth Day was born as an event which calmed tensions through dialogue between Detroit business owners and the youth. Under Ed's leadership as chairman and coordinator of Youth Day, it has continued to grow and evolve into an event focused on nurturing the great potential of our youth in the City of Detroit.

Part of Youth Days' evolution included expanding its impact on participants, supporters and volunteers. As part of this expansion, Youth Day began to focus on providing youth with guidance, mentoring, substance abuse prevention and motivational activities designed to allow them to channel their creativity and ideas into positive outcomes. As part of this empowerment, Youth Day began awarding participants with scholarships for youth that displayed outstanding citizenship, leadership and service. With over seven hundred scholarships awarded since 1991, Youth Day has undoubtedly provided many Metro Detroit young adults with the opportunity to pursue higher education and more fully realize their potential.

The success of Ed's vision speaks for itself, with Youth Day having become a tradition for the Metro Detroit community. Since its inception so many years ago, Youth Day has grown from twelve hundred participants to over thirty-seven thousand annually, with more than seven hundred thousand youth participants throughout its history. Of equal importance are the more than fifteen hundred annual volunteers who come from over six hundred community organizations and businesses who supervise sports clinics, games, contests and many other activities that are a part of this daylong event. For its impact, Youth Day has been awarded numerous accolades including a Point of Light award from President George H.W. Bush and the Michigan Governor's award for Physical Fitness.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the twenty-ninth annual Metro Detroit Youth Day and recognizing the organizers, supporters, volunteers and participants for working together to build a stronger future for Michigan youth in Metro Detroit.

IN HONOR OF ANNE FEENEY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Anne Feeney on the occasion of her 60th birthday. Anne is an exceptional person and a longtime political activist and musician. She has been called a ''union maid and hell raiser'' and has actively fought for social justice over the past four decades.

Anne was born in Charleroi, Pennsylvania on July 1, 1951. From an early age Anne's two great passions were politics and music. She was greatly influenced by the Vietnam War, the Civil Rights Movement, and her grandfather, William P. Feeney, a mineworkers' organizer and violinist.

Anne graduated from Fontbonne Academy in 1968. She spent the next year saving money until she had enough to purchase a Martin D-28 guitar in 1969. Anne played this guitar for over forty years at political rallies and festivals around the world until she recently retired it from use.

By 1972 Anne had co-founded the Pittsburgh Action Against Rape, which still provides services to rape victims in the Pittsburgh area. She graduated from the University of Pittsburgh in 1974 and the University of Pittsburgh School of Law in 1978. She worked as a trial attorney for twelve years and served as president of the Pittsburgh Musicians' Union from 1997–1998. To date, Anne is the only woman elected to this prestigious position. Her political activism continues to this day. Currently, Anne is a member of the Industrial Workers of the World and the American Federation of Musicians.

Since 1991, Anne has toured around the world playing her music and participating in labor and political rallies. She has released several albums and her music has been covered by the band Peter, Paul, and Mary. Anne is a proud mother of two, a gifted musician, and a renowned political activist.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in extending warm wishes to Anne Feeney on her 60th birthday.

DEPARTMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, I urge Members to support an amendment to the Fiscal Year 2012 Department of Defense Appropriations Act (H.R. 2219) to restore funding for the Gulf War Illness Research Program (GWIRP) of the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs (CDMRP).

The FY2012 Defense Appropriations bill, as passed by the Committee, cut many CDMRP programs by 20%. The amendment offered would restore $3.6 million to the GWIRP, bringing funding for the program back to FY2008 levels.

This program has made dramatic progress during the past year and deserves additional funding.

In a landmark Gulf War and Health report, the Institute of Medicine (IOM) has recognized that the chronic multi-symptom illness affecting 250,000 Gulf War veterans is a serious disease—not caused by psychiatric illness—that also affects other U.S. military forces, and called for a major national research effort to identify treatments. The scientific community has responded with a dramatic increase in the quality and quantity of proposals submitted to GWIRP. Most encouraging, GWIRP-funded researchers have completed the first successful pilot study of a medication to treat one of the major symptoms of Gulf War illness.

This effective small program demonstrably merits continuation and expansion, even in a time of fiscal austerity. As stated by the Institute of Medicine Chair, Dr. Stephen Hauser, it is ''vital to the health and effectiveness of current and future military forces, in addition to Gulf War veterans.''

The GWIRP is the only national program studying this issue. It is a competitive peer-reviewed program open to any doctor or scientist on a competitive basis. By contrast, Veterans Affairs (VA) research programs are only open to VA doctors, few of whom have expertise in chronic multi-symptom illness. To effectively address a difficult and specialized problem like this, it is necessary to enlist the entire medical scientific community.

Most importantly, it is working. GWIRP-funded researchers at the University of California, San Diego, will reported in June on the first successful medication treatment study in the history of Gulf War illness research. The study showed that the supplement CoQ10 produced significant improvement in one of the most serious symptoms of Gulf War illness, fatigue with exertion. It is not a cure, and the study needs to be replicated in a larger group, but the result is extremely encouraging.

At long last, the scientific community has recognized the severity and scope of this problem and is engaged in its solution. Congress has created this superb program, which is succeeding where others have failed. Congress must provide the necessary resources to continue this progress.

Additional funding would be used for pilot studies of promising treatments, for clinical trials of treatments shown effective in earlier pilot studies, and for the execution of collaborative research plans developed by consortiums of scientists funded in prior years.

As you know, our nation owes a sacred debt to the men and women who willingly serve and sacrifice while wearing our country's uniform. At this critical time in researching and understanding Gulf War illness, it is vital that bipartisan leadership points out the accomplishments of this small program to our colleagues, to ensure that it survives the current legislative session and its benefits are not lost to veterans of the Gulf War and future wars.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment to ensure the continuation of the Gulf War Illness Research Program.

BIRTHDAY OF IRV PICKLER

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor the life of Irv Pickler, and wish him the best in his 90th year of life. Irv has demonstrated an exceptional dedication to public service in the community, and has made a lasting effect on all the people he has touched.

After graduating from California State University, Los Angeles, with a bachelor's degree in Business Administration, Irv joined the United States Army and later transferred to the United States Air Force. In England, he flew 35 missions into France and Germany as a bombardier-navigator. After 4 years of service, he returned to Los Angeles to be with his wife and young children.

Eventually settling in Southern California, Irv opened his own printing company, ''Printing Dimensions,'' in Orange County. Today, nearly 55 years later, Irv works to bring people together to accomplish client objectives with his company, ''Pickler and Associates.'' Irv has demonstrated a firm commitment to community involvement. As a member of the Kiwanis Club of Greater Anaheim, he was twice named ''Kiwanian of the Year.'' In 1993, he was elected as a Distinguished Lieutenant Governor of the club. Irv has also served 25 years on the Cypress College Foundation Board of Directors.

In the 1970s, Irv was appointed to the Cemetery Commission in Anaheim, and to the Orange County Planning Commission, on which he served one term as a chairman. In 1982, Irv was elected to the Anaheim City Council, serving a total of 12 years, including 3 times as Mayor pro-tem. He consolidated half a dozen Orange County transportation agencies into the Orange County Transportation Authority, which produced gains in efficiency, and increased accountability. When California introduced its first cellular solar-powered callbox system, Irv was behind it. He negotiated the agreement with the California Department of Transportation and the California Private Transportation Corporation to construct the nation's first fully-automated, congestion priced toll road, State Route 91. Irv laid the groundwork for the purchase of right-of-way and widening of Interstate 5, which resulted in the largest public works project in Orange County in over a generation. He also helped pass Measure M, the successful sales tax program that invested in voter-approved transportation projects. It's no question that he demonstrated exceptional leadership during his tenure as Vice President of the Orange County Transportation Authority.

Irv currently serves as a member of the Orange County Water District Board of Directors. He has previously served as Water Issues Committee Chairman and on the Administration/Finance Committee, Investment Committee, External Communications Task Team, and Santa Ana Water Project Authority. During his tenure on the Water District Board of Directors, Irv played a key role in the development of the revolutionary Groundwater Replenishment System, a project that has been recognized with numerous national and international awards.

Irv has served as chairman of the Orange County Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Advisory Committee; president of Orange County Division of the League of California Cities, and member the Anaheim Union High School District Board of Trustees, Anaheim's Parks and Recreation Commission, the Anaheim Public Library Board, the Transportation Corridor Agencies, Southern California Regional Rail Authority, and the Southern California Air Quality Management District Inter-Agency Implementation Company.

Other goverment agencies with which Irv has worked include the Los Angeles/San Diego Rail Corridor Committee, Orange County Cities Airport Authority, Southern California Association of Governments, Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor Agency, and Metrolink Joint Committee, and he also supports Acacia Adult Day Care, Alzheimer's Foundation, the Anaheim Family YMCA, the Anaheim Boys and Girls Clubs, and Anaheim Arts Council.

It is clear that Irv Pickler has maintained a firm devotion to public service throughout his life. As he embarks upon his 90th year, I would like to recognize his achievements and thank him for his dedication.

HONORING MR. J.D. LINDSEY

HON. AUSTIN SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in honoring Mr. J.D. Lindsey of Tift County, GA. Mr. Lindsey is a U.S. Marine and a decorated World War II Veteran. He received the Purple Heart for wounds suffered while serving our Nation on active duty. Since his discharge from the Marine Corps, he has worked tirelessly for veterans' causes and issues. He was responsible for obtaining the DAV van that is used to transport veterans to their medical appointments at the VAMC facility in Dublin, GA each week. He uses his personal funds to see that the van continues to run each week without interruption. When necessary, he has also used his personal vehicle to ensure that every veteran in need makes it to his or her appointments. He has unselfishly given of his time and money to not only serve our Nation while on active duty, but has remained committed to caring for his fellow veterans and their families all over the Tift area. Any number of citizens of Tifton have benefited greatly from his kindness and benevolence.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me today in honoring Mr. J.D. Lindsey for his unwavering commitment and service to our country and our community.

REAFFIRMING COMMITMENT TO NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT OF ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for H. Res. 268, reaffirming America's support for direct Palestinian-Israeli negotiations as the best means to settle the conflict and the only path to statehood for the Palestinians.

A Palestinian state created in the middle of this conflict would be a state created to make war.

Nothing would be more dangerous or more unworkable than for the Palestinians to gain the status of statehood without at the same time taking on the duties of a responsible state—namely, a commitment to peace with its neighbors and basic rights for all of its citizens.

The United Nations—a body established as a place of peace—should not create a state that is committed to destroying its neighbor. And, until the Palestinians agree to recognize Israel's right to exist and disarm the terrorists, there is no chance that a Palestinian state would be committed to peaceful co-existence with its neighbor.

This resolution is a simple, basic, commonsense restatement of the clear fact that the dispute between the Palestinians and the Israelis cannot be resolved unilaterally; it cannot be resolved by UN fiat; it cannot be resolved by outside forces; it cannot be resolved if the Palestinians refuse to recognize Israel as a Jewish state; it cannot be resolved if Palestinians refuse to forswear terrorism against Israel and take actions to dismantle their terrorist infrastructure; it cannot be resolved if the Palestinians continue to set preconditions for coming to the bargaining table; and, it cannot be resolved unless all members of the Palestinian unity government agree to abide by previous agreements with the United States and Israel.

This conflict can only be resolved by both parties sitting down at a table and hammering out an agreement on the basic issues that divide them.

The Palestinians must understand that they will only have a state once they make peace with Israel.

I hope the United States would make clear its intention to veto any unilateral declaration of statehood at the United Nations and to penalize the Palestinians if they are foolhardy

enough to pursue a path that will only lead to more conflict and bloodshed.

That's why I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H. Res. 268 and in opposing the Palestinians' dangerous and desperate effort to obtain an empty declaration of statehood without peace at the United Nations.

HONORING REVEREND GEORGE LEE JOHNSON

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues, Mr. NUNES and Mr. COSTA, to acknowledge and honor the life of a beloved leader in the Fresno Community, Reverend George Lee Johnson, and to recognize his tireless work as the Senior Pastor of Peoples Church. Ministering to thousands, Reverend Johnson earned the respect of fellow clergy and civic leaders alike.

The son of a Baptist minister, George Lee Johnson, or G.L. as he came to be known, grew up in Houston. He moved to Fresno in 1961 to work as the Associate General Director of the Latin American Orphanage. That same year, Reverend Johnson and his wife, Jackie, joined the then small Peoples Church. In 1963, Reverend Johnson became the Pastor of Peoples Church at the age 37.

Reverend Johnson's commitment to his faith and the congregation of Peoples Church resulted in significant growth of the organization. His uplifting messages of hope and faith appealed to many worshipers. In 1978, Peoples Church moved to a sanctuary with capacity of more than 2,000 people, allowing over 5,000 people to attend numerous different services on Sunday. With an ever-increasing following, Peoples Church attracted a mix of civic leaders. Moreover, Reverend Johnson's hard work and service were influential in the community of Fresno. He organized the Pastor's Prayer Summit in Oakhurst, where over 45 clergy members met to pray for guidance for civic leaders in combating Fresno's crime rate and resolving socioeconomic problems. The success of this event inspired Reverend Johnson to organize a weekly Citywide Pastors Prayer Meeting which began in 1993 and still takes place today. In 2001, the Reverend was instrumental in bringing the Central Valley Billy Graham Crusade to Bulldog Stadium, an event which united more than 200,000 people.

Reverend G.L. Johnson retired from Peoples Church in 2008 after 45 years of service as the Senior Pastor. However, his retirement from the church did not mark the end of his ministry. Reverend Johnson continued to support the church and lend his wisdom and knowledge to the many Fresno residents who looked to him for guidance. He also traveled throughout the world, teaching at various religious conferences. After a brave battle with cancer, Reverend George Lee Johnson passed away surrounded by his loving family at the age of 83.

Mr. Speaker, please join Mr. NUNES, Mr. COSTA, and I in honoring Reverend George Lee Johnson for his unwavering leadership, and recognizing his accomplishments and contributions as Pastor of Peoples Church. The life of Reverend George Lee Johnson serves as an example of excellence to those in our community, and his legacy will not be soon forgotten.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 498 on July 6, 2011, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

INTRODUCING THE AMERICAN TRAVELER DIGNITY ACT OF 2011

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation to protect Americans from physical and emotional abuse by Federal Transportation Security Administration employees conducting screenings at the nation's airports. Year after year the TSA seems more belligerent toward Americans simply seeking to travel within their own country—a most basic of our fundamental rights—and sadly Americans are just expected to shut up and take it. We should not have to shut up and take it.

Many Americans continue to fool themselves into accepting TSA abuses by saying "I don't mind giving up my freedoms for security." In fact, they are giving up their liberties and not receiving security in return. Time and time again we see the revolting pictures of Federal screeners with their hands down the pants of children while parents watch helplessly in agony. We see elderly or disabled Americans being forced to endure all manner of indignity. At the same time, we repeatedly hear of passengers who seem to check all the boxes marked "suspicious activity" slipping through unencumbered. Just recently we read of a Nigerian immigrant breezing through TSA security checks to board a flight from New York to LA—with a stolen, expired boarding pass and an out-of-date student ID as his sole identification. We should not be surprised to find government ineptitude and indifference at the TSA, however.

What we ultimately need is real privatization of security, but not phony privatization with the same TSA screeners in private security firm uniforms still operating under the "guidance" of the Federal Government. Real security will be achieved when the airlines are once again in charge of protecting their property and their passengers.

To move us in that direction, I am today introducing the American Traveler Dignity Act, which establishes that any Federal employee or agency or any individual or entity that receives Federal funds is not immune from any U.S. law regarding physical contact with another person, making images of another person, or causing physical harm through the use of radiation-emitting machinery on another person. It means they are not above laws the rest of us must obey. As we continue to see more and more outrageous stories of TSA abuses and failures, I hope that my colleagues in the House will listen to their constituents and join with me to support this legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 24, I was delayed in leaving the Medal of Honor Recognition Ceremony for Staff Sergeant Salvatore Guinta and was unable to reach the floor to cast my vote before the vote was closed. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ANOTHER UNFOLDING TRAGEDY IN SUDAN

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I submit an article which recently ran in the BBC regarding the unfolding tragedy in Sudan.

On the eve of the birth of a new nation in South Sudan, Khartoum is once again perpetrating acts of violence against its own people—this time in Southern Kordofan.

First-hand accounts emerging from the region are chilling . . . door to door executions, reportedly based on ethnicity and political affiliation; Antonov bombers leaving a trail of devastation in their wake, mass displacement.

The world says, "never again," and yet in the face of mounting atrocities, where is the outrage?

[From BBC News, June 23, 2011]

SUDAN'S SOUTH KORDOFAN: ''BOMBINGS, BLOOD AND TERROR''

More than 70,000 people are said to have fled violence in Sudan's South Kordofan state, where the government says it is disarming rebels. The region borders South Sudan, a largely Christian and animist region, which is due to gain independence from the mostly Arabic-speaking, Muslim north on 9 July.

There is concern about the humanitarian crisis and the alleged atrocities being committed. The area has effectively been cut off by the military and not much has been heard from people in the area. One aid worker who has just left the region told the BBC's Will Ross about his experiences:

It is terrifying. The civilians try to hide but generally they run in panic and hence, sadly, there are many casualties who die because of shrapnel. There are bombings and shellings every day in different areas.

There is a plane called an Antonov which circles high in the sky and keeps coming over. Then there is the whistle of the bombs as they fall. You have a few seconds to run but you do not know if it is going to fall on you or not. The sounds of the explosions are huge and sometimes the craters they leave are five or six metres across.

Burning hot pieces of jagged metal, the shrapnel, go flying across the air and if you are not below the surface in a hole or a dugout you are at huge risk.

BLOOD AND FLIES

Then there are the MiGs [planes] which come in very, very fast and low. These fire

rockets and they are terrifying because they are on top of you before you know it. You have no warning.

They are very loud and so the terror that this incites in people, even if you survive these attacks, is enormous.

They can continue for hours on end. You can imagine how awful that is for women and children and men, rural farmers who have no military background whatsoever. And when they sense that this is not an enemy from outside that is attacking, this is their own government, they just do not understand why this is happening.

There are so many poignant, heartbreaking stories.

A local farmer was lying on the floor of a hospital in enormous pain, with a large piece of shrapnel that had gone through his leg, with blood and flies over him. Again and again he was asking the same desperate questions: ''Why is our president doing this to us? Why is he bombing us?''

He kept saying: ''This is wrong''.

Then there was a young man who had fled a village that was attacked and when the SAF [northern] troops withdrew, he found to his horror that his wife and children had been abducted by the army.

With anguish in his voice he said he would rather have been killed than his wife and child taken.

''I don't know what they will do to them, I don't think I will see them again,'' he said.

No less than 75,000 people have been displaced, and because the bombing and shelling is continuing, that number is probably going up every day.

This is not a war of north versus south—this is about a people within north Sudan who want a peaceful existence in the north just with social and economic opportunities and access to justice.

The Nuba, a large percentage of whom are Muslims, feel their future is with north Sudan.

The people of South Kordofan, both the Nuba and people from the nomadic Arab tribes, feel marginalised by Khartoum. They feel they are not granted basic human rights.

HOUSE-TO-HOUSE EXECUTIONS

The area offers a remarkable alternative vision of how Christian and Muslims and animists can live together. I have witnessed after Eid, the Christians bringing breakfast for their Muslim brothers and sisters, and at Christmas and Easter all the people from the mosque coming to say ''congratulations''.

But people there feel the government in the last few weeks has revealed it has no interest in allowing a political solution that gives rights to an alternative voice in the north, where there is religious tolerance and Christians and Muslims living together.

There is so much anguish. People say they don't want war but they say until the policies of Khartoum change, they see no alternative.

They are asking for help from all northern Sudanese to come back from this madness and have a look at how to build a peaceful, tolerant society in the north.

We are getting very strong reports that house-to-house executions are going on by internal security forces where summary executions are taking place based on ethnicity, political affiliation and even how black you are. These are civilians, intellectuals, teachers, community leaders, Muslims and Christians, and often they are killed by their throats being slit.

This may be only the beginning and it could well continue for many months and intensify. There is a complete lack of access—we learnt that the only airstrip that was left had been bombed and we have heard the government of Sudan will shoot down UN flights operating in South Kordofan so humanitarian flights are no longer an option.

We know that there is no access from the north by road so we are looking at a population that is now effectively besieged—without access to services or humanitarian aid and who are under fire.

I fear the government has started these military operations to try to ensure that opposition voice is completely squashed before the 9 July, so that no thought of help of any sort could come from the south, knowing that the emerging republic of South Sudan would be very unwilling to get involved as it would endanger their independence.

The great majority of Nuba people that I have spoken to are very worried the Egyptian forces that make up a large percentage of the UN peacekeepers are not seen as sufficiently neutral. Their cultural and religious background and their behaviour and attitude towards black Nuba people are unhelpful.

HONORING THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, 76 years ago, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed into law the National Labor Relations Act, which continues to protect the rights of employees and employers, encourages fair bargaining, and blocks harmful practices that hurt our Nation's workers, businesses and the economy.

This important piece of legislation in our Nation's history has allowed working Americans to enjoy their rights to assemble and organize into labor unions. Unions have been instrumental in strengthening the middle class. Leaders like AFL–CIO President Dennis Hughes, DC 37 Executive Director Lillian Roberts, Teamsters Local 237 President Gregory Floyd. SEIU Local 1199 President George Gresham and SEIU 32BJ President Mike Fishman, and AFT and UFT Presidents Randi Weingarten and Michael Mulgrew have all marched in the spirit of A. Philip Randolph and Thomas Van Arsdale to protect the civil rights of all Americans in the workplace and I stand by my fellow soldiers in our continued struggle to preserve the Labor Movement and all the victories fought and won.

With the recent change of rules enacted by the National Labor Relations Board, working Americans will be able to quickly unionize and cut the time businesses have to mount anti-union campaigns. There is still more to do for our workers. That is why I co-sponsored the Employee Non-Discrimination Act which prohibits discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender in the workforce. I will keep on supporting other bills that ensure labor rights and will work hand in hand with union leaders to create an equal partnership in revitalizing our economy.''

IN RECOGNITION OF TEMPLE EMANU-EL'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Temple Emanu-El of Edison, New Jersey, as its members gather to celebrate its 50th Anniversary. Under the leadership of Rabbi Emeritus Alfred Landsberg and Rabbi Deborah Bravo, Temple Emanu-El is a respected educational and religious institution for many families whose members remain committed to various community service activities. Their hard work and dedication are worthy of this body's recognition.

Since its founding in 1961, Temple Emanu-El's membership remains open to persons of any race, sex, ethnic background, physical capability, sexual orientation, national origin or marital status. The synagogue is a sanctuary for interfaith families, gay and lesbian groups as well as numerous organizations and religious communities interested in pursuing the Jewish faith. Its rich diversity ensures the organization's ability to provide various religious programs for all ages. The synagogue is proud to be the first religious school within the region to offer special education programs to its members. Pre-school students have the opportunity to celebrate Shabbat through song and craft programs. Teens also get together at Temple Emanu-El to study Judaism with their friends while community members remain engaged in the sacred work of 'tikkun olam', the repair of the world, through various social action programs.

The worshipers of Temple Emanu-El are committed to participating in various community programs and service endeavors. Food and monetary funds are collected by the worshipers and delivered to the members of the community. The members also partake in the weekend meals-on-wheels delivery program as they continue to reach out to members of their community in need.

The synagogue also maintains a commitment to provide various educational opportunities. Temple Emanu-El provides programs for the children to learn Hebrew and various Jewish traditions while adults are given the opportunity to study with Scholars-in-Resident and participate in Bar/Bat Mitzvah programs. Many congregants also join together on a weekly basis to study Torah. In addition to the plethora of activities offered at Temple Emanu-El, the synagogue remains a serene house of worship for its members to congregate and reflect.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Temple Emanu-El on its 50th Anniversary and thanking the members for their continued contribution to the Jewish community.

AFGHANISTAN DRAWDOWN

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, in October, our troops will have been in Afghanistan for ten years. It is the longest war in our country's history. I am concerned that the mission has become more ambitious and our exit strategy has become increasingly vague.

This year is on pace to become the deadliest of this war. Over 1,600 Americans have been killed and 11,000 wounded in Operation Enduring Freedom. A 2008 study by RAND Corp. estimates that over 26 percent of troops may return from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan with mental health issues. In terms of financial costs, California taxpayers alone have

spent over $50 billion on the war in Afghanistan. According to the Congressional Budget Office, ending the wars could save $1.4 trillion.

The President's announcement that he will begin removing surge troops does not reflect a significant policy change in Afghanistan. Removing the 30,000 surge troops from Afghanistan over the next year and a half only means that by the end of next year, we will be exactly where we were before the surge in December of 2009. Roughly 100,000 American soldiers will remain in Afghanistan to fight a war that I have serious reservations about.

I urge President Obama to reconsider his Afghanistan policy and commit to a meaningful drawdown of our troops.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE McCOLLUM AMENDMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. MIKE PENCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes:

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlelady from Minnesota, Ms. MCCOLLUM.

The amendment would prohibit the Department of Defense from advancing their recruitment and retention goals through various athletic sponsorships.

At a time when our forces are undertaking operations in multiple theaters, I think it is wise that this body not end the very successful platform used by the Department of Defense to recruit men and women into their ranks.

Contrary to popular belief, sponsorships also go far beyond driver appearances, commercials and decals on race cars. In fact, the National Guard's Sponsorship of the Panther Racing IndyCar team has not only been successful in recruitment efforts, but it also has been successful in technology sharing.

J.R. Hildebrand, who drives the National Guard Indy car, wears ear sensors that measure the G-forces he experiences during a crash. That information is very useful for neurosurgeons who treat soldiers suffering from Traumatic Brain Injury, often the result of roadside bomb attacks.

Understanding the nature and effects of Traumatic Brain Injury advances the ways in which we protect and treat our fighting men and women, and those same sensors worn by J.R. Hildebrand will soon be deployed to our soldiers downrange.

These athletic sponsorships are great recruitment and marketing tools, and they also help improve the lives and care of our service men and women. I urge my colleagues to oppose the McCollum Amendment.

HONORING TERRY DRESSLER

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Terry Dressler, recently retired after 33 years of public service devoted to protecting the air quality along the Central Coast of California.

Terry has had a distinguished career in his field, beginning his work with air pollution control in Ventura in 1978. He then worked in San Luis Obispo for almost eight years before coming to serve the Santa Barbara community for more than twenty three years, most recently serving for the last seven years as the Air Pollution Control Officer for the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD).

As a result of the work of Terry and his team, the County of Santa Barbara has improved its air quality through attainment of federal standards and has made major progress towards meeting state standards. Terry has effectively instituted and enforced programs that reduce stationary, marine shipping, and mobile source emissions while raising community awareness of air quality issues. Additionally, he was instrumental in the creation of the District Community Advisory Council and has worked with its members on state and federal clean air strategy. These initiatives have enhanced the agency's reputation for excellence in local and statewide communities.

My staff and I have worked closely with Terry in his efforts to lead the district towards its clean air mission and I have seen firsthand the great progress and improved air quality standards instituted by Terry and the APCD. His strong leadership and knowledge have directly, and positively, influenced the health of the residents of the County of Santa Barbara.

Terry is recognized as a dedicated public servant who has devoted his career to protecting the health and safety of the citizens of the County of Santa Barbara and the State of California. Terry's accomplishments in the field of air quality and his charismatic presence have left a lasting impact on his colleagues, staff, and community members, and we can all breathe a little easier as a result of his outstanding efforts. I am pleased to commend Terry for his commitment to excellence in the field of air quality, and I wish him a happy retirement surfing the Central Coast.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO LINDA S. MULLER

HON. MAURICE D. HINCHEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and salute Linda S. Muller, who is marking her 20th Anniversary as President and Chief Executive Officer of The Greater Hudson Valley Family Health Center. Under Linda's diligent and tireless leadership, The Greater Hudson Valley Family Health Center has grown from a small facility located in the basement of St. Luke's Hospital serving 4,000 patients each year to a greatly expanded and modern health center providing comprehensive primary and preventive health care to more than 18,000 patients annually in the City of Newburgh and the surrounding towns in eastern Orange County. As a result of Linda's tremendous commitment and passion for universal health care, many thousands of medically underserved families and individuals in our region receive the highest quality of care from the dedicated physicians and staff at The Greater Hudson Valley Family Health Center.

In addition to overseeing the historic expansion of the health center's physical facilities, including the recent construction of a state-of-the-art new facility in the City of Newburgh, Linda has devoted a great deal of energy to increasing the services offered to our local community. The obstetrical health program developed by Linda in 2005 has now assisted more than 3,000 women in delivering healthy babies, many of whom now continue to receive health care at the health center. Linda also has responded to the urgent medical needs of our local community. This included creating programs to improve chronic health care management for diabetics and those with cardiovascular disease and initiating a model treatment program for people in our community living with HIV. Similarly, when it appeared that urgently needed treatment for people with substance abuse and chemical dependency problems might be lost to the City of Newburgh, Linda stepped in and created The Center for Recovery, which has now supported more than 800 patients in making a transition into healthy lifestyles free from drugs and alcohol.

Linda has led The Greater Hudson Valley Family Health Center through her strong dedication to the premise that health care is a right and not a privilege. She has imparted to every one of the more than 200 employees who work at the health center the importance of fulfilling the center's mission to provide high-quality, affordable, and easily accessible health care to everyone in our community, regardless of their status or ability to pay for care. Linda and her husband Charles will also celebrate another anniversary this summer, celebrating 40 years of marriage. They have three wonderful children, Jonathan, Christopher, and Jessica and three beautiful grandchildren, each brought into this world by one of the health center's extraordinary obstetricians.

IN RECOGNITION OF GEORGIA CARAWAY

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a very special constituent of the 26th District of Texas, Georgia Caraway. After 13 years of service as the Executive Director of the Denton County Museums, Mrs. Caraway will retire later this month.

As Executive Director, Mrs. Caraway's professionalism and dedication has greatly impacted her community; she has spent her career striving to preserve Denton County's history through projects such as the Courthouse-on-the-Square Museum and the establishment of Denton County's Historical Park. Mrs. Caraway believes her greatest accomplishment

was the founding of the Denton County African American Museum. Through her astute leadership and cooperative fundraising efforts, she enabled the restoration of the county's museums and saved taxpayers thousands of dollars. In addition to her work with the museums, she has also helped complete a series of historical photography books that commemorate Denton County, and she hopes these achievements will encourage others to remember the county's origins and history.

Mrs. Caraway has left a lasting legacy in Denton County through her work. I thank Mrs. Caraway for her service and am proud to represent her in Congress.

HONORING MS. JEANNE KUCEY

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jeanne Kucey on her recent election to the Board of Directors at the National Association of Federal Credit Unions, NAFCU.

Ms. Kucey has served as President and CEO of JetStream Federal Credit Union since 2009. Responsible for operations in both Miami Dade County and Puerto Rico, her extensive experience in the financial services arena, including her time with credit unions in Atlanta, Georgia and San Diego, California, will be a tremendous asset to the NAFCU board.

Not only does Ms. Kucey bring a wealth of financial management knowledge to the table, she exemplifies the community based nature of credit unions through her work with the "Marlene Ericca Empowering Workshops" which provides life skills and mentoring to local disadvantaged women. Ms. Kucey is also an active member of the Chamber of Commerce.

Ms. Kucey is a welcomed addition to the NAFCU board and will have the opportunity to make an immediate impact in her new role as recent regulatory reforms have created a particularly challenging time in the credit union community.

It is because of the hard work and dedication of Jeanne and others like her that the credit union community has been able to continue to serve its members during the tough economic times our country continues to experience.

I wish Ms. Kucey the best of luck in her new role as a member of the NAFCU Board of Directors. I look forward to working with her in this capacity and ask that my colleagues join me today in congratulating Jeanne on this achievement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 497 on July 6, 2011, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

BELARUS DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 2011

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 515, the Belarus Democracy Reauthorization Act of 2011, which will support human rights in Belarus by encouraging the free expression of ideas among pro-democracy activists.

I would like to commend Mr. SMITH, the gentleman from New Jersey, for sponsoring this legislation and the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. BERMAN, for their efforts in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Madam Speaker, Belarusians have the same right to self-government and free speech as their neighbors and through the reauthorization of assistance to their civil society, H.R. 515 will help them regain rights which have been repressed by the ruling regime.

Since he was elected as his country's first president in 1994, Aleksandr Lukashenko has steadily consolidated his power, reversing promising reforms put in place following the dissolution of the Soviet Union. The CIA World Factbook describes Belarus as "a republic in name, although in fact a dictatorship." Former Secretary of State Condolezza Rice called it "the last true remaining dictatorship in the heart of Europe."

Belarus has been criticized for its dismal human rights record by the U.N. Security Council, the U.S. State Department, the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, the Council of Europe, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the European Council, the European Parliament, the European Commission, and the NATO Parliamentary Assembly.

As a result of its human rights violations and a steady record of state-sponsored political repression, Belarus is subject to numerous sanctions from both the United States and the European Union. In 2004, Congress unanimously passed the Belarus Democracy Act, which authorizes assistance for political parties, non-governmental organizations, and independent media toward democratic and humanitarian reforms.

This legislation affirms that it remains in the interest of our country that Belarus returns to its rightful place among its fellow European democracies. Unfortunately, recent events validate its current designation as a rogue state. The White House released the following statement regarding its last Presidential election which saw widespread violence and voting irregularities:

> The flawed December 2010 Presidential election in Belarus and its aftermath—the harsh violence against peaceful demonstrators; the continuing detention, prosecution, and imprisonment of opposition Presidential candidates and others; and the continuing repression of independent media and civil society activists—all show that the Government of Belams has taken steps backward in the development of democratic governance and respect for human rights.

Madam Speaker, the focus of H.R. 515 is on the Government of Belarus, not its people.

Many of my constituents and their families came to this country fleeing repression from totalitarian regimes. Hearing their stories, I am constantly reminded that a government which respects human rights, free speech, independent courts, and transparent elections is essential to personal liberty. As we pursue sanctions against the government of Belarus, we must provide support to the pro-democracy movement.

With H.R. 515, we will send a message that governing through fear, censorship, and the threat of violence has no place in a legitimate republic. As we mark the 235th birthday of the United States and the rights we enjoy, let us encourage those who wish to apply our principles to their own governments.

With this legislation, we support the political activists, the independent journalists, and the civil society leaders who risk so much for the good of Belarus.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 515.

CONGRATULATING CORPORAL BURT RICHARDS

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Corporal Burt Richards for being awarded the American Red Cross Community Courage Award for his work in educating the youth of today about the service of veterans.

Corporal Richards and the local chapter of the Jewish War Veterans spearheaded the campaign to close Palm Beach County schools in remembrance of Veteran's Day. While they were not successful in their efforts to close schools, they were successful in creating a new lecture series called "The Veteran Speaks," which has ensured that students in Palm Beach County are educated about our American war veterans.

I would like to congratulate Corporal Richards and the American Red Cross for the Palm Beach-Treasure Coast region for their great work on behalf of veterans and for the award. It is an honor having Corporal Richards as a constituent, and I look forward to a continued partnership in educating south Florida's youth about our veterans.

HONORING EULESS CITY SECRETARY SUSAN CRIM FOR MORE THAN 21 YEARS AS A DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, it my distinct pleasure to rise today to recognize Mrs. Susan Crim, a dedicated public servant who is retiring after serving more than 21 years as City Secretary for the City of Euless, TX.

Mrs. Crim was born in Woodward, OK, and is a graduate of Northwestern State University in Alva, OK, where she obtained an associates degree in applied science. She is also a graduate of the Texas Municipal Clerks Certification program, where she attained her Texas

Registered Municipal Clerks Certification in January 1991. In 1996 and 2001, she served as a trustee for the Texas Municipal Clerks Certification Program. Mrs. Crim is also a member of the North Texas Municipal Clerks Association, where she served as president from 1996–1997.

Mrs. Crim has a distinguished work history within the public and private sectors. In 1979, Susan was part owner and operator of Circle C Drilling Company. Following her time at Circle C, she took a position as executive assistant at Dresser Atlas. Mrs. Crim then served as office manager at Pecan Grove Baptist Church and School from 1983–1987. In June 1987, Mrs. Crim began her career as City Secretary with the city of Rosenberg, TX, where she served from 1987–1990.

In 1990, Mrs. Crim was hired as City Secretary of Euless. As City Secretary, Mrs. Crim recorded and maintained the minutes at city council meetings, managed the official Euless City public records, organized local elections and held the responsibility as keeper of the "Seal of the City." As a fundamental part of the Euless city government, Mrs. Crim has tirelessly served multiple mayors, council members and various city departments in Euless.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Mrs. Crim for her service to the city of Euless. Her experience and expertise will be sorely missed. I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating Susan Crim on a tremendous career as well as wishing her the best in her future endeavors.

CHICKASAW WARRIOR STATUE DEDICATION

HON. DAN BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an important milestone for a prestigious institution of higher learning in eastern Oklahoma. Bacone College, the oldest college or university in Oklahoma, recently dedicated the statue "Chickasaw Warrior" at its Founders' Day ceremony. This statue is a gift from its artist, Enoch Kelly Haney, and the Chickasaw Nation. Its dedication is a very special moment for this institution. Standing proudly at the center of campus, this tall, imposing statue depicts a battle-ready Native American man clenching arrows gazing into the distance.

In the six months this statue has been on campus, it has become symbolic of the common spirit found everywhere at Bacone. Founded in 1880 by Professor Almon C. Bacone in Muskogee, Oklahoma, Bacone College has been educating students of all backgrounds for the past 131 years. With more than two dozen Native American tribes represented in Bacone College's diverse student body, Bacone is known for preparing its students for success and preserving their cultural heritage. This statue aptly represents Bacone's long-standing relationship with the Native American community.

This impressive statue was sculpted by Enoch Kelly Haney. A 1962 graduate of Bacone College, Haney has become an internationally renowned artist and sculptor. His work spans four decades and his statue, The Guardian, stands proudly atop the Oklahoma State Capitol. In addition to his contributions to the field of art, Haney served in the Oklahoma legislature and in 2005 was elected Principal Chief of the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma. I would like to honor him for his time and effort in creating this generous gift to Bacone College and for his continuing service to the citizens of the state of Oklahoma.

Finally, I want to commend the Chickasaw Nation for donating this impressive statue to the college. Chickasaw Nation Governor Bill Anoatubby described this occasion perfectly when he said this statue reflects the "unconquerable" nature of the Chickasaw people and their unwavering determination to persevere. Now this statue will stand as a testament to their spirit, and there is no doubt this extraordinary gift will serve as an icon for Bacone College's future.

In these times of limited federal funding for higher education, it is important for the United States Congress to remember the local and regional universities that educate so many of our citizens, thereby empowering them to improve the future of their families and communities. Bacone College is a tremendous asset to eastern Oklahoma, and I recognize the Chickasaw Nation for their contribution to this important institution of higher learning.

H.R. 2112, AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

HON. KRISTI L. NOEM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2112, the Agriculture Appropriations bill. While agriculture, along with every other industry must take some reductions to get our spending under control, it should not be in a disproportionate manner. This bill would take a nearly 14 percent cut in discretionary funding compared to last year while other appropriations bills thus far have seen cuts less than 3 percent. I could not vote in favor of this bill because I did not feel that it recognized the importance that agriculture plays in our nation's economy or take into account the impact this would have on farmers. While it is important to reduce the deficit, we should do it in a responsible manner and not disproportionately on the backs of the farmers who are supplying our nation's, and much of the world's, food supply.

There were many provisions in the bill that I supported, but I felt the bill sent the wrong overall message about the importance of agriculture policy. As South Dakota's lone Representative, I could not in good conscience vote for a bill that unfairly singled out South Dakota's number one industry.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF GREG COOPER

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 2011, Greg Cooper lost his battle with cancer at his home in Tustin, Orange County, California.

Born on June 23, 1945, Greg Cooper proudly served as a United States Marine Corps Sergeant from 1963 to 1967. His commendable service included a tour of duty near the city of DaNang, in the Republic of Vietnam.

Upon his departure with the Marines, Greg worked with the Santa Ana Police Department where he held several high-profile management and tactical unit positions. Among these positions, Greg was the SWAT Commander for 10 years and was active in the original development and transition from traditional to community oriented policing (COP). This COP policing model has been successfully duplicated across the United States for decades.

While serving as a police officer with the Santa Ana Police Department, Greg earned a Police Science Degree from Santa Ana College, a Bachelors degree from California State University-Fullerton and a Masters degree from the University of Southern California.

Leaving the Santa Ana Police Department in 1992, Greg was appointed Chief of Police in Sanger, California. In 1996 he relocated to Washington, DC after accepting a position with the Department of Justice (DOJ) "COPS" Program. At the DOJ, Greg would be the Assistant Director, responsible for monitoring operations for more than 30,000 Federal grants to more than 13,000 State and local law enforcement agencies.

In 2002, Greg joined the newly formed Department of Homeland Security as FEMA's Director of Security/Chief Security Officer. He would later retire from this position in 2008. At FEMA, Greg had oversight for all FEMA facilities, disaster operations, information security, personnel security and all national security clearances.

Since retiring from government service, Greg, a highly regarded and well-known expert in several specialty fields, continued to serve as a consultant to numerous law enforcement agencies across the nation.

A grateful nation mourns the loss of a loyal friend, a respected leader and a dedicated public servant.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote number 496 on July 6, 2011, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is time to tell the story of all of the American people. Earlier this week we celebrated of our nation's 235th birthday. Here in Washington hundreds of thousands of people visited the National Mall, watched fireworks, took pictures of the monuments, and toured our national museums. The

story of our country's founding to our current status as the world's beacon of democracy and freedom, were on display.

But the full story of who we are as a nation and the many, vibrant ethnicities that make up the fabric of the American experience, remains incomplete. The story about the making of the American people—of all of the people—is missing and it needs to be told in the heart of our nation's capital.

That's why I am introducing a bipartisan resolution that calls for a Presidential Commission to study the establishment of the National Museum of the American People. A commission is the first critical step in the path toward the creation of a national museum that will highlight the diversity and richness of the cultures from which our ancestors came and will foster a sense of belonging to the nation by the waves of people who made us the leading economic, military, scientific, and cultural force in the world. The Museum's central theme takes its inspiration from our original national motto: "E Pluribus Unum"—From Many We Are One.

The Museum will be America's only national institution devoted exclusively to telling the full story of how the world's pioneers interwove their diverse races, religions, and ethnicities into the strongest societal fabric ever known to modern mankind. Both Canada and Mexico have major national museums in their capitals telling the story of their peoples and they are the most visited museums in those nations. People from every ethnic and minority group will come to see their own story and learn how they joined together with "the others" in pursuit of a more noble national purpose. Foreign visitors will come to learn how natives of their countries helped create our nation.

I fully understand the current fiscal realities of the day. This proposal will involve no authorization of federal funds and will not require the need for any taxpayer money. It does, however, already enjoy broad support having been endorsed by more than 130 organizations representing virtually every major ethnic and nationality group in the nation.

For the different groups who became Americans, the Museum will tell who, where, when, why and how transformed our nation. Today's technology makes all of this possible.

The Museum of the American People will be like walking though a dramatic documentary delving into these grand movements of peoples. It will follow in the tradition of some of today's most successful story-telling museums such as the Holocaust Memorial Museum. The goal will be to tell our peoples' compelling story with force and clarity.

While there should always be room for other national museums in our nation's capital devoted to all manner of art, cultural and scientific accomplishments, this Museum, covering accurately and adequately each group's story in the context of every group's story should help stem the trend of groups having their own individual, specific museums such as the National Museum of the American Indian, the National Museum of the African American History and Culture, and the National Museum of the American Latino. All of their stories should be told, but the list is nearly infinite while the space, money and political will is not. In telling everyone's story, the National Museum of the American People would recognize the important differences that set us apart while celebrating the common purpose that has brought us together—E Pluribus Unum.

I encourage my colleagues to support this measure.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CONNIE MACK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 6, 2011, I was unavoidably delayed and unable to vote on rollcall Nos. 495 through 501. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on No. 495, "yes" on No. 496, "no" on No. 497, "no" on No. 498, "no" on No. 499, "yes" on No. 500, and "yes" on No. 501.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARY BONO MACK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, on July 6, 2011, for rollcall Nos. 495 to 501, I was unavoidably absent and unable to vote due to travel delays. Had I been present, I would have voted, "no" on 495, "aye" on 496, "no" on 497, "no" on 498, "no" on 499, "aye" on 500, and "aye" on 501.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. TIMOTHY WARREN

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Memphis Police Officer Timothy Warren, a courageous and deeply generous man who bettered the Memphis community through his service as a police officer and through his charitable work for the homeless. Lamentably, on Sunday, July 3, Officer Warren laid down his life while responding to a rogue gunman in a Memphis hotel.

Public safety is an inherent power of government and every day across our nation police officers put their lives on the line to protect our citizens. Officer Warren, like his fellow Memphis police officers, responded when the need arose, without hesitation and with great courage. His actions on July 3rd may very well have saved the lives of others.

Born in 1971, Officer Warren grew up in Cleveland, Mississippi and received a bachelor's degree from Delta State University, where he also earned a spot on the Mississippi All State Football Team. Despite his successes during college, he briefly ended up homeless and was forced to sleep in abandoned houses in the dead of winter. The empathy Officer Warren developed for the homeless community would last a lifetime.

After moving to Memphis, Officer Warren served as a Deputy Jailer for the Shelby County Sheriffs office from 2000 until joining the Memphis Police Department in 2003. He served as a Patrolman in the South Main district, choosing to work a night shift in order to see his 8-year-old son, James, off to school in the mornings and to watch his 4-year-old daughter, Jewel, during the day.

Officer Warren and his wife, Betsy Gray, were active in the community helping to feed the homeless. While on patrol, Officer Warren would pass out bottles of cold water to the homeless sweltering in the heat and humidity of Memphis. While off duty with his family, they would take their grill to Overton Park to feed the homeless. At one point, Officer Warren considered leaving law enforcement to start a church. However his good friend and ordained minister, Jeff Gray, remembers him saying "Well, police work is all I know. I enjoy it. It also gives me the chance to minister to people because I'm right there."

Officer Timothy Warren was a man of exceptional courage with a big heart. His was a life too short, but today I honor him as a public servant and a hero. The city of Memphis is better because of his calling to serve and protect and because of his love for Memphis and its citizens. Officer Warren is survived by his wife Betsy, two children, James and Jewel, his father Jimmy Warren and his Sister Dondi Warren.

INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING NATIONAL DANCE DAY ON SATURDAY, JULY 30, 2011

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a resolution designating the last Saturday in July as National Dance Day to combat obesity and overweight through dance of all kinds. This year, each community throughout the country is encouraged to celebrate National Dance Day on Saturday, July 30. In the nation's capital, National Dance Day will be celebrated at the Sylvan Theatre on the National Mall.

Our country has a notorious adult and child overweight and obesity epidemic. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, childhood obesity in the United States has more than tripled in the past 30 years. In the United States, almost one-third of children and teenagers ages 2 to 19 and 68 percent of adults ages 20 and older are obese or overweight. We can promote physical activity among children and adults while having fun dancing, an exercise that most enjoy.

On the National Mall, "So You Think You Can Dance" producer and celebrity judge Nigel Lythgoe, the Dizzy Feet Foundation, and the Larry King Cardiac Foundation will host a variety of dance groups that will perform the dances that keep them fit. A Flash Mob will also have everybody dancing for fun and physical fitness on July 30.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the resolution and to encourage dancing for physical exercise on National Dance Day and throughout the year.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE OF RALPH CALCATERRA

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 2011, surrounded by his family, my friend Ralph Calcaterra of Atherton, California, passed away. He leaves his wife Ferne, two children, Melissa Freeman and Richard Calcaterra, and three grandchildren.

For almost forty years, my family was blessed with the friendship of Ralph Calcaterra.

He made us laugh across the decades and generations.

He rode his bike to our house on Saturdays for almost twenty years—smiling and calling out, "anybody home?" and "what's going on?"

We learned more about Iron Mountain, Michigan, and Las Vegas, than anybody else in Atherton.

We saw how much a man can love his wife, his children, and his grandchildren.

We learned the latest prices of real estate in Atherton—including who had bought what, and at what price.

Most of all, we saw close up and personal, what loyal friendship was. Ralph embodied it.

Today, heaven is a better place. Saints and sinners alike are laughing and learning as we did because Ralph is there.

Thank you Ralph, for being our loving, smiling and loyal friend.

You enriched our lives just by being wonderful you, and we are already missing you.

Happy bike riding across heaven, and know we will love you across eternity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in offering our condolences to the family of Ralph Calcaterra, a proud citizen and a true patriot of our country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 495 on July 6, 2011, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

THE AVIATION HALL OF FAME

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, the Aviation Hall of Fame was established in Dayton, Ohio, on October 5, 1961, with five Daytonians as its founding fathers.

The founders of the Hall of Fame were tasked with preserving the history of aviation heroes, fostering a better appreciation of the origins and growth of aviation and cataloging the role aviation has played in changing the economic, social and scientific trajectory of our nation.

Through the tireless efforts of its founders in establishing the Hall of Fame, aviation pioneers and achievers have been suitably honored for the last half-century.

Located within the NMUSAF with over 200 inductees, the Hall will induct 4 new honorees this month.

From pioneers Wilbur and Orville Wright of Ohio, to astronauts, such as Neil Armstrong, pilots, such as Charles Lindberg and Amelia Earhart, inventors, such as Alexander Graham Bell, and entrepreneurs, such as William Boeing, among countless others whose contributions to aviation have made the U.S. aerospace industry the most advanced in the world.

Since 1981 the Hall of Fame has annually bestowed its prestigious "Spirit of Flight" Award upon a group or organization in recognition of its achievement in advancing aviation. The 2011 Milton Caniff "Spirit of Flight" Award recipient will be the U.S. Navy Blue Angels Flight Demonstration Team, in recognition of the group's 65–year history of serving as positive role models and goodwill ambassadors for the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps. More than 460 million fans have witnessed the teams' spectacularly choreographed aerial performances since the group was formed in 1946.

The Hall of Fame Learning Center exhibit hall features interactive exhibits and displays serving nearly one million learners of all ages a year. Visitors can experience landing an aircraft on a Navy carrier, controlling the movement of a helicopter, docking in space with the Hubble Space Telescope, and taking the controls of an historic aircraft on one of four flight simulators.

On behalf of all the Americans who have been inspired by the history of flight and the accomplishments of our aviation pioneers, I congratulate the Aviation Hall of Fame, its board of trustees, and dedicated staff on their many accomplishments.

This month marks the Hall of Fame's fiftieth enshrinement ceremony, celebrating an historic milestone in the integral role it has served in honoring pioneers of aviation.

I join Ohioans and fans of aviation everywhere to recognize those founders and the National Aviation Hall of Fame: James W. Jacobs, Gregory C. Karas, John A. Lombard, Larry E. O'Neil, and Gerald E. Weller.

Their vision, leadership, and dedication have helped to preserve the rich history of aviation for all Americans over the past fifty years.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 25, I was delayed in leaving the Medal of Honor Recognition Ceremony for Staff Sergeant Salvatore Guinta and was unable to reach the floor to cast my vote before the vote was closed.

Had I been present, I would have voted, "yes".

HONORING THEOLA MARIE STARKS

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, Theola Marie Starks was born on June 2nd, 1928 in Grant, Oklahoma, the fourth of ten children of Reverend John B. and Marie C. Dawson. She and her husband, Burnes O. (Chief) Starks, Sr., moved to Phoenix in 1949 and started a family with the first of their ten children, Burnes O. (Burney) Starks, Jr. Mr. Starks was a chemist and soil tester for Arizona Testing Laboratories, and both Mr. and Mrs. Starks supplemented their income by picking cotton across the state.

The family moved to Tucson in 1966 and continued to raise their ten children on the south side of town in the Western Hills and Las Vistas neighborhoods. Mrs. Starks was very involved in community service, working as a teacher's aide and volunteering at a number of schools including Utterback, Cavett and Townsend. She always made friends easily and turned them into family. She believed in the Village raising children—she felt strongly that "your kids are mine and mine are yours."

Mrs. Starks also frequently volunteered with respected neighborhood matriarch Mrs. Tommie Thomas. Even though she only had a tenth grade education, she made sure her children understood the value and importance of education, integrity and hard work. All ten children—Burnes O., Gary E., Daryl D., Terry L., Charles G., Donna R., Harry J., Jacqueline B., Larry D., and Timothy B.—finished high school and entered college. Seven of the ten children earned college degrees.

Dr. Kevin Leman, noted psychologist and birth order doctor, has often commented on this woman and the remarkable way she raised ten children. Beyond her immediate family, nearly 100 children knew her as "mom" or "grandma."

Theola Starks' life was defined by miracles, as those who know her can testify, but the greatest miracle was her—the ability to smile, touch, befriend, forgive, mother and love anyone who came into her life. She was the ultimate prayer warrior. Today, we mark her passing and commend her as a role model and a wonderful person.

REAFFIRMING COMMITMENT TO NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT OF ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

SPEECH OF

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 2011

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I will vote yes on this resolution because I oppose a unilateral declaration of Palestinian statehood in the U.N.

We all know the status quo in Israel, Gaza and the West Bank is unsustainable. It's bad for Israelis, it's bad for Palestinians, and it's bad for the United States.

I believe that a negotiated agreement between both the Israelis and Palestinians is the

only way to reach a just and lasting peace in the region. But peace will never be achieved with senseless terrorism or soaring speeches or military might. Only through direct, honest, and earnest negotiations will the dream of peace be realized.

That is why I believe that both sides must put aside their preconditions and come to the table immediately.

As former Prime Minister Ehud Olmert recently wrote, peace will only be achieved "with the courage to take decisions that will change a reality which is increasingly creating a substantive threat on the State of Israel's stature, on the international support it receives, and on its future as a Jewish democratic state."

Yet, I'm concerned this resolution—instead of rising to Olmert's noble challenge—is yet another missed opportunity for the U.S. to advance peace in the region.

Just last December this House passed unanimously a substantially similar resolution opposing the unilateral declaration of Palestinian statehood. What are we accomplishing by restating our opposition?

Mr. Speaker, I worry that we have become too engrossed in the rhetorical debate of peace and are neglecting to fully pursue it. We could easily fill this Chamber with the words spoken over the years debating this conflict, but the room filled with actions taken to end it would sadly be much, much smaller.

This is a pivotal moment—a moment that demands bold, courageous leadership from Prime Minister Netanyahu, from President Abbas, and from President Obama. It is a moment that requires everyone—Israeli and Palestinian, friend and foe—to come together and resolve this crisis once and for all.

Congress can and should play a constructive role in this debate. But I'm concerned that repeatedly criticizing the Palestinians—and only the Palestinians—risks pushing Israelis and Palestinians further apart rather than bringing them closer together. Unfortunately, both Israelis and Palestinians are engaged in activities that are undermining peace efforts, and we must not ignore this mutual responsibility for the conflict.

And I'm also concerned that this resolution further isolates the United States and Israel and undermines our credibility as a serious broker for peace. There is no denying that both Israel and the United States are growing increasingly isolated in the international community. As President Obama said, "the international community is tired of an endless process that never procures an outcome." This resolution does nothing to change that.

Rather than spending our time reiterating the already established position against a unilateral declaration of statehood, we should be focusing on concrete measures that advance peace.

We should be looking for ways to help Israel adapt to the new realities of the Arab Spring rather than simply reinforcing the status quo.

And we should be encouraging both the Palestinians and Israelis to negotiate rather than just criticizing the Palestinians for not doing so.

At this critical juncture, with so much uncertainty and unrest throughout the Middle East, the U.S. needs to engage in constructive dialogue with all parties and help them bring this tragic conflict to an end. The U.S. cannot make peace in the region, only the parties can. But the U.S. has always been an indispensable agent in brokering peace.

That is why it is imperative that we reclaim that constructive role and foster a negotiated settlement that ensures the security of Israel, recognizes the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people, and promotes U.S. national security interests.

IN SUPPORT OF HOLDING THE 2016 DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION IN NORTHERN NEW JERSEY

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to propose that the 2016 Democratic Convention be held in Northern New Jersey. With easy access to a wide variety of transportation options, many local tourist attractions, and a proven record of successfully hosting large-scale events, Northern New Jersey is an ideal location and I urge my Democratic colleagues to join me in support of our bid to host the 2016 Convention.

Northern New Jersey has everything that a large-scale, high-profile event requires in order to go off without a hitch. Multiple airports provide access for visitors arriving from all across the country, while those traveling along the Eastern Seaboard have the option of taking Amtrak or one of several bus lines—all of which are particularly convenient to visitors from Washington, DC. Whether hosted in my district at the New Meadowlands Stadium in East Rutherford, at the Prudential Center in Newark, or both: our convention facilities are brand new, state-of-the-art, and well-equipped to host large events. Northern New Jersey boasts many hotels and tourist attractions for visitors, as well as proximity to other exciting locations; convention-goers would be just across the river from New York City and just up the Jersey shore from Atlantic City. Even as our national economy struggles to bounce back, tourism in Northern New Jersey has continued to flourish over the past few years, due in no small part to the infrastructure and facilities that our region has to offer visitors from across the Nation.

Most recently, the city of Newark hosted the 2011 NCAA East Regional Championship at the Prudential Center. Visitors, players, and league administrators alike were impressed and pleased with their newly chosen host city, with top NCAA officials noting that they are definitely on board with a future hosting bid. Looking toward the future, Super Bowl XLVII will be held at the New Meadowlands Stadium in 2014, and over 100,000 visitors from across the country are expected to travel to Northern New Jersey for this historic game. Both of these important events of national importance were brought to Northern New Jersey because of everything we have to offer, and I am confident that delegates and Convention participants alike would be pleased with the choice to hold our party's most important meeting here as well. A highly diverse region, Northern New Jersey is emblematic of the many cultures, ideas, and priorities that make up our great Nation, and I believe this is a fitting backdrop for the selection of our party's nominee for the 2016 Presidential race.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to consider Northern New Jersey as the site for the 2016 Democratic Convention. I know that we would host a memorable and well-executed Convention and I urge the Democratic Party to explore this option for 2016.

INTRODUCTION ON RESOLUTION TO GRANT THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE MONTFORD POINT MARINES

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with many of my colleagues to introduce a resolution to grant the Montford Point Marines a Congressional Gold Medal, the highest civilian honor that can be bestowed for an outstanding deed or act of service to the security, prosperity, and national interest of the United States.

On June 25, 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued Executive Order No. 8802 establishing the Fair Employment Practices Commission and opening the doors for the very first African Americans to enlist in the United States Marine Corps.

These African Americans, from all states, were not sent to the traditional boot camps of Parris Island, South Carolina, and San Diego, California. Instead, African American Marines were segregated—experiencing basic training at Camp Montford Point near the New River in Jacksonville, North Carolina. Approximately 20,000 African American Marines received basic training at Montford Point between 1942 and 1949.

On August 26, 1942, Howard P. Perry of Charlotte, North Carolina, was the first Black private to set foot on Montford Point.

During April 1943 the first African American Marine Drill Instructors took over as the senior Drill Instructors of the eight platoons then in training; the 16th Platoon (Edgar R. Huff), 17th (Thomas Brokaw), 18th (Charles E. Allen), 19th (Gilbert H. Johnson), 20th (Arnold R. Bostic), 21st (Mortimer A. Cox), 22nd (Edgar R. Davis, Jr.), and 23rd (George A. Jackson).

The initial intent was to discharge these African American Marines after the War, returning them to civilian life. Attitudes changed as the war progressed. Once given the chance to prove themselves, it became impossible to deny the fact that African American Marines were just as capable as all other Marines regardless of race, color, creed or National origin.

Black Marines of the 8th Ammunition Company and the 36th Depot Company landed on the island of Iwo Jima on D-day, February 19, 1945. The largest number of Black Marines to serve in combat during World War II took part in the seizure of Okinawa in the Ryuku Islands with some 2,000 Black Marines seeing action during the campaign. Overall 19,168 Blacks served in the Marine Corps in World War II.

On November 10, 1945, Frederick C. Branch was the first African American Marine to be commissioned as a second lieutenant, at the Marine Corps Base in Quantico, Virginia.

In July of 1948 President Harry S. Truman issued Executive Order 9981 ending segregation in the military. In September of 1949, Montford Marine Camp was deactivated—ending seven years of segregation.

I am honored to offer this resolution to recognize their service and sacrifice and acknowledge today's United States Marine Corps as an excellent opportunity for advancement of persons of all races due to the service and example of the original Montford Point Marines.

SUPREME COURT RECUSAL PROCESS IN NEED OF TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern that justices of the Supreme Court are not required to explain their decisions to recuse—or not recuse themselves in a particular case before the Court, and that those decisions are final and unreviewable. Recusal decisions, left to each individual justice to make on his or her own and with no opportunity for review, require that each justice be a judge in their own case.

Questions of impartiality erode the integrity of the Court and threaten to undermine public trust in our judicial system. The recusal process for Supreme Court justices must be reformed to provide an open and reviewable process.

A SUPREME COURT JUSTICE'S RECUSAL DECISIONS SHOULD BE TRANSPARENT AND REVIEWABLE

(By the Alliance for Justice)

The recusal process for Supreme Court justices needs transparency and accountability. Although there is a statute governing recusal—28 U.S.C. §4551—that applies to Supreme Court justices, the statute does not require individual justices to explain their recusal decisions, and those decisions are final and unreviewable. This system violates the basic maxim that no one should be a judge in his own case. It also ignores the fact that the standard to be applied in recusal cases is the appearance of bias, which by necessity depends on the views of others, and not the justice's own views of his or her impartiality. Exacerbating this lack of accountability is a lack of transparency, as justices are not required to issue a written opinion explaining a recusal decision.

That's why over 100 law professors recently sent a letter calling on Congress to hold hearings and implement legislation to increase the transparency and accountability of recusal decisions.

A recent Supreme Court case, Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal, Inc. provides an object lesson in the hazards of a self-policing judiciary, in which individual judges determine whether or not their impartiality can reasonably be questioned. In Caperton, West Virginia Justice Brent D. Benjamin received substantial campaign contributions made directly or indirectly from the president of a company with an outstanding $50 million judgment against it on appeal before the judge. Justice Benjamin denied three motions to recuse himself, and then voted in the 3–2 majority to reverse the judgment against the company. A public opinion poll indicated that 67% of West Virginians doubted Justice Benjamin would be fair and impartial.

The Supreme Court reversed Justice Benjamin's decisions not to recuse himself on the basis that the risk of actual bias was so high that it violated petitioners' constitutional due process rights. It did not matter what Justice Benjamin thought of his own potential for bias, the key was whether the appearance of impartiality was compromised, the Court held. The Court emphasized the need for an objective test to evaluate whether an interest rises to such a degree that the average judge might become biased, rather than relying on a judge's self-evaluation of actual bias. ''The difficulties of inquiring into actual bias and the fact that the inquiry is often a private one, simply underscore the need for objective rules,'' the Court added. The Court held that the need for an independent inquiry is particularly important ''where, as here, there is no procedure for judicial factfinding and the sole trier of fact is the one accused of bias.''

The opacity and lack of accountability of the recusal process erodes public confidence in the integrity of the Court and the sense that justice is being administered fairly. For example:

In 2003, a prominent legal ethicist argued that Justice Breyer should have recused from Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America v. Walsh, in which an association of drug manufacturers, including three in which Justice Breyer held stock, brought suit challenging the constitutionality of state regulations aimed at keeping drug costs down for consumers. Justice Breyer chose not to recuse himself, despite his potential financial conflict of interest.

In 2004, just weeks after the Supreme Court granted certiorari in a public records case brought by the Sierra Club against then-Vice President Dick Cheney, Justice Scalia went duck hunting with Cheney and accepted a free ride on the Vice President's plane. Despite widespread public criticism questioning his appearance of bias in the case, Justice Scalia refused to recuse himself. In a memorandum opinion denying the Sierra Club's motion to recuse, Justice Scalia wrote that he ''would have been pleased to demonstrate [his] integrity'' by disqualifying himself from the case, but nonetheless decided there was no basis for recusal. He then cast his vote in support of Vice President Cheney's position.

This year, the advocacy organization Common Cause filed a petition with the Department of Justice, requesting that it file a Rule 60(b) motion seeking the invalidation of last year's Citizens United v. FEC ruling on the basis that Justices Scalia and Thomas should have recused themselves. The petition alleged the impartiality of both justices could reasonably be questioned under 18 U.S.C. §455(a) due to their alleged attendance at a closed-door retreat hosted by Koch Industries, a politically active corporation that supported and has benefited from Citizen United's dismantling of campaign finance laws. Common Cause also alleges that Justice Thomas had an obligation to recuse himself under 18 U.S.C. §455(b), due to a financial conflict of interest created by his wife's employment at a conservative political organization that stood to benefit from unrestricted corporate donations made possible by Citizens United.

Also this year, Representative Anthony Weiner (D–NY) and 73 other members of the House of Representatives have asked Justice Thomas to recuse himself from any upcoming review of the Affordable Care Act due to his wife's ties to organizations lobbying to repeal the Act. Rep. Weiner asserts that IRS records show that between 2003 and 2007, Virginia (''Ginni'') Thomas was paid $686,589 by the conservative Heritage Foundation, which at the time opposed health care reform. He adds that in 2009, Ms. Thomas became the CEO of a nonprofit, Liberty Central, which also opposed health care reform, and that earlier this year, Ms. Thomas announced that she had formed a lobbying firm, ''Liberty Consulting,'' to advance various Tea Party legislative initiatives, including the repeal or nullification of the Affordable Care Act. Rep. Weiner alleges that these connections give rise to an appearance of partiality, and a potential financial conflict of interest that require Justice Thomas to recuse himself, if the Affordable Care Act reaches the Court. While a judge's spouse is not prohibited from engaging in political activities, Judicial Conference Advisory Opinions interpreting the Code of Conduct make clear that a spouse's political activities may increase the likelihood that a judge must recuse from a particular case.

These examples highlight the need for transparency and review of recusal issues that arise for Supreme Court justices. The impartiality of specific justices, and thereby the integrity of the Court, has come under question because the recusal statute fails to provide an open and reviewable process. This needs to change, either through Congressional legislation, or by the Court itself adopting new recusal policies.

REAFFIRMING COMMITMENT TO NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT OF ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

SPEECH OF

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 2011

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, the effort to establish a lasting peace in the Middle East does not lend itself to a simple up or down vote on a resolution in Congress, and so I rise to offer my thoughts on the resolution before us today.

While I voted in favor of H. Res. 268, because it reinforces the importance of direct talks for a two-state solution, I was disappointed with the resolution regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that was brought to the floor today. The fact is that this resolution was made possible because of the absence of a viable peace process.

I am disappointed with the resolution not so much because of the general contents of the resolution, but because this resolution does not treat the issue with the serious and careful consideration that it deserves. It is simply one in a series of votes in the House that fail to address the entirety of the conflict and take instead political shots at one side of the conflict.

Israel is and has always been a close friend and ally of the United States, and rightfully so. We share many goals and values, including a strong commitment to a vibrant democracy and diverse economy. Too often, however, Congress uses resolutions regarding the Middle East as referenda on whether or not a particular Member supports or does not support Israel, even though such support is not in question. That is unfortunate and does a disservice to the effort to establish peace between Israel and the Palestinians.

The Obama Administration, like its predecessors, has been working to keep the two parties at the table and to try to ensure that they can make the necessary compromises to ensure that type of lasting peace. Here in Congress, we should be supporting these important efforts, rather than playing political games, given the real-life consequences that this conflict is having on millions of people's lives and on our own country's security interests.

I am glad to see that today's resolution encouraged the formation of a two-state solution through the process of direct negotiations. I am also glad to see that it acknowledges the work that President Obama has done to try and ward off unilateral attempts to break out of the negotiating process. This resolution also importantly notes the violent and harmful actions of Hamas.

Yet I am disappointed that the resolution specifically criticizes the Palestinians for their actions but does not acknowledge that the Israeli government has also not always moved productively toward peace—in particular, through the ongoing construction of new settlements in the West Bank.

Furthermore, the truth of the matter is that the failure of the peace talks has provided the opening for an alliance between the Palestinian Authority and Hamas and, in their view, a reason for them to go before the United Nations, rather than continue direct talks. I support the continuation of direct talks and do not believe this issue should be resolved before the U.N. But make no mistake that the failure to achieve sufficient progress in talks has provided momentum to this latest effort to seek the U.N.'s involvement. That is all the more reason why Congress should prioritize real progress over political games.

I am further disappointed that the resolution misstates U.S. law, incorrectly claiming that current law precludes the United States from providing aid to the Palestinian Authority if it agrees to share power with Hamas. Current law rightfully provides an exception to the prohibition in order to enhance border security and the peace process.

In addition, I do not believe it would be beneficial to cut off aid to the Palestinian Authority. This aid provides Fatah with negotiating leverage among their fellow Palestinians against Hamas. Security experts, including Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak and others, have warned against such a cutoff, since it could destabilize the security situation on the West Bank. Fortunately, the language of the resolution only asks that the Administration consider withholding such aid, yet this is still unwise.

Congress could—and Congress should—take the peace process in the Middle East more seriously than it has with this resolution and similar resolutions before it.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today our national debt is $14,343,021,848,987.23.

On January 6th, 2009, the start of the 111th Congress, the national debt was $10,638,425,746,293.80.

This means the national debt has increased by $3,704,596,102,693.43 since then.

This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA LETTER CARRIERS LEAD NATION IN COLLECTION OF FOOD

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the third time in five years, the men and women of the National Association of Letter Carriers Branch 1477 of St. Petersburg, Florida, led the Nation in food collection as part of the national "Stamp Out Hunger" food drive.

Their chapter alone collected an astounding 1,770,814 pounds of food that has been distributed to Pinellas County food banks, pantries and shelters, many of which are affiliated with Feeding America. St. Petersburg Branch 1477, combined with another local branch, Tampa 599, collected 3,500,196 pounds, more food than in any other geographic area in the Nation. In fact, these two chapters accounted for two of the top five branch totals nationally.

Having spent time with many members of Branch 1477, I know of the great pride they have in serving our community. They acknowledge that the "Stamp Out Hunger" food drive is an outstanding partnership between the National Association of Letter Carriers, the United States Postal Services, the American Postal Workers Union, the National Rural Letter Carrier's Association, Campbell's Soup Company, United Way Worldwide, AFL–CIO, and local businesses including Uncle Bob's Self Storage and Valpak, a major sponsor in my area. Most importantly though, the level of success of this annual drive is due to the compassion and support of the residents of our local communities who place bag after bag of food out at their mail box on this one day of the year to lend a helping hand to their neighbors in need.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking the National Association of Letter Carriers for taking the initiative to sponsor the "Stamp Out Hunger" program for these past 19 years and in congratulating the letter carriers of Branch 1477 who serve from Dunedin through Largo, Pinellas Park, St. Petersburg and south to Punta Gorda, Florida, for once again topping the Nation in the collection of food. This program is in the finest American tradition of neighbor helping neighbor.

HONORING LOUIS AND SUSANNA HAGER AS CO-CHAIRS OF THE OTSEGO COUNTY CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

HON. RICHARD L. HANNA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Louis and Susanna Busch Hager, co-chairs of the Otsego County Conservation Association, serving as long-time stewards of Otsego Lake. The Hagers are dedicated to the preservation of our most precious natural resources, particularly Otsego Lake in Cooperstown, New York.

Mr. and Mrs. Hager have played a vital role in supporting community education regarding the challenging present issues surrounding development and maintenance of healthy lakes. They have also generously supported numerous environmental campaigns and programs, most notably the Otsego Lake Challenge Campaign.

It is with great honor that I rise today to commend the Hagers for their tremendously positive impact on our community and its future. They are being honored tonight for working tirelessly and devoting countless volunteer hours to the Otsego County Conservation Association and other community organizations. Through their significant philanthropic contributions, future generations can have hope for a clean and healthy living environment.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Louis and Susanna Busch Hager for their invaluable contribution to this community, our environment and our future. The positive results of their contribution will be noted for generations to come.

REAFFIRMING COMMITMENT TO NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT OF ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

SPEECH OF

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my concern that H. Res. 268 threatens Palestinians with sanctions if they attempt to get UN membership this fall. This resolution, which addresses the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, unfairly demands more of the Palestinians than it does of Israel. The United States cannot be a force for peace by unfairly singling out one party and ignoring the faults of another. While the United States concerns about Hamas's inclusion in the Palestinian unity government are valid, we should not prematurely pull the rug underneath the feet of the Palestinian unity government.

In an effort to achieve peace, the United States must hold both Israeli and Palestinian decision-makers accountable for upholding past agreements and negotiating a new one. I urge my colleagues to support more balanced policies and actions that seek a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

As our country continues to help move the peace process forward, I remain committed to preserving the peace negotiations between all parties. I will continue to work with the Administration in honoring our commitment to a peaceful resolution in the Middle East.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4403–S4459

Measures Introduced: Five bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1336–1340, and S. Res. 226–229. **Pages S4450–51**

Measures Reported:

S. 275, to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for enhanced safety and environmental protection in pipeline transportation, to provide for enhanced reliability in the transportation of the Nation's energy products by pipeline, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 112–30).

S. 951, to improve the provision of Federal transition, rehabilitation, vocational, and unemployment benefits to members of the Armed Forces and veterans, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S4450**

Measures Passed:

Recognizing the Heroic Efforts of Firefighters: Senate agreed to S. Res. 229, recognizing the heroic efforts of firefighters to contain numerous wildfires that have affected thousands of people throughout the United States. **Pages S4458–59**

Measures Considered:

Sense of the Senate Regarding the Budget Deficit—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1323, to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit. **Pages S4404–38**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 74 yeas to 22 nays (Vote No. 106), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S4406**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at 2 p.m., on Monday, July 11, 2011; with the time until 5:30 p.m. equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees; and at 5:30 p.m., Senate vote on the adoption of the motion to proceed to the bill. **Page S4406**

Messages from the House: **Page S4449**

Measures Referred: **Page S4449**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S4449, S4459**

Executive Communications: **Pages S4449–50**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S4450**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4451–52**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4452–55**

Additional Statements: **Page S4449**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4455–58**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S4458**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—106) **Page S4406**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 5:51 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, July 11, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4459.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

PROPOSED TRADE LEGISLATION

Committee on Finance: Committee approved the proposed "United States-South Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act," the proposed "United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act," and the proposed "United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act," and the associated proposed Statements of Administrative Action.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 24 public bills, H.R. 2433, 2435–2457; and 5 resolutions, H.J. Res. 71; H. Con. Res. 63; and H. Res. 339, 341–342 were introduced. **Pages H4747–48**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4750–51**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2434, making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 112–136);

First Semiannual Report on the Activities of the Committee on House Administration for the 112th Congress (H. Rept. 112–137); and

H. Res. 340, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1309) to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risk, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 112–138). **Page H4747**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Webster to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4677**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:07 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H4684**

Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2012: The House resumed consideration of H.R. 2219, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012. Consideration of the measure began on June 23rd. **Pages H4689–H4732, H4733–46**

Agreed to:

McCollum amendment that was debated on July 6th that reduces by $124,800,000 the total amount of appropriations made available by this Act (by a recorded vote of 226 ayes to 201 noes, Roll No. 511); **Pages H4700–01**

Cole amendment (No. 13 printed in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used by 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 (by a recorded vote of 225 ayes to 201 noes, Roll No. 513); **Pages H4689–90, H4702**

Michaud amendment (No. 64 printed in the Congressional Record of July 5, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of the Berry Amendment; **Page H4707**

Kissell amendment that prohibits funds from being used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any U.S. commercial air carrier if that contract, memorandum of understanding, cooperative agreement, grant, loan, or loan guarantee allows the air carrier to charge baggage fees to any member of the Armed Forces who is traveling on official military orders; **Page H4707**

Bass amendment that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of section 1590 or 1591 of title 18, United States Code, or in contravention of the requirements of section 106(g) or (h) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000; **Pages H4709–10**

Runyan amendment that prohibits funds from being used to procure air transportation from a commercial air carrier for a member of the Armed Forces who is traveling under orders to deploy to or return from an overseas contingency operation under terms that allow the carrier to charge the member fees for checked baggage other than for bags weighing more than 80 pounds or bags in excess of four per individual; **Page H4710**

Engel amendment that prohibits funds from being used by the Department of Defense to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum–Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011; **Page H4714**

Neugebauer amendment (No. 89 printed in the Congressional Record of July 6, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to reduce the number of B–1 aircraft of the Armed Forces; **Pages H4714–17**

Gosar amendment that prohibits funds from being obligated or expended for assistance to the following entities: (1) The Government of Iran. (2) Hamas. (3) Hizbullah. (4) The Muslim Brotherhood; **Pages H4717–18**

Flores amendment (No. 30 printed in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007; **Pages H4719–20**

Fortenberry amendment that prohibits funds from being used to support any military training or operations that include child soldiers, as defined by the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008; **Pages H4725–26**

Foxx amendment (No. 61 printed in the Congressional Record of July 5, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of the Defense of Marriage Act (by a recorded vote of 248 ayes to 175 noes, Roll No. 516); **Pages H4705–07, H4712–13, H4727**

Sherman amendment (No. 8 printed in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (by a recorded vote of 316 ayes to 111 noes, Roll No. 518); **Pages H4710–11, H4728–29**

Cole amendment (No. 4 printed in the Congressional Record of June 21, 2011) that prohibits funds from being 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 (by a recorded vote of 256 ayes to 170 noes, Roll No. 522); **Pages H4721–22, H4731**

DeFazio amendment (No. 96 printed in the Congressional Record of July 6, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to enforce section 376 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006; **Pages H4733–35**

Conyers amendment that prohibits funds from being used for (1) deploying members of the Armed Forces on to the ground of Libya for the purposes of engaging in military operations, unless the purpose of such deployment is limited solely to rescuing members of the U.S. Armed Forces; (2) awarding a contract to a private security contractor to conduct any activity on the ground of Libya; or (3) otherwise establishing or maintaining any presence of members of the Armed Forces or private security contractors on the ground of Libya, unless the purpose of such deployment is limited solely to rescuing members of the U.S. Armed Forces; **Pages H4737–38**

Kinzinger amendment that prohibits funds from being used to research, develop, manufacture, or procure a newly designed flight suit or integrated aircrew ensemble; and **Pages H4739–40**

Herrera Beutler amendment that prohibits funds from being used to enter into a contract that allows the contractor to use amounts paid to the contractor under such contract to pay a tax to the Afghan Ministry of Finance. **Page H4745**

Rejected:

Lee amendment that was debated on July 6th that sought to reduce funding for title IX, Overseas Contingency Operations, by $33,000,124,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 97 ayes to 322 noes, Roll No. 502); **Pages H4694–95**

Garamendi amendment that was debated on July 6th that sought to reduce funding for title IX, Overseas Contingency Operations, by $20,887,651,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 133 ayes to 295 noes, Roll No. 503); **Pages H4695–96**

Nadler amendment that was debated on July 6th sought to redirect $15 million with respect to Operation and Maintenance, Army (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 251 noes, Roll No. 504); **Page H4696**

Poe amendment that was debated on July 6th that sought to reduce funding for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide by $1 billion and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 131 ayes to 297 noes, Roll No. 505); **Pages H4696–97**

Lee amendment that was debated on July 6th that sought to eliminate the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 114 ayes to 314 noes, Roll No. 506); **Pages H4697–98**

Cohen amendment (No. 41 printed in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2011) that was debated on July 6th that sought to reduce funding for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund by $200 million and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 210 ayes to 217 noes, Roll No. 507); **Page H4698**

Cicilline amendment that was debated on July 6th that sought to eliminate the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 145 ayes to 283 noes, Roll No. 508); **Pages H4698–99**

Cohen amendment that was debated on July 6th that sought to reduce funding for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund by $4 billion and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 119 ayes to 306 noes, Roll No. 509) **Pages H4699–H4700**

Poe amendment that was debated on July 6th that sought to reduce funding for the Pakistan Counter-insurgency Fund by $1 billion and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 140 ayes to 285 noes, Roll No. 510); **Page H4700**

McCollum amendment that was debated on July 6th that sought to limit funds to pay motorsport drivers, racing teams, or racing cars or otherwise conduct recruiting outreach through motor sports to $20 million (by a recorded vote of 167 ayes to 260 noes, Roll No. 512); **Page H4701**

Amash amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used for the use of military force against Libya (by a recorded vote of 199 ayes to 229 noes, Roll No. 514); **Pages H4690–94, H4702–03**

Norton amendment that sought to redirect $1 million with respect to Operation and Maintenance, Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites; **Pages H4704–05**

Rigell amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used to support Operation Odyssey Dawn or Operation Unified Protector (by a recorded vote of 176 ayes to 249 noes, Roll No. 515);

Pages H4703–04, H4726–27

Mulvaney amendment that sought to reduce the total amount of appropriations made available by this Act by $17,192,000,000, not to be derived from amounts made available by title IX (by a recorded vote of 135 ayes to 290 noes, Roll No. 517);

Pages H4708–09, H4727–28

Rohrabacher amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used to provide assistance to Pakistan (by a recorded vote of 89 ayes to 338 noes, Roll No. 519); **Pages H4711–12, H4729**

Gohmert amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being obligated, expended, or used in any manner to support military operations, including NATO or United Nations operations, in Libya or in Libya's airspace (by a recorded vote of 162 ayes to 265 noes, Roll No. 520); **Pages H4713–14, H4729–30**

Welch amendment that sought to limit funds available for the Commander's Emergency Response Program to $200 million (by a recorded vote of 169 ayes to 257 noes, Roll No. 521); and

Pages H4718–19, H4730–31

Frank (MA) amendment that sought to reduce the total amount of appropriations made available by this Act by $8,500,000,000, not to be derived from Military Personnel, the Defense Health Program, or Overseas Contingency Operations (by a recorded vote of 181 ayes to 244 noes, Roll No. 523).

Pages H4722–25, H4731–32

Point of Order sustained against:

Eshoo amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used to enter into a contract with a corporation or other business entity that does not disclose its political expenditures; **Pages H4707–08**

Welch amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used for tax collection purposes by the Afghan Ministry of Finance; **Pages H4720–21**

Lee amendment that sought to add a section to the bill regarding the withdrawal of all United States Armed Forces and military contractors from Iraq by December 31, 2011; **Page H4740**

Lee amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used for any account of the Department of Defense in excess of the amount made available for such account for fiscal year 2011, unless the financial statements of the Department for fiscal year 2011 are validated as ready for audit within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act;

Pages H4740–41

Tonko amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor or subcontractor to an employee performing work under the contract for compensation if the compensation of the employee for a fiscal year exceeds the rate payable for level I of the Executive Schedule; **Pages H4742–43**

Murphy (CT) amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used to purchase non-combat vehicles for use outside of the U.S. if such vehicles are not substantially manufactured in the U.S.; and

Pages H4744–45

Lewis (GA) amendment that sought to require the Secretary of Defense to post on the public website of the Department the cost to each American taxpayer of each of the wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya. **Pages H4745–46**

Proceedings Postponed:

Flake amendment that seeks to reduce funding for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide by $250 million; **Pages H4735–36**

Flake amendment that seeks to reduce funding for the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund by $3,577,192,676; **Pages H4736–37**

Flake amendment that seeks to reduce funding for the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation accounts under title IV of this Act by $730 million;

Pages H4738–39

Huelskamp amendment (No. 77 printed in the Congressional Record of July 6, 2011) that seeks to prohibit funds from being used to implement the curriculum of the Chaplain Corps Tier 1 DADT repeal training dated April 11, 2011; and

Pages H4741–42

Polis amendment that seeks to prohibit funds from being used to maintain an end strength level of members of the Armed Forces assigned to permanent duty in Europe in excess of 30,000 members and to reduce funding for military personnel accordingly. **Pages H4743–44**

H. Res. 320, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to on June 23rd.

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and agree to the following measure which was debated yesterday, July 6th:

Reaffirming the United States' commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: H. Res. 268, to reaffirm the United States' commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 407 yeas to 6 nays with 13 voting ''present'', Roll No. 524. **Pages H4732–33**

Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H4751–53.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and twenty-two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4694–95, H4695–96, H4696, H4696–97, H4697–98, H4698, H4698–99, H4699, H4700, H4700–01, H4701, H4702, H4702–03, H4726–27, H4727, H4728, H4728–29, H4729, H4730, H4730–31, H4731, H4731–32 and H4732–33. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

Committee Meetings

EXAMINATION OF CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry held a hearing on Agricultural Program Audit: Examination of Conservation Programs. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Agriculture officials: Rayne Pegg, Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service; and Rebecca Bech, Deputy Administrator for Plant Protection and Quarantine, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

EXAMINATION OF SPECIALTY CROP PROGRAMS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Nutrition and Horticulture held a hearing on Agricultural Program Audit: Examination of Specialty Crop Programs. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Agriculture officials: Dave White, Chief, Natural Resources Conservation Services; and Bruce Nelson, Administrator, Farm Service Agency.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies held a markup of the FY 2012 Interior and Environment Appropriations Bill. The bill was forwarded without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science held a markup of the FY 2012 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Bill. The bill was forwarded without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a markup of the FY 2012 Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill. The bill was forwarded without amendment.

BUDGETING FOR AMERICA'S NATIONAL SECURITY

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Budgeting for America's National Security.'' Testimony was heard from David E. Mosher, Assistant Director, Congressional Budget Office; and public witnesses. Prior to the hearing the committee met to mark up the Committee Activity Report. The report was agreed to without amendment.

RUSHING UNION ELECTIONS

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Rushing Union Elections: Protecting the Interests of Big Labor at the Expense of Workers' Free Choice.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MEDICAL INNOVATION, JOBS, AND PATIENTS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''PDUFA V: Medical Innovation, Jobs, and Patients.'' Testimony was heard from Janet Woodcock, Director, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration; and public witnesses.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES ON REGULATORY REFORM

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''The Views of the Independent Agencies on Regulatory Reform.'' Testimony was heard from Robert S. Adler, Commissioner, Consumer Product Safety Commission; Anne Meagher Northup, Commissioner, Consumer Product Safety Commission; Robert McDowell, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission; Jon Wellinghoff, Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; Philip D. Moeller, Commissioner, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; Jon Leibowitz, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission; and William E. Kovacic, Commissioner, Federal Trade Commission.

MORTGAGE SERVICING

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a joint hearing entitled ''Mortgage Servicing: An Examination of the Role of Federal Regulators in Settlement Negotiations and the Future of Mortgage Servicing Standards.'' Testimony was heard from Julie Williams, First Senior Deputy Comptroller and Chief Counsel, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency; Mark Pearce, Director, Division of Depositor and Consumer Protection, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Raj Date, Associate Director of Research, Markets and Regulations, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Department

of the Treasury; Luther Strange, Alabama Attorney General; and public witnesses.

U.S. INTERESTS IN THE FACE OF RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing on Time to Pause the Reset? Defending U.S. Interests in the Face of Russian Aggression. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ASSESSING THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE FAILED STATE OF SOMALIA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights and the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade held a joint hearing on Assessing the Consequences of the Failed State of Somalia. Testimony was heard from Donald Y. Yamamoto, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs, Department of State; Nancy Lindborg, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development; Reuben Brigety, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration, Department of State; and public witnesses.

MASSACRE AT CAMP ASHRAF

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on Massacre at Camp Ashraf: Implications for U.S. Policy. Testimony was heard from Michael Mukasey, former Attorney General of the United States; Gary Morsch, M.D., former Commander of Forward Operation Base Ashraf; Colonel Wes Martin, USA, (retired), former Base Commander of Camp Ashrafl; and public witnesses.

DHS'S EFFORTS TO PROTECT AMERICAN JOBS AND SECURE THE HOMELAND

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Management held a hearing entitled ''Homeland Security Investigations: Examining DHS's Efforts to Protect American Jobs and Secure the Homeland.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HEZBOLLAH IN LATIN AMERICA

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence held a hearing entitled ''Hezbollah in Latin America—Implications for U.S. Homeland Security.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup of the following: H.R. 966, the ''Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2011''; H.R. 1439, the ''Business Activity Tax Simplification Act of 2011''; and H.R. 527, the ''Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2011.'' H.R. 1439 was order reported without amendment. H.R. 966 and H.R. 527 were ordered reported, as amended.

NATION'S ABILITY TO ADDRESS THE GROWING CYBER THREAT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Cybersecurity: Assessing the Nation's Ability to Address the Growing Cyber Threat.'' Testimony was heard from Greg Schaffer, Acting Deputy Undersecretary, National Protection and Programs Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; James A. Baker, Associate Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice; Robert J. Butler, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Cyber Policy, Department of Defense; and Ari Schwartz, Senior Internet Policy Advisor, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce.

FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 2011

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 1309, the ''Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011.'' The Committee granted, by voice vote, a structured rule providing one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and 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 printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report.

The rule provides that the chair of the Committee on Financial Services or his designee may offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the Rules Committee report not earlier disposed of, which shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and

controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their designee, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Testimony was heard from Rep. Biggert; Rep. Waters; Rep. Burton of Indiana; Rep. Sherman; Rep. Miller of Michigan; Rep. Cardoza; Rep. Walberg; Rep. Wilson of Florida; and Rep. Rivera.

HITTING THE ETHANOL BLEND WALL: EXAMINING THE SCIENCE ON E15

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy and Environment held a hearing entitled "Hitting the Ethanol Blend Wall: Examining the Science on E15." Testimony was heard from Margo Oge, Director, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, EPA; and public witnesses.

HOW USDA'S PROPOSED GIPSA RULE HURTS AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy and Trade held a hearing entitled "Regulatory Injury: How USDA's Proposed GIPSA Rule Hurts America's Small Businesses." Testimony was heard from Edward Avalos, Under Secretary, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture; Alan Christian, Deputy Administrator, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA), Department of Agriculture; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Recovery held a hearing on the following: H.R. 1911, the "Protecting Veterans' Homes Act; H.R. 240, to amend title 38, United States Code, to promote jobs for veterans through the use of sole source contracts by Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of meeting the contracting goals and preferences of the Department of Veterans Affairs for small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans; H.R. 1263, to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide surviving spouses with certain protections relating to mortgages and mortgage foreclosures; H.R. 120, the "Disabled Veterans' Surviving Spouses Home Loans Act;" H.R. 2274, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress annual reports on the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program, and for other purposes; H.R. 2301, the "Streamlining Education Claims Processing Act of 2011;" H.R. 2302, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to notify Congress of conferences sponsored by the Department of Veterans Affairs; H.R. 2345, to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay a monthly assistance allowance to disabled veterans training or competing for the Paralympic Team and the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide assistance to United States Paralympics, Inc.; and H.R. 2329, the "Ensuring a Response for Servicemembers Act." Testimony was heard from Curtis L. Coy, Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Opportunity, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs held a hearing on the following: H.R. 923, the "Veterans Pensions Protection Act of 2011;" H.R. 1025, to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law; H.R. 1826, to amend title 38, United States Code, to reinstate criminal penalties for persons charging veterans unauthorized fees; H.R. 1898, the "Veterans 2nd Amendment Protection Act;" and H.R. 2349, the "Veterans' Benefits Training Improvement Act of 2011." Testimony was heard from Thomas Murphy, Director, Compensation Service, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a non-markup on legislation regarding the following: the "United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act", the "United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act", and the "United States-South Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act." Testimony was heard from Angela Ellard, Chief Trade Counsel, Committee on Ways and Means and Staff Director, Subcommittee on Trade; Timothy Reif, General Counsel, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative; Wendy Cutler, Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for Japan, Korea, and APEC Affairs; and Bennett Harman, Deputy Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for the Western Hemisphere.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 8, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, markup of H.R. 2401, the ''Transparency in Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation Act of 2011.'' 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, hearing entitled ''Legislative Proposals Regarding Bank Examination Practices.'' 9:30 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing on Emerging Threats and Security in the Western Hemisphere: Next Steps for U.S. Policy, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, hearing entitled ''Communicating With the Public During Emergencies: An Update on Federal Alert and Warning Efforts.'' 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, hearing on the following: H.R. 1505, the ''National Security and Federal Lands Protection Act''; and H.R. 587, the ''Public Lands Service Corps Act of 2011.'' 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, and Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy and Forestry, joint hearing entitled ''Challenges Facing Domestic Oil and Gas Development: Review of Bureau of Land Management/U.S. Forest Service Ban on Horizontal Drilling on Federal Lands.'' 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, Stimulus Oversight and Government Spending and the Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training, joint hearing entitled ''The Gainful Employment Regulation: Limiting Job Growth and Student Choice.'' 10 a.m., 2154 Longworth.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, hearing and markup of H.R. 104, the ''Realize America's Maritime Promise (RAMP) Act.'' 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Social Security, hearing on Social Security's current benefit expenditures, proposed changes to future benefits and the impact those changes would have on the program, future beneficiaries, workers, and the economy, 9 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, July 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1323, Sense of the Senate Regarding the Budget Deficit, and vote on adoption of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, July 8

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Resume consideration of H.R. 2219—Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2012.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bonner, Jo, Ala., E1252, E1252
Bono Mack, Mary, Calif., E1261
Boren, Dan, Okla., E1260
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E1263
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E1258
Capps, Lois, Calif., E1258, E1262
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1265
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E1261
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E1253
Denham, Jeff, Calif., E1256
Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E1259
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E1259
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1262
Filner, Bob, Calif., E1254
Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E1262
Hanna, Richard L., N.Y., E1265
Hinchey, Maurice D., N.Y., E1258
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1265
King, Steve, Iowa, E1256, E1262
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E1253, E1254
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E1257
McIntyre, Mike, N.C., E1252, E1254, E1256, E1259, E1260, E1262
Mack, Connie, Fla., E1261
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1255
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E1259
Miller, George, Calif., E1264
Moran, James P., Va., E1260
Noem, Kristi L., S.D., E1260
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1261
Olver, John W., Mass., E1253
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E1257
Paul, Ron, Tex., E1256
Pence, Mike, Ind., E1258
Peters, Gary C., Mich., E1254
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1257
Richardson, Laura, Calif., E1252, E1259
Rothman, Steven R., N.J., E1263
Sanchez, Loretta, Calif., E1255, E1260
Austin, David, Ga., E1255
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E1264
Smith, Adam, Wash., E1253
Turner, Michael R., Ohio, E1262
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1251, E1256
Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E1265

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.