United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 10, 2012 No. 66

House of Representatives

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

PRAYER

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

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

Help us this day to draw closer to You so that, with Your Spirit and aware of Your presence among us, we may all face the tasks of this day.

Bless the Members of the people's House. Help them to think clearly, speak confidently, and act courageously in the belief that all noble service is based upon patience, truth, and love.

During this week of special recognition, we ask Your blessing on America's teachers, who give of their lives and talents to empower young Americans with the tools to mold creative and productive lives. Bless also the millions of foster parents, who have generously provided homes for young people in need of safe and secure shelter. May they be assured of the appreciation of a grateful Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

REDUCING AMERICA'S MILITARY FOOTPRINT AND SPENDING IN EUROPE

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am announcing my intention to offer an amendment on the Defense authorization bill to reduce our military footprint and spending in Europe.

In January, the Pentagon announced that two U.S. Army combat brigade teams would be withdrawn from Europe. I don't think that goes far enough. The current proposal is only a step in the right direction. We should retain only the headquarters and support infrastructure necessary for expeditionary capabilities, and we should withdraw all four combat brigades from Europe.

In order for the U.S. military to modernize and move forward towards a more agile strategy, we must close bases in Europe. There is no longer a strategic reason to maintain nearly 80,000 troops in Europe.

Additionally, only four of our 28 NATO allies are spending more than 2 percent of their GDP on defense. The reason they can get away with spending so little on defense is that they are relying on the United States to provide it for them. We currently spend 4.7 percent of GDP on defense, but we should have higher priorities for our defense dollars these days than for the defense of Europe.

USIS INVESTIGATOR OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Tim Earnshaw, who was recently named Investigator of the Year by the United States Investigations Services, which is the largest commercial provider of background investigations for the Federal Government.

Mr. Earnshaw was chosen out of a group of nearly 2,300 full-time employees from all across the country based on his exceptional performance shown through production and quality metrics, mentoring others, initiative leadership, and community leadership.

Mr. Earnshaw, who has worked for USIS for the past 7½ years, lives with his wife, Colleen, in my district of North Providence, Rhode Island, where they are active in several charitable and nonprofit organizations.

I was honored to welcome Mr. Earnshaw to my office recently and to congratulate him on winning this award. We all take great pride in his

Printed on recycled paper.

accomplishments today. His professionalism and work ethic are a great example of the extraordinary men and women of Rhode Island's First Congressional District.

IN TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF JOE LANDERS

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the service of Joe Landers, chief of police in Lowell, Arkansas, who died Friday morning, May 4, as a result of injuries suffered in a hit-and-run, drunk driver accident while on vacation in Florida on April 27.

Chief Landers was a dedicated public servant—everything you could want in a leader. He loved his job, his community, those under his command, and the people he served. It was evident in the way he carried out his duties.

He began his law enforcement career with the Benton County Sheriff's Office before joining the Lowell Police Department in 1995. In 1997, he was promoted to chief, and in the last 15 years, led his organization during a period of unprecedented growth. He was responsible for the development of the Lowell motorcycle patrol, dispatch center, K–9 unit, and the Special Response Team. In 2005, Chief Landers performed international duty as a law enforcement adviser in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, our State and Nation has lost a valued member of the law enforcement community. Tomorrow will be a sad day when we say our final good-byes. I speak for Arkansas' Third Congressional District in expressing our deepest sympathy to his family, to the city of Lowell, and to the great State of Arkansas.

TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, we honor American teachers nationwide this week, who, day in and day out, work to make a future brighter for America.

We all have had at least one or more teachers who has shaped our lives and who have believed in us. Mine was Mrs. Myrna Collins, who taught me in both the fourth and seventh grades back at Kearney Elementary School. This no-nonsense woman with a Texas drawl was determined that, despite the fact that I could be a handful, I was going to behave and learn—and learn I did.

A few years back, I made an effort to have lunch with Mrs. Collins, and she made the comment that she knew that I could be successful if I only applied myself, and she was right. Her guidance back then showed me how much could be accomplished with hard work and focus.

In the San Joaquin Valley and nationwide, teachers of America meet the challenges in the classroom with grace and grit every day. As we recognize these teachers throughout our country, we thank you for what you do every week of the school year.

God bless you, Mrs. Collins, for all the students whose lives you've touched. Thank you.

SAVING THE GREAT AMERICAN PATRIOTS OF THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor and personal privilege to represent Selfridge Air National Guard Base, the home of the 107th Fighter Squadron, also known as the Michigan Red Devils.

The 107th flies the A–10, and they just recently returned from a redeployment to Afghanistan, where they performed so magnificently, so bravely, and made us all proud.

The 107th was one of the units scheduled to be eliminated under the President's proposed budget; but, fortunately, the House Armed Services Committee will present a Defense reauthorization bill, scheduled for a floor vote here next week, which reverses that and saves the 107th along with protecting the Air National Guard across the entire country.

Instead, the Air Force will be required to do a cost analysis of the National Guard cuts, which is very good because the Air National Guard performs 35 percent of the flying missions for just 6 percent of the budget. That is the best bang for the taxpayers' buck in these very restrained budgetary times.

This House, Mr. Speaker, is going to do the right thing for the great American patriots of the Air National Guard, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to do the same.

□ 0910

PROTECT THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, in Congress, it's our job to help protect the American Dream. We have to remain the land of opportunity where anyone willing to work hard and stay focused can secure a brighter future. If Congress fails to act, 7 million college students across the country will see their student loan interest rates double to 6.8 percent.

I met some of these students last week at Palm Beach State College. Whether it's the young man who works 85 hours a week while carrying 12 credit hours—the first in his family to go to college—or the young man who described in passion the 14-year path he has embarked upon to serve out his dream by becoming a surgeon, their pursuing higher education is a path of opportunity.

If we want to protect the American Dream here in Congress, then we should give legislation that keeps interest rates low a fair shot. After all, that's all America's students are asking for—a fair shot at the American Dream.

WORKING FOR JOBS

(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, for almost 40 months, unemployment has been at or above 8 percent. That's too high for too long.

Right now, over 88 million people are not even considered in the workforce. These are people who have given up on searching for a job. It's time to restore economic freedom to America and put Americans back to work. This will happen when Washington stops being an obstacle to job creation through its overtaxing, overspending, overregulating practices, and starts promoting an economic environment where our job creators can do what they do best: create jobs.

Americans are ready to go to work. Just this past week, I sponsored a job fair in East Liverpool, Ohio, where hundreds of Ohioans showed up for a chance to enter the workforce. In fact, many job seekers actually left the job fair with renewed self-confidence, hope in the fact that they had a job to go to the next day, and a belief that the American Dream still might exist for them. We need to see more of this, Mr. Speaker.

BARBARISM

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I have watched saddened as this House led by the Republican majority has fought to gut those things that made and that will make this country great.

I'm reading a history of the U.S. House of Representatives right now, and early in that history, this body—when this Nation was barely yet born—pulled together the resources to build the Erie Canal, coming together to do great things that benefited the Nation. The list of those things goes on and on: the Louisiana Purchase, public education, land grant colleges, the GI Bill. I could go on for a very long time.

Today, the Republican majority says to transportation and infrastructure, which are key to our businesses, they say kill it; to medical research, kill it; to education, kill it. Mr. Speaker, that instinct is utterly inconsistent with who we have always been as a country and why we are great and powerful and ultimately economically prosperous. It

is not stewardship. It is not governance. It is barbarism.

NATO SUMMIT

(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, today I rise to call attention to the NATO summit that will take place next week in Chicago.

NATO was founded with the signing of the Washington Treaty in 1949 to safeguard the freedom and security of all of its members. Since then, the alliance has been the mainstay of the transatlantic cooperation that has been an important part of this Nation's security.

All 27 of our NATO allies, along with 22 non-NATO partners, have served shoulder to shoulder with our brave men and women in Afghanistan, working to ensure that that country never again becomes a safe haven for terrorists.

In Chicago, we will continue important discussions on the transition of security responsibility from ISAF to the Afghans. Particularly in today's global economic environment, Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we recognize the value of NATO as a proven force multiplier. The alliance is working to ensure that NATO is well prepared for future challenges.

As we welcome our friends to Chicago on May 20 and 21, we affirm the vitality of this transatlantic bond and of our continued commitment to our common defense.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5652, SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2012

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 648 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 648

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5652) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112–21 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you coming in early to be with us early this morning. This is a big day. This is the reconciliation bill.

I serve on both the Rules Committee and the Budget Committee, Mr. Speaker. As you know, we've had some tremendous successes in the appropriations process. This week, we've been working through the Commerce-Justice-Science bill. It's a bill that's reduced spending to those levels that we had in 2008, doing those things that the voters sent us here to do.

We're going to vote on that bill today in final passage. But that appropriations process that we have control over here in the House, that process where we reduced spending from 2010 levels down to 2011 levels, down to 2012 levels, and are going to go down again to 2013 levels to be responsible stewards of taxpayers' dollars, those are only one-third of the taxpayer dollars.

Two-thirds of the taxpayer dollars that are spent in this town—and by spent I really mean borrowed and then spent—come on what they call mandatory spending programs. Mr. Speaker, as you know, mandatory spending programs are dollars that go out the door whether Congress acts or not. Appropriation bills require Congress to act affirmatively, but mandatory spending goes right out the door without any oversight from this body until you get to reconciliation.

Reconciliation is that process that Democrats put in place wisely years and years ago to allow the House and the Senate to come together and begin to reduce, restrain, do oversight on those mandatory spending dollars. This is a rule that brings that bill to the floor.

That bill is going to be coming under a closed rule, Mr. Speaker. We're talking about a bill that has been put together by almost every committee of jurisdiction here in this House and then assembled by the Budget Committee and brought here to the floor. It's been the subject of countless hearings already. We looked at whether we'd be able to bring a Democratic substitute to the floor. None was submitted that complied with the rules of the House.

So we have one bill on the floor today, an up-and-down vote, on whether or not we're willing to engage in the first serious reconciliation process on this floor—I would argue—since 1997. Some folks might say 2003. I say 1997. Why, Mr. Speaker?

□ 0920

I'll tell you, it's the right thing to do anyway. It's the right thing to do anyway as responsible stewards of taxpayer dollars. But in this case, these aren't reductions for the sake of reductions. These are reductions for the sake of complying with what I would argue is a very good deficit-reduction agreement between the President and the Senate and the House last August. And as a part of that agreement, we put in some blanket cuts to national security, some blanket cuts to national defense. And some commentators have described these cuts, Mr. Speaker, as being intentionally so crazy that they would never happen but would be used only as a tool to get the Joint Select Committee to act.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Joint Select Committee did not succeed last fall. It's a source of great frustration for me and is also a source of great frustration for the Members who served on that committee. They had an opportunity to bring an up-or-down vote to both the House and the Senate floor on anything they came up with, Mr. Speaker. They didn't have to get the whole $1.2 trillion. They didn't have to get $1.5 trillion. They could have gotten $1 trillion. They could have gotten $500 billion. They could have gotten $250 billion, and we would have brought that to the floor for an up-or-down vote. But they got nothing.

So where are we? Well, in the words of Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, he says:

> We are at a place where, if these cuts were allowed to go, the impact of these cuts would be devastating to the Defense Department.

I happen to share his concerns. Again, these were across-the-board cuts put in place to be so intentionally crazy that Congress would never allow them to occur, and it would spur the Joint Committee to action.

I happen to have supported an amendment offered by CHRIS VAN HOLLEN of Maryland, the ranking member on the Budget Committee. When we were going through the Budget Committee process last year, he offered an amendment that said, dadgummit, everything's got to be on the table, and that includes the Defense Department. I agree with him. The Defense Department does need to be on the table. And in fact, the Defense Department is undergoing $300 billion worth of reductions today.

This bill does nothing to change that. There is $300 billion being reduced from the Defense Department, as well it should. It's not easy, but it should happen, and it is happening. This isn't dealing with that. This is dealing with even additional cuts. Again, in the words of Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, a former Democratic Member of this House:

The impact of these cuts would be devastating for the Department.

So we have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to do what, I would argue, you and I came here to do—and not just you and I, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—to do those things not just that happened year after year after year, those things that have 12 months of efficacy and then go away, but the things that can be set in permanent law to change the direction of spending and borrowing in this country. And, candidly, Mr. Speaker, it's more about the borrowing than it is about the spending.

There are priorities in this country that we need to focus on, and I would argue that we've done a great job of focusing on those priorities. But when you are borrowing 40 cents of every dollar from your children and your grandchildren, we have to redefine what responsibility is because, I will tell you, that is irresponsible.

And this bill then takes a step in two directions: one, turning back this second round of Defense Department cuts—not the first round but the second round, the round that Leon Panetta describes as devastating to the Defense Department—and then setting us on a path to bend that cost curve going forward by tackling mandatory spending programs for the first time in almost a decade.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to strongly support this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, my friend, Mr. WOODALL, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this rule. It is totally closed, and it denies Democrats, led by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the substitute.

We're not asking for dozens of amendments or something that hasn't been done in the past with regards to reconciliation bills. All we are asking for is one vote on our substitute, one vote on what we believe is a better alternative to the Republican bill. Last night in the Rules Committee, every single Republican—every single one of them—voted to deny Democrats that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, as one who does not believe in arbitrary and thoughtless across-the-board cuts as a way to balance our budget, I want to support Mr. VAN HOLLEN's substitute in order to avoid the implementation of the Budget Control Act's sequester. In my opinion, to allow this sequester to go into full effect would be bad for the country.

We are here in this awful mess because a so-called supercommittee failed to reach agreement last fall on a comprehensive and balanced deficit-reduction plan due in very large part to the absolute refusal of Republicans to put revenues on the table. Bowles-Simpson, Rivlin-Domenici, and the Gang of Six all had deficit-reduction proposals that sought to be balanced with both spending cuts and revenues. They sought to be fair. They realized that you cannot solve our long-term fiscal problems by slashing and burning the last century of social progress in America.

But, today, my Republican friends have brought to the floor a reconciliation bill that actually makes sequestration look good. What's going on here is very simple—very troubling, but very simple. They are protecting the massive Pentagon budget and demanding no accountability by exempting it from sequestration and finding even deeper cuts in programs that benefit the people of this country.

The bill before us would create a government where there is no conscience, where the wealthy and well connected are protected and enriched, and where the middle class, the poor, and the vulnerable are essentially forgotten. I have never seen anything like this. It is outrageous. It takes my breath away.

My friends won't cut billions in subsidies for Big Oil at a time when oil companies are making record profits and gauging Americans at the pump. They won't address the inequities of the Tax Code, which allows billionaire Warren Buffett to pay a lower tax rate than his secretary. The revenues from fixing these two unjust policies alone would result in billions and billions and billions of dollars in deficit reduction. But the Republicans have protected Big Oil, and they've protected the billionaires. However, my Republican friends take a meat-ax to SNAP, formerly known as food stamps. This is a program to help poor people afford food.

My friends on the other side of the aisle should heed the words of President John F. Kennedy:

If a free society will not help the many who are poor, they cannot save the few who are rich.

Mr. Speaker, we are one country. We should care about one another, especially those who are most vulnerable. That's not a weakness or something we should be ashamed of. Rather, it's something that makes us strong and great.

As my friends know, I have spent a lot of time and effort in Congress on the issues of hunger, food insecurity, and nutrition. Tens of millions of our fellow citizens don't have enough to eat, and every single one of us—Democrats and Republicans alike—should be ashamed. And that's why I am so outraged by the $36 billion in SNAP cuts.

This notion that SNAP promotes a culture of dependency, that SNAP is a golden ticket to prosperity is just wrong. Some on the Republican side have even claimed that SNAP enslaves Americans. Give me a break. In fact, even in 2010, when unemployment was close to 10 percent and jobs were scarce, the majority of SNAP households with a nondisabled working-age adult were working households—working households.

Working families are trying to earn more. No one wakes up in the morning dreaming to be on SNAP, but these are tough economic times. Some people have no choice. But we know that SNAP enrollment and spending on SNAP will go down as the economy improves, as families see their incomes rise and no longer need SNAP to feed their families. Don't take my word for it. This is directly from the Congressional Budget Office.

Of course, last night in the Rules Committee, we heard the tired line that there's a lot of abuse in the SNAP program. We heard that there are countless numbers of people receiving benefits who do not deserve them. That, Mr. Speaker, is simply not true.

It's a common and unfortunate misconception that SNAP is rife with fraud, waste, and abuse. Many have decried SNAP as a handout that can be sold or traded for alcohol and other items that shouldn't be purchased with taxpayer funds. It cannot. And to the extent that there is abuse, the USDA is cracking down on it.

SNAP is both effective and efficient. In fact, the error rate for SNAP is not only at an all-time low, but it has among the lowest—if not the lowest—error rate of any Federal program. If only we could find a program at the Pentagon that had such a low error rate.

Last night we also heard about categorical eligibility, a process in which a low-income person is automatically eligible for food stamps if they are already enrolled in another low-income assistance program.

□ 0920

Categorical eligibility—and I think it's important to state this because there's such misconception here. Categorical eligibility makes it easier for poor people, those people who are already approved for low-income assistance programs, to receive SNAP benefits. But it also makes it easier on the States that have to administer these programs. This saves time and money and paperwork, because the people who are already eligible for similarly administered benefits do not have to reapply for SNAP, and States do not have to waste workers' hours processing paperwork for people who are already eligible based on their incomes.

Categorical eligibility does not mean that people who don't qualify for SNAP get those benefits. To the contrary, people still have to qualify for the program to receive food. Any claim that this is a fraudulent practice or that it is rife with abuse is just another falsehood and smear against one of the most efficient Federal programs.

The demonization of SNAP and other food and nutrition programs by my Republican friends must come to an end.

We have an obligation in this country to provide a circle of protection for the most vulnerable.

Cutting $36 billion means that more than 22 million households will see a cut in their benefit. This means 22 million families will have less food tomorrow than they do today. In fact, 2 million people would be cut from the SNAP program altogether. Another 280,000 kids will lose access to free school meals.

My friends on the other side of the aisle don't like to hear this, but sometimes the truth hurts. If this bill before us becomes law, it will take food out of the mouths of children in America, all in the name of protecting tax cuts for the wealthy and increased Pentagon spending. The Republican reconciliation bill threatens Medicare, it threatens children's programs, it threatens educational programs, as well as programs that support our infrastructure. In short, if this were to be adopted as law, it would threaten our economy as a whole.

And the bill not only protects the Pentagon budget, it increases it by billions of dollars. Does anyone here honestly believe there's not a single dollar to be saved anywhere in the Pentagon? If you do, you're not reading the newspapers. It's there in front of us every single day, the abuse that goes on. No-bid defense contractors. I can go on and on and on.

We have, and will continue to have, the strongest military on the face of the Earth. But at some point national security must mean more than throwing billions of dollars at unnecessary nuclear weapons or at pie-in-the sky Star Wars programs that will never actually materialize.

But national security has to mean taking care of our own people. It means educating our children. It means an infrastructure that isn't crumbling around us. It means clean air and clean water and a health care system that works. Those should be our priorities. But sadly, those are not the priorities in the bill before us today.

Of course, Senator REID says the bill is dead in the water in the Senate. At a press conference yesterday, the Senate Majority Leader said:

> As long as Republicans refuse to consider a more reasonable approach, one that asks every American to pay his fair share while making difficult choices to reduce spending, the sequester is the only path forward.

That's a pretty clear statement that the Senate will not consider this bill. Quite frankly, it's the right thing to do.

A reasonable approach is what the American people want. Yes, they want us to get our fiscal house in order. They want us to reduce the deficit in a fair way so that the wealthiest among us pay their fair share. But mostly the American people want jobs, something the House Republican leadership continues to ignore.

The American people know that the best way to bring this deficit down is through job creation. They want the economy to improve. They want their lives to get better. This bill does not do that.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by quoting President Dwight Eisenhower in a speech he made in 1953:

> Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in the final sense a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.

I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that President Eisenhower wouldn't recognize today's Republican Party.

We should reject this closed rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I say to my friend, as the Republican Budget chairman said to him yesterday, I appreciate his passion on this issue. What brings us to the very best decisions that we can make in this body, Mr. Speaker, is having folks who work hard day in and day out educating themselves on the issues. They can bring the very best case for the American people to the floor.

And that's why I would ask my friend whether or not he believes it actually helps that debate to get involved in some of those rhetorical feats of mind, I guess we would call them, because he knows as well as I know that under the law of the land, in 2002, food stamp benefits, SNAP benefits, would have gone up by about 40 percent over the last 10 years, and Republicans and Democrats came together over the last decade and increased those benefits 270 percent, Mr. Speaker.

Now, this proposal suggests that instead of going up 270 percent, we allow those benefits to go up 260 percent. That's the draconian cut.

We see that in the same rhetoric in the student loan program, Mr. Speaker. Everyone in this body knows the law of the land was that student loan rates were at 6.8 percent—a below-market rate of 6.8 percent. They were lowered for a very small fraction of the student population for a very temporary period of time to 3.4 percent, and the law now hasn't gone back to 6.8 percent, to standard levels. But folks want to talk about that as a doubling instead of a returning to common law.

And more importantly, Mr. Speaker, to continue to suggest, as he knows is not the case, that Republicans are unwilling to focus on the Defense Department, let me say it plainly. I believe there is waste and fraud and abuse in the Defense Department, and I stand here willing to work with you to eradicate it all. I supported Ranking Member VAN HOLLEN's amendment to put Defense on the table. The budget that this House passed—the only budget that's passed in all of Washington, D.C.—reduced defense spending by $300 billion in recognition of exactly that.

And, Mr. Speaker, again, the rhetoric just gets a little overheated from time to time, and, candidly, I think it gets in the way of us doing the people's business. When I say to you that Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, on August 4, 2011, said:

> If these defense cuts happen—and God willing that will not be the case, but if it did happen—it would result in a further round—because we've already cut once; in fact, already cut twice—a further round of very dangerous across-the-board defense cuts that I believe, says Leon Panetta, Secretary of Defense, would do real damage to our security, our troops, and their families.

I would say to my friend: How does it advantage us to make this a Republican-Democratic issue when the Democratic chairman of the House Budget Committee, Leon Panetta, says allowing these cuts to go forward would be dangerous to our defense, to our national security, to our troops, and to our families? How does it advantage us to make this a Republican-Democratic issue when President Clinton's OMB Director, Leon Panetta, says this would be dangerous across-the-board defense cuts that would do real damage to our security, our troops, and our families? How does it advantage us to make this a partisan issue when President Clinton's Chief of Staff, Leon Panetta, former OMB Director, former Democratic Budget Committee chairman, says: I believe allowing these cuts to go forward would do real damage to our security, to our troops, and to our families?

Do we have real choices to make? We do.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you.

The Democrats have a substitute amendment that would replace the sequester in a different way. It would prevent the across-the-board cuts from happening to defense and the non-defense programs. So there's an agreement that that meat-ax approach is the wrong way. We have an alternative.

The gentleman just talked about how we have this great debate of ideas on the floor of the House. I have a very simple question: Why are we not going to get an up-or-down vote on our idea on how we would replace the sequester in a balanced way?

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman both for his comments and for his offering of that substitute.

The reason is threefold:

Number one, that substitute doesn't comply with the rules of the House. We made a decision in this body that we were going to not continue to ask for more and more and more out of taxpayers' pockets but that we were going to try to do our own business here in terms of oversight on all the money that's already being borrowed and spent and sent out the door.

□ 0940

Number two, that happened to be the rules that we adopted in this Congress,

Mr. Speaker, but under the rules adopted in the last Congress in which you were the Budget chairman, you know your substitute would also not have been in order under the PAYGO rules that you instituted. Again, not a Republican or Democratic issue. Under a Republican House, the substitute is not in order. And under a Democratic House, the substitute is not in order.

But, number 3, and, I would argue, most importantly, I say to my friend, we've got a trust deficit with the American people, and it doesn't surprise me. When we talk about the 5-year impact of the reconciliation plan that we passed out of our Budget Committee and I hope that this House will pass today, we're talking about a net effect on debt reduction, the process for which reconciliation was created, of $65 billion over 5 years. Over the next 5 years, $65 billion is not going to have to be borrowed from our children and our grandchildren. Under the gentleman's substitute, over that same period of time, spending is actually going to go up by almost $37 billion. This is a process that is designed to reduce borrowing and spending, to reduce the burden we are placing on our children, and the gentleman's substitute increases the burden that we place on our children.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I don't want to take up all your time, but I would like to make the point that what our substitute does is, dollar for dollar, replace the sequester, which is what our Republican colleagues have said is the object of this effort, which is to make sure that we don't have the meat-ax approach.

I would just note that the gentleman said that one of the reasons that we're not going to have an opportunity to vote on ours is because it doesn't comply exactly with the rules. In bringing the Republican bill to the floor today, I'm reading right here on the report, the committee report, you waived three rules. You waived three rules, and yet you can't allow an up-or-down vote on a substitute amendment. You know that you have it within the power to allow our substitute, just as you waived these three rules.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I would say to my friend, what we have within our power is the power to stop the borrowing and the spending. I'm reading here from today's Congressional Quarterly, because folks sometimes get confused, Mr. Speaker. We talked about the Reading Clerk and the tough work they had yesterday, reading today from Congressional Quarterly, it says here that Democrats left open the possibility that they would offer an alternative proposal through a motion to recommit, which is allowed under the rule. My friend on the Rules Committee knows that to be true. My friend on the Budget Committee knows that to be true.

I look forward to your using that opportunity to bring your substitute to the floor for a vote. I think that is the right of the minority. I'm glad we preserved the right of the minority, Mr. Speaker.

And with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to reemphasize the point that Mr. VAN HOLLEN made.

You know, the Rules Committee has the right to be able to waive the rules to bring any piece of legislation to the floor. And as Mr. VAN HOLLEN rightly pointed out, in the report on this rule, the Republicans waive, implement waivers because their proposal, without these waivers, would violate the rules.

And so, you know, my friend talks about that this shouldn't be a partisan discussion. I would just say to my friend, the reason that this is a partisan discussion is because the Republicans have made it such by denying us the right to come to the floor and offer our substitute, not as a procedural matter, but as a real substitute. You have politicized this debate. You have shut us out, and that is why there is frustration.

And I just want to say one other thing again because I am so sick and tired of the demonization of programs that benefit poor people in this country, especially the SNAP program.

My friend was talking about all of this money that we invested in SNAP as if somehow we were giving these very generous benefits out. Just for the record, in 2002, the average SNAP benefit was $1 per meal per day per person—$1. With all of the improvements we have made, today it is about $1.50 per meal per day; and it is going to go down next year because of cutbacks we've already made in this program, unfortunately, to offset other things over the past few years. That means in a 10-year period that we have increased this benefit by 50 cents per meal. Now, I don't know about my friend, but $1.50 doesn't go very far today.

So when we're talking about trying to help people get through this economic crisis, that's what we're talking about. So this is not some extravagant, overly generous benefit. That's what it is. That's what it is. And rather than cutting waste in the Pentagon budget, which we all know exists, you protect the Pentagon budget. Rather than going after subsidies for oil companies and going after billionaire tax breaks, you protect all of that. And where do you go to find the savings? From programs that help the poorest of the poor. I mean, it's outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts, and thank him for his leadership on efforts to ensure that those families who are struggling most in our country continue to have access to food and nutrition, and that children in our country continue to have access to health care. And that's what this debate is all about, because we do have an alternative.

There is no disagreement on two things: Number one, we need to reduce our deficit in this country in a credible way; number two, the meat-ax approach of the sequester is not a smart way to do it.

So how should we go about reducing our deficit? Well, we propose to do it in the same balanced way that every bipartisan commission that has looked at this issue has recommended—through a combination of difficult cuts. And I would remind everybody that just last August we cut a trillion dollars through a combination of cuts as well as cuts to tax breaks for special interests and by asking the wealthiest people in this country, people who are making $1 million a year, to contribute a little bit more toward deficit reduction.

Mr. WOODALL. Will my friend yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I will yield very briefly, yes.

Mr. WOODALL. I have a very brief question.

My understanding of your substitute is that it raises $3 in taxes for every $1 in spending cuts. Could you tell me which bipartisan commissions have represented that, have also agreed that $3 to $1 is the right combination?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Absolutely. I'm glad the gentleman asked the question.

Simpson-Bowles, Rivlin-Domenici, they proposed an approach which was about $3 in cuts to $1 in revenue, depending on the accounting rules. We've already enacted $1 trillion in cuts, 100 percent in cuts. You voted for that; I voted for that, 100 percent cuts.

What this does is, for the next 1 year, we do another $30 billion in cuts—a little over that, actually—and then we get about $80 billion through closing loopholes.

For example, we say that the big oil companies don't need taxpayer subsidies to encourage them to go drill. They've already testified, their chief executives, they don't need that. They're making plenty right now. We also say that millionaires should pay the same effective tax rate as the people who work for them.

And if you take that approach, frankly, with the trillion dollars in cuts we've already made, we are still cutting a lot more than the bipartisan groups recommended compared to the revenue. So our ratio of cuts to revenue is much higher because those bipartisan groups, they recommended that trillion dollars in cuts, and we adopted that on a bipartisan basis.

What they are not doing, what you're not doing, is taking the other part of their recommendation, frankly, which is to say let's close some of these outrageous tax loopholes for the purpose

of deficit reduction. And because 98 percent of our House Republican colleagues have signed this pledge saying that they won't take one penny of—

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. You won't ask one penny more for people making over $1 million a year to help reduce our deficit, not one penny. And the math is pretty simple after that; because you ask nothing of them, your budget whacks everyone else. That's why your budget ends the Medicare guarantee; that's why you cut $800 billion out of Medicaid; and that's why, in your sequester proposal here, you whack programs that help the most vulnerable, struggling families.

Let's talk about what the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office said your proposal would do: 22 million households with children would see their food and nutrition support cut under the SNAP reductions; 300,000 kids will no longer get the school lunch program; 300,000 kids will lose their health coverage under the children's health insurance program. Those are the decisions you have to make because you don't want to ask the oil companies to give up their taxpayer subsidy.

We say the American people would make a different choice. We have that different choice in the substitute amendment. That substitute amendment would prevent those cuts to the Defense Department. It would prevent cuts to NIH and biomedical research. But it would prevent those cuts without whacking seniors and children's health programs. It would do it in a balanced way.

We say we don't need the direct payments to agricultural businesses. These are payments that go to ag businesses whether they're making money or not. The spigot is on. We cut those; you don't in your proposal that's before us today. Why not? Instead, you cut the food and nutrition programs.

So we think the right approach is the balanced approach that every bipartisan group that has gotten together has recommended.

□ 0950

Because 98 percent of our Republican colleagues have signed this pledge saying they're not going to ask the folks at the very top to put in one penny, one dime more, you're smacking everybody else. We don't think that's the right way to go. We agree we should reduce the deficit. And we eliminate the sequester, but just in a different way.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say we just disagree on what balance is. When our proposal for budget reduction is to reduce spending by $65 billion over 5 years and your proposal for budget reduction is to spend an additional $35 billion over those same 5 years, we disagree on what balance is. We are moving in the wrong direction under your proposal, right direction under our proposal. I'm very proud of our proposal, proud to serve on the committee with my friend.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise to support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to represent Selfridge Air National Guard Base, which is home to the Michigan Red Devils, the 107th Fighter Squadron.

The 107th, Mr. Speaker, flies A–10s, and they recently returned from a redeployment to Afghanistan where they performed so bravely and made us all proud. The 107th was one of the Air Guard units scheduled to be eliminated under the President's budget proposal, but fortunately the House Armed Services Committee will present a Defense reauthorization bill next week which reverses that and saves the 107th, along with protecting the Air National Guard actually across the entire country.

This House is going to do the right thing for the great American patriots of the Air National Guard by prioritizing spending within our budget, not by spending more money. So I would certainly urge our colleagues in the Senate to join us.

Mr. Speaker, we need to remember that the cuts that caused the Obama administration to target the Air Guard were before the sequester. If the sequester is allowed to go into effect, the impact on the community that I represent, for example, would be immense, and the defense corridor we are building as a part of our economic revitalization would be stopped, really, dead in its tracks. Not only would the National Guard again be put at risk of massive new cuts, but military contracting across the board would be faced with additional cuts. In Macomb County alone—the county that I'm proud to represent as part of my congressional district—this would mean $200 million in additional cuts, Mr. Speaker, and obviously would cost countless jobs in the defense-related corridor.

This House has taken steps to stop the devastation of our Air National Guard and now is taking steps to stop the devastation of our defense base and needless loss of jobs with commonsense reforms. So I would urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting reconciliation today, and the Defense reauthorization bill that's coming to the floor next week.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'm proud to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill, which chooses to slash programs that help struggling families get back on their feet without closing a single tax loophole or eliminating a single special interest subsidy.

Our budget should reflect our values and, as many in the faith community have argued, it should advance the moral responsibilities of the Nation to provide for the common good. I note that the Catholic Bishops just sent a letter concluding that ''the proposed cuts to programs in the Republican budget reconciliation fail this basic moral test.'' I'm pleased that the bishops are speaking out, as they should.

Forty percent of the total cuts here come from cutting assistance to low- and moderate-income families, including food stamps, Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program, and social services for vulnerable children and elderly and disabled people. But instead of eliminating big agricultural subsidies where people don't have to plant a seed and they get paid, this budget would cause more than 200,000 children to lose their school lunch and would cut the food stamp program by $36 billion. That means 46 million Americans, one-half of whom are children, would see their benefits cut, and 2 million Americans would lose them entirely. This, at a time when one in seven seniors faces the threat of hunger and one in five children right here in America—a land of plenty—face a similar risk. They are going to bed hungry in the United States of America. We know the impact of hunger and malnutrition: lower performances at school, poor growth, and an immune system less able to fend off illness.

Instead of ending subsidies to big oil companies, this budget eliminates the Social Services Block Grant, which provides childcare assistance to low-income working mothers, addresses child abuse, and provides care for the elderly and disabled. About 23 million people, half of them children, would lose services.

Instead of ending tax breaks that allow corporations to ship jobs overseas, this budget cuts Medicaid, slashes the Children's Health Insurance Program, and forces 350,000 Americans to forego health care coverage provided by the health care reform.

Instead of asking millionaires to pay the same tax rates as middle class families, this budget makes children who are U.S. citizens but have immigrant parents ineligible for the child tax credit, harming 2 million families and 4.5 million children who are United States citizens. They end the Medicare guarantee for seniors in this Nation.

These cuts have a catastrophic effect on the most vulnerable in our Nation, and for what? All to protect special interest subsidies and tax breaks for the richest members of our society. My friends, it's $150,000 for the average millionaire in a tax cut. That's what we're talking about in this piece of legislation. It is wrong. Budgets are about choices, about values. And this bill exposes exactly what this majority is all about.

We need to pass legislation that strengthens and rebuilds the middle

class of this country, creates jobs, invests in rebuilding our infrastructure, supports manufacturers, and restores fairness to our Tax Code. This reverse Robin Hood agenda of the House majority fails in every single regard, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, you know, when I hear my colleagues talk, it sounds as if we have a choice about doing one thing or another thing. I will say to my colleagues, when you're borrowing $1.4 trillion a year from your children——

Ms. DELAURO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. Just a moment. I'd be happy to yield to my friend.

When you're borrowing $1.4 trillion a year from your children, when you're mortgaging the future of this country, it's not a choice of either spending cuts or revenue changes; we've got to have both. We've got to have both. And to describe it to the American people as if we can do one or the other and get ourselves out of this mess, we cannot. We absolutely cannot. It takes both.

I would ask my friends—and with this, I'd be happy to yield to my colleague—when this House brought to the floor a tax cut bill that gave every Member of Congress a tax cut at the end of 2011 that said we only have to pay 4 percent of payroll taxes that we owe, instead of 6 percent of payroll taxes that we owe, I voted ''no.'' I said there's not a Member in this body that needs a tax cut. I said we have too big a problem in this Nation to give tax cuts to Members of Congress. I voted ''no.'' Did anybody else vote ''no'' with me? Did anybody else vote ''no'' with me?

I will not be lectured about how it is that tax cuts are distributed in this country when we have opportunities to cut them on this floor, to eliminate them on this floor, and my colleagues continue to vote ''yes.'' We could have added a provision that eliminated those tax cuts for the rich. We did not, and we should have.

With that, I'd be happy to yield to my friend.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The fact of the matter is that there are choices, and the majority refuses to make those choices.

Let's not provide the tax cuts for people who are making over $250,000 in this Nation. Let us pull back from Afghanistan in an orderly way and save the money. Let us cut the subsidies for those who are sending the jobs overseas.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time from my colleague, and I very much appreciate her passion—if I can get regular order, please, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Connecticut will suspend.

The gentleman from Georgia has the time.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the Speaker for his help there. I'm sorry that I needed it, but I appreciate him offering it.

You know, we passed a budget in this House, a comprehensive budget in this House. And to hear my colleagues talk, you'd think this is the only bill we're going to pass for the rest of the year. To hear my colleagues talk, you'd think we're not going to bring the farm bill to the floor and go after ag subsidies. To hear my colleagues talk, you'd think we're not going to bring a tax bill to the floor and try to raise revenues in this country. To hear my colleagues talk, this is it.

This isn't it. This is the bill that responds to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, who said in February of this year about the cuts that we're trying to prevent today:

> I will tell you that I am prepared to say that sequestration will pose an unacceptable risk.

□ 1000

That's what we're here to talk about today: How do we mitigate the unacceptable risk? How do we mitigate against the challenges that former Democratic Budget Committee chairman, former Clinton OMB Director, former Clinton Chief of Staff, current Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta says threaten our national security?

And, again, we're going to have a choice, Mr. Speaker. We've brought a very powerful program, a very powerful proposal to the floor today, a very powerful proposal. For the first time in over a decade, we're trying to get a handle on that out-of-control portion of spending in this budget. Just a little bit, Mr. Speaker. Just a little bit.

And, again, we just have a different idea of what balance is. We have a different idea of what deficit reduction is. My idea of deficit reduction is over the next 5 years we reduce the deficit.

My colleagues' idea of deficit reduction is over the next 5 years we spend an additional $40 billion above and beyond what we were going to borrow and spend anyway. It's a legitimate difference of opinion. I'm glad we're bringing this rule to the floor, Mr. Speaker, so that we can have a vote on that opinion. I look forward to the debate on the underlying bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the gentleman.

First of all, no one here on our side is arguing that sequestration should go into effect. We don't think that's good for our country, but we think that the Republican reconciliation bill is even worse for our country because of the cuts in so many programs that actually help our people.

There's no balance in there. The gentleman can say I'm all for balance. There's none in your reconciliation bill. It's all cuts to programs that actually help the people of this country.

And, finally, I'd just say we have an alternative to sequestration. Mr. VAN HOLLEN brought that before the Rules Committee last night. The Rules Committee Republicans, every single one of them, voted ''no.''

Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I think I'll let this thing cool down a little bit.

But the gentleman on the other side of this debate is quite wrong. There's no balance in this particular bill at all. There is no balance.

The cuts are devastating. Meals on Wheels for seniors, Medicare programs, Medicaid programs for seniors. And if you take a look at the rest of the issues, school lunch programs, kids are going to go hungry. There's no balance.

There is no tax proposal in this. There's no balance at all.

But the reason I rise today is to add one more problem that's not being solved by this reconciliation. The National Flood Insurance bill was folded in to this reconciliation, and it has a gaping hole. The Corps of Engineers has gone through the Nation's levees and downgraded those levees, creating an enormous problem for agriculture throughout this Nation, and certainly in California, where many of the levees have been downgraded. It's now impossible for farmers and the agricultural community to obtain loans to continue to produce and to enhance their agricultural production.

This amendment, which I had hoped could be put into the bill but was not allowed by the Rules Committee, would simply require an immediate study by the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Emergency Management Agency to undertake a study on the impact of the downgrading of the levees and the resultant inability to get national flood insurance, and the impact that that has on the agricultural communities, keeping in mind that agriculture, in a flood zone, is one of the very best ways to reduce the risk.

I would hope that the majority would consider, as this thing moves along, to fold into the National Flood Insurance Program an opportunity for the Farm Flood Program that I've introduced, which would allow farmers to obtain national flood insurance, and then the lending that the banks could make available so they can continue to build the necessary facilities for their agricultural production.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, there are no tough choices here. I talked to the gentleman whose seat I took the other day. I said, John, you know, when you were up here as a Congressman, you made it look fun. Folks were always saying thank you, thank you, thank you for all the spending that was going on here. I said, I don't get to make any fun decisions.

When you've increased the public debt in this country by 50 percent over the last 4 years, you're all out of giveaway decisions. All we have now are tough decisions. That's all we have.

And, again, I know that my friend from Massachusetts speaks with passion and conviction. His advocacy for

the neediest among us is an inspiration on the floor and in committee and on and on, and I don't fault him for that a bit.

But I would say to my friend, had we not given that payroll tax cut to Members of Congress, we could have provided that food stamp increase that you discussed earlier to an additional 2 million individuals in this country, an additional 2 million individuals in this country had we foregone that tax increase right here. But we didn't. We chose just to go along with the program and cut away, spend away. We can't do that. We've got to stop that.

And I would say to my friend, because it's hard, I have the same families struggling in my district that you do. In fact, our foreclosure rate in my district is higher than it is in your district. Our number of folks who are going homeless in Georgia as a result of foreclosures, higher than it is in Massachusetts.

But when you talk about the additional 1.8 million folks, 1.8 million folks, Mr. Speaker, according to the CBO, who are going to lose their food stamp benefits under this bill, there's no question about that.

But here's the thing, Mr. Speaker, and this is important. This bill doesn't cut anybody from food stamps. This bill says the only people who can get food stamps are people who apply and qualify for food stamps. Hear that, Mr. Speaker.

The CBO tells us, and my friend from Massachusetts quotes, that 1.8 million people are going to lose food stamp benefits. But the only change this bill makes is that you actually have to apply for the benefits to get the benefits. So that means 1.8 million people in this country are receiving food stamp benefits who would not qualify for food stamp benefits if they had to go and apply.

Mr. Speaker, that is not mean-spirited. If you want to change the food stamp rules, if you want to make it a laxer process, whatever you want to do, let's do that. But let's not demonize each other. Let's not say we're trying to throw poor children out in the streets, when all we're saying is we have a successful food stamp program, and why don't we just limit it to those people who qualify for it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I'd be happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you for the courtesy of yielding.

The fact of the matter is that 1.8 million people will not be able to get the supplemental food that they get from food stamps. They're going to be hungry. That's a fact.

Now, the rest of the fact is the application process has been supported by the Federal Government and by the legislation so that the States can reach out to those people that are hungry and that are able to qualify for food stamps. That's gone in this bill. So the ability to reach out and to bring into those programs——

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time from my friend, I would say reaching out and bringing folks into the program who do not qualify for the program. The rules for the program are clear, Mr. Speaker. If you qualify for food stamps, I am the first one who wants you to have it. If you qualify for the SNAP program, under SNAP program rules, you should get food stamps.

Mr. McGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I'll be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. McGOVERN. Just so the gentleman understands, the General Accountability Office says the error rate in the SNAP program is less than 3 percent. What is he talking about when people are getting benefits that they don't deserve? I'd like to know the numbers of that. How much?

Mr. WOODALL. This is important, Mr. Speaker, and I hope folks are paying attention back in their offices. The gentleman is talking about the error rate, the error rate, folks who have mistakenly gotten food stamps because in the application process they got the application process wrong. They shouldn't have qualified but they have given them away anyway.

What the CBO says is something entirely different. What the CBO says is that 1.8 million American families, if they walked into the office today and applied for food stamps today, would not qualify for food stamps. It's not an error. It's not a mistake. It's that the rules of the game have been changed to say we just want everybody, we just want everybody to have a part in the program.

When the gentleman says it's a paperwork nightmare for States, I happen to agree with the gentleman. There's a tremendous paperwork challenge for States. But this does not solve that. All we're saying is go through the application process. To suggest that we're trying to take benefits away from people who need those benefits is disingenuous.

Mr. McGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to let the gentleman have his own time, Mr. Speaker, because I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Just by way of time update, the gentleman from Georgia has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield myself 30 seconds, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman is wrong. He's just wrong when he talks about the abuse of the SNAP program, that people are somehow getting benefits that they're not entitled to. And the demagoguery that's going on with regard to categorical eligibility is just inexcusable. That actually cuts paperwork and bureaucracy at a State level, and it helps people who are eligible to get the benefits.

I'd also say to the gentleman, he gets up on the floor and talks about this payroll tax cut for Members of Congress. That was a payroll tax cut for everybody.

□ 1010

Now, if you wanted to exempt Members of Congress, that would be minuscule. That would do nothing to provide any benefit to anyone.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend that I wish he would show me the code sections here that go into the SNAP program, the codes that say, under the SNAP program, the income criteria that we had yesterday is changing, and so folks aren't going to get those benefits tomorrow. That's not here. All this bill does is to say you need to apply, and you need to earn those benefits on your own merits.

When the gentleman talks about paperwork, he knows good and well the CBO took that into consideration. When the CBO says 1.8 million families are no longer going to qualify, it means some folks are going to get thrown off of categorical eligibility because that is the gaming of the system. They're going to go back in, and they're going to apply for benefits, and they're going to get them, but 1.8 million are going to go back in and apply and get denied because they don't qualify for benefits.

Mr. Speaker, if we need to change the eligibility criteria, if we have folks in need who can't qualify, let's change the eligibility criteria. But in the name of good government, when we're going into programs and saying we have rules of the game—we just want people to have to follow them—to somehow define that as being mean-spirited, it galls me.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

What galls me is that the Republican majority is balancing the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable in this country, on the poorest of the poor.

The gentleman talks about the CBO. The CBO says that cutting $36 billion from the SNAP program means that more than 22 million households will see a cut in their benefits. It means that 22 million families will have less food tomorrow than they do today. In fact, 2 million people would be cut from SNAP altogether. That is not my making up numbers. That's the CBO. That's where I get that from. I think that's cruel and inhumane during one of the worst economic crises that we've faced.

Yes, we have to balance the budget, and we have to make tough choices, but why does it have to be on the backs of the most vulnerable? Why can't Donald Trump pay a couple of more dollars in taxes? Why can't we end the subsidies to Big Oil? Why can't we make it so that Warren Buffett pays the same tax rate as his secretary? That's all we're saying here.

Your reconciliation bill represents your priorities. What we're arguing is that your priorities are wrong and bad for the country. We have an alternative. You won't even let us have the opportunity to debate that alternative on the floor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Massachusetts that I am prepared to close if he has anymore speakers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I'm it.

Mr. WOODALL. Then I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to this closed rule to let the House work its will and to give Mr. VAN HOLLEN's substitute an up-or-down vote in the House. It deserves more than a procedural vote.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I think what we're talking about here today are two different visions for this country. The Republicans have their vision that is outlined in their reconciliation package. Mr. VAN HOLLEN, I think, has adequately summarized what the Democratic priorities are.

The main difference is that, in their proposal, there is no balance. It's a meat-ax approach to everything—cut, cut, cut, cut—regardless of what it means to the people of this country. What we're trying to do and, quite frankly, what other bipartisan commissions have recommended, is a more balanced approach: we cut spending, but there are also some revenues to be raised.

At a time in our country when we have a Tax Code that allows Warren Buffett to pay a lower tax rate than his secretary, it seems that it's time for a little fairness, and that's all we're asking for here. That's all we're asking for—a balanced, fair approach. We are prepared to make the tough choices. Yes, some of those tough choices mean cuts. But I'd say to the Republicans that some of those tough choices may mean you'll have to go back on the pledge that you signed with Grover Norquist, that you'll have to support closing tax loopholes and raising taxes on the wealthiest individuals in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would at this time like to insert in the RECORD a letter from the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, and I want to read one paragraph from that letter, which is to the Members of Congress:

The Catholic bishops of the United States recognize the serious deficits our country faces, and we acknowledge that Congress must make difficult decisions about how to allocate burdens and sacrifices and balance resources and needs. However, deficit reduction and fiscal responsibility efforts must protect and not undermine the needs of poor and vulnerable people. The proposed cuts to programs in the budget reconciliation fail this basic moral test. The catechism of the Catholic Church states it is the proper role of government to ''make accessible to each what is needed to lead a truly human life: food, clothing, health, work, education and culture, suitable information, the right to establish a family, and so on.'' Poor and vulnerable people do not have powerful lobbyists to advocate their interests, but they have the most compelling needs.

Mr. Speaker, that paragraph sums up what I feel and what so many of us feel about what my friends on the other side of the aisle are doing. Yes, we have to make tough choices, but why are always the tough choices on the backs of middle-income families and on the backs of the poor?

There are people in this country who are hungry. We are the richest country on the planet, and we have hungry people here. Yet what is our response? It's not to figure out a way to help deal with this terrible scourge. Our response—their response—is to take a meat-ax approach to SNAP, which will cut benefits. That's what the CBO says, that it will cut benefits and that people will have less food tomorrow than they have today if this is to become law.

I think that's a horrible choice. That's not a choice we should be discussing on the floor. Yes, let's make these programs more efficient. But I'm going to tell you the SNAP Program is a hell of a lot more efficient than the Pentagon—the waste, the fraud, and the abuse in the Pentagon, the wasteful weapons systems in the Pentagon. I want to tell you that I don't care what Leon Panetta says. There are savings to be found in the Pentagon's budget, and we ought to go after that. We ought to make sure that Donald Trump pays his fair share in taxes, and we ought to close these corporate tax loopholes that allow corporations to get away with paying no taxes. Middle-income families can't do that.

This is about fairness. That's what we're looking for—fairness and balance. This is a tough time. But rather than following the European model—which my friends seem to love, a model of austerity and of cut, cut, cut, cut, which is not very popular, as they're seeing—what we're trying to do here is to make responsible cutbacks and responsible investments: investing in a robust highway bill to put people back to work, investing in education to make sure our young people are prepared to compete in the 21st century economy, and, yes, investing in the social safety net and investing in programs that provide a circle of protection to the poor and the most vulnerable.

There is nothing wrong with that. We should be proud of the fact that we are a country that cares. Let's not give that up. That's a strength. It's not a weakness. It's a strength. I say to my colleagues that my biggest problem with what the Republicans are doing is that it fails that test. What it does is it goes after the most vulnerable in a way that, I think, is cruel and wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and to defeat the previous question. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC JUSTICE AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, DC, May 8, 2012.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As you vote on a reconciliation package for the fiscal year 2013 budget, I would like to affirm the principle contained in the Committee Report that the ''budget starts with the proposition that first, Congress must do no harm.'' In this light, I urge you to ensure all policies meet the moral criteria established by the Catholic bishops of the United States to create a circle of protection around programs that serve poor and vulnerable people and communities:

1. Every budget decision should be assessed by whether it protects or threatens human life and dignity.

2. A central moral measure of any budget proposal is how it affects the lives and dignity of ''the least of these'' (Matthew 25). The needs of those who are hungry and homeless, without work or in poverty should come first.

3. Government and other institutions have a shared responsibility to promote the common good of all, especially ordinary workers and families who struggle to live in dignity in difficult economic times.

A just framework for future budgets cannot rely on disproportionate cuts in essential services to poor persons; it requires shared sacrifice by all, including raising adequate revenues, eliminating unnecessary military and other spending, and addressing the long-term costs of health insurance and retirement programs fairly.

I reiterate our strong opposition to an unfair proposal that would alter the Child Tax Credit to exclude children of hard-working, immigrant families. The bishops' conference has long supported the Child Tax Credit because it is pro-work, pro-family, and one of the most effective antipoverty programs in our nation. Denying the credit to children of working poor immigrant families—the large majority of whom are American citizens—would hurt vulnerable kids, increase poverty, and would not advance the common good.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly known as food stamps), provides vital food security to families during tough economic times. It is estimated that cuts proposed in this bill would deny assistance to two million families, and cut the benefit for everyone else. No poor family that receives food assistance would be unaffected, constituting a direct threat to their human dignity. If savings in agricultural programs need to be achieved, subsidies and direct payments can be reduced and targeted to small and moderate-sized farms.

The Social Services Block Grant is an important source of funding for programs throughout the country that serve vulnerable members of our communities—the homeless, the elderly, people with disabilities, children living in poverty, and abuse victims. We should prioritize programs that serve ''the least of these,'' not eliminate them.

The Catholic bishops of the United States recognize the serious deficits our country

faces, and we acknowledge that Congress must make difficult decisions about how to allocate burdens and sacrifices and balance resources and needs. However, deficit reduction and fiscal responsibility efforts must protect and not undermine the needs of poor and vulnerable people. The proposed cuts to programs in the budget reconciliation fail this basic moral test. The Catechism of the Catholic Church states it is the proper role of government to ''make accessible to each what is needed to lead a truly human life: food, clothing, health, work, education and culture, suitable information, the right to establish a family, and so on'' (no. 1908). Poor and vulnerable people do not have powerful lobbyists to advocate their interests, but they have the most compelling needs.

As you pursue responsible deficit reduction, the Catholic bishops join other faith leaders and people of good will urging you to protect the lives and dignity of poor and vulnerable families by putting a circle of protection around these essential programs and to refrain from cutting programs that serve them.

Sincerely,

Most Reverend STEPHEN E. BLAIRE,
Chairman, Committee on Domestic Justice and Human Development.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for joining me on the floor today.

I will say I think he chose exactly the right words when he was trying to make his points: describe your opposition as hating women and children, and that's your best chance of winning your argument. If only it were true.

And that's what I hope the American people take home from debates like these, Mr. Speaker—that there are serious challenges here and that there are serious people who are here who are trying to solve these challenges. But we get wrapped around the axle in the name-calling I hear, that I would argue does nothing to feed a child and that does nothing to take care of a family.

The gentleman says that we're the richest Nation in the world. I would tell the gentleman there is no poorer nation on the planet. There is not a nation on the planet that has borrowed more money than this Nation has—not one, not one. What do they say about socialism, Mr. Speaker? It's a great plan until you run out of other people's money. Guess what? We've run out of other people's money.

I just want to show you a chart, Mr. Speaker. This is a chart—and I'll show it so that other Members can see it. The green line represents tax revenues in this country. It goes back to 1947. What you'll see is that tax revenues are fairly flat as a percent of the economy. In fact, because this chart goes all the way back to 1947, it reflects the New Deal with FDR. It reflects all of that growth in government. The red line is the government spending. It goes all the way back through 1965. It reflects Lyndon Johnson and all the Great Society spending that goes on.

I just want to make sure all of my colleagues can see it there. The red line represents where spending is going in this Nation, and the green line represents where taxes are historically in this Nation. Mr. Speaker, does this look like we have a tax problem here? Does it look like we have a spending problem in this Nation?

□ 1020

Taxes have remained the same as a percentage of GDP, as has spending, until now. Until now, we have a spending-driven crisis in this Nation. I say to my friend that, again, he chose all the right talking points: they want to protect the rich; they want to protect the oil companies.

There is one bill in this Congress that you know well, Mr. Speaker, that eliminates every single corporate loophole exemption deduction and break. There's one. That same bill, Mr. Speaker, eliminates every loophole the wealthy use to avoid paying their fair share. Mr. Speaker, it is the single most popularly cosponsored tax bill, fundamental reform bill in the House and in the Senate. It has almost 70 Members in the House; it has nine Members in the Senate, and there is one Democrat on it.

Mr. Speaker, giving the right speech down here about what folks ought to do doesn't move us in the right direction. Putting your name behind some legislation and moving something forward gets us in the right direction. This Budget Committee chairman sitting here beside me, I'm so proud of him. Chairman PAUL RYAN, that's a man known around this country as a man who is trying.

There are a lot of folks here who are known for blaming. There aren't many folks who are known for trying, who say, I don't care about the slings and the arrows. America is facing crisis. And if not me, then who?

We got that in the House-passed budget, Mr. Speaker, folks who said, If not me, then who? And they made tough choices. Here we have the first reconciliation bill. My colleagues on the other side are going to offer a motion to recommit to this deficit-reduction bill that actually increases spending and call that balance.

Mr. Speaker, the food stamp program spending has increased 270 percent over the last decade. The mean-spirited folks that my colleagues talk about want to increase it by 260 percent instead. These aren't easy decisions, Mr. Speaker, but they're not going to put one family out that qualifies for food stamps.

We're going to move beyond the demagoguery, Mr. Speaker. We're going to move into the real business that governing this Nation takes. I hope we'll get a strong bipartisan vote on this rule. I hope we'll get a strong bipartisan vote on the underlying bill. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of both the rule and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 648 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike ''and (2)'' and insert ''(2) a further amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted for printing in the Congressional Record pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVIII, if offered by Representative Van Hollen of Maryland or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3)''.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 177, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

YEAS—237

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
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
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
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)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—177

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
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
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Burgess
Dicks
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Granger
Hinchey
Hurt
Johnson (GA)
Lynch
Mack
McCaul
Noem
Paul
Slaughter
Stutzman
Waters
Young (AK)

□ 1046

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. KISSELL changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 244, on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 648. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 244, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 183, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 245]

AYES—233

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
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
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert

Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
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
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—183

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

NOT VOTING—15

Austria
Bachus
Berman
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Hinchey
Johnson (GA)
Mack
Noem
Paul
Slaughter
Stutzman
Young (AK)

□ 1053

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 245, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2224. An act to require the President to report to Congress on issues related to Syria.

SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2012

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 648, I call up the bill (H.R. 5652) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 648, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112–21 shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered read.

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

H.R. 5652

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 ''Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—AGRICULTURE

Sec. 101. Short title.
Sec. 102. ARRA sunset at June 30, 2012.
Sec. 103. Categorical eligibility limited to cash assistance.
Sec. 104. Standard utility allowances based on the receipt of energy assistance payments.
Sec. 105. Employment and training; workfare.
Sec. 106. End State bonus program for the supplemental nutrition assistance program.
Sec. 107. Funding of employment and training programs.
Sec. 108. Turn off indexing for nutrition education and obesity prevention.
Sec. 109. Extension of Authorization of Food and Nutrition Act of 2008.
Sec. 110. Effective dates and application of amendments.

TITLE II—COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

Subtitle A—Repeal of Certain ACA Funding Provisions

Sec. 201. Repealing mandatory funding to states to establish American Health Benefit Exchanges.
Sec. 202. Repealing Prevention and Public Health Fund.
Sec. 203. Rescinding unobligated balances for CO-OP program.

Subtitle B—Medicaid

Sec. 211. Revision of provider tax indirect guarantee threshold.
Sec. 212. Rebasing of State DSH allotments for fiscal year 2022.
Sec. 213. Repeal of Medicaid and CHIP maintenance of effort requirements under PPACA.
Sec. 214. Medicaid payments to territories.
Sec. 215. Repealing bonus payments for enrollment under Medicaid and CHIP.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL SERVICES

Sec. 301. Table of contents.

Subtitle A—Orderly Liquidation Fund

Sec. 311. Repeal of liquidation authority.

Subtitle B—Home Affordable Modification Program

Sec. 321. Short title.
Sec. 322. Congressional findings.
Sec. 323. Termination of authority.
Sec. 324. Sense of Congress.

Subtitle C—Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection

Sec. 331. Bringing the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection into the regular appropriations process.

Subtitle D—Flood Insurance Reform

Sec. 341. Short title.
Sec. 342. Extensions.
Sec. 343. Mandatory purchase.
Sec. 344. Reforms of coverage terms.
Sec. 345. Reforms of premium rates.
Sec. 346. Technical Mapping Advisory Council.
Sec. 347. FEMA incorporation of new mapping protocols.
Sec. 348. Treatment of levees.
Sec. 349. Privatization initiatives.
Sec. 350. FEMA annual report on insurance program.
Sec. 351. Mitigation assistance.
Sec. 352. Notification to homeowners regarding mandatory purchase requirement applicability and rate phase-ins.
Sec. 353. Notification to members of congress of flood map revisions and updates.
Sec. 354. Notification and appeal of map changes; notification to communities of establishment of flood elevations.
Sec. 355. Notification to tenants of availability of contents insurance.
Sec. 356. Notification to policy holders regarding direct management of policy by FEMA.
Sec. 357. Notice of availability of flood insurance and escrow in RESPA good faith estimate.
Sec. 358. Reimbursement for costs incurred by homeowners and communities obtaining letters of map amendment or revision.
Sec. 359. Enhanced communication with certain communities during map updating process.
Sec. 360. Notification to residents newly included in flood hazard areas.

Sec. 361. Treatment of swimming pool enclosures outside of hurricane season.
Sec. 362. Information regarding multiple perils claims.
Sec. 363. FEMA authority to reject transfer of policies.
Sec. 364. Appeals.
Sec. 365. Reserve fund.
Sec. 366. CDBG eligibility for flood insurance outreach activities and community building code administration grants.
Sec. 367. Technical corrections.
Sec. 368. Requiring competition for national flood insurance program policies.
Sec. 369. Studies of voluntary community-based flood insurance options.
Sec. 370. Report on inclusion of building codes in floodplain management criteria.
Sec. 371. Study on graduated risk.
Sec. 372. Report on flood-in-progress determination.
Sec. 373. Study on repaying flood insurance debt.
Sec. 374. No cause of action.
Sec. 375. Authority for the corps of engineers to provide specialized or technical services.

Subtitle E—Repeal of the Office of Financial Research

Sec. 381. Repeal of the Office of Financial Research.

TITLE IV—COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Sec. 401. Short title.
Sec. 402. Encouraging speedy resolution of claims.
Sec. 403. Compensating patient injury.
Sec. 404. Maximizing patient recovery.
Sec. 405. Punitive damages.
Sec. 406. Authorization of payment of future damages to claimants in health care lawsuits.
Sec. 407. Definitions.
Sec. 408. Effect on other laws.
Sec. 409. State flexibility and protection of States' rights.
Sec. 410. Applicability; effective date.

TITLE V—COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

Sec. 501. Retirement contributions.
Sec. 502. Annuity supplement.
Sec. 503. Contributions to Thrift Savings Fund of payments for accrued or accumulated leave.

TITLE VI—COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Subtitle A—Recapture of Overpayments Resulting From Certain Federally-subsidized Health Insurance

Sec. 601. Recapture of overpayments resulting from certain federally-subsidized health insurance.

Subtitle B—Social Security Number Required to Claim the Refundable Portion of the Child Tax Credit

Sec. 611. Social security number required to claim the refundable portion of the child tax credit.

Subtitle C—Human Resources Provisions

Sec. 621. Repeal of the program of block grants to States for social services.

TITLE VII—SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT

Sec. 701. Short title.
Sec. 702. Protecting veterans programs from sequester.
Sec. 703. Achieving $19 billion in discretionary savings.
Sec. 704. Conforming amendments to section 314 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.
Sec. 705. Treatment for PAYGO purposes.
Sec. 706. Elimination of the fiscal year 2013 sequestration for defense direct spending.

TITLE I—AGRICULTURE

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Agricultural Reconciliation Act of 2012''.

SEC. 102. ARRA SUNSET AT JUNE 30, 2012.

Section 101(a)(2) of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5; 123 Stat. 120) is amended by striking ''October 31, 2013'' and inserting ''June 30, 2012''.

SEC. 103. CATEGORICAL ELIGIBILITY LIMITED TO CASH ASSISTANCE.

Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(1) in the 2d sentence of subsection (a) by striking ''households in which each member receives benefits'' and inserting ''households in which each member receives cash assistance'', and

(2) in subsection (j) by striking ''or who receives benefits under a State program'' and inserting ''or who receives cash assistance under a State program''.

SEC. 104. STANDARD UTILITY ALLOWANCES BASED ON THE RECEIPT OF ENERGY ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS.

(a) STANDARD UTILITY ALLOWANCE.—Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)(6)(C) by striking clause (iv), and

(2) in subsection (k) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

''(4) THIRD PARTY ENERGY ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS.—For purposes of subsection (d)(1), a payment made under a State law (other than a law referred to in paragraph (2)(G)) to provide energy assistance to a household shall be considered money payable directly to the household.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2605(f)(2) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8624(f)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and for purposes of determining any excess shelter expense deduction under section 5(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(e))'', and

(2) in subparagraph (A) by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', except that such payments or allowances shall not be deemed to be expended for purposes of determining any excess shelter expense deduction under section 5(e)(6) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(e)(6))''.

SEC. 105. EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING; WORKFARE.

(a) ADMINISTRATIVE COST-SHARING FOR EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 16 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a) by inserting ''(other than a program carried out under section 6(d)(4) or section 20)'' after ''supplemental nutrition assistance program'' the 1st place it appears, and

(B) in subsection (h)—

(i) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3), and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 17(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(hh) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(hh)) is amended by striking ''(g), (h)(2), or (h)(3)'' and inserting ''or (g)''.

(B) Section 22(d)(1)(B)(ii) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2031(d)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended is amended by striking '', (g), (h)(2), and (h)(3)'' and inserting ''and (g)''.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE COST-SHARING AND REIMBURSEMENTS FOR WORKFARE.—Section 20 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2029) is amended by striking subsection (g).

SEC. 106. END STATE BONUS PROGRAM FOR THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 16 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025) is amended by striking subsection (d).

SEC. 107. FUNDING OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.

For purposes of fiscal year 2013, the reference to $90,000,000 in section 16(h)(1)(A) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(h)(1)(A)) shall be deemed to be a reference to $79,000,000.

SEC. 108. TURN OFF INDEXING FOR NUTRITION EDUCATION AND OBESITY PREVENTION.

Section 28(d) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2037(d)) is amended by striking ''years—'' and all that follows through the period at the end, and inserting ''years, $375,000,000.''.

SEC. 109. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF FOOD AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2008.

Section 18(a)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2013''.

SEC. 110. EFFECTIVE DATES AND APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.

(a) GENERAL EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 2012, and shall apply only with respect to certification periods that begin on or after such date.

(b) SPECIAL EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 107 and the amendments made by sections 102, 103, 104, and 109 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply only with respect to certification periods that begin on or after such date.

TITLE II—COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

Subtitle A—Repeal of Certain ACA Funding Provisions

SEC. 201. REPEALING MANDATORY FUNDING TO STATES TO ESTABLISH AMERICAN HEALTH BENEFIT EXCHANGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1311(a) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031(a)) is repealed.

(b) RESCISSION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Of the funds made available under such section 1311(a), the unobligated balance is rescinded.

SEC. 202. REPEALING PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u–11) is repealed.

(b) RESCISSION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Of the funds made available by such section 4002, the unobligated balance is rescinded.

SEC. 203. RESCINDING UNOBLIGATED BALANCES FOR CO-OP PROGRAM.

Of the funds made available under section 1322(g) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18042(g)), the unobligated balance is rescinded.

Subtitle B—Medicaid

SEC. 211. REVISION OF PROVIDER TAX INDIRECT GUARANTEE THRESHOLD.

Section 1903(w)(4)(C)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(w)(4)(C)(ii)) is amended by inserting ''and for portions of fiscal years beginning on or after October 1, 2012,'' after ''October 1, 2011,''.

SEC. 212. REBASING OF STATE DSH ALLOTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022.

Section 1923(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-4(f)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (10);

(2) in paragraph (3)(A) by striking ''paragraphs (6), (7), and (8)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (6), (7), (8), and (9)''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

''(9) REBASING OF STATE DSH ALLOTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022.—With respect to fiscal 2022, for purposes of applying paragraph (3)(A) to determine the DSH allotment for a State, the amount of the DSH allotment for the State under paragraph (3) for fiscal year 2021 shall be

treated as if it were such amount as reduced under paragraph (7).''.

SEC. 213. REPEAL OF MEDICAID AND CHIP MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT REQUIREMENTS UNDER PPACA.

(a) REPEAL OF PPACA MEDICAID MOE.—Section 1902 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a) is amended by striking subsection (gg).

(b) REPEAL OF PPACA CHIP MOE.—Section 2105(d)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(d)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A);

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(3) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''CONTINUATION OF ELIGIBILITY STANDARDS FOR CHILDREN UNTIL OCTOBER 1, 2019'' and inserting ''CONTINUITY OF COVERAGE''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1902(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (74).

(2) Effective January 1, 2014, paragraph (14) of section 1902(e) (as added by section 2002(a) of Public Law 111–148) is amended by striking the third sentence of subparagraph (A).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (c)(2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this section.

SEC. 214. MEDICAID PAYMENTS TO TERRITORIES.

(a) LIMIT ON PAYMENTS.—Section 1108(g) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1308(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''paragraphs (3) and (5)''; and

(B) by inserting ''paragraph (3)'' after ''and subject to'';

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''(3), and'' and all that follows through ''of this subsection'' and inserting ''and (3) of this subsection''; and

(3) by striking paragraph (5).

(b) FMAP.—The first sentence of section 1905(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(b)) is amended by striking ''shall be 55 percent'' and inserting ''shall be 50 percent''.

SEC. 215. REPEALING BONUS PAYMENTS FOR ENROLLMENT UNDER MEDICAID AND CHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 2105(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(a)) are repealed.

(b) RESCISSION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Of the funds made available by section 2105(a)(3) of the Social Security Act, the unobligated balance is rescinded.

(c) CONFORMING CHANGES.—

(1) AVAILABILITY OF EXCESS FUNDS FOR PERFORMANCE BONUSES.—Section 2104(n)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(n)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (D).

(2) OUTREACH OR COVERAGE BENCHMARKS.—Section 2111(b)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397kk(b)(3)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i), by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon at the end; and

(ii) by striking clause (ii); and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C).

TITLE III—FINANCIAL SERVICES

SEC. 301. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this title is as follows:

TITLE III—FINANCIAL SERVICES

Sec. 301. Table of contents.

Subtitle A—Orderly Liquidation Fund

Sec. 311. Repeal of liquidation authority.

Subtitle B—Home Affordable Modification Program

Sec. 321. Short title.
Sec. 322. Congressional findings.
Sec. 323. Termination of authority.
Sec. 324. Sense of Congress.

Subtitle C—Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection

Sec. 331. Bringing the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection into the regular appropriations process.

Subtitle D—Flood Insurance Reform

Sec. 341. Short title.
Sec. 342. Extensions.
Sec. 343. Mandatory purchase.
Sec. 344. Reforms of coverage terms.
Sec. 345. Reforms of premium rates.
Sec. 346. Technical Mapping Advisory Council.
Sec. 347. FEMA incorporation of new mapping protocols.
Sec. 348. Treatment of levees.
Sec. 349. Privatization initiatives.
Sec. 350. FEMA annual report on insurance program.
Sec. 351. Mitigation assistance.
Sec. 352. Notification to homeowners regarding mandatory purchase requirement applicability and rate phase-ins.
Sec. 353. Notification to members of congress of flood map revisions and updates.
Sec. 354. Notification and appeal of map changes; notification to communities of establishment of flood elevations.
Sec. 355. Notification to tenants of availability of contents insurance.
Sec. 356. Notification to policy holders regarding direct management of policy by FEMA.
Sec. 357. Notice of availability of flood insurance and escrow in RESPA good faith estimate.
Sec. 358. Reimbursement for costs incurred by homeowners and communities obtaining letters of map amendment or revision.
Sec. 359. Enhanced communication with certain communities during map updating process.
Sec. 360. Notification to residents newly included in flood hazard areas.
Sec. 361. Treatment of swimming pool enclosures outside of hurricane season.
Sec. 362. Information regarding multiple perils claims.
Sec. 363. FEMA authority to reject transfer of policies.
Sec. 364. Appeals.
Sec. 365. Reserve fund.
Sec. 366. CDBG eligibility for flood insurance outreach activities and community building code administration grants.
Sec. 367. Technical corrections.
Sec. 368. Requiring competition for national flood insurance program policies.
Sec. 369. Studies of voluntary community-based flood insurance options.
Sec. 370. Report on inclusion of building codes in floodplain management criteria.
Sec. 371. Study on graduated risk.
Sec. 372. Report on flood-in-progress determination.
Sec. 373. Study on repaying flood insurance debt.
Sec. 374. No cause of action.
Sec. 375. Authority for the corps of engineers to provide specialized or technical services.

Subtitle E—Repeal of the Office of Financial Research

Sec. 381. Repeal of the Office of Financial Research.

Subtitle A—Orderly Liquidation Fund

SEC. 311. REPEAL OF LIQUIDATION AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is hereby repealed and any Federal law amended by such title shall, on and after the date of enactment of this Act, be effective as if title II of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act had not been enacted.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) DODD-FRANK WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT.—The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended—

(A) in the table of contents for such Act, by striking all items relating to title II;

(B) in section 165(d)(6), by striking '', a receiver appointed under title II,'';

(C) in section 716(g), by striking ''or a covered financial company under title II'';

(D) in section 1105(e)(5), by striking ''amount of any securities issued under that chapter 31 for such purpose shall be treated in the same manner as securities issued under section 208(n)(5)(E)'' and inserting ''issuances of such securities under that chapter 31 for such purpose shall by treated as public debt transactions of the United States, and the proceeds from the sale of any obligations acquired by the Secretary under this paragraph shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts''; and

(E) in section 1106(c)(2), by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

''(A) require the company to file a petition for bankruptcy under section 301 of title 11, United States Code; or''.

(2) FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT.—Section 10(b)(3) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(b)(3)) is amended by striking '', or of such nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors or bank holding company described in section 165(a) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010, for the purpose of implementing its authority to provide for orderly liquidation of any such company under title II of that Act''.

(3) FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.—Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking '', resolution under title II of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, or'' and inserting ''or is subject to resolution under''; and

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking '', resolution under title II of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, or'' and inserting ''or resolution under''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (E).

Subtitle B—Home Affordable Modification Program

SEC. 321. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''HAMP Termination Act of 2012''.

SEC. 322. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) According to the Department of the Treasury—

(A) the Home Affordable Modification Program (HAMP) is designed to ''help as many as 3 to 4 million financially struggling homeowners avoid foreclosure by modifying loans to a level that is affordable for borrowers now and sustainable over the long term''; and

(B) as of February 2012, only 782,609 active permanent mortgage modifications were made under HAMP.

(2) Many homeowners whose HAMP modifications were canceled suffered because they made futile payments and some of those homeowners were even forced into foreclosure.

(3) The Special Inspector General for TARP reported that HAMP ''benefits only a small portion of distressed homeowners, offers others little more than false hope, and in certain cases causes more harm than good''.

(4) Approximately $30 billion was obligated by the Department of the Treasury to HAMP, however, approximately only $2.54 billion has been disbursed.

(5) Terminating HAMP would save American taxpayers approximately $2.84 billion, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

SEC. 323. TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.

Section 120 of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5230) is amended

by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE NEW ASSISTANCE UNDER THE HOME AFFORDABLE MODIFICATION PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under paragraph (2), after the date of the enactment of this subsection the Secretary may not provide any assistance under the Home Affordable Modification Program under the Making Home Affordable initiative of the Secretary, authorized under this Act, on behalf of any homeowner.

''(2) PROTECTION OF EXISTING OBLIGATIONS ON BEHALF OF HOMEOWNERS ALREADY EXTENDED AN OFFER TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PROGRAM.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to assistance provided on behalf of a homeowner who, before the date of the enactment of this subsection, was extended an offer to participate in the Home Affordable Modification Program on a trial or permanent basis.

''(3) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—

''(A) USE OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the amounts described in subparagraph (B) shall not be available after the date of the enactment of this subsection for obligation or expenditure under the Home Affordable Modification Program of the Secretary, but should be covered into the General Fund of the Treasury and should be used only for reducing the budget deficit of the Federal Government.

''(B) IDENTIFICATION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—The amounts described in this subparagraph are any amounts made available under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 that—

''(i) have been allocated for use, but not yet obligated as of the date of the enactment of this subsection, under the Home Affordable Modification Program of the Secretary; and

''(ii) are not necessary for providing assistance under such Program on behalf of homeowners who, pursuant to paragraph (2), may be provided assistance after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

''(4) STUDY OF USE OF PROGRAM BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES, VETERANS, AND GOLD STAR RECIPIENTS.—

''(A) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the extent of usage of the Home Affordable Modification Program by, and the impact of such Program on, covered homeowners.

''(B) REPORT.—Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report setting forth the results of the study under subparagraph (A) and identifying best practices, derived from studying the Home Affordable Modification Program, that could be applied to existing mortgage assistance programs available to covered homeowners.

''(C) COVERED HOMEOWNER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'covered homeowner' means a homeowner who is—

''(i) a member of the Armed Forces of the United States on active duty or the spouse or parent of such a member;

''(ii) a veteran, as such term is defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code; or

''(iii) eligible to receive a Gold Star lapel pin under section 1126 of title 10, United States Code, as a widow, parent, or next of kin of a member of the Armed Forces person who died in a manner described in subsection (a) of such section.

''(5) PUBLICATION OF MEMBER AVAILABILITY FOR ASSISTANCE.—Not later than 5 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary of the Treasury shall publish to its Website on the World Wide Web in a prominent location, large point font, and boldface type the following statement: 'The Home Affordable Modification Program (HAMP) has been terminated. If you are having trouble paying your mortgage and need help contacting your lender or servicer for purposes of negotiating or acquiring a loan modification, please contact your Member of Congress to assist you in contacting your lender or servicer for the purpose of negotiating or acquiring a loan modification.'.

''(6) NOTIFICATION TO HAMP APPLICANTS REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary of the Treasury shall inform each individual who applied for the Home Affordable Modification Program and will not be considered for a modification under such Program due to termination of such Program under this subsection—

''(A) that such Program has been terminated;

''(B) that loan modifications under such Program are no longer available;

''(C) of the name and contact information of such individual's Member of Congress; and

''(D) that the individual should contact his or her Member of Congress to assist the individual in contacting the individual's lender or servicer for the purpose of negotiating or acquiring a loan modification.''.

SEC. 324. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

The Congress encourages banks to work with homeowners to provide loan modifications to those that are eligible. The Congress also encourages banks to work and assist homeowners and prospective homeowners with foreclosure prevention programs and information on loan modifications.

Subtitle C—Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection

SEC. 331. BRINGING THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION INTO THE REGULAR APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.

Section 1017 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending the heading of such subsection to read as follows: ''BUDGET, FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, AND AUDIT.—'';

(B) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(D) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F) of paragraph (1), as so redesignated;

(2) by striking subsections (b), (c), and (d);

(3) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (b); and

(4) in subsection (b), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) and inserting the following:

''(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $200,000,000 to carry out this title for each of fiscal years 2012 and 2013.''; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

Subtitle D—Flood Insurance Reform

SEC. 341. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012''.

SEC. 342. EXTENSIONS.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 1319 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4026) is amended by striking ''the earlier of the date of the enactment into law of an Act that specifically amends the date specified in this section or May 31, 2012'' and inserting ''September 30, 2016''.

(b) EXTENSION OF FINANCING.—Section 1309(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)) is amended by striking ''the earlier of the date of the enactment into law of an Act that specifically amends the date specified in this section or May 31, 2012'' and inserting ''September 30, 2016''.

SEC. 343. MANDATORY PURCHASE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO TEMPORARILY SUSPEND MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) AUTHORITY TO TEMPORARILY SUSPEND MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) FINDING BY ADMINISTRATOR THAT AREA IS AN ELIGIBLE AREA.—For any area, upon a request submitted to the Administrator by a local government authority having jurisdiction over any portion of the area, the Administrator shall make a finding of whether the area is an eligible area under paragraph (3). If the Administrator finds that such area is an eligible area, the Administrator shall, in the discretion of the Administrator, designate a period during which such finding shall be effective, which shall not be longer in duration than 12 months.

''(2) SUSPENSION OF MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.—If the Administrator makes a finding under paragraph (1) that an area is an eligible area under paragraph (3), during the period specified in the finding, the designation of such eligible area as an area having special flood hazards shall not be effective for purposes of subsections (a), (b), and (e) of this section, and section 202(a) of this Act. Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to prevent any lender, servicer, regulated lending institution, Federal agency lender, the Federal National Mortgage Association, or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, at the discretion of such entity, from requiring the purchase of flood insurance coverage in connection with the making, increasing, extending, or renewing of a loan secured by improved real estate or a mobile home located or to be located in such eligible area during such period or a lender or servicer from purchasing coverage on behalf of a borrower pursuant to subsection (e).

''(3) ELIGIBLE AREAS.—An eligible area under this paragraph is an area that is designated or will, pursuant to any issuance, revision, updating, or other change in flood insurance maps that takes effect on or after the date of the enactment of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, become designated as an area having special flood hazards and that meets any one of the following 3 requirements:

''(A) AREAS WITH NO HISTORY OF SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARDS.—The area does not include any area that has ever previously been designated as an area having special flood hazards.

''(B) AREAS WITH FLOOD PROTECTION SYSTEMS UNDER IMPROVEMENTS.—The area was intended to be protected by a flood protection system—

''(i) that has been decertified, or is required to be certified, as providing protection for the 100-year frequency flood standard;

''(ii) that is being improved, constructed, or reconstructed; and

''(iii) for which the Administrator has determined measurable progress toward completion of such improvement, construction, reconstruction is being made and toward securing financial commitments sufficient to fund such completion.

''(C) AREAS FOR WHICH APPEAL HAS BEEN FILED.—An area for which a community has appealed designation of the area as having special flood hazards in a timely manner under section 1363.

''(4) EXTENSION OF DELAY.—Upon a request submitted by a local government authority having jurisdiction over any portion of the eligible area, the Administrator may extend the period during which a finding under paragraph (1) shall be effective, except that—

''(A) each such extension under this paragraph shall not be for a period exceeding 12 months; and

''(B) for any area, the cumulative number of such extensions may not exceed 2.

''(5) ADDITIONAL EXTENSION FOR COMMUNITIES MAKING MORE THAN ADEQUATE PROGRESS ON FLOOD PROTECTION SYSTEM.—

''(A) EXTENSION.—

''(i) AUTHORITY.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in the case of an eligible area for which the Administrator has, pursuant to paragraph (4), extended the period of effectiveness of the finding under paragraph (1) for the area, upon a request submitted by a local government

authority having jurisdiction over any portion of the eligible area, if the Administrator finds that more than adequate progress has been made on the construction of a flood protection system for such area, as determined in accordance with the last sentence of section 1307(e) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014(e)), the Administrator may, in the discretion of the Administrator, further extend the period during which the finding under paragraph (1) shall be effective for such area for an additional 12 months.

''(ii) LIMIT.— For any eligible area, the cumulative number of extensions under this subparagraph may not exceed 2.

''(B) EXCLUSION FOR NEW MORTGAGES.—

''(i) EXCLUSION.—Any extension under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph of a finding under paragraph (1) shall not be effective with respect to any excluded property after the origination, increase, extension, or renewal of the loan referred to in clause (ii)(II) for the property.

''(ii) EXCLUDED PROPERTIES.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'excluded property' means any improved real estate or mobile home—

''(I) that is located in an eligible area; and

''(II) for which, during the period that any extension under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph of a finding under paragraph (1) is otherwise in effect for the eligible area in which such property is located—

''(aa) a loan that is secured by the property is originated; or

''(bb) any existing loan that is secured by the property is increased, extended, or renewed.

''(6) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to affect the applicability of a designation of any area as an area having special flood hazards for purposes of the availability of flood insurance coverage, criteria for land management and use, notification of flood hazards, eligibility for mitigation assistance, or any other purpose or provision not specifically referred to in paragraph (2).

''(7) REPORTS.—The Administrator shall, in each annual report submitted pursuant to section 1320, include information identifying each finding under paragraph (1) by the Administrator during the preceding year that an area is an area having special flood hazards, the basis for each such finding, any extensions pursuant to paragraph (4) of the periods of effectiveness of such findings, and the reasons for such extensions.''.

(2) NO REFUNDS.—Nothing in this subsection or the amendments made by this subsection may be construed to authorize or require any payment or refund for flood insurance coverage purchased for any property that covered any period during which such coverage is not required for the property pursuant to the applicability of the amendment made by paragraph (1).

(b) TERMINATION OF FORCE-PLACED INSURANCE.—Section 102(e) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''insurance.'' and inserting ''insurance, including premiums or fees incurred for coverage beginning on the date on which flood insurance coverage lapsed or did not provide a sufficient coverage amount.'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (5) and 6), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraphs:

''(3) TERMINATION OF FORCE-PLACED INSURANCE.—Within 30 days of receipt by the lender or servicer of a confirmation of a borrower's existing flood insurance coverage, the lender or servicer shall—

''(A) terminate the force-placed insurance; and

''(B) refund to the borrower all force-placed insurance premiums paid by the borrower during any period during which the borrower's flood insurance coverage and the force-placed flood insurance coverage were each in effect, and any related fees charged to the borrower with respect to the force-placed insurance during such period.

''(4) SUFFICIENCY OF DEMONSTRATION.—For purposes of confirming a borrower's existing flood insurance coverage, a lender or servicer for a loan shall accept from the borrower an insurance policy declarations page that includes the existing flood insurance policy number and the identity of, and contact information for, the insurance company or agent.''.

(c) USE OF PRIVATE INSURANCE TO SATISFY MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.—Section 102(b) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''lending institutions not to make'' and inserting ''lending institutions—

''(A) not to make'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), as designated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, by striking ''less.'' and inserting ''less; and''; and

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

''(B) to accept private flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under subparagraph (A) if the coverage provided by such private flood insurance meets the requirements for coverage under such subparagraph.'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting after ''provided in paragraph (1).'' the following new sentence: ''Each Federal agency lender shall accept private flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under the preceding sentence if the flood insurance coverage provided by such private flood insurance meets the requirements for coverage under such sentence.'';

(3) in paragraph (3), in the matter following subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation shall accept private flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under the preceding sentence if the flood insurance coverage provided by such private flood insurance meets the requirements for coverage under such sentence.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'private flood insurance' means a contract for flood insurance coverage allowed for sale under the laws of any State.''.

SEC. 344. REFORMS OF COVERAGE TERMS.

(a) MINIMUM DEDUCTIBLES FOR CLAIMS.—Section 1312 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4019) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Director is'' and inserting the following: ''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator is''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) MINIMUM ANNUAL DEDUCTIBLES.—

''(1) SUBSIDIZED RATE PROPERTIES.—For any structure that is covered by flood insurance under this title, and for which the chargeable rate for such coverage is less than the applicable estimated risk premium rate under section 1307(a)(1) for the area (or subdivision thereof) in which such structure is located, the minimum annual deductible for damage to or loss of such structure shall be $2,000.

''(2) ACTUARIAL RATE PROPERTIES.—For any structure that is covered by flood insurance under this title, for which the chargeable rate for such coverage is not less than the applicable estimated risk premium rate under section 1307(a)(1) for the area (or subdivision thereof) in which such structure is located, the minimum annual deductible for damage to or loss of such structure shall be $1,000.''.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL COVERAGE LIMITS.—Section 1306(b) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''in the case of any residential property'' and inserting ''in the case of any residential building designed for the occupancy of from one to four families''; and

(B) by striking ''shall be made available to every insured upon renewal and every applicant for insurance so as to enable such insured or applicant to receive coverage up to a total amount (including such limits specified in paragraph (1)(A)(i)) of $250,000'' and inserting ''shall be made available, with respect to any single such building, up to an aggregate liability (including such limits specified in paragraph (1)(A)(i)) of $250,000''; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking ''in the case of any nonresidential property, including churches,'' and inserting ''in the case of any nonresidential building, including a church,''; and

(B) by striking ''shall be made available to every insured upon renewal and every applicant for insurance, in respect to any single structure, up to a total amount (including such limit specified in subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), as applicable) of $500,000 for each structure and $500,000 for any contents related to each structure'' and inserting ''shall be made available with respect to any single such building, up to an aggregate liability (including such limits specified in subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), as applicable) of $500,000, and coverage shall be made available up to a total of $500,000 aggregate liability for contents owned by the building owner and $500,000 aggregate liability for each unit within the building for contents owned by the tenant''.

(c) INDEXING OF MAXIMUM COVERAGE LIMITS.—Subsection (b) of section 1306 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and'';

(3) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (7); and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) each of the dollar amount limitations under paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) shall be adjusted effective on the date of the enactment of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, such adjustments shall be calculated using the percentage change, over the period beginning on September 30, 1994, and ending on such date of enactment, in such inflationary index as the Administrator shall, by regulation, specify, and the dollar amount of such adjustment shall be rounded to the next lower dollar; and the Administrator shall cause to be published in the Federal Register the adjustments under this paragraph to such dollar amount limitations; except that in the case of coverage for a property that is made available, pursuant to this paragraph, in an amount that exceeds the limitation otherwise applicable to such coverage as specified in paragraph (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6), the total of such coverage shall be made available only at chargeable rates that are not less than the estimated premium rates for such coverage determined in accordance with section 1307(a)(1).''.

(d) OPTIONAL COVERAGE FOR LOSS OF USE OF PERSONAL RESIDENCE AND BUSINESS INTERRUPTION.—Subsection (b) of section 1306 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013(b)), as amended by the preceding provisions of this section, is further amended by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

''(5) the Administrator may provide that, in the case of any residential property, each renewal or new contract for flood insurance coverage may provide not more than $5,000 aggregate liability per dwelling unit for any necessary increases in living expenses incurred by

the insured when losses from a flood make the residence unfit to live in, except that—

''(A) purchase of such coverage shall be at the option of the insured;

''(B) any such coverage shall be made available only at chargeable rates that are not less than the estimated premium rates for such coverage determined in accordance with section 1307(a)(1); and

''(C) the Administrator may make such coverage available only if the Administrator makes a determination and causes notice of such determination to be published in the Federal Register that—

''(i) a competitive private insurance market for such coverage does not exist; and

''(ii) the national flood insurance program has the capacity to make such coverage available without borrowing funds from the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1309 or otherwise;

''(6) the Administrator may provide that, in the case of any commercial property or other residential property, including multifamily rental property, coverage for losses resulting from any partial or total interruption of the insured's business caused by damage to, or loss of, such property from a flood may be made available to every insured upon renewal and every applicant, up to a total amount of $20,000 per property, except that—

''(A) purchase of such coverage shall be at the option of the insured;

''(B) any such coverage shall be made available only at chargeable rates that are not less than the estimated premium rates for such coverage determined in accordance with section 1307(a)(1); and

''(C) the Administrator may make such coverage available only if the Administrator makes a determination and causes notice of such determination to be published in the Federal Register that—

''(i) a competitive private insurance market for such coverage does not exist; and

''(ii) the national flood insurance program has the capacity to make such coverage available without borrowing funds from the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1309 or otherwise;''.

(e) PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS IN INSTALLMENTS FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.—Section 1306 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS IN INSTALLMENTS FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.—

''(1) AUTHORITY.—In addition to any other terms and conditions under subsection (a), such regulations shall provide that, in the case of any residential property, premiums for flood insurance coverage made available under this title for such property may be paid in installments.

''(2) LIMITATIONS.—In implementing the authority under paragraph (1), the Administrator may establish increased chargeable premium rates and surcharges, and deny coverage and establish such other sanctions, as the Administrator considers necessary to ensure that insureds purchase, pay for, and maintain coverage for the full term of a contract for flood insurance coverage or to prevent insureds from purchasing coverage only for periods during a year when risk of flooding is comparatively higher or canceling coverage for periods when such risk is comparatively lower.''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE OF POLICIES COVERING PROPERTIES AFFECTED BY FLOODS IN PROGRESS.—Paragraph (1) of section 1306(c) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013(c)) is amended by adding after the period at the end the following: ''With respect to any flood that has commenced or is in progress before the expiration of such 30-day period, such flood insurance coverage for a property shall take effect upon the expiration of such 30-day period and shall cover damage to such property occurring after the expiration of such period that results from such flood, but only if the property has not suffered damage or loss as a result of such flood before the expiration of such 30-day period.''.

SEC. 345. REFORMS OF PREMIUM RATES.

(a) INCREASE IN ANNUAL LIMITATION ON PREMIUM INCREASES.—Section 1308(e) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(e)) is amended by striking ''10 percent'' and inserting ''20 percent''.

(b) PHASE-IN OF RATES FOR CERTAIN PROPERTIES IN NEWLY MAPPED AREAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''or notice'' after ''prescribe by regulation'';

(B) in subsection (c), by inserting ''and subsection (g)'' before the first comma; and

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

''(g) 5-YEAR PHASE-IN OF FLOOD INSURANCE RATES FOR CERTAIN PROPERTIES IN NEWLY MAPPED AREAS.—

''(1) 5-YEAR PHASE-IN PERIOD.—Notwithstanding subsection (c) or any other provision of law relating to chargeable risk premium rates for flood insurance coverage under this title, in the case of any area that was not previously designated as an area having special flood hazards and that, pursuant to any issuance, revision, updating, or other change in flood insurance maps, becomes designated as such an area, during the 5-year period that begins, except as provided in paragraph (2), upon the date that such maps, as issued, revised, updated, or otherwise changed, become effective, the chargeable premium rate for flood insurance under this title with respect to any covered property that is located within such area shall be the rate described in paragraph (3).

''(2) APPLICABILITY TO PREFERRED RISK RATE AREAS.—In the case of any area described in paragraph (1) that consists of or includes an area that, as of date of the effectiveness of the flood insurance maps for such area referred to in paragraph (1) as so issued, revised, updated, or changed, is eligible for any reason for preferred risk rate method premiums for flood insurance coverage and was eligible for such premiums as of the enactment of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, the 5-year period referred to in paragraph (1) for such area eligible for preferred risk rate method premiums shall begin upon the expiration of the period during which such area is eligible for such preferred risk rate method premiums.

''(3) PHASE-IN OF FULL ACTUARIAL RATES.—With respect to any area described in paragraph (1), the chargeable risk premium rate for flood insurance under this title for a covered property that is located in such area shall be—

''(A) for the first year of the 5-year period referred to in paragraph (1), the greater of—

''(i) 20 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property; and

''(ii) in the case of any property that, as of the beginning of such first year, is eligible for preferred risk rate method premiums for flood insurance coverage, such preferred risk rate method premium for the property;

''(B) for the second year of such 5-year period, 40 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property;

''(C) for the third year of such 5-year period, 60 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property;

''(D) for the fourth year of such 5-year period, 80 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property; and

''(E) for the fifth year of such 5-year period, 100 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property.

''(4) COVERED PROPERTIES.—For purposes of the subsection, the term 'covered property' means any residential property occupied by its owner or a bona fide tenant as a primary residence.''.

(2) REGULATION OR NOTICE.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall issue an interim final rule or notice to implement this subsection and the amendments made by this subsection as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) PHASE-IN OF ACTUARIAL RATES FOR CERTAIN PROPERTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1308(c) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(c)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (7); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraphs:

''(2) COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES.—Any nonresidential property.

''(3) SECOND HOMES AND VACATION HOMES.—Any residential property that is not the primary residence of any individual.

''(4) HOMES SOLD TO NEW OWNERS.—Any single family property that—

''(A) has been constructed or substantially improved and for which such construction or improvement was started, as determined by the Administrator, before December 31, 1974, or before the effective date of the initial rate map published by the Administrator under paragraph (2) of section 1360(a) for the area in which such property is located, whichever is later; and

''(B) is purchased after the effective date of this paragraph, pursuant to section 345(c)(3)(A) of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012.

''(5) HOMES DAMAGED OR IMPROVED.—Any property that, on or after the date of the enactment of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, has experienced or sustained—

''(A) substantial flood damage exceeding 50 percent of the fair market value of such property; or

''(B) substantial improvement exceeding 30 percent of the fair market value of such property.

''(6) HOMES WITH MULTIPLE CLAIMS.—Any severe repetitive loss property (as such term is defined in section 1366(j)).''.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''the limitations provided under paragraphs (1) and (2)'' and inserting ''subsection (e)''; and

(ii) in paragraph (1), by striking '', except'' and all that follows through ''subsection (e)''; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking ''paragraph (2) or (3)'' and inserting ''paragraph (7)''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE AND TRANSITION.—

(A) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply beginning upon the expiration of the 12-month period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, except as provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph.

(B) TRANSITION FOR PROPERTIES COVERED BY FLOOD INSURANCE UPON EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(i) INCREASE OF RATES OVER TIME.—In the case of any property described in paragraph (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6) of section 1308(c) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection, that, as of the effective date under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, is covered under a policy for flood insurance made available under the national flood insurance program for which the chargeable premium rates are less than the applicable estimated risk premium rate under section 1307(a)(1) of such Act for the area in which the property is located, the Administrator of the

Federal Emergency Management Agency shall increase the chargeable premium rates for such property over time to such applicable estimated risk premium rate under section 1307(a)(1).

(ii) AMOUNT OF ANNUAL INCREASE.—Such increase shall be made by increasing the chargeable premium rates for the property (after application of any increase in the premium rates otherwise applicable to such property), once during the 12-month period that begins upon the effective date under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph and once every 12 months thereafter until such increase is accomplished, by 20 percent (or such lesser amount as may be necessary so that the chargeable rate does not exceed such applicable estimated risk premium rate or to comply with clause (iii)).

(iii) PROPERTIES SUBJECT TO PHASE-IN AND ANNUAL INCREASES.—In the case of any pre-FIRM property (as such term is defined in section 578(b) of the National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1974), the aggregate increase, during any 12-month period, in the chargeable premium rate for the property that is attributable to this subparagraph or to an increase described in section 1308(e) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 may not exceed 20 percent.

(iv) FULL ACTUARIAL RATES.—The provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of such section 1308(c) shall apply to such a property upon the accomplishment of the increase under this subparagraph and thereafter.

(d) PROHIBITION OF EXTENSION OF SUBSIDIZED RATES TO LAPSED POLICIES.—Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015), as amended by the preceding provisions of this subtitle, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by inserting ''or subsection (h)'' after ''subsection (c)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) PROHIBITION OF EXTENSION OF SUBSIDIZED RATES TO LAPSED POLICIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to chargeable risk premium rates for flood insurance coverage under this title, the Administrator shall not provide flood insurance coverage under this title for any property for which a policy for such coverage for the property has previously lapsed in coverage as a result of the deliberate choice of the holder of such policy, at a rate less than the applicable estimated risk premium rates for the area (or subdivision thereof) in which such property is located.''.

(e) RECOGNITION OF STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING FOR CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENT OF FLOOD PROTECTION SYSTEMS IN DETERMINATION OF RATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1307 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014) is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking ''construction of a flood protection system'' and inserting ''construction, reconstruction, or improvement of a flood protection system (without respect to the level of Federal investment or participation)''; and

(ii) in the second sentence—

(I) by striking ''construction of a flood protection system'' and inserting ''construction, reconstruction, or improvement of a flood protection system''; and

(II) by inserting ''based on the present value of the completed system'' after ''has been expended''; and

(B) in subsection (f)—

(i) in the first sentence in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''(without respect to the level of Federal investment or participation)'' before the period at the end;

(ii) in the third sentence in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting '', whether coastal or riverine,'' after ''special flood hazard''; and

(iii) in paragraph (1), by striking ''a Federal agency in consultation with the local project sponsor'' and inserting ''the entity or entities that own, operate, maintain, or repair such system''.

(2) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall promulgate regulations to implement this subsection and the amendments made by this subsection as soon as practicable, but not more than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. Paragraph (3) may not be construed to annul, alter, affect, authorize any waiver of, or establish any exception to, the requirement under the preceding sentence.

SEC. 346. TECHNICAL MAPPING ADVISORY COUNCIL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a council to be known as the Technical Mapping Advisory Council (in this section referred to as the ''Council'').

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall consist of—

(A) the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (in this section referred to as the ''Administrator''), or the designee thereof;

(B) the Director of the United States Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior, or the designee thereof;

(C) the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, or the designee thereof;

(D) the commanding officer of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, or the designee thereof;

(E) the chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, or the designee thereof;

(F) the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, or the designee thereof;

(G) the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the Department of Commerce, or the designee thereof; and

(H) 14 additional members to be appointed by the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, who shall be—

(i) an expert in data management;

(ii) an expert in real estate;

(iii) an expert in insurance;

(iv) a member of a recognized regional flood and storm water management organization;

(v) a representative of a State emergency management agency or association or organization for such agencies;

(vi) a member of a recognized professional surveying association or organization;

(vii) a member of a recognized professional mapping association or organization;

(viii) a member of a recognized professional engineering association or organization;

(ix) a member of a recognized professional association or organization representing flood hazard determination firms;

(x) a representative of State national flood insurance coordination offices;

(xi) representatives of two local governments, at least one of whom is a local levee flood manager or executive, designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency as Cooperating Technical Partners; and

(xii) representatives of two State governments designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency as Cooperating Technical States.

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—Members of the Council shall be appointed based on their demonstrated knowledge and competence regarding surveying, cartography, remote sensing, geographic information systems, or the technical aspects of preparing and using flood insurance rate maps. In appointing members under paragraph (1)(H), the Administrator shall ensure that the membership of the Council has a balance of Federal, State, local, and private members, and includes an adequate number of representatives from the States with coastline on the Gulf of Mexico and other States containing areas identified by the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency as at high-risk for flooding or special flood hazard areas.

(c) DUTIES.—

(1) NEW MAPPING STANDARDS.—Not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning upon the date of the enactment of this Act, the Council shall develop and submit to the Administrator and the Congress proposed new mapping standards for 100-year flood insurance rate maps used under the national flood insurance program under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. In developing such proposed standards the Council shall—

(A) ensure that the flood insurance rate maps reflect true risk, including graduated risk that better reflects the financial risk to each property; such reflection of risk should be at the smallest geographic level possible (but not necessarily property-by-property) to ensure that communities are mapped in a manner that takes into consideration different risk levels within the community;

(B) ensure the most efficient generation, display, and distribution of flood risk data, models, and maps where practicable through dynamic digital environments using spatial database technology and the Internet;

(C) ensure that flood insurance rate maps reflect current hydrologic and hydraulic data, current land use, and topography, incorporating the most current and accurate ground and bathymetric elevation data;

(D) determine the best ways to include in such flood insurance rate maps levees, decertified levees, and areas located below dams, including determining a methodology for ensuring that decertified levees and other protections are included in flood insurance rate maps and their corresponding flood zones reflect the level of protection conferred;

(E) consider how to incorporate restored wetlands and other natural buffers into flood insurance rate maps, which may include wetlands, groundwater recharge areas, erosion zones, meander belts, endangered species habitat, barrier islands and shoreline buffer features, riparian forests, and other features;

(F) consider whether to use vertical positioning (as defined by the Administrator) for flood insurance rate maps;

(G) ensure that flood insurance rate maps differentiate between a property that is located in a flood zone and a structure located on such property that is not at the same risk level for flooding as such property due to the elevation of the structure;

(H) ensure that flood insurance rate maps take into consideration the best scientific data and potential future conditions (including projections for sea level rise); and

(I) consider how to incorporate the new standards proposed pursuant to this paragraph in existing mapping efforts.

(2) ONGOING DUTIES.—The Council shall, on an ongoing basis, review the mapping protocols developed pursuant to paragraph (1), and make recommendations to the Administrator when the Council determines that mapping protocols should be altered.

(3) MEETINGS.—In carrying out its duties under this section, the Council shall consult with stakeholders through at least 4 public meetings annually, and shall seek input of all stakeholder interests including State and local representatives, environmental and conservation organizations, insurance industry representatives, advocacy groups, planning organizations, and mapping organizations.

(d) PROHIBITION ON COMPENSATION.—Members of the Council shall receive no additional compensation by reason of their service on the Council.

(e) CHAIRPERSON.—The Administrator shall serve as the Chairperson of the Council.

(f) STAFF.—

(1) FEMA.—Upon the request of the Council, the Administrator may detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, personnel of the Federal Emergency

Management Agency to assist the Council in carrying out its duties.

(2) OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon request of the Council, any other Federal agency that is a member of the Council may detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, personnel to assist the Council in carrying out its duties.

(g) POWERS.—In carrying out this section, the Council may hold hearings, receive evidence and assistance, provide information, and conduct research, as the Council considers appropriate.

(h) TERMINATION.—The Council shall terminate upon the expiration of the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(i) MORATORIUM ON FLOOD MAP CHANGES.—

(1) MORATORIUM.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, or the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, during the period beginning upon the date of the enactment of this Act and ending upon the submission by the Council to the Administrator and the Congress of the proposed new mapping standards required under subsection (c)(1), the Administrator may not make effective any new or updated rate maps for flood insurance coverage under the national flood insurance program that were not in effect for such program as of such date of enactment, or otherwise revise, update, or change the flood insurance rate maps in effect for such program as of such date.

(2) LETTERS OF MAP CHANGE.—During the period described in paragraph (1), the Administrator may revise, update, and change the flood insurance rate maps in effect for the national flood insurance program only pursuant to a letter of map change (including a letter of map amendment, letter of map revision, and letter of map revision based on fill).

SEC. 347. FEMA INCORPORATION OF NEW MAPPING PROTOCOLS.

(a) NEW RATE MAPPING STANDARDS.—Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning upon submission by the Technical Mapping Advisory Council under section 346 of the proposed new mapping standards for flood insurance rate maps used under the national flood insurance program developed by the Council pursuant to section 346(c), the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (in this section referred to as the ''Administrator'') shall establish new standards for such rate maps based on such proposed new standards and the recommendations of the Council.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The new standards for flood insurance rate maps established by the Administrator pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

(1) delineate and include in any such rate maps—

(A) all areas located within the 100-year flood plain; and

(B) areas subject to graduated and other risk levels, to the maximum extent possible;

(2) ensure that any such rate maps—

(A) include levees, including decertified levees, and the level of protection they confer;

(B) reflect current land use and topography and incorporate the most current and accurate ground level data;

(C) take into consideration the impacts and use of fill and the flood risks associated with altered hydrology;

(D) differentiate between a property that is located in a flood zone and a structure located on such property that is not at the same risk level for flooding as such property due to the elevation of the structure;

(E) identify and incorporate natural features and their associated flood protection benefits into mapping and rates; and

(F) identify, analyze, and incorporate the impact of significant changes to building and development throughout any river or costal water system, including all tributaries, which may impact flooding in areas downstream; and

(3) provide that such rate maps are developed on a watershed basis.

(c) REPORT.—If, in establishing new standards for flood insurance rate maps pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator does not implement all of the recommendations of the Council made under the proposed new mapping standards developed by the Council pursuant to section 346(c), upon establishment of the new standards the Administrator shall submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate specifying which such recommendations were not adopted and explaining the reasons such recommendations were not adopted.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Administrator shall, not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning upon establishment of the new standards for flood insurance rate maps pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, commence use of the new standards and updating of flood insurance rate maps in accordance with the new standards. Not later than the expiration of the 10-year period beginning upon the establishment of such new standards, the Administrator shall complete updating of all flood insurance rate maps in accordance with the new standards, subject to the availability of sufficient amounts for such activities provided in appropriation Acts.

(e) TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN PROPERTIES.—

(1) SUBMISSION OF ELEVATION CERTIFICATE.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, subsections (a), (b), and (e) of section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a), and section 202(a) of such Act, shall not apply to a property located in an area designated as having a special flood hazard if the owner of such property submits to the Administrator an elevation certificate for such property showing that the lowest level of the primary residence on such property is at an elevation that is at least three feet higher than the elevation of the 100-year flood plain.

(2) REVIEW OF CERTIFICATE.—The Administrator shall accept as conclusive each elevation certificate submitted under paragraph (1) unless the Administrator conducts a subsequent elevation survey and determines that the lowest level of the primary residence on the property in question is not at an elevation that is at least three feet higher than the elevation of the 100-year flood plain. The Administrator shall provide any such subsequent elevation survey to the owner of such property.

(3) DETERMINATIONS FOR PROPERTIES ON BORDERS OF SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREAS.—

(A) EXPEDITED DETERMINATION.—In the case of any survey for a property submitted to the Administrator pursuant to paragraph (1) showing that a portion of the property is located within an area having special flood hazards and that a structure located on the property is not located within such area having special flood hazards, the Administrator shall expeditiously process any request made by an owner of the property for a determination pursuant to paragraph (2) or a determination of whether the structure is located within the area having special flood hazards.

(B) PROHIBITION OF FEE.—If the Administrator determines pursuant to subparagraph (A) that the structure on the property is not located within the area having special flood hazards, the Administrator shall not charge a fee for reviewing the flood hazard data and shall not require the owner to provide any additional elevation data.

(C) SIMPLIFICATION OF REVIEW PROCESS.—The Administrator shall collaborate with private sector flood insurers to simplify the review process for properties described in subparagraph (A) and to ensure that the review process provides for accurate determinations.

(4) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—This subsection shall cease to apply to a property on the date on which the Administrator updates the flood insurance rate map that applies to such property in accordance with the requirements of subsection (d).

SEC. 348. TREATMENT OF LEVEES.

Section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) TREATMENT OF LEVEES.—The Administrator may not issue flood insurance maps, or make effective updated flood insurance maps, that omit or disregard the actual protection afforded by an existing levee, floodwall, pump or other flood protection feature, regardless of the accreditation status of such feature.''.

SEC. 349. PRIVATIZATION INITIATIVES.

(a) FEMA AND GAO REPORTS.—Not later than the expiration of the 18-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Comptroller General of the United States shall each conduct a separate study to assess a broad range of options, methods, and strategies for privatizing the national flood insurance program and shall each submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate with recommendations for the best manner to accomplish such privatization.

(b) PRIVATE RISK-MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency may carry out such private risk-management initiatives under the national flood insurance program as the Administrator considers appropriate to determine the capacity of private insurers, reinsurers, and financial markets to assist communities, on a voluntary basis only, in managing the full range of financial risks associated with flooding.

(2) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall assess the capacity of the private reinsurance, capital, and financial markets by seeking proposals to assume a portion of the program's insurance risk and submit to the Congress a report describing the response to such request for proposals and the results of such assessment.

(3) PROTOCOL FOR RELEASE OF DATA.—The Administrator shall develop a protocol to provide for the release of data sufficient to conduct the assessment required under paragraph (2).

(c) REINSURANCE.—The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended—

(1) in section 1331(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 4051(a)(2)), by inserting '', including as reinsurance of insurance coverage provided by the flood insurance program'' before '', on such terms'';

(2) in section 1332(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 4052(c)(2)), by inserting ''or reinsurance'' after ''flood insurance coverage'';

(3) in section 1335(a) (42 U.S.C. 4055(a))—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(a)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The Administrator is authorized to secure reinsurance coverage of coverage provided by the flood insurance program from private market insurance, reinsurance, and capital market sources at rates and on terms determined by the Administrator to be reasonable and appropriate in an amount sufficient to maintain the ability of the program to pay claims and that minimizes the likelihood that the program will utilize the borrowing authority provided under section 1309.'';

(4) in section 1346(a) (12 U.S.C. 4082(a))—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting '', or for purposes of securing reinsurance of insurance coverage provided by the program,'' before ''of any or all of'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''estimating'' and inserting ''Estimating''; and

(ii) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''receiving'' and inserting ''Receiving''; and

(ii) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period;

(D) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''making'' and inserting ''Making''; and

(ii) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period;

(E) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''otherwise'' and inserting ''Otherwise''; and

(ii) by redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (5); and

(F) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) Placing reinsurance coverage on insurance provided by such program.''; and

(5) in section 1370(a)(3) (42 U.S.C. 4121(a)(3)), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', is subject to the reporting requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, pursuant to section 13(a) or 15(d) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)), or is authorized by the Administrator to assume reinsurance on risks insured by the flood insurance program''.

(d) ASSESSMENT OF CLAIMS-PAYING ABILITY.—

(1) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than September 30 of each year, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall conduct an assessment of the claims-paying ability of the national flood insurance program, including the program's utilization of private sector reinsurance and reinsurance equivalents, with and without reliance on borrowing authority under section 1309 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016). In conducting the assessment, the Administrator shall take into consideration regional concentrations of coverage written by the program, peak flood zones, and relevant mitigation measures.

(2) REPORT.—The Administrator shall submit a report to the Congress of the results of each such assessment, and make such report available to the public, not later than 30 days after completion of the assessment.

SEC. 350. FEMA ANNUAL REPORT ON INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Section 1320 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4027) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT'' and inserting ''ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS'';

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''biennially'';

(B) by striking ''the President for submission to''; and

(C) by inserting ''not later than June 30 of each year'' before the period at the end;

(3) in subsection (b), by striking ''biennial'' and inserting ''annual''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) FINANCIAL STATUS OF PROGRAM.—The report under this section for each year shall include information regarding the financial status of the national flood insurance program under this title, including a description of the financial status of the National Flood Insurance Fund and current and projected levels of claims, premium receipts, expenses, and borrowing under the program.''.

SEC. 351. MITIGATION ASSISTANCE.

(a) MITIGATION ASSISTANCE GRANTS.—Section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: ''Such financial assistance shall be made available—

''(1) to States and communities in the form of grants under this section for carrying out mitigation activities;

''(2) to States and communities in the form of grants under this section for carrying out mitigation activities that reduce flood damage to severe repetitive loss structures; and

''(3) to property owners in the form of direct grants under this section for carrying out mitigation activities that reduce flood damage to individual structures for which 2 or more claim payments for losses have been made under flood insurance coverage under this title if the Administrator, after consultation with the State and community, determines that neither the State nor community in which such a structure is located has the capacity to manage such grants.''.

(2) by striking subsection (b);

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''flood risk'' and inserting ''multi-hazard'';

(B) by striking ''provides protection against'' and inserting ''examines reduction of''; and

(C) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (b);

(4) by striking subsection (d);

(5) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking the paragraph designation and all that follows through the end of the first sentence and inserting the following:

''(1) REQUIREMENT OF CONSISTENCY WITH APPROVED MITIGATION PLAN.—Amounts provided under this section may be used only for mitigation activities that are consistent with mitigation plans that are approved by the Administrator and identified under subparagraph (4).'';

(B) by striking paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(2) REQUIREMENTS OF TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY, COST EFFECTIVENESS, AND INTEREST OF NFIF.—The Administrator may approve only mitigation activities that the Administrator determines are technically feasible and cost-effective and in the interest of, and represent savings to, the National Flood Insurance Fund. In making such determinations, the Administrator shall take into consideration recognized benefits that are difficult to quantify.

''(3) PRIORITY FOR MITIGATION ASSISTANCE.—In providing grants under this section for mitigation activities, the Administrator shall give priority for funding to activities that the Administrator determines will result in the greatest savings to the National Flood Insurance Fund, including activities for—

''(A) severe repetitive loss structures;

''(B) repetitive loss structures; and

''(C) other subsets of structures as the Administrator may establish.'';

(C) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking all of the matter that precedes subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(4) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Eligible activities may include—'';

(ii) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (H);

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (D), (F), and (G) as subparagraphs (E), (G), and (H);

(iv) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

''(D) elevation, relocation, and floodproofing of utilities (including equipment that serve structures);'';

(v) by inserting after subparagraph (E), as so redesignated by clause (iii) of this subparagraph, the following new subparagraph:

''(F) the development or update of State, local, or Indian tribal mitigation plans which meet the planning criteria established by the Administrator, except that the amount from grants under this section that may be used under this subparagraph may not exceed $50,000 for any mitigation plan of a State or $25,000 for any mitigation plan of a local government or Indian tribe;'';

(vi) in subparagraph (H); as so redesignated by clause (iii) of this subparagraph, by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(vii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(I) other mitigation activities not described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) or the regulations issued under subparagraph (H), that are described in the mitigation plan of a State, community, or Indian tribe; and

''(J) personnel costs for State staff that provide technical assistance to communities to identify eligible activities, to develop grant applications, and to implement grants awarded under this section, not to exceed $50,000 per State in any Federal fiscal year, so long as the State applied for and was awarded at least $1,000,000 in grants available under this section in the prior Federal fiscal year; the requirements of subsections (d)(1) and (d)(2) shall not apply to the activity under this subparagraph.'';

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) ELIGIBILITY OF DEMOLITION AND REBUILDING OF PROPERTIES.—The Administrator shall consider as an eligible activity the demolition and rebuilding of properties to at least base flood elevation or greater, if required by the Administrator or if required by any State regulation or local ordinance, and in accordance with criteria established by the Administrator.''; and

(E) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (c);

(6) by striking subsections (f), (g), and (h) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(d) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—The Administrator may provide grants for eligible mitigation activities as follows:

''(1) SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURES.—In the case of mitigation activities to severe repetitive loss structures, in an amount up to 100 percent of all eligible costs.

''(2) REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURES.—In the case of mitigation activities to repetitive loss structures, in an amount up to 90 percent of all eligible costs.

''(3) OTHER MITIGATION ACTIVITIES.— In the case of all other mitigation activities, in an amount up to 75 percent of all eligible costs.'';

(7) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''certified under subsection (g)'' and inserting ''required under subsection (d)''; and

(ii) by striking ''3 times the amount'' and inserting ''the amount''; and

(B) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (e);

(8) in subsection (j)—

(A) by striking ''Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994'' and inserting ''Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012'';

(B) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (f); and

(9) by striking subsections (k) and (m) and inserting the following new subsections:

''(g) FAILURE TO MAKE GRANT AWARD WITHIN 5 YEARS.—For any application for a grant under this section for which the Administrator fails to make a grant award within 5 years of the date of application, the grant application shall be considered to be denied and any funding amounts allocated for such grant applications shall remain in the National Flood Mitigation Fund under section 1367 of this title and shall be made available for grants under this section.

''(h) LIMITATION ON FUNDING FOR MITIGATION ACTIVITIES FOR SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURES.—The amount used pursuant to section 1310(a)(8) in any fiscal year may not exceed $40,000,000 and shall remain available until expended.

''(i) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

''(1) COMMUNITY.—The term 'community' means—

''(A) a political subdivision that—

''(i) has zoning and building code jurisdiction over a particular area having special flood hazards, and

''(ii) is participating in the national flood insurance program; or

''(B) a political subdivision of a State, or other authority, that is designated by political subdivisions, all of which meet the requirements of subparagraph (A), to administer grants for

mitigation activities for such political subdivisions.

''(2) REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURE.—The term 'repetitive loss structure' has the meaning given such term in section 1370.

''(3) SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURE.—The term 'severe repetitive loss structure' means a structure that—

''(A) is covered under a contract for flood insurance made available under this title; and

''(B) has incurred flood-related damage—

''(i) for which 4 or more separate claims payments have been made under flood insurance coverage under this title, with the amount of each such claim exceeding $15,000, and with the cumulative amount of such claims payments exceeding $60,000; or

''(ii) for which at least 2 separate claims payments have been made under such coverage, with the cumulative amount of such claims exceeding the value of the insured structure.''.

(b) ELIMINATION OF GRANTS PROGRAM FOR REPETITIVE INSURANCE CLAIMS PROPERTIES.—Chapter I of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by striking section 1323 (42 U.S.C. 4030).

(c) ELIMINATION OF PILOT PROGRAM FOR MITIGATION OF SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS PROPERTIES.—Chapter III of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by striking section 1361A (42 U.S.C. 4102a).

(d) NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND.—Section 1310(a) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (8) and (9).

(e) NATIONAL FLOOD MITIGATION FUND.—Section 1367 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) in each fiscal year, from the National Flood Insurance Fund in amounts not exceeding $90,000,000 to remain available until expended, of which—

''(A) not more than $40,000,000 shall be available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section only for assistance described in section 1366(a)(1);

''(B) not more than $40,000,000 shall be available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section only for assistance described in section 1366(a)(2); and

''(C) not more than $10,000,000 shall be available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section only for assistance described in section 1366(a)(3).''.

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''section 1366(i)'' and inserting ''section 1366(e)'';

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''sections 1366 and 1323'' and inserting ''section 1366'';

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsections:

''(d) PROHIBITION ON OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, amounts made available pursuant to this section shall not be subject to offsetting collections through premium rates for flood insurance coverage under this title.

''(e) CONTINUED AVAILABILITY AND REALLOCATION.—Any amounts made available pursuant to subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(1) that are not used in any fiscal year shall continue to be available for the purposes specified in such subparagraph of subsection (b)(1) pursuant to which such amounts were made available, unless the Administrator determines that reallocation of such unused amounts to meet demonstrated need for other mitigation activities under section 1366 is in the best interest of the National Flood Insurance Fund.''.

(f) INCREASED COST OF COMPLIANCE COVERAGE.—Section 1304(b)(4) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), respectively.

SEC. 352. NOTIFICATION TO HOMEOWNERS REGARDING MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT APPLICABILITY AND RATE PHASE-INS.

Section 201 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4105) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) ANNUAL NOTIFICATION.—The Administrator, in consultation with affected communities, shall establish and carry out a plan to notify residents of areas having special flood hazards, on an annual basis—

''(1) that they reside in such an area;

''(2) of the geographical boundaries of such area;

''(3) of whether section 1308(g) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 applies to properties within such area;

''(4) of the provisions of section 102 requiring purchase of flood insurance coverage for properties located in such an area, including the date on which such provisions apply with respect to such area, taking into consideration section 102(i); and

''(5) of a general estimate of what similar homeowners in similar areas typically pay for flood insurance coverage, taking into consideration section 1308(g) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968.''.

SEC. 353. NOTIFICATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OF FLOOD MAP REVISIONS AND UPDATES.

Section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101), as amended by the preceding provisions of this subtitle, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(l) NOTIFICATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OF MAP MODERNIZATION.—Upon any revision or update of any floodplain area or flood-risk zone pursuant to subsection (f), any decision pursuant to subsection (f)(1) that such revision or update is necessary, any issuance of preliminary maps for such revision or updating, or any other significant action relating to any such revision or update, the Administrator shall notify the Senators for each State affected, and each Member of the House of Representatives for each congressional district affected, by such revision or update in writing of the action taken.''.

SEC. 354. NOTIFICATION AND APPEAL OF MAP CHANGES; NOTIFICATION TO COMMUNITIES OF ESTABLISHMENT OF FLOOD ELEVATIONS.

Section 1363 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104) is amended by striking the section designation and all that follows through the end of subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 1363. (a) In establishing projected flood elevations for land use purposes with respect to any community pursuant to section 1361, the Administrator shall first propose such determinations—

''(1) by providing the chief executive officer of each community affected by the proposed elevations, by certified mail, with a return receipt requested, notice of the elevations, including a copy of the maps for the elevations for such community and a statement explaining the process under this section to appeal for changes in such elevations;

''(2) by causing notice of such elevations to be published in the Federal Register, which notice shall include information sufficient to identify the elevation determinations and the communities affected, information explaining how to obtain copies of the elevations, and a statement explaining the process under this section to appeal for changes in the elevations;

''(3) by publishing in a prominent local newspaper the elevations, a description of the appeals process for flood determinations, and the mailing address and telephone number of a person the owner may contact for more information or to initiate an appeal;

''(4) by providing written notification, by first class mail, to each owner of real property affected by the proposed elevations of—

''(A) the status of such property, both prior to and after the effective date of the proposed determination, with respect to flood zone and flood insurance requirements under this Act and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973;

''(B) the process under this section to appeal a flood elevation determination; and

''(C) the mailing address and phone number of a person the owner may contact for more information or to initiate an appeal; and''.

SEC. 355. NOTIFICATION TO TENANTS OF AVAILABILITY OF CONTENTS INSURANCE.

The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by inserting after section 1308 (42 U.S.C. 4015) the following new section:

''SEC. 1308A. NOTIFICATION TO TENANTS OF AVAILABILITY OF CONTENTS INSURANCE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall, upon entering into a contract for flood insurance coverage under this title for any property—

''(1) provide to the insured sufficient copies of the notice developed pursuant to subsection (b); and

''(2) require the insured to provide a copy of the notice, or otherwise provide notification of the information under subsection (b) in the manner that the manager or landlord deems most appropriate, to each such tenant and to each new tenant upon commencement of such a tenancy.

''(b) NOTICE.—Notice to a tenant of a property in accordance with this subsection is written notice that clearly informs a tenant—

''(1) whether the property is located in an area having special flood hazards;

''(2) that flood insurance coverage is available under the national flood insurance program under this title for contents of the unit or structure leased by the tenant;

''(3) of the maximum amount of such coverage for contents available under this title at that time; and

''(4) of where to obtain information regarding how to obtain such coverage, including a telephone number, mailing address, and Internet site of the Administrator where such information is available.''.

SEC. 356. NOTIFICATION TO POLICY HOLDERS REGARDING DIRECT MANAGEMENT OF POLICY BY FEMA.

Part C of chapter II of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4081 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 1349. NOTIFICATION TO POLICY HOLDERS REGARDING DIRECT MANAGEMENT OF POLICY BY FEMA.

''(a) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 60 days before the date on which a transferred flood insurance policy expires, and annually thereafter until such time as the Federal Emergency Management Agency is no longer directly administering such policy, the Administrator shall notify the holder of such policy that—

''(1) the Federal Emergency Management Agency is directly administering the policy;

''(2) such holder may purchase flood insurance that is directly administered by an insurance company; and

''(3) purchasing flood insurance offered under the National Flood Insurance Program that is directly administered by an insurance company will not alter the coverage provided or the premiums charged to such holder that otherwise would be provided or charged if the policy was directly administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

''(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'transferred flood insurance policy' means a flood insurance policy that—

''(1) was directly administered by an insurance company at the time the policy was originally purchased by the policy holder; and

''(2) at the time of renewal of the policy, direct administration of the policy was or will be transferred to the Federal Emergency Management Agency.''.

SEC. 357. NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF FLOOD INSURANCE AND ESCROW IN RESPA GOOD FAITH ESTIMATE.

Subsection (c) of section 5 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2604(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Each such good faith estimate shall include the following conspicuous statements and information: (1) that flood insurance coverage for residential real estate is generally available under the national flood insurance program whether or not the real estate is located in an area having special flood hazards and that, to obtain such coverage, a home owner or purchaser should contact the national flood insurance program; (2) a telephone number and a location on the Internet by which a home owner or purchaser can contact the national flood insurance program; and (3) that the escrowing of flood insurance payments is required for many loans under section 102(d) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, and may be a convenient and available option with respect to other loans.''.

SEC. 358. REIMBURSEMENT FOR COSTS INCURRED BY HOMEOWNERS AND COMMUNITIES OBTAINING LETTERS OF MAP AMENDMENT OR REVISION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101), as amended by the preceding provisions of this subtitle, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(m) REIMBURSEMENT.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT UPON BONA FIDE ERROR.—If an owner of any property located in an area described in section 102(i)(3) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, or a community in which such a property is located, obtains a letter of map amendment, or a letter of map revision, due to a bona fide error on the part of the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Administrator shall reimburse such owner, or such entity or jurisdiction acting on such owner's behalf, or such community, as applicable, for any reasonable costs incurred in obtaining such letter.

''(2) REASONABLE COSTS.—The Administrator shall, by regulation or notice, determine a reasonable amount of costs to be reimbursed under paragraph (1), except that such costs shall not include legal or attorneys fees. In determining the reasonableness of costs, the Administrator shall only consider the actual costs to the owner or community, as applicable, of utilizing the services of an engineer, surveyor, or similar services.''.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall issue the regulations or notice required under section 1360(m)(2) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as added by the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 359. ENHANCED COMMUNICATION WITH CERTAIN COMMUNITIES DURING MAP UPDATING PROCESS.

Section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101), as amended by the preceding provisions of this subtitle, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(n) ENHANCED COMMUNICATION WITH CERTAIN COMMUNITIES DURING MAP UPDATING PROCESS.—In updating flood insurance maps under this section, the Administrator shall communicate with communities located in areas where flood insurance rate maps have not been updated in 20 years or more and the appropriate State emergency agencies to resolve outstanding issues, provide technical assistance, and disseminate all necessary information to reduce the prevalence of outdated maps in flood-prone areas.''.

SEC. 360. NOTIFICATION TO RESIDENTS NEWLY INCLUDED IN FLOOD HAZARD AREAS.

Section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101), as amended by the preceding provisions of this subtitle, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(o) NOTIFICATION TO RESIDENTS NEWLY INCLUDED IN FLOOD HAZARD AREA.—In revising or updating any areas having special flood hazards, the Administrator shall provide to each owner of a property to be newly included in such a special flood hazard area, at the time of issuance of such proposed revised or updated flood insurance maps, a copy of the proposed revised or updated flood insurance maps together with information regarding the appeals process under section 1363 (42 U.S.C. 4104).''.

SEC. 361. TREATMENT OF SWIMMING POOL ENCLOSURES OUTSIDE OF HURRICANE SEASON.

Chapter I of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 1325. TREATMENT OF SWIMMING POOL ENCLOSURES OUTSIDE OF HURRICANE SEASON.

''In the case of any property that is otherwise in compliance with the coverage and building requirements of the national flood insurance program, the presence of an enclosed swimming pool located at ground level or in the space below the lowest floor of a building after November 30 and before June 1 of any year shall have no effect on the terms of coverage or the ability to receive coverage for such building under the national flood insurance program established pursuant to this title, if the pool is enclosed with non-supporting breakaway walls.''.

SEC. 362. INFORMATION REGARDING MULTIPLE PERILS CLAIMS.

Section 1345 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4081) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) INFORMATION REGARDING MULTIPLE PERILS CLAIMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), if an insured having flood insurance coverage under a policy issued under the program under this title by the Administrator or a company, insurer, or entity offering flood insurance coverage under such program (in this subsection referred to as a 'participating company') has wind or other homeowners coverage from any company, insurer, or other entity covering property covered by such flood insurance, in the case of damage to such property that may have been caused by flood or by wind, the Administrator and the participating company, upon the request of the insured, shall provide to the insured, within 30 days of such request—

''(A) a copy of the estimate of structure damage;

''(B) proofs of loss;

''(C) any expert or engineering reports or documents commissioned by or relied upon by the Administrator or participating company in determining whether the damage was caused by flood or any other peril; and

''(D) the Administrator's or the participating company's final determination on the claim.

''(2) TIMING.—Paragraph (1) shall apply only with respect to a request described in such paragraph made by an insured after the Administrator or the participating company, or both, as applicable, have issued a final decision on the flood claim involved and resolution of all appeals with respect to such claim.''.

SEC. 363. FEMA AUTHORITY TO REJECT TRANSFER OF POLICIES.

Section 1345 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4081) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) FEMA AUTHORITY TO REJECT TRANSFER OF POLICIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Administrator may, at the discretion of the Administrator, refuse to accept the transfer of the administration of policies for coverage under the flood insurance program under this title that are written and administered by any insurance company or other insurer, or any insurance agent or broker.''.

SEC. 364. APPEALS.

(a) TELEVISION AND RADIO ANNOUNCEMENT.—Section 1363 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104), as amended by the preceding provisions of this subtitle, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) by notifying a local television and radio station,''; and

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (b), by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and shall notify a local television and radio station at least once during the same 10-day period''.

(b) EXTENSION OF APPEALS PERIOD.—Subsection (b) of section 1363 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b) The Director'' and inserting ''(b)(1) The Administrator''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The Administrator shall grant an extension of the 90-day period for appeals referred to in paragraph (1) for 90 additional days if an affected community certifies to the Administrator, after the expiration of at least 60 days of such period, that the community—

''(A) believes there are property owners or lessees in the community who are unaware of such period for appeals; and

''(B) will utilize the extension under this paragraph to notify property owners or lessees who are affected by the proposed flood elevation determinations of the period for appeals and the opportunity to appeal the determinations proposed by the Administrator.''.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to any flood elevation determination for any area in a community that has not, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, been issued a Letter of Final Determination for such determination under the flood insurance map modernization process.

SEC. 365. RESERVE FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Chapter I of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by inserting after section 1310 (42 U.S.C. 4017) the following new section:

''SEC. 1310A. RESERVE FUND.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF RESERVE FUND.—In carrying out the flood insurance program authorized by this title, the Administrator shall establish in the Treasury of the United States a National Flood Insurance Reserve Fund (in this section referred to as the 'Reserve Fund') which shall—

''(1) be an account separate from any other accounts or funds available to the Administrator; and

''(2) be available for meeting the expected future obligations of the flood insurance program.

''(b) RESERVE RATIO.—Subject to the phase-in requirements under subsection (d), the Reserve Fund shall maintain a balance equal to—

''(1) 1 percent of the sum of the total potential loss exposure of all outstanding flood insurance policies in force in the prior fiscal year; or

''(2) such higher percentage as the Administrator determines to be appropriate, taking into consideration any circumstance that may raise a significant risk of substantial future losses to the Reserve Fund.

''(c) MAINTENANCE OF RESERVE RATIO.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall have the authority to establish, increase, or decrease the amount of aggregate annual insurance premiums to be collected for any fiscal year necessary—

''(A) to maintain the reserve ratio required under subsection (b); and

''(B) to achieve such reserve ratio, if the actual balance of such reserve is below the amount required under subsection (b).

''(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In exercising the authority under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall consider—

''(A) the expected operating expenses of the Reserve Fund;

''(B) the insurance loss expenditures under the flood insurance program;

''(C) any investment income generated under the flood insurance program; and

''(D) any other factor that the Administrator determines appropriate.

''(3) LIMITATIONS.—In exercising the authority under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall be subject to all other provisions of this Act, including any provisions relating to chargeable premium rates and annual increases of such rates.

''(d) PHASE-IN REQUIREMENTS.—The phase-in requirements under this subsection are as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in fiscal year 2012 and not ending until the fiscal year in which the ratio required under subsection (b) is achieved, in each such fiscal year the Administrator shall place in the Reserve Fund an amount equal to not less than 7.5 percent of the reserve ratio required under subsection (b).

''(2) AMOUNT SATISFIED.—As soon as the ratio required under subsection (b) is achieved, and except as provided in paragraph (3), the Administrator shall not be required to set aside any amounts for the Reserve Fund.

''(3) EXCEPTION.—If at any time after the ratio required under subsection (b) is achieved, the Reserve Fund falls below the required ratio under subsection (b), the Administrator shall place in the Reserve Fund for that fiscal year an amount equal to not less than 7.5 percent of the reserve ratio required under subsection (b).

''(e) LIMITATION ON RESERVE RATIO.—In any given fiscal year, if the Administrator determines that the reserve ratio required under subsection (b) cannot be achieved, the Administrator shall submit a report to the Congress that—

''(1) describes and details the specific concerns of the Administrator regarding such consequences;

''(2) demonstrates how such consequences would harm the long-term financial soundness of the flood insurance program; and

''(3) indicates the maximum attainable reserve ratio for that particular fiscal year.

''(f) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—The reserve ratio requirements under subsection (b) and the phase-in requirements under subsection (d) shall be subject to the availability of amounts in the National Flood Insurance Fund for transfer under section 1310(a)(10), as provided in section 1310(f).''.

(b) FUNDING.—Subsection (a) of section 1310 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017(a)), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(10) for transfers to the National Flood Insurance Reserve Fund under section 1310A, in accordance with such section.''.

SEC. 366. CDBG ELIGIBILITY FOR FLOOD INSURANCE OUTREACH ACTIVITIES AND COMMUNITY BUILDING CODE ADMINISTRATION GRANTS.

Section 105(a) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (24), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (25), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

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

''(26) supplementing existing State or local funding for administration of building code enforcement by local building code enforcement departments, including for increasing staffing, providing staff training, increasing staff competence and professional qualifications, and supporting individual certification or departmental accreditation, and for capital expenditures specifically dedicated to the administration of the building code enforcement department, except that, to be eligible to use amounts as provided in this paragraph—

''(A) a building code enforcement department shall provide matching, non-Federal funds to be used in conjunction with amounts used under this paragraph in an amount—

''(i) in the case of a building code enforcement department serving an area with a population of more than 50,000, equal to not less than 50 percent of the total amount of any funds made available under this title that are used under this paragraph;

''(ii) in the case of a building code enforcement department serving an area with a population of between 20,001 and 50,000, equal to not less than 25 percent of the total amount of any funds made available under this title that are used under this paragraph; and

''(iii) in the case of a building code enforcement department serving an area with a population of less than 20,000, equal to not less than 12.5 percent of the total amount of any funds made available under this title that are used under this paragraph,

except that the Secretary may waive the matching fund requirements under this subparagraph, in whole or in part, based upon the level of economic distress of the jurisdiction in which is located the local building code enforcement department that is using amounts for purposes under this paragraph, and shall waive such matching fund requirements in whole for any recipient jurisdiction that has dedicated all building code permitting fees to the conduct of local building code enforcement; and

''(B) any building code enforcement department using funds made available under this title for purposes under this paragraph shall empanel a code administration and enforcement team consisting of at least 1 full-time building code enforcement officer, a city planner, and a health planner or similar officer; and

''(27) provision of assistance to local governmental agencies responsible for floodplain management activities (including such agencies of Indians tribes, as such term is defined in section 4 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4103)) in communities that participate in the national flood insurance program under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), only for carrying out outreach activities to encourage and facilitate the purchase of flood insurance protection under such Act by owners and renters of properties in such communities and to promote educational activities that increase awareness of flood risk reduction; except that—

''(A) amounts used as provided under this paragraph shall be used only for activities designed to—

''(i) identify owners and renters of properties in communities that participate in the national flood insurance program, including owners of residential and commercial properties;

''(ii) notify such owners and renters when their properties become included in, or when they are excluded from, an area having special flood hazards and the effect of such inclusion or exclusion on the applicability of the mandatory flood insurance purchase requirement under section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a) to such properties;

''(iii) educate such owners and renters regarding the flood risk and reduction of this risk in their community, including the continued flood risks to areas that are no longer subject to the flood insurance mandatory purchase requirement;

''(iv) educate such owners and renters regarding the benefits and costs of maintaining or acquiring flood insurance, including, where applicable, lower-cost preferred risk policies under this title for such properties and the contents of such properties;

''(v) encourage such owners and renters to maintain or acquire such coverage;

''(vi) notify such owners of where to obtain information regarding how to obtain such coverage, including a telephone number, mailing address, and Internet site of the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (in this paragraph referred to as the 'Administrator') where such information is available; and

''(vii) educate local real estate agents in communities participating in the national flood insurance program regarding the program and the availability of coverage under the program for owners and renters of properties in such communities, and establish coordination and liaisons with such real estate agents to facilitate purchase of coverage under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 and increase awareness of flood risk reduction;

''(B) in any fiscal year, a local governmental agency may not use an amount under this paragraph that exceeds 3 times the amount that the agency certifies, as the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall require, that the agency will contribute from non-Federal funds to be used with such amounts used under this paragraph only for carrying out activities described in subparagraph (A); and for purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'non-Federal funds' includes State or local government agency amounts, in-kind contributions, any salary paid to staff to carry out the eligible activities of the local governmental agency involved, the value of the time and services contributed by volunteers to carry out such services (at a rate determined by the Secretary), and the value of any donated material or building and the value of any lease on a building;

''(C) a local governmental agency that uses amounts as provided under this paragraph may coordinate or contract with other agencies and entities having particular capacities, specialties, or experience with respect to certain populations or constituencies, including elderly or disabled families or persons, to carry out activities described in subparagraph (A) with respect to such populations or constituencies; and

''(D) each local government agency that uses amounts as provided under this paragraph shall submit a report to the Secretary and the Administrator, not later than 12 months after such amounts are first received, which shall include such information as the Secretary and the Administrator jointly consider appropriate to describe the activities conducted using such amounts and the effect of such activities on the retention or acquisition of flood insurance coverage.''.

SEC. 367. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) FLOOD DISASTER PROTECTION ACT OF 1973.—The Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4002 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Director'' each place such term appears, except in section 102(f)(3) (42 U.S.C. 4012a(f)(3)), and inserting ''Administrator''; and

(2) in section 201(b) (42 U.S.C. 4105(b)), by striking ''Director's'' and inserting ''Administrator's''.

(b) NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1968.—The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Director'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Administrator''; and

(2) in section 1363 (42 U.S.C. 4104), by striking ''Director's'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Administrator's''.

(c) FEDERAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1956.—Section 15(e) of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 (42 U.S.C. 2414(e)) is amended by striking ''Director'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Administrator''.

SEC. 368. REQUIRING COMPETITION FOR NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM POLICIES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning upon the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, in consultation with insurance companies, insurance agents and other organizations with which the Administrator has contracted, shall submit to the Congress a report describing procedures and policies that the Administrator shall implement to limit the percentage of policies for flood insurance coverage under the national flood insurance program that are directly managed by the Agency to not more than 10 percent of the aggregate number of flood insurance policies in force under such program.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—Upon submission of the report under subsection (a) to the Congress, the Administrator shall implement the policies and procedures described in the report. The Administrator shall, not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning upon submission of such report, reduce the number of policies for flood insurance coverage that are directly managed by the Agency, or by the Agency's direct servicing contractor that is not an insurer, to not more than 10 percent of the aggregate number of flood insurance policies in force as of the expiration of such 12-month period.

(c) CONTINUATION OF CURRENT AGENT RELATIONSHIPS.—In carrying out subsection (b), the Administrator shall ensure that—

(1) agents selling or servicing policies described in such subsection are not prevented from continuing to sell or service such policies; and

(2) insurance companies are not prevented from waiving any limitation such companies could otherwise enforce to limit any such activity.

SEC. 369. STUDIES OF VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY-BASED FLOOD INSURANCE OPTIONS.

(a) STUDIES.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Comptroller General of the United States shall each conduct a separate study to assess options, methods, and strategies for offering voluntary community-based flood insurance policy options and incorporating such options into the national flood insurance program. Such studies shall take into consideration and analyze how the policy options would affect communities having varying economic bases, geographic locations, flood hazard characteristics or classifications, and flood management approaches.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than the expiration of the 18-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Comptroller General of the United States shall each submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate on the results and conclusions of the study such agency conducted under subsection (a), and each such report shall include recommendations for the best manner to incorporate voluntary community-based flood insurance options into the national flood insurance program and for a strategy to implement such options that would encourage communities to undertake flood mitigation activities.

SEC. 370. REPORT ON INCLUSION OF BUILDING CODES IN FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT CRITERIA.

Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall conduct a study and submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate regarding the impact, effectiveness, and feasibility of amending section 1361 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4102) to include widely used and nationally recognized building codes as part of the floodplain management criteria developed under such section, and shall determine—

(1) the regulatory, financial, and economic impacts of such a building code requirement on homeowners, States and local communities, local land use policies, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(2) the resources required of State and local communities to administer and enforce such a building code requirement;

(3) the effectiveness of such a building code requirement in reducing flood-related damage to buildings and contents;

(4) the impact of such a building code requirement on the actuarial soundness of the National Flood Insurance Program;

(5) the effectiveness of nationally recognized codes in allowing innovative materials and systems for flood-resistant construction;

(6) the feasibility and effectiveness of providing an incentive in lower premium rates for flood insurance coverage under such Act for structures meeting whichever of such widely used and nationally recognized building code or any applicable local building code provides greater protection from flood damage;

(7) the impact of such a building code requirement on rural communities with different building code challenges than more urban environments; and

(8) the impact of such a building code requirement on Indian reservations.

SEC. 371. STUDY ON GRADUATED RISK.

(a) STUDY.—The National Academy of Sciences shall conduct a study exploring methods for understanding graduated risk behind levees and the associated land development, insurance, and risk communication dimensions, which shall—

(1) research, review, and recommend current best practices for estimating direct annualized flood losses behind levees for residential and commercial structures;

(2) rank such practices based on their best value, balancing cost, scientific integrity, and the inherent uncertainties associated with all aspects of the loss estimate, including geotechnical engineering, flood frequency estimates, economic value, and direct damages;

(3) research, review, and identify current best floodplain management and land use practices behind levees that effectively balance social, economic, and environmental considerations as part of an overall flood risk management strategy;

(4) identify examples where such practices have proven effective and recommend methods and processes by which they could be applied more broadly across the United States, given the variety of different flood risks, State and local legal frameworks, and evolving judicial opinions;

(5) research, review, and identify a variety of flood insurance pricing options for flood hazards behind levees which are actuarially sound and based on the flood risk data developed using the top three best value approaches identified pursuant to paragraph (1);

(6) evaluate and recommend methods to reduce insurance costs through creative arrangements between insureds and insurers while keeping a clear accounting of how much financial risk is being borne by various parties such that the entire risk is accounted for, including establishment of explicit limits on disaster aid or other assistance in the event of a flood; and

(7) taking into consideration the recommendations pursuant to paragraphs (1) through (3), recommend approaches to communicating the associated risks to community officials, homeowners, and other residents.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the National Academy of Sciences shall submit a report to the Committees on Financial Services and Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate on the study under subsection (a) including the information and recommendations required under such subsection.

SEC. 372. REPORT ON FLOOD-IN-PROGRESS DETERMINATION.

The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall review the processes and procedures for determining that a flood event has commenced or is in progress for purposes of flood insurance coverage made available under the national flood insurance program under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 and for providing public notification that such an event has commenced or is in progress. In such review, the Administrator shall take into consideration the effects and implications that weather conditions, such as rainfall, snowfall, projected snowmelt, existing water levels, and other conditions have on the determination that a flood event has commenced or is in progress. Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning upon the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit a report to the Congress setting forth the results and conclusions of the review undertaken pursuant to this section and any actions undertaken or proposed actions to be taken to provide for a more precise and technical determination that a flooding event has commenced or is in progress.

SEC. 373. STUDY ON REPAYING FLOOD INSURANCE DEBT.

Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall submit a report to the Congress setting forth a plan for repaying within 10 years all amounts, including any amounts previously borrowed but not yet repaid, owed pursuant to clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 1309 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)(2)).

SEC. 374. NO CAUSE OF ACTION.

No cause of action shall exist and no claim may be brought against the United States for violation of any notification requirement imposed upon the United States by this subtitle or any amendment made by this subtitle.

SEC. 375. AUTHORITY FOR THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS TO PROVIDE SPECIALIZED OR TECHNICAL SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the request of a State or local government, the Secretary of the Army may evaluate a levee system that was designed or constructed by the Secretary for the purposes of the National Flood Insurance Program established under chapter 1 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011 et seq.).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—A levee system evaluation under subsection (a) shall—

(1) comply with applicable regulations related to areas protected by a levee system;

(2) be carried out in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, may establish; and

(3) be carried out only if the State or local government agrees to reimburse the Secretary for all cost associated with the performance of the activities.

Subtitle E—Repeal of the Office of Financial Research

SEC. 381. REPEAL OF THE OFFICE OF FINANCIAL RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title I of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is hereby repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO THE DODD-FRANK ACT.—The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended—

(1) in section 102(a), by striking paragraph (5);

(2) in section 111—

(A) in subsection (b)(2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D), respectively;

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D)'';

(3) in section 112—

(A) in subsection (a)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''direct the Office of Financial Research to'';

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), (J), (K), (L), (M), and (N) as subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), (J), (K), (L), and (M), respectively; and

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''the Office of Financial Research, member agencies, and'' and inserting ''member agencies and'';

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''the Office of Financial Research, any member agency, and'' and inserting ''any member agency and'';

(iii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) by striking '', acting through the Office of Financial Research,'' each place it appears; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''the Office of Financial Research or''; and

(iv) in paragraph (5)(A), by striking '', the Office of Financial Research,'';

(4) in section 116, by striking '', acting through the Office of Financial Research,'' each place it appears; and

(5) by striking section 118.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—Effective as of the date specified in section 1100H of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, section 1100D(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

''(a) DESIGNATION AS AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY.—Section 3502(5) of subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the Paperwork Reduction Act) is amended by inserting 'the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection,' after 'the Securities and Exchange Commission,'.''.

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents for the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to section 118; and

(2) by striking the items relating to subtitle B of title I.

TITLE IV—COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Help Efficient, Accessible, Low-cost, Timely Healthcare (HEALTH) Act of 2011''.

SEC. 402. ENCOURAGING SPEEDY RESOLUTION OF CLAIMS.

The time for the commencement of a health care lawsuit shall be 3 years after the date of manifestation of injury or 1 year after the claimant discovers, or through the use of reasonable diligence should have discovered, the injury, whichever occurs first. In no event shall the time for commencement of a health care lawsuit exceed 3 years after the date of manifestation of injury unless tolled for any of the following—

(1) upon proof of fraud;

(2) intentional concealment; or

(3) the presence of a foreign body, which has no therapeutic or diagnostic purpose or effect, in the person of the injured person.

Actions by a minor shall be commenced within 3 years from the date of the alleged manifestation of injury except that actions by a minor under the full age of 6 years shall be commenced within 3 years of manifestation of injury or prior to the minor's 8th birthday, whichever provides a longer period. Such time limitation shall be tolled for minors for any period during which a parent or guardian and a health care provider or health care organization have committed fraud or collusion in the failure to bring an action on behalf of the injured minor.

SEC. 403. COMPENSATING PATIENT INJURY.

(a) UNLIMITED AMOUNT OF DAMAGES FOR ACTUAL ECONOMIC LOSSES IN HEALTH CARE LAWSUITS.—In any health care lawsuit, nothing in this title shall limit a claimant's recovery of the full amount of the available economic damages, notwithstanding the limitation in subsection (b).

(b) ADDITIONAL NONECONOMIC DAMAGES.—In any health care lawsuit, the amount of noneconomic damages, if available, may be as much as $250,000, regardless of the number of parties against whom the action is brought or the number of separate claims or actions brought with respect to the same injury.

(c) NO DISCOUNT OF AWARD FOR NONECONOMIC DAMAGES.—For purposes of applying the limitation in subsection (b), future noneconomic damages shall not be discounted to present value. The jury shall not be informed about the maximum award for noneconomic damages. An award for noneconomic damages in excess of $250,000 shall be reduced either before the entry of judgment, or by amendment of the judgment after entry of judgment, and such reduction shall be made before accounting for any other reduction in damages required by law. If separate awards are rendered for past and future noneconomic damages and the combined awards exceed $250,000, the future noneconomic damages shall be reduced first.

(d) FAIR SHARE RULE.—In any health care lawsuit, each party shall be liable for that party's several share of any damages only and not for the share of any other person. Each party shall be liable only for the amount of damages allocated to such party in direct proportion to such party's percentage of responsibility. Whenever a judgment of liability is rendered as to any party, a separate judgment shall be rendered against each such party for the amount allocated to such party. For purposes of this section, the trier of fact shall determine the proportion of responsibility of each party for the claimant's harm.

SEC. 404. MAXIMIZING PATIENT RECOVERY.

(a) COURT SUPERVISION OF SHARE OF DAMAGES ACTUALLY PAID TO CLAIMANTS.—In any health care lawsuit, the court shall supervise the arrangements for payment of damages to protect against conflicts of interest that may have the effect of reducing the amount of damages awarded that are actually paid to claimants. In particular, in any health care lawsuit in which the attorney for a party claims a financial stake in the outcome by virtue of a contingent fee, the court shall have the power to restrict the payment of a claimant's damage recovery to such attorney, and to redirect such damages to the claimant based upon the interests of justice and principles of equity. In no event shall the total of all contingent fees for representing all claimants in a health care lawsuit exceed the following limits:

(1) Forty percent of the first $50,000 recovered by the claimant(s).

(2) Thirty-three and one-third percent of the next $50,000 recovered by the claimant(s).

(3) Twenty-five percent of the next $500,000 recovered by the claimant(s).

(4) Fifteen percent of any amount by which the recovery by the claimant(s) is in excess of $600,000.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The limitations in this section shall apply whether the recovery is by judgment, settlement, mediation, arbitration, or any other form of alternative dispute resolution. In a health care lawsuit involving a minor or incompetent person, a court retains the authority to authorize or approve a fee that is less than the maximum permitted under this section. The requirement for court supervision in the first two sentences of subsection (a) applies only in civil actions.

SEC. 405. PUNITIVE DAMAGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Punitive damages may, if otherwise permitted by applicable State or Federal law, be awarded against any person in a health care lawsuit only if it is proven by clear and convincing evidence that such person acted with malicious intent to injure the claimant, or that such person deliberately failed to avoid unnecessary injury that such person knew the claimant was substantially certain to suffer. In any health care lawsuit where no judgment for compensatory damages is rendered against such person, no punitive damages may be awarded with respect to the claim in such lawsuit. No demand for punitive damages shall be included in a health care lawsuit as initially filed. A court may allow a claimant to file an amended pleading for punitive damages only upon a motion by the claimant and after a finding by the court, upon review of supporting and opposing affidavits or after a hearing, after weighing the evidence, that the claimant has established by a substantial probability that the claimant will prevail on the claim for punitive damages. At the request of any party in a health care lawsuit, the trier of fact shall consider in a separate proceeding—

(1) whether punitive damages are to be awarded and the amount of such award; and

(2) the amount of punitive damages following a determination of punitive liability.

If a separate proceeding is requested, evidence relevant only to the claim for punitive damages, as determined by applicable State law, shall be inadmissible in any proceeding to determine whether compensatory damages are to be awarded.

(b) DETERMINING AMOUNT OF PUNITIVE DAMAGES.—

(1) FACTORS CONSIDERED.—In determining the amount of punitive damages, if awarded, in a health care lawsuit, the trier of fact shall consider only the following—

(A) the severity of the harm caused by the conduct of such party;

(B) the duration of the conduct or any concealment of it by such party;

(C) the profitability of the conduct to such party;

(D) the number of products sold or medical procedures rendered for compensation, as the case may be, by such party, of the kind causing the harm complained of by the claimant;

(E) any criminal penalties imposed on such party, as a result of the conduct complained of by the claimant; and

(F) the amount of any civil fines assessed against such party as a result of the conduct complained of by the claimant.

(2) MAXIMUM AWARD.—The amount of punitive damages, if awarded, in a health care lawsuit may be as much as $250,000 or as much as two times the amount of economic damages awarded, whichever is greater. The jury shall not be informed of this limitation.

(c) NO PUNITIVE DAMAGES FOR PRODUCTS THAT COMPLY WITH FDA STANDARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) No punitive damages may be awarded against the manufacturer or distributor of a medical product, or a supplier of any component or raw material of such medical product, based on a claim that such product caused the claimant's harm where—

(i)(I) such medical product was subject to premarket approval, clearance, or licensure by the Food and Drug Administration with respect to the safety of the formulation or performance of the aspect of such medical product which caused the claimant's harm or the adequacy of the packaging or labeling of such medical product; and

(II) such medical product was so approved, cleared, or licensed; or

(ii) such medical product is generally recognized among qualified experts as safe and effective pursuant to conditions established by the Food and Drug Administration and applicable

Food and Drug Administration regulations, including without limitation those related to packaging and labeling, unless the Food and Drug Administration has determined that such medical product was not manufactured or distributed in substantial compliance with applicable Food and Drug Administration statutes and regulations.

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subparagraph (A) may not be construed as establishing the obligation of the Food and Drug Administration to demonstrate affirmatively that a manufacturer, distributor, or supplier referred to in such subparagraph meets any of the conditions described in such subparagraph.

(2) LIABILITY OF HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS.—A health care provider who prescribes, or who dispenses pursuant to a prescription, a medical product approved, licensed, or cleared by the Food and Drug Administration shall not be named as a party to a product liability lawsuit involving such product and shall not be liable to a claimant in a class action lawsuit against the manufacturer, distributor, or seller of such product. Nothing in this paragraph prevents a court from consolidating cases involving health care providers and cases involving products liability claims against the manufacturer, distributor, or product seller of such medical product.

(3) PACKAGING.—In a health care lawsuit for harm which is alleged to relate to the adequacy of the packaging or labeling of a drug which is required to have tamper-resistant packaging under regulations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services (including labeling regulations related to such packaging), the manufacturer or product seller of the drug shall not be held liable for punitive damages unless such packaging or labeling is found by the trier of fact by clear and convincing evidence to be substantially out of compliance with such regulations.

(4) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply in any health care lawsuit in which—

(A) a person, before or after premarket approval, clearance, or licensure of such medical product, knowingly misrepresented to or withheld from the Food and Drug Administration information that is required to be submitted under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262) that is material and is causally related to the harm which the claimant allegedly suffered

(B) a person made an illegal payment to an official of the Food and Drug Administration for the purpose of either securing or maintaining approval, clearance, or licensure of such medical product; or

(C) the defendant caused the medical product which caused the claimant's harm to be misbranded or adulterated (as such terms are used in chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 351 et seq.)).

SEC. 406. AUTHORIZATION OF PAYMENT OF FUTURE DAMAGES TO CLAIMANTS IN HEALTH CARE LAWSUITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In any health care lawsuit, if an award of future damages, without reduction to present value, equaling or exceeding $50,000 is made against a party with sufficient insurance or other assets to fund a periodic payment of such a judgment, the court shall, at the request of any party, enter a judgment ordering that the future damages be paid by periodic payments, in accordance with the Uniform Periodic Payment of Judgments Act promulgated by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies to all actions which have not been first set for trial or retrial before the effective date of this title.

SEC. 407. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION SYSTEM; ADR.—The term ''alternative dispute resolution system'' or ''ADR'' means a system that provides for the resolution of health care lawsuits in a manner other than through a civil action brought in a State or Federal court.

(2) CLAIMANT.—The term ''claimant'' means any person who brings a health care lawsuit, including a person who asserts or claims a right to legal or equitable contribution, indemnity, or subrogation, arising out of a health care liability claim or action, and any person on whose behalf such a claim is asserted or such an action is brought, whether deceased, incompetent, or a minor.

(3) COMPENSATORY DAMAGES.—The term ''compensatory damages'' means objectively verifiable monetary losses incurred as a result of the provision of, use of, or payment for (or failure to provide, use, or pay for) health care services or medical products, such as past and future medical expenses, loss of past and future earnings, cost of obtaining domestic services, loss of employment, and loss of business or employment opportunities, damages for physical and emotional pain, suffering, inconvenience, physical impairment, mental anguish, disfigurement, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of society and companionship, loss of consortium (other than loss of domestic service), hedonic damages, injury to reputation, and all other nonpecuniary losses of any kind or nature. The term ''compensatory damages'' includes economic damages and noneconomic damages, as such terms are defined in this section.

(4) CONTINGENT FEE.—The term ''contingent fee'' includes all compensation to any person or persons which is payable only if a recovery is effected on behalf of one or more claimants.

(5) ECONOMIC DAMAGES.—The term ''economic damages'' means objectively verifiable monetary losses incurred as a result of the provision of, use of, or payment for (or failure to provide, use, or pay for) health care services or medical products, such as past and future medical expenses, loss of past and future earnings, cost of obtaining domestic services, loss of employment, and loss of business or employment opportunities.

(6) HEALTH CARE LAWSUIT.—The term ''health care lawsuit'' means any health care liability claim concerning the provision of health care goods or services or any medical product affecting interstate commerce, or any health care liability action concerning the provision of health care goods or services or any medical product affecting interstate commerce, brought in a State or Federal court or pursuant to an alternative dispute resolution system, against a health care provider, a health care organization, or the manufacturer, distributor, supplier, marketer, promoter, or seller of a medical product, regardless of the theory of liability on which the claim is based, or the number of claimants, plaintiffs, defendants, or other parties, or the number of claims or causes of action, in which the claimant alleges a health care liability claim. Such term does not include a claim or action which is based on criminal liability; which seeks civil fines or penalties paid to Federal, State, or local government; or which is grounded in antitrust.

(7) HEALTH CARE LIABILITY ACTION.—The term ''health care liability action'' means a civil action brought in a State or Federal court or pursuant to an alternative dispute resolution system, against a health care provider, a health care organization, or the manufacturer, distributor, supplier, marketer, promoter, or seller of a medical product, regardless of the theory of liability on which the claim is based, or the number of plaintiffs, defendants, or other parties, or the number of causes of action, in which the claimant alleges a health care liability claim.

(8) HEALTH CARE LIABILITY CLAIM.—The term ''health care liability claim'' means a demand by any person, whether or not pursuant to ADR, against a health care provider, health care organization, or the manufacturer, distributor, supplier, marketer, promoter, or seller of a medical product, including, but not limited to, third-party claims, cross-claims, counterclaims, or contribution claims, which are based upon the provision of, use of, or payment for (or the failure to provide, use, or pay for) health care services or medical products, regardless of the theory of liability on which the claim is based, or the number of plaintiffs, defendants, or other parties, or the number of causes of action.

(9) HEALTH CARE ORGANIZATION.—The term ''health care organization'' means any person or entity which is obligated to provide or pay for health benefits under any health plan, including any person or entity acting under a contract or arrangement with a health care organization to provide or administer any health benefit.

(10) HEALTH CARE PROVIDER.—The term ''health care provider'' means any person or entity required by State or Federal laws or regulations to be licensed, registered, or certified to provide health care services, and being either so licensed, registered, or certified, or exempted from such requirement by other statute or regulation.

(11) HEALTH CARE GOODS OR SERVICES.—The term ''health care goods or services'' means any goods or services provided by a health care organization, provider, or by any individual working under the supervision of a health care provider, that relates to the diagnosis, prevention, or treatment of any human disease or impairment, or the assessment or care of the health of human beings.

(12) MALICIOUS INTENT TO INJURE.—The term ''malicious intent to injure'' means intentionally causing or attempting to cause physical injury other than providing health care goods or services.

(13) MEDICAL PRODUCT.—The term ''medical product'' means a drug, device, or biological product intended for humans, and the terms ''drug'', ''device'', and ''biological product'' have the meanings given such terms in sections 201(g)(1) and 201(h) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(g)(1) and (h)) and section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(a)), respectively, including any component or raw material used therein, but excluding health care services.

(14) NONECONOMIC DAMAGES.—The term ''noneconomic damages'' means damages for physical and emotional pain, suffering, inconvenience, physical impairment, mental anguish, disfigurement, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of society and companionship, loss of consortium (other than loss of domestic service), hedonic damages, injury to reputation, and all other nonpecuniary losses of any kind or nature.

(15) PUNITIVE DAMAGES.—The term ''punitive damages'' means damages awarded, for the purpose of punishment or deterrence, and not solely for compensatory purposes, against a health care provider, health care organization, or a manufacturer, distributor, or supplier of a medical product. Punitive damages are neither economic nor noneconomic damages.

(16) RECOVERY.—The term ''recovery'' means the net sum recovered after deducting any disbursements or costs incurred in connection with prosecution or settlement of the claim, including all costs paid or advanced by any person. Costs of health care incurred by the plaintiff and the attorneys' office overhead costs or charges for legal services are not deductible disbursements or costs for such purpose.

(17) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 408. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

(a) VACCINE INJURY.—

(1) To the extent that title XXI of the Public Health Service Act establishes a Federal rule of law applicable to a civil action brought for a vaccine-related injury or death—

(A) this title does not affect the application of the rule of law to such an action; and

(B) any rule of law prescribed by this title in conflict with a rule of law of such title XXI shall not apply to such action.

(2) If there is an aspect of a civil action brought for a vaccine-related injury or death to which a Federal rule of law under title XXI of the Public Health Service Act does not apply, then this title or otherwise applicable law (as determined under this title) will apply to such aspect of such action.

(b) OTHER FEDERAL LAW.—Except as provided in this section, nothing in this title shall be deemed to affect any defense available to a defendant in a health care lawsuit or action under any other provision of Federal law.

SEC. 409. STATE FLEXIBILITY AND PROTECTION OF STATES' RIGHTS.

(a) HEALTH CARE LAWSUITS.—The provisions governing health care lawsuits set forth in this title preempt, subject to subsections (b) and (c), State law to the extent that State law prevents the application of any provisions of law established by or under this title. The provisions governing health care lawsuits set forth in this title supersede chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, to the extent that such chapter—

(1) provides for a greater amount of damages or contingent fees, a longer period in which a health care lawsuit may be commenced, or a reduced applicability or scope of periodic payment of future damages, than provided in this title; or

(2) prohibits the introduction of evidence regarding collateral source benefits, or mandates or permits subrogation or a lien on collateral source benefits.

(b) PROTECTION OF STATES' RIGHTS AND OTHER LAWS.—(1) Any issue that is not governed by any provision of law established by or under this title (including State standards of negligence) shall be governed by otherwise applicable State or Federal law.

(2) This title shall not preempt or supersede any State or Federal law that imposes greater procedural or substantive protections for health care providers and health care organizations from liability, loss, or damages than those provided by this title or create a cause of action.

(c) STATE FLEXIBILITY.—No provision of this title shall be construed to preempt—

(1) any State law (whether effective before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act) that specifies a particular monetary amount of compensatory or punitive damages (or the total amount of damages) that may be awarded in a health care lawsuit, regardless of whether such monetary amount is greater or lesser than is provided for under this title, notwithstanding section 303(a); or

(2) any defense available to a party in a health care lawsuit under any other provision of State or Federal law.

SEC. 410. APPLICABILITY; EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title shall apply to any health care lawsuit brought in a Federal or State court, or subject to an alternative dispute resolution system, that is initiated on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that any health care lawsuit arising from an injury occurring prior to the date of the enactment of this Act shall be governed by the applicable statute of limitations provisions in effect at the time the injury occurred.

TITLE V—COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

SEC. 501. RETIREMENT CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

(1) INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 8334(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''(c) Each'' and inserting ''(c)(1) Each''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the applicable percentage of basic pay under this subsection shall—

''(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B) or (C), for purposes of computing an amount—

''(i) for a period in calendar year 2013, be equal to the applicable percentage under this subsection for calendar year 2012, plus an additional 1.5 percentage points;

''(ii) for a period in calendar year 2014, be equal to the applicable percentage under this subsection for calendar year 2013 (as determined under clause (i)), plus an additional 0.5 percentage point;

''(iii) for a period in calendar year 2015, 2016, or 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this subsection for the preceding calendar year (as determined under clause (ii) or this clause, as the case may be), plus an additional 1.0 percentage point; and

''(iv) for a period in any calendar year after 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this subsection for calendar year 2017 (as determined under clause (iii));

''(B) for purposes of computing an amount with respect to a Member for Member service—

''(i) for a period in calendar year 2013, be equal to the applicable percentage under this subsection for calendar year 2012, plus an additional 2.5 percentage points;

''(ii) for a period in calendar year 2014, 2015, 2016, or 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this subsection for the preceding calendar year (as determined under clause (i) or this clause, as the case may be), plus an additional 1.5 percentage points; and

''(iii) for a period in any calendar year after 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this subsection for calendar year 2017 (as determined under clause (ii)); and

''(C) for purposes of computing an amount with respect to a Member or employee for Congressional employee service—

''(i) for a period in calendar year 2013, be equal to the applicable percentage under this subsection for calendar year 2012, plus an additional 2.5 percentage points;

''(ii) for a period in calendar year 2014, 2015, 2016, or 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this subsection for the preceding calendar year (as determined under clause (i) or this clause, as the case may be), plus an additional 1.5 percentage points; and

''(iii) for a period in any calendar year after 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this subsection for calendar year 2017 (as determined under clause (ii)).

''(3)(A) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(2), any excess contributions under subsection (a)(1)(A) (including the portion of any deposit under this subsection allocable to excess contributions) shall, if made by an employee of the United States Postal Service or the Postal Regulatory Commission, be deposited to the credit of the Postal Service Fund under section 2003 of title 39, rather than the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund.

''(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'excess contributions', as used with respect to contributions made under subsection (a)(1)(A) by an employee of the United States Postal Service or the Postal Regulatory Commission, means the amount by which—

''(i) deductions from basic pay of such employee which are made under subsection (a)(1)(A), exceed

''(ii) deductions from basic pay of such employee which would have been so made if paragraph (2) had not been enacted.''.

(2) GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 8334(a)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''Except as provided in clause (ii),'' and inserting ''Except as provided in clause (ii) or (iii),''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) The amount to be contributed under clause (i) shall, with respect to a period in any year beginning after December 31, 2012, be equal to—

''(I) the amount which would otherwise apply under clause (i) with respect to such period, reduced by

''(II) the amount by which, with respect to such period, the withholding under subparagraph (A) exceeds the amount which would otherwise have been withheld from the basic pay of the employee or elected official involved under subparagraph (A) based on the percentage applicable under subsection (c) for calendar year 2012.''.

(b) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

(1) INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 8422(a)(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the applicable percentage under this paragraph for civilian service by employees or Members other than revised annuity employees shall—

''(i) except as provided in clause (ii) or (iii), for purposes of computing an amount—

''(I) for a period in calendar year 2013, be equal to the applicable percentage under this paragraph for calendar year 2012, plus an additional 1.5 percentage points;

''(II) for a period in calendar year 2014, be equal to the applicable percentage under this paragraph for calendar year 2013 (as determined under subclause (I)), plus an additional 0.5 percentage point;

''(III) for a period in calendar year 2015, 2016, or 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this paragraph for the preceding calendar year (as determined under subclause (II) or this subclause, as the case may be), plus an additional 1.0 percentage point; and

''(IV) for a period in any calendar year after 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this paragraph for calendar year 2017 (as determined under subclause (III));

''(ii) for purposes of computing an amount with respect to a Member—

''(I) for a period in calendar year 2013, be equal to the applicable percentage under this paragraph for calendar year 2012, plus an additional 2.5 percentage points;

''(II) for a period in calendar year 2014, 2015, 2016, or 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this paragraph for the preceding calendar year (as determined under subclause (I) or this subclause, as the case may be), plus an additional 1.5 percentage points; and

''(III) for a period in any calendar year after 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this paragraph for calendar year 2017 (as determined under subclause (II)); and

''(iii) for purposes of computing an amount with respect to a Congressional employee—

''(I) for a period in calendar year 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, or 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this paragraph for the preceding calendar year (including as increased under this subclause, if applicable), plus an additional 1.5 percentage points; and

''(II) for a period in any calendar year after 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this paragraph for calendar year 2017 (as determined under subclause (I)).''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated by subparagraph (A))—

(i) by striking ''9.3'' each place it appears and inserting ''12''; and

(ii) by striking ''9.8'' each place it appears and inserting ''12.5''.

(2) GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 8423(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''(2)'' and inserting ''(2)(A)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B)(i) Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii), for purposes of any period in any year beginning after December 31, 2012, the normal-cost percentage under this subsection shall be determined and applied as if section 501(b)(1) of the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012 had not been enacted.

''(ii) Any contributions under this subsection in excess of the amounts which (but for clause (i)) would otherwise have been payable shall be applied toward reducing the unfunded liability of the Civil Service Retirement System.

''(iii) After the unfunded liability of the Civil Service Retirement System has been eliminated, as determined by the Office, Government contributions under this subsection shall be determined and made disregarding this subparagraph.

''(iv) The preceding provisions of this subparagraph shall be disregarded for purposes of determining the contributions payable by the United States Postal Service and the Postal Regulatory Commission.''.

SEC. 502. ANNUITY SUPPLEMENT.

Section 8421(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''paragraph (3)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (3) and (4)'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''paragraph (3)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (3) and (4)''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(4)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), no annuity supplement under this section shall be payable in the case of an individual who first becomes subject to this chapter after December 31, 2012.

''(B) Nothing in this paragraph applies in the case of an individual separating under subsection (d) or (e) of section 8412.''.

SEC. 503. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THRIFT SAVINGS FUND OF PAYMENTS FOR ACCRUED OR ACCUMULATED LEAVE.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO CSRS.—Section 8351(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2)(A) and inserting the following:

''(2)(A) An employee or Member may contribute to the Thrift Savings Fund in any pay period any amount of such employee's or Member's basic pay for such pay period, and may contribute (by direct transfer to the Fund) any part of any payment that the employee or Member receives for accumulated and accrued annual or vacation leave under section 5551 or 5552. Notwithstanding section 2105(e), in this paragraph the term 'employee' includes an employee of the United States Postal Service or of the Postal Regulatory Commission.'';

(2) by striking subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2); and

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (C) of paragraph (2) as subparagraph (B).

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO FERS.—Section 8432(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking all that precedes paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(a)(1) An employee or Member—

''(A) may contribute to the Thrift Savings Fund in any pay period, pursuant to an election under subsection (b), any amount of such employee's or Member's basic pay for such pay period; and

''(B) may contribute (by direct transfer to the Fund) any part of any payment that the employee or Member receives for accumulated and accrued annual or vacation leave under section 5551 or 5552.

''(2) Contributions made under paragraph (1)(A) pursuant to an election under subsection (b) shall, with respect to each pay period for which such election remains in effect, be made in accordance with a program of regular contributions provided in regulations prescribed by the Executive Director.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) Notwithstanding section 2105(e), in this subsection the term 'employee' includes an employee of the United States Postal Service or of the Postal Regulatory Commission.''.

(c) REGULATIONS.—The Executive Director of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board shall promulgate regulations to carry out the amendments made by this section.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE VI—COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Subtitle A—Recapture of Overpayments Resulting From Certain Federally-subsidized Health Insurance

SEC. 601. RECAPTURE OF OVERPAYMENTS RESULTING FROM CERTAIN FEDERALLY-SUBSIDIZED HEALTH INSURANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 36B(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraph (B).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—So much of paragraph (2) of section 36B(f) of such Code, as amended by subsection (a), as precedes ''advance payments'' is amended to read as follows:

''(2) EXCESS ADVANCE PAYMENTS.—If the''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2013.

Subtitle B—Social Security Number Required to Claim the Refundable Portion of the Child Tax Credit

SEC. 611. SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER REQUIRED TO CLAIM THE REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO TAXPAYER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year unless the taxpayer includes the taxpayer's Social Security number on the return of tax for such taxable year.

''(B) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, the requirement of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as met if the Social Security number of either spouse is included on such return.

''(C) LIMITATION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to the extent the tentative minimum tax (as defined in section 55(b)(1)(A)) exceeds the credit allowed under section 32.''.

(b) OMISSION TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR.—Subparagraph (I) of section 6213(g)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(I) an omission of a correct Social Security number required under section 24(d)(5) (relating to refundable portion of child tax credit), or a correct TIN under section 24(e) (relating to child tax credit), to be included on a return,''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (e) of section 24 of such Code is amended by inserting ''WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFYING CHILDREN'' after ''IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT'' in the heading thereof.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle C—Human Resources Provisions

SEC. 621. REPEAL OF THE PROGRAM OF BLOCK GRANTS TO STATES FOR SOCIAL SERVICES.

(a) REPEALS.—Sections 2001 through 2007 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397–1397f) are repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 404(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 604(d)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''any or all of the following provisions of law:'' and all that follows through ''The'' and inserting ''the'';

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''RULES'' and all that follows through ''any amount paid'' and inserting ''RULES.—Any amount paid'';

(ii) by striking ''a provision of law specified in paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990''; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(2) Section 422(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(i) by striking ''administers or supervises'' and inserting ''administered or supervised''; and

(ii) by striking ''subtitle 1 of title XX'' and inserting ''subtitle A of title XX (as in effect before the repeal of such subtitle)''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''under subtitle 1 of title XX,''.

(3) Section 471(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking '', under subtitle 1 of title XX of this Act,''; and

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking ''XIX, or XX'' and inserting ''or XIX''.

(4) Section 472(h)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 672(h)(1)) is amended by striking the 2nd sentence.

(5) Section 473(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''(3)'' and inserting ''(2)'';

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking ''paragraphs (1) and (2)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)''; and

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively.

(6) Section 504(b)(6) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 704(b)(6)) is amended in each of subparagraphs (A) and (B) by striking ''XIX, or XX'' and inserting ''or XIX''.

(7) Section 1101(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1301(a)(1)) is amended by striking the penultimate sentence.

(8) Section 1128(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a-7(h)) is amended—

(A) by adding ''or'' at the end of paragraph (2); and

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(9) Section 1128A(i)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a-7a(i)(1)) is amended by striking ''or subtitle 1 of title XX''.

(10) Section 1132(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-2(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''XIX, or XX'' and inserting ''or XIX''.

(11) Section 1902(e)(13)(F)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(e)(13)(F)(iii)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''EXCLUSIONS'' and inserting ''EXCLUSION''; and

(B) by striking ''an agency that determines eligibility for a program established under the Social Services Block Grant established under title XX or''.

(12) The heading for title XX of the Social Security Act is amended by striking ''BLOCK GRANTS TO STATES FOR SOCIAL SERVICES'' and inserting ''HEALTH PROFESSIONS DEMONSTRATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH CONDITION DETECTION''.

(13) The heading for subtitle A of title XX of the Social Security Act is amended by striking ''**Block Grants to States for Social Services**'' and inserting ''**Health Professions Demonstrations and Environmental Health Condition Detection**''.

(14) Section 16(k)(5)(B)(i) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(k)(5)(B)(i)) is amended by striking '', or title XX,''.

(15) Section 402(b)(3) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1612(b)(3)) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B).

(16) Section 245A(h)(4)(I) of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (8 U.S.C. 1255a(h)(4)(I)) is amended by striking '', XVI, and XX'' and inserting ''and XVI''.

(17) Section 17 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking ''—'' and all that follows through ''(i)'';

(II) by striking ''or'' at the end of clause (i); and

(III) by striking clause (ii); and

(ii) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by striking ''or title XX''; and

(B) in subsection (o)(2)(B)—

(i) by striking ''or title XX'' each place it appears; and

(ii) by striking ''or XX''.

(18) Section 201(b) of the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1931(b)) is amended by striking ''titles IV–B and XX'' each place it appears and inserting ''part B of title IV''.

(19) Section 3803(c)(2)(C) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking clause (vi) and redesignating clauses (vii) through (xvi) as clauses (vi) through (xv), respectively.

(20) Section 14502(d)(3) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''and title XX''; and

(B) by striking '', 1397 et seq.''.

(21) Section 2006(a)(15) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300z-5(a)(15)) is amended by striking ''and title XX''.

(22) Section 203(b)(3) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3013(b)(3)) is amended by striking ''XIX, and XX'' and inserting ''and XIX''.

(23) Section 213 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3020d) is amended by striking ''or title XX''.

(24) Section 306(d) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3026(d)) is amended in each of paragraphs (1) and (2) by striking ''titles XIX and XX'' and inserting ''title XIX''.

(25) Section 2605 of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8624) is amended in each of subsections (b)(4) and (j) by striking ''under title XX of the Social Security Act,''.

(26) Section 602 of the Child Development Associate Scholarship Assistance Act of 1985 (42 U.S.C. 10901) is repealed.

(27) Section 3(d)(1) of the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act of 1997 (42 U.S.C. 14402(d)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraph (C) and redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (K) as subparagraphs (C) through (J), respectively.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The repeals and amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2012.

TITLE VII—SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Sequester Replacement Act of 2012''.

SEC. 702. PROTECTING VETERANS PROGRAMS FROM SEQUESTER.

Section 256(e)(2)(E) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is repealed.

SEC. 703. ACHIEVING $19 BILLION IN DISCRETIONARY SAVINGS.

(a) REVISED 2013 DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMIT.—Paragraph (2) of section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended to read as follows:

''(2) with respect to fiscal year 2013, for the discretionary category, $1,047,000,000,000 in new budget authority;''.

(b) DISCRETIONARY SAVINGS.—Section 251A(7)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended to read as follows:

''(A) FISCAL YEAR 2013.—

''(i) FISCAL YEAR 2013 ADJUSTMENT.—On January 2, 2013, the discretionary category set forth in section 251(c)(2) shall be decreased by $19,104,000,000 in budget authority.

''(ii) SUPPLEMENTAL SEQUESTRATION ORDER.—On January 15, 2013, OMB shall issue a supplemental sequestration report for fiscal year 2013 and take the form of a final sequestration report as set forth in section 254(f)(2) and using the procedures set forth in section 253(f), to eliminate any discretionary spending breach of the spending limit set forth in section 251(c)(2) as adjusted by clause (i), and the President shall order a sequestration, if any, as required by such report.''.

SEC. 704. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 314 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET AND IMPOUNDMENT CONTROL ACT OF 1974.

Section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended to read as follows:

''(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate may make adjustments as set forth in paragraph (2) for a bill or joint resolution, amendment thereto or conference report thereon, by the amount of new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom in the same amount as required by section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

''(2) MATTERS TO BE ADJUSTED.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate may make the adjustments referred to in paragraph (1) to—

''(A) the allocations made pursuant to the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 302(a);

''(B) the budgetary aggregates as set forth in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget; and

''(C) the discretionary spending limits, if any, set forth in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget.''.

SEC. 705. TREATMENT FOR PAYGO PURPOSES.

The budgetary effects of this Act and any amendment made by it shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

SEC. 706. ELIMINATION OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 SEQUESTRATION FOR DEFENSE DIRECT SPENDING.

Any sequestration order issued by the President under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to carry out reductions to direct spending for the defense function (050) for fiscal year 2013 pursuant to section 251A of such Act shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5652, the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind everybody for a minute as to how we got here. Why are we doing this? What's going on?

When the President was requesting an increase in the debt limit last year, he wanted a blank check. Just increase the debt limit. Borrowing unchecked. Then when that wasn't going to happen, he asked for a big tax increase. That didn't occur.

□ 1100

What occurred out of that was the Budget Control Act. You've got to cut at least a dollar's worth of spending for every dollar of debt-limit increase that occurs.

So Congress passed the Budget Control Act with no tax increases, spending cuts. Half of it, approximately, were the caps on discretionary spending netting about $1 trillion in savings—$917 billion, to be specific. The other half, the $1.2 trillion, was the Select Committee—people call this the supercommittee. That committee failed to produce a result. As a result of that, a sequester occurs. And the sequester, according to people on a bipartisan basis, is not good government. The sequester, according to the Secretary of Defense, the President himself, would hollow out our military when it kicks in on January 2 next year. The sequester will take nondefense discretionary spending down 8 percent and defense down 10 percent.

We believe the purpose of the sequester was to replace the fact that Congress isn't governing. Well, let's have Congress govern. That's why we're doing this. What we're doing is we're bringing a bill to the floor to cut 405 percent of the spending cuts that are in the sequester in the first year. A net deficit reduction of $242.8 billion to set aside the sequester under discretionary for 1 year of $78 billion, we think that's a good tradeoff.

More to the point, we need to get in the habit of doing reconciliation because 61 percent of the Federal budget is off limits, it's autopilot, it's not touched. Congress doesn't deal with it. So we should look at this part of our government that is not being dealt with.

The last time we used reconciliation for its intended purpose—to cut spending, to reduce deficits—was 2005. So rather than just having annual discretionary spending bouts and debates, we should look at the other parts of government that are on autopilot.

Take a look at what we're doing. We basically are doing five things. We're stopping the abuse by ensuring individuals are actually eligible for the taxpayer benefits they receive—novel idea, I know. We're eliminating government slush funds to stop bailouts. We're controlling runaway, unchecked spending. We're putting restraints on government spending by bureaucracies. And we're getting rid of duplicative spending.

I can go through each program, and we will do this in this debate, but what we're simply saying is people should actually be eligible for the benefits that they receive, whether it's a tax credit, whether it's a SNAP benefit, whatever it is. When we take a look at why we're cutting spending, we are

doing this with the guise of the fact that we have a spending-driven debt crisis on the horizon. If taxes go back to where they've been for the last 40 years, which is what they are projected to do, there's no way you can fix this problem by raising taxes.

We have a spending-driven debt crisis, and the debt crisis is one in which we have a tidal wave of debt coming to this country just like Europe is experiencing. If we don't get our spending under control and we don't get our deficit under control, the people who need government the most—the poor, the elderly—they're the ones who get hurt the first and the worst.

We need to get spending and, therefore, deficits under control to prevent a debt crisis. That's what this does. It's a downpayment. Instead of saving hundreds of billions of dollars like this bill does, we need to get into the practice of actually saving trillions of dollars, which is what our budget does, in order to prevent a debt crisis from ruining the American Dream for Americans.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there's agreement here on two things: one, we need to reduce our long-term deficits—the question is not whether we need to do that, but how; second, we agree that the automatic, indiscriminate, meat-ax cuts scheduled to begin next January are the wrong way to reduce the deficit. We need a responsible alternative.

Now, the House Democrats put forward a budget, as did the President, that deals with this issue over 10 years in a balanced way, building on the more than $1 trillion of cuts we already made on a bipartisan basis last August, and including additional cuts, but also cutting tax loopholes that benefit special interests, and asking people who make more than $1 million per year to help a little bit more toward deficit reduction. That is the kind of bipartisan approach that's been recommended by bipartisan groups like Simpson-Bowles and Rivlin-Domenici. Unfortunately, the Republican approach to the budget—and now to the sequester issue—takes this lopsided approach.

Now, let's remember, 98 percent of our House Republican colleagues, while they come down here and talk about how we have this big deficit and debt problem, they have signed a pledge that says we're not going to ask for one penny of additional contribution from people making more than $1 million a year to help reduce our deficit, not one penny. We won't take one penny of taxpayer subsidies away from the big oil companies to help reduce the deficit.

And the math is pretty simple after that. If you say from the beginning you're not going to ask people making $1 million a year to help do a little more to reduce our common deficit, if you say you're not going to ask companies that have these tax loopholes that actually incentivize them to ship jobs overseas to pay a little bit more, what do you do? Your budget has to whack everyone else, and that's what it did. That's why their budget ended the Medicare guarantee. That's why they cut $800 billion from Medicaid—two-thirds of Medicaid spending goes to help seniors and disabled people in nursing homes. That's why they slash vital investments in education, research, infrastructure, things that had been bipartisan investments to help our economy grow. That's what they did then.

And now on this sequester proposal, what do they do? The chairman talks about eligibility. These are people who are eligible to get food and nutrition assistance because they're struggling. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, which is our referee around here, has told us what the real-world consequences of their proposal before us today would be. Over 22 million households with kids would see their food and nutrition support reduced; 300,000 kids knocked off the school lunch program; 300,000 kids knocked off the Children's Health Insurance Program. Those are the kinds of choices they make because they refuse to take a balanced approach to this deficit issue.

Now, I want to say one word about defense spending. Last August, as part of the bipartisan Budget Control Act, our Republican colleagues deliberately chose to expose defense spending to deep additional cuts rather than ask millionaires and big corporations to share a greater responsibility for paying for our national security. Now our Republican colleagues are on the floor today saying these defense cuts would devastate our national security; but they still, even today, apparently aren't concerned enough about the impact of those cuts on national security to ask millionaires to pay a little bit more for our common defense. That's the same kind of mentality that led us to put two wars—Iraq and Afghanistan—on our national credit card. Even as we asked our soldiers to sacrifice, we said we're just going to put that on our national credit card.

So there's a fundamental question here: If you're so concerned about those cuts to defense, why is it you won't close one special interest tax loophole to help pay for them?

We, the Democrats, had a substitute amendment that we would have been able to debate and vote on right here today. We took an alternative approach. We also prevented those defense cuts. You know how we did it? We said we don't need to make these big agricultural subsidies in direct payments. We also don't think we should have taxpayer subsidies for the big oil companies. We did it in a different way. Apparently, our Republican colleagues are kind of worried about what we were going to propose because they brought a closed rule to the floor, meaning Democrats didn't have an opportunity to get a vote on our alternative.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 1 minute to say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman's substitute raises taxes $85 billion and raises spending $55 billion on the net to achieve simply $30 billion in deficit reduction. This bill achieves $243 billion in deficit reduction without raising taxes.

The ratio of tax increases to spending cuts gross 3 to 1. That's what they think balance is.

□ 1110

Let's look at food stamps. Food stamps went up 270 percent over the last decade. If this passes, it will have gone up 260 percent.

Let's talk about Medicaid and SCHIP. This program has gone up 50 percent over the last 10 years. It's projected to grow 125 percent over the next 10 years. If this passes, it will grow 123 percent over the next 10 years.

If we can't have a civil debate about how to slow the growth of spending around here then we'll never get this under control. Medicaid alone made $15.8 billion in overpayments in 2011 alone. If we can't deal with this waste, if we can't deal with this overspending, we can't fix this problem.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes of my time to Mr. HENSARLING of the Financial Services Committee, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to yield time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) will control the time.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, the Financial Committee's work on this reconciliation package saves more than $35 billion. But more importantly, it does what 2,300 pages of Dodd-Frank, 400 new regulations, over 2,000 newly hired Federal regulators, many them living in my Maryland colleague's district, and more than $24 million worth of compliance work required of America's companies, at the cost of $100 billion, don't: it ends the bailouts.

A bailout fund doesn't end the bailout; it guarantees them. We're telling the big banks what my Democratic colleagues didn't want to tell them: if they make risky bets and make bad decisions, they're on the hook, not the taxpayers. No more privatizing the profits, no more socializing the losses. In short, no more bailouts, period.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. At this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member VAN HOLLEN.

Well, here we are again. America is still recovering from the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, and the Republicans don't

seem to understand that we need to focus on job creation.

Our economy has been producing private sector jobs each month for the last 2 years, in stark contrast to the Bush years. But today we're not debating job growth to balance the budget. We aren't considering a transportation bill today. No, that would create the most new jobs, making real investments in America by putting people back to work and growing our economy.

Today we are debating nothing more than the latest political talking points for the Republican Party. We all know that this strategy is going nowhere in the Senate. So instead of focusing on economic growth and job creation, the Republicans have decided to protect their rich friends and slash the programs that the most needy in our country depend upon.

While protecting the well-heeled, here's what the Republican bill does to ordinary families:

Cuts health coverage for the least among us, 300,000 low-income children.

The Republican bill slashes food and nutrition support for the unemployed and for struggling children and families.

The Republican bill eliminates Social Services Block Grants, which give States and local communities flexibility to target funding for essential services like Meals on Wheels, preventing child abuse and neglect, and providing child care for working parents.

The Republican bill wants to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund established under the Affordable Care Act. And what does that do? It supports cancer screenings, including for breast and cervical cancer, immunizations, education, research, and prevention, which, in the end, saves the most money. Prevention saves money.

If the Republicans were serious about putting our fiscal house in order, they would put forward a serious proposal that grows our economy and creates jobs to balance the budget and involves shared sacrifice. That's how you balance budgets—you grow the economy.

I look forward to that day.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, a lot of discussion here this morning about who we're protecting. Well, really the reason we're here today is to protect the future of America.

They're throwing around a lot of large numbers here, but I think what we need to do is put in perspective what we're talking about here today. I want to talk to you about a little family that's making $24,000 a year. Unfortunately, this family is spending $37,000 a year, so they're spending $13,000 more a year than they're making.

And they just got their credit card statement the other day, Mr. Speaker, and they found out they owe $157,000 on their credit card. And people out there would say, that's a family that doesn't have a future.

Unfortunately, the family that I'm just talking about here, Mr. Speaker, is the United States of America, because I took the eight zeros off of the front of these numbers that we're kicking around today.

So I think the American people ought to be excited that we're here today making a start. And let me point out, this is just a start to addressing a very large problem. And so when we go into some of the programs out there like the Consumer Protection Financial Bureau basically that was tucked inside the Fed, has no accountability, that was the reason I was pleased to introduce H.R. 1355 to bring accountability to that.

The American people deserve accountability, and they also deserve for this body to come together and work on this very large problem because, as has been pointed out, a lot of the things that we actually vote on, in fact, this $13,000 deficit, if we eliminated the part of spending that we are talking about voting on in these appropriation bills, it would only eliminate $11,000 of that deficit. And so this family would still have a $2,000 budget deficit, even after we eliminate all of the programs that we vote on.

Mr. Speaker, this is the business that we are supposed to be about. Let's work together and protect the future of our children and our grandchildren so that they will have a future, they will have an opportunity to have jobs and opportunities in America.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I just would like to respond to the chairman of the Budget Committee in terms of the ratio of cuts to revenue. I think the gentleman will recall that one of the recommendations that the bipartisan commission made was the trillion dollars in cuts that we made as part of the Budget Control Act, that was 100 percent cuts. If you take that into account, the reality is what we've done so far with our proposal is 92 percent cuts, 8 percent revenue, and with that revenue generated by closing those tax loopholes I talked about earlier.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act, the second phase in the Republicans' Pathway to Poverty plan.

This bill, once again, fails to reach any measure of fairness and shared responsibility. All of us agree that the implementation of sequestration would be a damaging, harmful approach to take in an effort to achieve deficit reduction.

The difference between Democrats and Republicans is that, instead of taking a balanced approach, the Republicans would replace sequestration with tax breaks to millionaires and special interests while ending the Medicare guarantee, slashing investments that strengthen our economy, and shredding the social safety net. Not surprisingly, important provisions of the Affordable Care Act are in their sights.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund was an unprecedented investment in our Nation's health and well-being, particularly the health of America's women and children. By providing funding for vital cancer and infection screenings, modernizing vaccine systems, and the fight against epidemics like obesity and diabetes, this fund truly invests in our Nation's health, and it will provide savings down the line by helping to catch afflictions early.

By seeking to undermine the Affordable Care Act, the Republican reconciliation bill would eliminate funding for hundreds of thousands of lifesaving screenings, all to score political points with their extreme base.

Mr. Speaker, just a few years ago, when I was 41 years old, I found a lump in my breast, which was confirmed to be cancer in a series of screenings, including a clinical screening just like the ones that this fund provides. These screenings saved my life.

But this bill would prevent 326,000 women from having access to the same lifesaving screenings that I did. It will prevent an estimated 10,300 women from being diagnosed with breast and cervical cancer in its early stages, and it may cost them their lives.

Furthermore, this bill slashes funding for screening for birth defects, developmental disabilities, and hearing loss in children.

How can any of us, in good conscience, cut funding by cutting investments in children's health?

Frankly, as a mom of three young kids, I'm stunned because I think it's just common sense that you don't pay down a deficit our children didn't create by compromising their health.

Our constituents deserve a balanced approach to deficit reduction. The Republicans' approach would deny women like me access to screenings that save lives and deny children the screenings they need so we can keep them healthy. It's unacceptable, and I ask colleagues with a conscience to vote down this terrible bill.

□ 1120

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

It is important for us to remember why we are here. We are here because the President's policies have failed—a trillion-dollar deficit, a second trillion-dollar deficit, a third trillion-dollar deficit, and now a fourth trillion-dollar deficit—putting the Nation on the road to bankruptcy. That's why we have a reconciliation bill before us.

I hear my friends on the other side of the aisle talk about deep cuts. The deepest cuts that are happening in America today are to the family budgets of breadwinners who are either unemployed or underemployed due to the

economic policies of this administration. We just got the news last month: the third month in a row where job growth is down. We're not even keeping pace. We have the lowest labor force participation rate in 30 years because, Mr. Speaker, people have given up on the Obama economy. Those are the deep cuts that truly count.

Republicans have a plan for America's job creators. We want to get this economy going; and as we do, as people go back to work, they will get off of the welfare checks and onto the paychecks. That's what counts. So Republicans have brought forth a reconciliation plan that says, You know what? Maybe we ought to quit spending money we don't have, and maybe this will help provide part of the confidence that job creators need to put America back to work.

I am very proud of the work that was done on the Financial Services Committee, among other things, to end the perpetual Wall Street bailout fund that was put in by the Democrats in the Dodd-Frank bill, because if you lose your ability to fail in America, you lose your ability to succeed, and the American people are tired of the bailouts.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, before I turn to one of my colleagues, let me say in response to my friend Mr. HENSARLING that the American people are well aware of what was happening to the economy the very day the President was sworn in as President of the United States: losing 800,000 jobs every month, the economy in free fall, almost 9 percent in negative economic growth. People's retirement savings had dropped by one-third compared to where they were in 2007. That's the economy the President inherited.

As a result of the extraordinary measures taken by the President, by the previous Congress and, most importantly, with the fortitude of the American people, what we see is this. After the day the President was sworn in and when the economy was in free fall—those were jobs lost—we began to lift ourselves slowly out. We have now had 25 consecutive months of positive private sector job growth.

Is it enough? No. Of course, we had no help from our Republican colleagues in working on the turnaround. The President's jobs bill that he submitted to this House last September is still sitting here. Fortunately, we finally did a piece of it with the payroll tax cut.

My Republican colleagues say they have an answer. Their answer is back to the old trickle-down economics: another round of tax breaks for the folks at the very top, and somehow that's going to trickle down and lift everybody up.

Do you know what? We tried it. It didn't work. It was called 8 years of the Bush administration. We had two back-to-back tax cuts at the end of the 8 years, a net job loss in the private sector after those 8 years, and we had big deficits. The last time we had a balanced budget here was in 2001, which was before those policies. So it is important for us to get the history of the past right in order to make sure we know how to move forward properly in the future.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this just as I appreciate his setting the stage in terms of why we're here, in terms of what President Obama inherited when he was elected to office.

But another reason we're here is that the Republican leadership doesn't want to work with us in a balanced and reasonable way to reduce the deficit and get us on a sustainable path. Nothing is a greater illustration of this than the response to an amendment that I offered in the Budget Committee. On Monday, when we were dealing with this, I offered up to my colleagues:

Instead of eliminating food stamp benefits for 2 million people, cutting benefits early to 20 months, reducing benefits for 44 million people in total, school lunches for 280,000 children, I said, Wait a minute. Why don't we work together on something that we agree on?

I've worked with the chairman of the Budget Committee in the past to try and reform agriculture subsidies. We got reconciliation instruction from the Ag Committee that takes it all out of the nutrition for poor people, for children, for struggling families. I said, Why don't we go to where we agree: crop insurance wastes billions, and direct payments go to farmers who don't need them and don't deserve them.

We have an opportunity to put reasonable limits on the amount that goes to the wealthiest agribusiness interests. We've worked on that together. A majority of the Budget Committee, I'm sure, agrees. It would pass on the floor, and we could meet this objective and more without assaulting the well-being of 44 million struggling Americans. I've looked at those people in my community, and I can't imagine my colleagues who are proposing this have worked with the food kitchens, have worked with the food stamp recipients.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. The answer, in part, was that we can't do this. We do agree on some farm reform, but we have to do it when we reform the farm bill. That's coming up for reauthorization later. You'll have to do it in the farm bill. That's where we deal with direct payments. That's where we deal with crop insurance.

Hello? Where are food stamps authorized? They're in the exact same farm bill, and the Republicans have decided they're going to ignore this opportunity for a bipartisan compromise that will save more money and protect families. Instead, they're going to protect agribusiness and avoid an opportunity for everybody to win on the floor. It's shameful and should be rejected.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CANSECO).

Mr. CANSECO. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Financial Services Committee has responsibly contributed, roughly, $35 billion in deficit reduction measures to this bill, and I am happy that one of these measures that I sponsored—a repeal of the Office of Financial Research—was adopted by voice vote in our committee. This agency, which was created by the Dodd-Frank, is a threat to the privacy of every American citizen, and it has no place in a system of checks and balances such as ours. Repealing the OFR will save $270 million over 10 years, and Americans will be better off for it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining 1½ minutes.

The American people know that after the Nation's first, second, third, and now fourth trillion-dollar deficit—the American people know after the worst employment record in 30 years—that the problem is with the President's economic policies. Ultimately, the debate comes down to this: Do we have a debt crisis because Washington spends too much or because the American people are undertaxed?

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say a nation can tax its way into economic growth, that it can tax its way into economic prosperity. They want to impose taxes on 40 percent of the income on small businesses, and they somehow think they will create more jobs.

Mr. Speaker, if you gave them every job-harming tax increase that they have asked for, it would be roughly 16 percent of the additional $11 trillion of debt that the President wants to put on this economy, our children and our grandchildren. The American people know we can do better. It is time to quit spending money we don't have for jobs the stimulus program never creates.

□ 1130

I'm proud to be a part of this reconciliation package which will save the draconian cuts that are aimed at our warfighters and their families and be able to begin the process of ensuring that a great Nation lives within its means and that we can give the next generation greater hope, greater opportunity, greater economic growth.

I urge all my colleagues to support this reconciliation bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out that the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office

has stated that as a result of the economic recovery bill and the extraordinary actions that were taken, over 4 million jobs were created or saved. That means a lot to the people who didn't lose their jobs and to the people who were losing their jobs at the rate of 800,000 per month when the President was sworn in. Are we where we want to be? Of course not. Are we a lot better off than we were? We're pulling ourselves up. The last thing we want to do is go back to where we were.

Nobody on the Democratic side has said we can deal with this on the tax side alone. I keep hearing that. It's just not true. We just voted on a bipartisan basis in August for a trillion dollars in cuts. What we propose is what every bipartisan group that has looked at this challenge has said: you have to do this through a combination of cuts, but you also have to get rid of all that pork-barrel stuff in the Tax Code and use some of that to reduce our deficit. Ask the folks who have been making over a million dollars a year to help pay more for our common defense. That is just common sense.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, normally when we think of reconciliation, we think of a coming together, of finding common ground. This is not such a reconciliation. Rather, this is a bill that provides more tax breaks to the few and more pain to the many. It is, in fact, a wreck, as in a train- or auto-wreck—''wreckonciliation.''

There is legitimate concern that we must address our budget difficulties to avoid a long-term budget wreck, but I am concerned about the wreck that this legislation under consideration today poses to the lives of so many Americans. It is a wreck for educational opportunity. The failure of this Budget Committee to address the needs of our youngest Americans with Head Start and early learning, the failure to extend the More Education tuition tax credit that I authored for more opportunity at the Alamo Colleges, at Texas State and institutions across this country.

It is a wreck for our most vulnerable neighbors, the Texas seniors, who rely on one hot meal a day from Meals on Wheels. Their director says it will be ''devastating'' to eliminate the Social Services Block Grant, a wreck for those seniors. It is a wreck for those who are relying on food security, like the 74-year-old who gave me this paper plate at the food bank in San Antonio:

> ''My Social Security check doesn't give me enough to buy any groceries, just my rent and utilities. Without the food bank, I would starve.''

Those are the kinds of people for whom this bill is a wreck right now.

We had a President once who realized the need for shared sacrifice. He had almost half of his budget from new revenue. What he said was that ''closing off special interest loopholes'' was just ''a matter of simple fairness.'' His name was Ronald Reagan. I think we might follow that example.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. We would contrast that example with those Republican Presidential candidates who said they wouldn't support $1 of additional revenue for $10 of spending cuts to get our budget in balance.

This is a ''wreckonciliation'' bill that asks nothing of Mr. Exxon, that asks nothing more of hedge fund managers, but asks those who are most vulnerable in our society to share more pain.

I think we must reject this reconciliation bill which is a wreck for so many American families.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes to just address a few of these.

If you're eligible for food stamps today, you'll be eligible for food stamps tomorrow under this bill. We're simply saying you have to be eligible for this benefit to actually get the benefit.

The slush fund, which is called the Preventive Services Fund, doesn't fund cervical and breast cancer research. It funded things such as the Pitt County, North Carolina, funds for signage to promote recreational destinations, including public parks, bike lanes, and more. The city of Boston received a $1 million grant for urban gardening. The New York Department of Health used a $3 million taxpayer-funded grant from this fund to lobby for a soda-tax initiative. The Cascade Bicycle Club Education Foundation granted $3 million to the Seattle and King County Public Health Facility to use taxpayer dollars to ''improve the walking and biking environment.'' This is where our taxpayer dollars are going.

With regard to the child tax credit, one investigation in Indiana said an illegal immigrant is claiming $29,608 as a tax credit for 20 children who live in Mexico and have never visited the United States before.

What we're saying is government spending on these programs should go to the people who they are intended for, not to people who are not eligible and are not intended for. If we're going to do prevention for health care, then do cancer screenings, do cancer research. Don't fund signs for bike paths.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. MCKEON.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5652.

Fifty percent of the savings that we have already generated this year have come from the military cuts, and we're talking about adding another $500 billion to $600 billion on top of that next January with sequestration. That's over a trillion dollars a year coming out of the military over the next 10 years, while defense spending only accounts for less than 20 percent of our budget and while we're fighting a war in Afghanistan and facing other uncertainties around the world.

Let me remind everyone here of the major consequences of sequestration. There will be 200,000 troops taken out of the Army and the Marines, bringing our force level down below pre-9/11 levels. The ability to respond to contingencies in North Korea and Iran and other hot spots around the world will be put in jeopardy. We will have a fleet of fewer than 230 ships for a Navy that has protected the sea lanes around the world and our commerce. Ninety-five percent of our commerce travels on the sea. They've protected that since World War II. They'll be taken down to pre-World War I levels.

We'll have a smaller Air Force than at any time since the Air Force was created and two rounds of base closures. That's why Secretary Panetta has said, It's not shooting ourselves in our foot with sequestration; it's shooting ourselves in the head. That's why 31 organizations representing more than 5½ million American troops and veterans have called on Congress to act immediately to prevent these catastrophic cuts to our military.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support our troops, support our national security, and support this bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I also urge all our colleagues to support our troops and support our military, and the Democratic substitute that we offered would have made sure that the sequester on defense spending did not take place.

I have great respect for the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. MCKEON, who just spoke. Here's what he said not long ago. He said:

> We need to address our budget problems comprehensively, through smarter spending and increased revenue.

He also said:

> If it came that I only had two choices, one was a tax increase and one was a cut in defense over and above where we already are, I would go to strengthen defense.

In our Democratic substitute, we said let's close some of those tax loopholes to generate a little more revenue to help pay for defense; let's ask people who are making over a million dollars a year to get rid of some of their tax breaks to help pay for our common defense so that we don't have to have a budget that whacks everybody else in the country. That's what the chairman of the Armed Services Committee said. I agree with him. He got beaten down by many in the Republican Party after he made those comments with them saying, oh, you violated that pledge that says we're not going to raise one more penny of revenue to reduce the deficit. But he was candid.

□ 1140

Unfortunately, neither he nor any one of us are going to have a chance to vote on the Democratic substitute that makes sure that we don't have the defense sequestration. We just do it in a

balanced way, through cuts as well as closing some of these tax loopholes.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, two of the most prominent independent scholars on Congress, Thomas Mann and Norm Ornstein, recently completed a detailed research initiative. They've never been shy in criticizing either side of the aisle. But their latest research concluded that the Republican Party has become ''ideologically extreme; scornful of compromise; unpersuaded by conventional understanding of facts, evidence, and science.'' And they said:

> When one party moves this far from the mainstream, it makes it nearly impossible for the political system to deal constructively with the Nation's challenges.

The Republican budget is a perfect example of that. The Republican budget shields special interests from participating in deficit reduction, and instead says, We want to end Medicare as we know it. We target children and our older neighbors and middle class families for the overwhelming burden of deficit reduction.

If a political party wanted to undermine the health and economic security of millions of American families, well, then, this is the way to do it. And it's too bad, because I believe Democrats and Republicans agree on the need for deficit reduction, but we have starkly different visions on how to get there. Others have called this Republican budget extreme, reverse Robin Hood, destructive, and a threat to middle class security.

And here's an example. In the Budget Committee, I offered an amendment to say, It's time. We don't have the luxury to be giving big oil companies tax breaks any longer. Instead, let's make sure that children across America can see a doctor, can get the immunizations that they need. But what was the vote? The Republicans rejected that commonsense amendment. It was paid for by eliminating these Big Oil subsidies.

This is what Thomas Mann and Norm Ornstein mean by they are ''ideologically extreme.'' It's not in keeping with our values, as Americans. And I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Republican budget and sequestration plan.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to make three points.

That line the gentlelady used about Medicare was rated the ''lie of the year'' in 2011 by PolitiFact. Number two, the reason the Democratic substitute is not being considered is because it violates the House rules. What's interesting about that is, it would have violated the House rules that the Democrats had when they were in the majority. The third point is, when it comes to tax loopholes, we're proposing to close those tax loopholes in order to lower tax rates for American families and businesses to create jobs. They want to do it to prevent spending cuts; $3 of tax increases for $1 of spending cuts is the math and the logic that the other side chooses to use. When you have a spending problem, you've got to cut spending.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to yield time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Oklahoma will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

It's no secret that we're facing a severe debt crisis right now. We have almost $16 trillion in debt piled up. And if we don't act quickly, we will be passing a crushing burden on to our children and grandchildren.

Reducing government spending, though, is never an easy task. We face difficult choices, but House Republicans have lived up to our responsibility to find ways to cut our costs so that we can once again live within our means.

The House Agriculture Committee has been asked to do its part by finding $33 billion in savings over 10 years. We did that by making credible, commonsense reforms to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP. These provisions reduce waste and abuse and close program loopholes.

SNAP, formerly known as food stamps, comprises almost 80 percent of the Agriculture Committee's mandatory spending. Over the past 10 years, the cost of SNAP has nearly tripled, increasing by 270 percent. The changes that we're proposing today cut only 4 percent over the next 10 years.

I would like to make it absolutely clear. None of these recommendations will prevent families that qualify for assistance under SNAP from receiving their benefits. We are working to better target the program and improve its integrity so that families in need can continue to receive nutritional assistance.

Opponents of this legislation would have you believe that we are decimating the nutritional safety net and that hungry children and seniors will be left to fend for themselves. That is a false and misleading scare tactic. It's important to remember that many of the very people opposing these cuts proposed and voted for similar measures during the last Congress when they were in control of this body. Not once, but twice my colleagues on the left voted to cut a temporary increase in SNAP benefits under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. One of those cuts was to pay for the bailout of a union. And now that House Republicans are advocating that same policy, those across the aisle are crying foul.

By ending the artificial increase in SNAP benefits, we can save $5.9 billion over 10 years, and we won't be turning that into more government spending. It will go towards deficit reduction.

This legislation also ends bonuses that have been awarded to States on the taxpayer dime. States are responsible for administering SNAP, and it's their duty to make sure the program is operating in the most efficient and effective fashion. We save nearly $500 million by ending bonuses that are given to States for merely doing their job. We also find savings by closing loopholes that allow States to game the system when administering SNAP.

First, we'll stop States from abusing the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, to inflate SNAP benefits. States are exploiting the interaction between LIHEAP and SNAP by sending a token check to households which can trigger hundreds of dollars in increased SNAP benefits. LIHEAP is a valuable program for households in need of assistance with heating and energy costs. It shouldn't be abused in this fashion.

In New York City, a $1 LIHEAP check triggers an additional $131 in SNAP benefits per month for nearly 90,000 households. In Washington State, a $1 LIHEAP check triggers an additional $43 million in SNAP benefits. That's egregious, and taxpayers know it. These token checks not only undermine the integrity of both SNAP and LIHEAP, but they also cost taxpayers billions of dollars in overpayments. Closing this loophole saves $14.3 billion over 10 years and ensures that both LIHEAP and SNAP are targeted to the families who truly need the assistance.

Another loophole we've closed is called categorical eligibility, which allows any household that receives a benefit from certain low-income assistance programs to become automatically eligible for SNAP. Some of these benefits can be as simple as providing a household with a pamphlet or access to a 1–800 number hotline. When States implement categorical eligibility, these households do not need to meet SNAP or gross income tests. That's how lottery winners slip through the cracks and continue to receive nutrition assistance. When someone is categorically eligible for SNAP, States don't have to verify assets, like lottery winnings.

And it isn't just lottery winners that are unfairly collecting benefits either. The Cincinnati Enquirer reported that one woman collecting $500 per month in SNAP benefits had $80,000 in savings, a paid-for home valued at about $300,000, and a Mercedes.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LUCAS. So let me repeat what I said earlier: These provisions do not decimate the program and leave struggling families to fend for themselves. What they do is restore program integrity. They reserve taxpayer dollars for families that are in need of assistance.

Every one of these provisions represents common sense and good government in a time of fiscal restraint.

There's no denying that SNAP provides important support to many Americans.

□ 1150

That's why it's important that we ensure the integrity of the program. Those who qualify for SNAP under the law will continue to receive benefits.

By voting for this package, we're not only doing our part to reduce the debt, we're improving the implementation of this important program while continuing to meet the nutritional needs of our fellow Americans.

I urge my colleagues to put aside the rhetoric and vote for these reforms.

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

First, I would just like to respond to the chairman of the Budget Committee and point out that the Rules Committee waived three rules to bring the Republican legislation to the floor. It couldn't waive one rule to allow a Democratic substitute to have an up-or-down vote. And the one rule you wouldn't waive is the one that rigs the process against closing special interest tax loopholes.

To the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, I think everybody needs to know that the Ag Committee didn't reduce one subsidy to ag businesses—not one. Even though the overall Republican budget says it should be $30 billion, there's a bipartisan bill that would do that, but not one. Instead, they took $33 billion out of food and nutrition programs.

Now, we should be very clear on this. People say that they're going to make sure that everyone who's eligible to get food stamps will. And then they say, under SNAP, suggesting that there are a lot of people who are getting it who are cheating. That's not true. All those other people are eligible. They're eligible.

And it's not Democratic scare tactics saying all these people are going to lose their access to food and nutrition programs. It's the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the referee here, that was never contested by our Republican colleagues in the Budget Committee. They say 22 million American households with children will see their food and nutrition support reduced; 2 million Americans, approximately, will lose all access to the food and nutrition programs through SNAP; 300,000 kids will lose the school lunch program. Those aren't our facts. That's what the Congressional Budget Office says.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Thank you, Ranking Member VAN HOLLEN.

I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5652, the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act.

Not long ago, we were here debating a very misguided budget resolution. And today, with H.R. 5652, the leadership has decided to double down on the draconian cuts that were contained in that budget.

We should be able to come together and have a frank discussion about deficit reduction. That is what the American people expect, and that's what the American people deserve. But instead, here we are today considering another bill, and here we are today with another missed opportunity. There's not even the ability to consider a balanced alternative today. This is of particular concern because of what is actually in this bill.

Instead of cutting back generous agriculture subsidies, this bill is cutting food stamps, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. This means a reduction in benefits for an estimated 47 million people and a loss of benefits for almost 2 million people.

Instead of closing loopholes for oil companies, this bill eliminates the Social Services Block Grant—not reduces, not tweaks, eliminates the Social Services Block Grant—which are grants that assist States in providing a wide range of services, from support to Meals on Wheels, to foster care. These are programs that feed struggling seniors and protect abused children. These are just two examples.

Now, we have a moral responsibility to get this right, Mr. Speaker. This bill, yet again, attempts to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable—our seniors, our children, those who are struggling—while not asking the most fortunate in our society to contribute anything more.

I urge my colleagues to reject this latest misguided effort by voting against H.R. 5652.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds simply to say that the Social Services Block Grant, according to the Government Accountability Office, is a textbook example of overlap and duplication of Federal programs. It's one of 69 programs to fund early education; it's one of 200 programs serving Americans with disabilities; and it's one of 49 programs providing education and training services. The program demands no accountability for results and provides no means to measure the impact of the programs.

Mr. Speaker, we've got to end duplication and waste in government. We're saying also, on the tax side, close loopholes for tax reform, not to fuel more spending.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to yield time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania will control the time.

There was no objection.

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

The reconciliation package we bring to the floor today sensibly reduces spending so that we can continue to adequately defend our Nation.

The first responsibility of the Federal Government is to keep our Nation safe from foreign threats. By cutting wasteful spending and reforming programs, we can continue to maintain a military that keeps us secure at home and makes the world a more peaceful place.

I am proud to report that the Energy and Commerce Committee exceeded the budget instructions by $17 billion to save a total of $114 billion over 10 years. In three titles, we cut wasteful programs created by ObamaCare, reform the Medicaid program, and reform our broken medical liability system.

With the Nation struggling with trillion-dollar deficits, the President chose to increase government spending by more than another $1 trillion with his health care law. This wasn't reform; it was a government takeover of one-sixth of the U.S. economy that will increase dependency and bankrupt the Nation. We continue to push for full repeal, but also do everything we can to stop wasteful and unwise spending immediately.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is a classic example of how government bureaucrats fail to spend public funds wisely. The health care law provided an advance appropriation of $16 billion and called for a permanent annual allotment of $2 billion per year for this fund. That's $2 billion a year in perpetuity. So, in 2036, 2037, and 2057, the Secretary of HHS has complete authority over this $2 billion to spend on whatever he or she wishes without coming back for appropriations authorization from Congress. Let's call this what it is: It's a slush fund for the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Almost any program can make a claim that it is preventative. The Secretary has the sole role of control of the fund and, so far, has found some quite interesting ways to spend it. For example:

In Pitt County, North Carolina, a recipient used the money to fund signage for parks and bike lanes;

In Boston, they spent $1 million on urban gardening;

One of the vaunted successes of the program was getting the city of Baldwin Park, California, to put a 9-month moratorium on construction of fast food restaurants. Government should be encouraging job creation, not finding ways to stop it for a few months;

New York spent $3 million to lobby for a soda tax issue;

Philadelphia spent money to push for higher State cigarette excise taxes. Why on Earth is the Federal Government paying for campaigns to lobby State governments?

These are all examples from just the last 2 years. Who knows what projects will get money in the future.

We have numerous public health and prevention funds that can be managed through the yearly appropriations process. A permanent slush fund with

limited oversight guarantees that money will be wasted every year.

We also repealed the unlimited authority to fund the implementation of State health insurance exchanges. ObamaCare gave the Secretary a credit card with no limit, a bottomless direct appropriation. This is unprecedented and unwise. Again, we need oversight in order to make sure that the public's money is being wisely spent. Congress never should have abdicated its authority in this area, and now we need to reclaim it.

We defund the CO-OP program before billions of public dollars can be lost. The Office of Management and Budget estimates that a significant portion of the funds given to unproven CO-OPs would never be returned to the Treasury. We would stop this funding before HHS creates its own Solyndra.

□ 1200

The President's health care law places a dramatically increased burden on State Medicaid programs. The maintenance of effort provisions restrict States from making commonsense reforms to stop fraud and abuse. We know that Medicaid is rife with fraudulent claims. In 2011, there were $15 billion in improper payments. We need to give States the flexibility to run these programs efficiently and to help the truly needy.

We also repeal an unwise bonus program that encourages States to undermine the integrity of the program. We should not place unnecessary barriers to qualifying for Medicaid, but neither should we encourage States to oversimplify reviews of eligibility. We do not have unlimited funds. Again, Medicaid coverage needs to be open only to the truly needy.

Finally, we include real medical liability reform in this reconciliation package. The President's health care law gave a pitiful $50 million for liability reform demonstration projects.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PITTS. This is paying lip service to a $200 billion problem.

I recently heard from a doctor who has been practicing in my district for decades. He bemoaned defensive medicine but was even more concerned that doctors being trained in today's climate don't even realize that they are prescribing unnecessary tests.

Defensive medicine is simply becoming the norm. Medical liability reform means saving for consumers, for doctors, and for the government.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the job we've done in the Energy and Commerce Committee.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the reconciliation package.

I would now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise today to engage in a colloquy with my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), chairman of the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I am clearly no fan of ObamaCare, and I know that you are not as well, Mr. PITTS. You and your committee have done some excellent work in the reconciliation process in eliminating some of the major spending abuses in this law. I do have a concern, however, with one of the provisions that would affect Puerto Rico and what they receive in Medicaid funding.

The fact of the matter is the question regarding Medicaid funding for the territories was separate and has been separate from many issues that many of us on this side of the aisle find so objectionable in ObamaCare—for example, like the individual mandate and the raid on Medicare and the slew of job-killing new taxes and regulations. They are at least partially responsible for the unacceptable unemployment situation, including 10 percent unemployment among Hispanics in the United States.

As you know, the bill before us returns the Medicaid funding cap and Federal match to pre-ObamaCare levels for the U.S. territories.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. If I may have an additional 30 seconds, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. An additional 30 seconds. I've got three other committees that are coming.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I thank the gentleman.

For years, the territories have expressed concern with the funding levels, and I believe that PPACA was a vehicle to try to alleviate some of those concerns. My hope is that we can work together, along with Governor Fortuño, who has been the most fiscally responsible Governor in Puerto Rico, looking into the funding levels in Medicaid so that we can properly address the needs of the millions of U.S. citizens in the territories.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the gentleman's concerns and want to assure him that these issues deserve the attention of my Health Subcommittee. And as we continue the legislative process, I will gladly work with the gentleman and Governor Fortuño to address the needs of our most vulnerable citizens in the territories.

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

I know it makes our Republican colleagues feel better when they pretend that these cuts don't harm real people, but the reality is they do harm real people, and the cuts that were made in Energy and Commerce will mean that 300,000 children will no longer get health care throughout the Children's Health Insurance Program. That's not my fact. That's from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

We have heard a lot about the fact that cuts to the prevention fund to help provide for healthier starts, that won't have any impact. We hear these stories coming up. I would just like to put in the RECORD information from the Centers for Disease Control that refutes this urban legend that somehow these funds were used to spay or neuter dogs. These things just aren't true.

The reality is that it will mean 326,000 women will not get breast cancer screenings and 284,000 will not get cervical cancer screenings. That's what happens when you zero out the prevention fund.

CDC ANALYSIS: ENERGY & COMMERCE COMMITTEE'S PRESS RELEASE REGARDING COMMUNITIES PUTTING PREVENTION TO WORK

BACKGROUND

CDC carefully monitors grantee activity for appropriate use of Federal funds, and to ensure that investments are directed to evidence-based interventions that make a difference in health.

CDC continues to review all reported allegations regarding grantee activities.

CDC has not found among these examples any instance in which the anti-lobbying prohibitions have been violated. Many allegations relate to activities that were performed by outside organizations not using federal funds, or activities that actually took place before CDC funding was even awarded to the grantee. Other activities are, in fact, permissible under the restrictions, such as educating the public on health risks.

See below for information on CDC's Communities Putting Prevention to Work program, which was primarily funded in FY 2009 with funding from the Recovery Act.

See below for additional information on how CDC implements restrictions on grantee lobbying with Federal funding.

CDC ANALYSIS OF PRESS RELEASE STATEMENTS

On May 2, the Energy and Commerce Committee issued a press release including references to activities of specific CDC grantees. Below is CDC's analysis of each statement and further information relevant to the work being done within these CPPW communities.

PITT COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT, NORTH CAROLINA

Energy and Commerce Press Release Statement: ''Pitt County, North Carolina, a recipient of a CPPW grant funded by health care law, used these federal taxpayer funds to place 'signage to promote recreational destinations including public parks, bike lanes, and more.''

CDC Analysis

Improving physical activity by placing signage about parks, bike lanes and safe routes to school is an effective, evidence-based activity that can increase physical activity.

CPPW staff in Pitt County, North Carolina has been working to implement a wide range of interventions to address obesity prevention within their community.

One of the ten approved objectives included in Pitt County's workplan is to evaluate county planning and include comprehensive land use plans, transportation plans, and other plans that set community standards for biking, walking, and zoning restrictions.

Elements included incorporating elements to improve infrastructure for biking and walking, improve interconnectivity of existing and proposed mobility networks, and make it easier to establish access to healthy food. Among the steps was the implementation of bike racks, signage, and crosswalks once changes to planning documents were implemented.

According to Pitt County, approximately $66,000 of their $1.6 million in CPPW funding supported activities to implement bike racks and signage for cross walks, safe routes to schools, and other directional signs.

This project is the only one of those in the Energy and Commerce release that is funded by PPHF.

NASHVILLE/DAVIDSON COUNTY METRO PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT, TENNESSEE

Energy and Commerce Press Release Statement: The City of Nashville, which received a $7.5 million ''Communities Putting Prevention to Work'' grant, provided free pet spaying and neutering.

CDC Analysis

No CPPW funds were used to pay for spaying or neutering dogs. Rather, a grant from PetSmart paid for the veterinary neutering services.

A published report in The Hill on May 3, 2012 includes a direct account from the grantee that non-Federal funds were used. (http://thehill.com/blogs/healthwatch/health-reform-implementation/225367 -official-no-taxpayer-funds-went-to-neuter -tenn-dogs).

The Nashville/Davidson County CPPW project has been working on a range of strategies to promote safe and accessible opportunities for physical activity.

As part of the effort to increase outdoor physical activity in low income areas, CPPW has worked with other groups on a variety of activities to make parks safe. These include enforcement of an existing leash law and other pet ordinances, increased community awareness of responsible dog ownership, and publicizing referrals to spay/neuter services supported by other funding sources.

The Nashville/Davidson County CPPW project has been involved in promoting safe parks because the large number of loose/stray dogs was identified by the community as a safety risk and environmental barrier to increasing outdoor physical activity in low income areas.

The Nashville/Davidson County CPPW project has been working on a range of strategies to promote safe and accessible opportunities for physical activity and improve nutrition—two modifiable risk factors to prevent obesity.

The Community Guide for Preventive Services includes evidence-based recommendations that creation of or enhanced access to places for physical activity combined with informational outreach activities is effective in increasing levels of physical activity, as measured by an increase in the percentage of people engaging in physical activity or other measures of physical activity.

Early data indicate that the public education campaign has been successful.

This project was funded in 2009 by the Recovery Act, not by the PPHF.

BOSTON PUBLIC HEALTH COMMISSION, MASSACHUSETTS

Energy and Commerce Press Release Statement: ''The City of Boston received $1 million for 'urban gardening.' ''

CDC Analysis

This project tackles two evidence-based strategies for addressing obesity: increasing physical activity, and improving the availability of fresh fruits and vegetables to underserved areas.

The CPPW project in Boston has supported a range of evidence-based strategies to increase opportunities for physical activity and supported four evidence-based projects to improve nutrition among low-income residents in Boston—two modifiable risk factors to prevent obesity. Boston has focused on improving access to fresh fruits and vegetables in neighborhoods that have limited access.

Up to 360,000 Bostonians now have increased access to fresh fruits and vegetables as a result of this CPPW investment.

CPPW funds are being used to improve access to affordable produce in Roxbury, Mattapan, and Dorchester, which have higher rates of obesity—at 40 percent, 33 percent, and 31 percent, respectively—and chronic disease than the city as a whole.

The project includes hiring and training up to 250 youths to work with The Food Project to build 400 backyard gardens in the three neighborhoods; transforming a vacant 10,000-square foot greenhouse in the heart of Roxbury into a community growing and education center; doubling the number of community garden plots in Dorchester, and expanding the Nightingale Garden in Dorchester by 65,000 square feet, so that it stretches across 1.5 acres.

To ensure the sustainability of these urban gardening gains, Boston has enacted citywide changes regarding use of open city land to encourage temporary or permanent land utilization for community gardens and other agricultural use.

An evaluation of a large urban gardening project found that gardeners reported a higher consumption of specific vegetables and a lower consumption of sweet foods and drinks than non-gardeners. Focus groups conducted with inner-city youth revealed that those involved in garden programs reported more willingness to eat healthy food and try unfamiliar food, than those not involved in a program.

This project was funded in 2009 by the Recovery Act, not by the PPHF.

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Energy and Commerce Press Release Statement: ''The New York Department of Health used a $3 million taxpayer-funded grant to lobby for a soda tax initiative.''

CDC Analysis

The press release mischaracterizes the program, which is not one that used CDC funding.

CDC has been in contact with the grantee and the grantee reports that no CPPW funds were used by the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) to lobby the New York State Legislature for a soda tax.

The actual use of CPPW funding by NYSDOH is to implement strategies to increase access to healthy food choices.

CDC worked with NYSDOH at the beginning of the project period to ensure that activities were both appropriate and in compliance with applicable anti-lobbying provisions. CDC has monitored the use of funds throughout project implementation.

As background, prior to CPPW funds being awarded, the Governor's office initiated and put forth a soda tax proposal. However, the Governor did not pursue implementing a tax and withdrew his proposal, and the grantee has stated no CPPW dollars were used to pursue this.

This project was funded in 2009 by the Recovery Act, not by the PPHF.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH, CALIFORNIA

Energy and Commerce Press Release Statement: '' . . . moratorium on fast food construction in Baldwin Park, California . . .''

CDC Analysis

No Los Angeles County CPPW funds were used to lobby for a moratorium on fast food restaurants. The presentation referenced in the press release referred to a city-led and funded initiative supported by the California Center for Public Health Advocacy, an independent organization, and was not supported by CPPW funding.

Los Angeles County work on a moratorium predated the inception of the CPPW program. These efforts were documented to have started in 2008 by this independent organization.

This independent organization has provided education and community-driven feedback to the City Planning Department in Baldwin Park, California. Los Angeles County reports that no CPPW funds were used to support lobbying activities.

CDC staff regularly interact with grantees to ensure that they are implementing the activities and strategies set forth in the grantee's work plan and that grantees are adhering to administrative requirements, including adhering to provisions relating to lobbying.

This project was funded by the Recovery Act, not the PPHF.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

Energy and Commerce Press Release Statement: ''. . . increased cigarette taxes in South Carolina.''

CDC Analysis

The South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control reports that no CPPW funds supported lobbying for the South Carolina Cigarette Tax.

CPPW funds were used for public education efforts on the science of health effects of second hand smoke exposure. Activities included developing fact sheets for the public that provided scientific data.

CDC staff regularly interact with grantees to ensure that they are implementing the activities and strategies set forth in the grantee's work plan and that grantees are adhering to administrative requirements, including adhering to provisions relating to lobbying.

This project was funded in 2009 by the Recovery Act, not by the PPHF.

PHILADELPHIA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH, PENNSYLVANIA

Energy and Commerce Press Release Statement: ''The Philadelphia Department of Public Health used their taxpayer-funded grant to push for higher state cigarette excise tax rates.''

CDC Analysis

No CPPW funds are being used by PDPH for lobbying or for any other activities in support of a state cigarette excise tax.

Philadelphia Department of Public Health (PDPH) has been researching potential opportunities for a higher cigarette excise tax at the local level, but this does not fall within the scope of CPPW activity and is not being paid for by CPPW funds.

This project was funded in 2009 by the Recovery Act, not by the PPHF.

SEATTLE AND KING COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH, WASHINGTON

Energy and Commerce Press Release Statement: ''The Cascade Bicycle Club Education Foundation received a portion of the $3 million grant awarded to Seattle and King County Public Health and used the taxpayer dollars to 'improve the walking and biking environment.' ''

CDC Analysis

CPPW project in Seattle/King County has been working to implement a wide range of

evidence-based strategies to address obesity prevention.

One of the seventeen approved objectives included within Seattle and King County's CPPW obesity workplan is to increase opportunities for physical activity through changes made to local transportation plans and other planning tools.

Evidence-based infrastructure changes to support bicycling and walking are interventions that aim to increase physical activity as means to combat obesity, and are working in Seattle/King County where 327,000 residents already benefit from sustainable changes made in their neighborhoods.

Sustainable changes have come from technical assistance from the project that led to improvements in approaches to new and reconstructed roadways in the area meet safety and mobility needs of all travelers, including pedestrians and bicyclists and also community members who have visual or mobility impairments.

This project was funded in 2009 by the Recovery Act, not by the PPHF.

BACKGROUND: CDC'S COMMUNITIES PUTTING PREVENTION TO WORK INITIATIVE

Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) is primarily a Recovery Act funded program that provides states and localities with resources to support locally designed efforts to create healthy environments for their residents.

The preponderance of work under the CPPW program has been completed; most were one-time awards made in FY 2009.

Only one community listed in the press release, Pitt County North Carolina, is funded by the Prevention and Public Health Fund (PPHF).

Each CPPW community selected strategies from evidence-based interventions based on local context, priorities, and capacity. CDC provided support to these communities through a competitive process. Awardees then developed a locally relevant workplan, which allowed CDC to monitor progress on an ongoing basis.

CPPW programs are funded under a 2-year cooperative agreement to implement evidence- and practice-based strategies, with overarching goals, such as increasing availability of healthy foods and beverages, improving access to safe places for physical activity, discouraging tobacco use, and encouraging smoke-free environments.

Each workplan represents a multi-pronged approach to address obesity and/or tobacco prevention. All objectives and activities included within the workplan must comply with federal lobbying restrictions.

CDC does not allow funding to be used for lobbying at the Federal, state, or local level. Awards include specific language to this effect; grantees are educated on this requirement; and CDC monitors the use of grant funds by grantees and their sub-recipients to ensure compliance.

What problem was CPPW designed to address?

CPPW provides a significant investment in the prevention of chronic diseases.

Obesity and tobacco are two leading causes of preventable death and disability.

CPPW aims to address poor nutrition, lack of physical activity and tobacco use to make an impact on preventing serious health problems such as heart disease, stroke, type 2 diabetes, and cancer.

Annually obesity-related medical spending costs our nation $147 billion.

Annually, tobacco use costs our nation $96 billion in direct medical expenses.

Seven out of ten deaths among Americans each year are from chronic diseases.

BACKGROUND: CDC STEPS TO PREVENT LOBBYING WITH FEDERAL FUNDING

CDC is committed to ensuring the proper use of appropriated funds, and to ensuring awardees' compliance with all applicable regulations and statutes related to lobbying activities. CDC's policy prohibits lobbying at the federal, state, and local levels. These restrictions apply to CDC grants, including the CPPW and CTG programs.

CDC awardees, including those in the CPPW and the CTG programs, are informed about the federal laws relating to use of federal funds, including applicable anti-lobbying provisions. Included within funding opportunity announcements is specific language restricting lobbying, including ''any activity designed to influence action in regard to a particular piece of pending legislation.'' This lobbying prohibition was also included within the terms and conditions to which each grantee agreed prior to receiving federal funds. In addition, CDC staffs has conducted trainings for CPPW and CTG awardees on these prohibitions.

Applicable lobbying restrictions do not prohibit awardees from interacting with policymakers. Federal law allows many activities that are not considered lobbying and that community awardees may decide to pursue. For example, awardees may use funds to disseminate information about public health problems and science-based solutions and to implement specific programs, such as evidence-based educational materials and media on the health effects of increasing physical activity or decreasing exposure to secondhand smoke.

We take our responsibility as stewards of taxpayer dollars very seriously. CDC staff interact with awardees regularly to monitor implementation of the activities and strategies set forth in awardees' work plans and compliance with administrative requirements, including provisions related to lobbying. In addition, CDC staff monitors the use of federal funds by awardees using tools such as on-site review and risk mitigation plans.

CDC continues to review all reported allegations regarding grantee activities. Thus far, we have not found among these examples any instance in which the anti-lobbying prohibitions have been violated. Many allegations relate to activities that were performed by outside organizations not using federal funds, or activities that actually took place before CDC funding was even awarded to the grantee. Other activities are, in fact, permissible under the restrictions, such as educating the public on health risks.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ), a member of the Budget Committee, who has focused very clearly on these health issues.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the ranking member's comments and his good work and important work on the plan, the Republican plan and the Democratic alternative.

Let me start by saying very clearly, once again, House Republicans are taking a shortsighted approach to deficit reduction and economic growth in this country. The Federal budget is a statement of our priorities and our values as a Nation, and Republicans have made their priorities and their values very clear. The Federal budget is about choices: the choice to protect seniors; the choice to grow our middle class; the choice to make smart investments in our economy. Or not.

The Republicans have made their choice very clear. They are choosing to cut prevention and public health efforts, immunizations and flu vaccines, screenings for birth defects, developmental disabilities, and hearing loss in children. They are hurting mothers who need prenatal care, children who need hearing and eye exams, women who need screenings for cancer and heart disease, and our frailest, sickest seniors who need nursing home and in-home care.

Republicans are choosing to eliminate essential health services that save dollars and save lives. This choice will hurt millions of American women, children, and seniors. Instead, Republicans are choosing to protect tax breaks for the largest oil and gas companies and tax breaks for companies that ship American jobs overseas.

There is a better way. The Democratic budget takes a balanced approach to deficit reduction and makes spending cuts and targeted investments to grow our economy, and it meets our obligations to our Nation. The Republican plan rejects this balanced approach. It rejects efforts to grow our economy. It rejects protections for our seniors, our children, and our future. It is the wrong choice for the American people, and we must reject this plan.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5652, to stop sequestration of our Nation's defense. We need certainty in the future of our national defense.

We need certainty in the industry that serves our national defense. We can't wait until January to make decisions about sequestration, what the funding is going to be. The Pentagon will begin in the next month to prepare industry to begin stopping contracts, not issuing contracts, basically putting small suppliers out of business, putting small contractors out of business.

It is important for the readiness of our Nation, to defend our Nation, that we avoid sequestration at all costs. There is much more to be said about this. This is serious. When we talk about sequestration regarding our national defense, this, my colleagues, is serious. We've got to take this first step so, before the deadline, we can complete this job.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5652, the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012. It is the first step we must take if we are to avert sequestration and prevent the dismantling of our national security.

Contrary to what some would say, this is not just a political exercise today. This is a very real action that we must take for our nation to avoid the threat to our national security and our nation's economic security if we do not stop sequestration from taking place next January.

The Secretary of Defense and our nation's senior military leadership have all warned of the severe consequences we face if automatic sequestration takes effect next year. We are a nation at war in Afghanistan, we face multiple threats around the globe, our troops are stretched thin from multiple deployments, and our equipment is wearing out.

These situations will only grow worse with sequestration as we are forced to further draw down our forces and significantly scale back—if not stop altogether—the repair and replacement of our vehicles, aircraft, and ships. And the prospect of a hollow force would be an almost certainty as training and maintenance would be delayed and canceled.

As the Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on National Defense, I know that we have already made a number of difficult spending decisions—$39 billion of cuts last year and any major reductions as required by sequestration will affect the readiness of our troops. I also know that any decision we are going to make about averting sequestration cannot wait until the eleventh hour, as so many other decisions are made before recess.

Our service chiefs tell me that planning will have to begin this summer on how to respond to sequestration. Industry leaders are already hearing the award of contracts will be delayed and that the advance procurement of material and equipment will be postponed. This will not only affect the large defense contractors, but will impact thousands of small businesses in every part of our nation who provide unique components for some of our most critical defense systems.

At a time when our national security remains at risk from emerging threats abroad and from ongoing terrorist operations, our nation's economy also remains at risk from a softening job market that will only worsen with the closure of small defense suppliers and layoffs at larger defense contractors.

The Secretary of Defense has already warned that sequestration could add a full one percent to our nation's unemployment rate—many of these as a direct result of civilian furloughs and military personnel draw downs, but also from the companies and small businesses back home who are second and third-tier suppliers for contracts that will be abrogated or canceled.

Mr. Speaker, this cannot be an issue on which we act then sit and wait for our colleagues in the Senate to respond. This is an issue on which we must work together, in an expedient manner, to send a message to our nation's military leadership and to the leadership of industry that we are serious about averting this crisis and that we are committed to working in a bipartisan manner to do it sooner rather than later.

Our military leadership wants certainty. They want certainty for our troops in the field and for their families at home. The leaders of business and industry want certainty so they can make the investments they need to make to help us rebuild our worn out force. And small business suppliers want certainty that they will be able to continue providing the critiical components for systems that are in many cases their only line of work.

Mr. Speaker, the specter of sequestration is a serious national security issue and it is a serious national economic issue. This is not an issue that will be solved by talking at one another. This is an issue that will only be solved by working together in the best traditions of this House and the Senate. We have risen to the challenge before and we can do so again. The legislation we consider today is a first step in this process. We can't wait or we will face the most severe and in my opinion irreversible consequences for the security of our nation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is serious, and the Democratic substitute proposal would have prevented those cuts from going across the board in defense, as well as the non-defense part of the budget. Unfortunately, our Republican colleagues don't think it is serious enough to ask oil companies to do without taxpayer subsidies to help cover the cost. They apparently don't think it is serious enough to ask people making $1 million a year to help with our deficit reduction to pay for the military that we have.

I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. FRANK, to talk about some of the impact of this on taxpayers.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Republican approach does some cutting, but it does even more shifting. I agreed with The Wall Street Journal editorial of a few weeks ago, which praised the gentleman from Wisconsin because he was shielding the military from any significant cuts and, instead, was making it up from Medicare and Medicaid. That's The Wall Street Journal, Mr. Murdoch, thanking the gentleman from Wisconsin for cutting Medicare and Medicaid, not to balance the budget or reduce the deficit, but to pump up military spending.

Similarly, this claim that they are saving $20-some-odd billion in dealing with the liquidation authority is exactly wrong. What the Republican approach says, and we have a roll call vote in our committee which did this, it continues their position that the large financial institutions, financial institutions with more than $50 billion in assets, should pay nothing—nothing—for the costs of cleaning up the mess.

□ 1210

In our original bill in 2010, we met CBO's requirement that there be a $20 billion cost by assessing the large financial institutions. To get cloture in the Senate, three Republicans managed to back off. In our committee this year, the Republicans said, We don't like this, and it's going to cost $20 billion. CBO, by the way, says that it costs $20 billion only within the 10-year window. CBO said the $20 billion will be paid out, and it will be repaid by the large financial institutions. I will submit another article from The Wall Street Journal making that point.

But here's what the Republicans did: they said, Let's not have the financial institutions be vulnerable. We looked at what CBO said, and we said, okay, CBO says the $20 billion from the financial institutions will come at the end of the 10 years rather than the beginning. So we had an amendment to assess the large financial institutions $20 billion—$29 billion, the CBO said it would cost—at the beginning of the period. The Republicans said the banks were being overtaxed and voted it down on a party-line vote.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 18, 2012]

WOULD REPEAL OF KEY DODD-FRANK PROVISION REALLY SAVE $22 BILLION?

A House committee later today will vote on a bill being pushed by Republicans to repeal a central plank of the 2010 Dodd-Frank financial law, claiming it would save taxpayers $22 billion over 10 years.

The figure triggered some head-scratching around Washington. ''It's tough to understand where the $22 billion comes from—it's a wild assumption since there are currently no cash flows involved with this part of Dodd-Frank,'' Brian Gardner, a Washington analyst with investment bank Keefe, Bruyefte & Woods, in a note to clients. (He's a former GOP Hill aide). ''Republicans on the committee would only eliminate the possibility that the government might have to spend money on liquidating a distress financial firm in the future,'' he wrote, adding that investors shouldn't waste any time thinking about the issue since the GOP bill ''has virtually no shot at passing'' the Senate.

The provision in question is the so-called ''orderly liquidation authority'' that gives regulators broad new powers to take control of faltering megafirms and wind them down in an orderly way so that their failure doesn't wreak havoc on the broader economy a la 2008. The provision does allow the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. to borrow money from the Treasury to finance the process—but that money, by law, has to be paid back to Treasury. If the FDIC can't recoup enough by selling off assets of the failed firm, then regulators will levy a fee on the big financial firms left standing over a five-year period.

House Republicans say they got the $22 billion figure from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. Looking at that office's 2011 cost estimate for the whole Dodd-Frank bill shows how the CBO came up with the number—and the budget quirks behind it that make it far from a tangible boost to government coffers.

First, the CBO assumes regulators have to step in and use their new powers to deal with a teetering financial giant during the next 10 years. That's a pretty big if. Nonetheless, as CBO puts it, while the likelihood of the feds having to use this new process in any year ''is small, the potential costs of liquidating a systemically important firm could be large.'' And experts do say there will be another financial crisis sooner or later.

Even so, the CBO's approach of only looking at 10 years at a time is another quirk at play here. As the agency explained in its 2011 document, ''[A] snapshot of cash flows in any given 10-year budget window is unlikely to net to zero because the spending to liquidate a firm would occur before the income was received to cover those costs.''

In other words, the CBO is assuming that the FDIC won't be able to get all the money it needs to pay back Treasury within the 10-year period—but that doesn't mean that the FDIC won't ever get that money. If the law works as it is supposed to, in the end the total cost to taxpayers would be zero—not $22 billion.

Of course, there are lots of critics who say that this new resolution authority won't work and either regulators or Congress will decide to bailout financial firms when the next crisis strikes, in which case taxpayers would be on the hook. But the CBO is assuming the law works like it's supposed to.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Medicaid is projected to grow at 125 percent over the next decade; under this bill, it will grow 123 percent. Food

stamps grew 270 percent; under this bill, they would have grown 260 percent. Only in Washington is this considered draconian cuts. Slowing the growth of spending is not cutting; it's slowing the growth of spending.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), a member of the Judiciary Committee, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to yield time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Arizona will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I certainly thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it's important, first of all, in this challenge that we have with our Federal budget, to realize that all budgets, whether they are personal budgets or business budgets or budgets by governments, all of them eventually and inevitably come to balance. They either do so by wise fiscal policy or by catastrophic failure.

The fact is that this administration has spent us into the stone age and added to our deficit approximately $1 trillion a year since they came into office. Mr. Speaker, the result is that we have more people living in poverty under this administration than ever before. So there is something wrong with the equation.

Now, having listened to the debate over this reconciliation bill, it's clear to me that Republicans and Democrats have a very fundamental, philosophical difference over whether or not we should take steps to reduce the Federal deficit and avoid the arbitrary and inflexible automatic spending cuts that are set to go into effect next year.

Republicans propose to reduce the deficit and avoid the automatic sequestration by eliminating wasteful programs, wasteful government spending, and curbing fraud in government programs in general. The President, on the other hand, has proposed raising taxes on the American people and American families and businesses, while at the same time increasing Federal Government spending. I cannot think of a more stark contrast, Mr. Speaker.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have demagogued this reconciliation bill beyond recognition. The fact, however, remains that this bill reduces the deficit—not by some parade of horribles, but by stopping fraud, eliminating government slush funds and duplicative programs, and controlling runaway Federal spending. It does so while preventing devastating defense cuts that the Obama administration's own Defense Department has called ''unacceptable.'' And it does so by making sure that the domestic spending cuts that the President's own budget claimed will ''inflict great damage on critical domestic priorities'' do not go unaddressed.

As part of the reconciliation process, the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Speaker, has recommended reforms to our medical liability system to rein in unlimited lawsuits and to make health care more accessible and affordable to all Americans.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Judiciary Committee's proposed medical liability reforms will reduce the deficit by more than $48 billion the very first year and beyond. The simple fact is that frivolous lawsuits drive physicians out of the practice of medicine in the primes of their careers, it pushes others away from high-risk medical specialties, and causes the vast majority of health care providers to practice defensive medicine. Studies indicate that the cost of health care lawsuit abuse is between $230 billion and $650 billion annually. The Judiciary Committee's proposal helps to eliminate the cause of this out-of-control lawsuit abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I would just urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this reconciliation package so that we can both reduce the Federal deficit and avoid the draconian sequestration of Defense Department funding that threatens serious harm to our national security.

Mr. Speaker, just a word on our national security. There is no more important thing to our economy of any kind than making sure that we are doing everything to be productive in a secure environment. If our national security is undermined, our economic security will be writing its own economic obituary.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

We keep hearing from our Republican colleagues that there's nothing more important than making sure we defend our national security. We agree that that's essential. We also agree that we need a strong economy. What's confusing is, if that's so important, why are our Republican colleagues refusing to ask the big oil companies to give up their big subsidies? They've said they don't need them.

So, Mr. Speaker, again, we also keep hearing that these cuts aren't going to have an effect. There's the old saying that you're entitled to your own opinions, but not your own facts. What we've been talking about are facts from the Congressional Budget Office about the number of kids that would lose their health care and the number of struggling families that would lose their food and nutrition support.

I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI).

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the provision in this legislation that would single out the Medicaid programs in the U.S. territories for a 65 percent cut, even though the territories are already treated in a profoundly unequal manner under this program. I'm joined in my opposition to this cut by the Republican Governor of Puerto Rico, Luis Fortuño, who knows discrimination when he sees it.

And I'd like to remind the gentleman from Wisconsin that in the case of the territories, we are talking about an actual cut. We're not talking about a reduction in the growth of our funding, because we have a cap to live with.

Just as we fought to obtain the funding that this bill now seeks to repeal, we will fight alongside our allies in the White House, the Senate, and this Chamber to retain this funding. This is a fight we intend to win.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to yield time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

Our committee has participated in $83 billion worth of this package, saving our men and women in uniform from finding themselves holding wooden rifles. I use that term because it once happened. It wouldn't happen under sequestration, but we would make cuts that would make them just as endangered in some cases as if they were carrying wooden rifles.

Now, many people will talk about public servants in a less than kind way. I am not one of them. The Federal workforce has kept its promises. The Federal workers are not always well led or well managed, but they themselves deliver the product they're asked to deliver. However, the President's own commission—often called Simpson-Bowles on which the chairman of the Budget Committee served—found something that they all agreed on, that was that, in fact, the pension program that we as Federal employees—and I say ''we'' because Members of Congress pay into Social Security, have a 401(k), but we also have a pension—that that pension was more generous than our counterparts in the private sector.

□ 1220

They recommended that we, in fact, make it a 50/50 shared pension. My contribution from our committee, in fact, does that. At a rate of 5 percent, phased in over 5 years, we bring the Federal workforce, members of the civilian DOD, members of your Park Service and Members of Congress, House and Senate, we bring us all into paying what Simpson-Bowles, on a bipartisan basis, very much felt was a fair share.

Now, I want to make sure that everyone understands today that this is, in fact, a changing for members of the Federal workforce from what they perceived they would always have. It will not be easy. They will know that after this goes into effect, they will, in fact,

not have as much take-home as they did the day before.

That's not to say it isn't due, that it isn't known, and it doesn't need to happen. What it's to say is, let's be understanding. These are tough times. The American people have made sacrifices for many years before this one. The Federal workforce has made some sacrifices. The President implemented a pay freeze.

But I must tell you, our looking at it is that because of an outdated system, the pay freeze does not, in fact, freeze pay. Step increases have virtually automatically, almost 100 percent automatically caused the vast majority of these individuals to be eligible and receive pay increases, even at a time in which, theoretically, it was frozen.

Additionally, civil servants know that if we're going to continue to hold on to a civil service workforce that has the confidence of the American people, their wages have to be comparable to their civilian counterparts.

Our committee will continue to work with others to study to make sure we do keep Federal workers fairly paid as compared to the nongovernment workforce. But our bill today takes the President's own recommendations, the recommendations made to the President, and implements them, for a savings over 10 years of $83 billion.

We believe this is the Federal workforce and we, as their representatives, asking them to make a reasonable sacrifice, one that I know they will do, while remaining confident that they will deliver the kinds of products they can.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, there are things that are not in this bill. The kind of pay-for-performance that we'd like to see enhanced, the kind of procedure for a quick remedy for individuals who have become disabled—those are not in there. There are many other savings and improvements for the Federal workforce. We intend to go back on a bipartisan basis and do that.

But when it comes to purely paying your fair share, we believe that Simpson-Bowles got it right. We believe the Federal workforce will not like this, but they will accept that this allows them to say our package is not inherently more generous than the private sector. It's been normalized for it.

That and other changes that we made in this bill allow the Federal workforce to say stop saying that we somehow get something everyone else doesn't. The Federal workforce pays into Social Security, into Medicare and, in fact, they're going to be paying half the cost of their pension plan, which is commensurate with their private sector.

So I want to be very positive here in saying this is never easy to do in times of austerity, but, in fact, the Federal workforce will stand behind this, as Congress will, in recognizing that they're doing their share.

I'm very proud of the people throughout government who recognize that getting this right is part of being able to say to the American people, we're all in this together.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words the chairman of the Government Reform Committee said with respect to Federal employees.

If you listen to the comments of a lot of these colleagues, they have made Federal civil servants scapegoats, and, in fact, their budget that's before us today does hit Federal employees.

So the folks in the intelligence community who helped track down Osama Bin Laden, what do they get under this proposal? A 5 percent pay cut.

How about the folks at NIH who are, every day, looking to find cures and treatments for diseases that plague every American family? A 5 percent pay cut.

How about the nurses who work in the Veterans Hospitals? A 5 percent pay cut.

And yet, you don't cut the direct payment subsidies to agriculture. You don't cut the subsidies to the big oil companies. You just want to whack Federal civil servants.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who has been working on this issue for a very long time.

Mr. HOYER. I want to thank my friend, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for the work he's done.

I want to rise in opposition to this focus on Federal employees. First of all, Federal employees have contributed $75 billion over the last 2 years towards helping us reduce the deficit—$75 billion. No other working American has been asked to do that.

You treat Federal employees in this House as second-class working people. That's wrong. This is a 5 percent tax increase on Federal employees. Nobody else, nobody else do we ask—the richest people in America we don't ask to solve this deficit problem. But Federal employees, yes, a $75 billion contribution. And you don't blink an eye because it's easy, because we demagogue about government and, by association, we demagogue about bureaucrats used as an epithet.

These are, as Mr. VAN HOLLEN pointed out, people who protect our food, try to make sure that we can find cures for cancer, protect us from terrorism, guard our borders. That's who we're talking about. And we treat them as second-class citizens. That's wrong. It's wrong for our country, it's wrong for the American people, and it's wrong for us as an institution representing the government of this country.

Ladies and gentlemen, reject this. I'm going to talk about other aspects of this so-called reconciliation bill at a future date. But I ask you on this basis alone: federal employees—I will tell you as one who represents a large number of them—are ready to participate in helping to bring down this deficit and meet this crisis. But do not ask them to do it alone.

That's what Mr. VAN HOLLEN says about oil companies, big corporations, loopholes, and the wealthiest in America. Don't simply ask more from those who have less and ask less from those who have more. That is not good policy. Let us not pursue it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

It is now my privilege to yield 3 minutes to another great Member of Congress from the State of Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member on the Government Reform Committee.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN. This week marks the 28th anniversary of Public Service Recognition Week, a week in which we honor the contributions of Federal, State, local, and government employees. These employees include outstanding public servants like IRS' Shauna Henline, from Representative ROB BISHOP's congressional district, who saved the United States taxpayers billions of dollars by identifying and bringing to justice tax evaders and scammers.

They include the State Department's Shane Morris, a constituent of Representative CHRISTOPHER SMITH of New Jersey, who played a critical role in ensuring that United States diplomats in the Middle East continued to receive classified information, material, and equipment during the Arab Spring uprisings in 2011.

Instead of us using this week to celebrate the good work of government employees who dedicate their lives to serving others, the Republican majority has put legislation on the House floor today that would take billions of dollars out of their pockets.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, where is the appreciation or compassion for the dedication and commitment that public employees display day by day? It certainly is not in this bill, which is an uncompassionate and wrongheaded approach to our fiscal problems.

The Federal employee-related provisions in this bill which were reported out of the Oversight Committee would reduce the take-home pay of nearly 3 million middle class Americans by 5 percent, mandating increased retirement contributions.

The bill also would eliminate the FERS annuity supplement for new workers who retire before they are eligible for Social Security at 62. According to the Office of Personnel Management, the average annuity amount for current FERS retirees is nearly $700 per month. I do not think any American who has dedicated his life to the public service should be forced to lose that much money on a monthly basis, particularly those on a fixed retirement budget.

Our middle class Federal employees have already contributed $75 billion towards deficit reduction and other government programs, while millionaires and billionaires have not been asked to

contribute one additional cent to improve our government's financial condition.

□ 1230

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation and, instead, to support a more rational and equitable budget proposal that asks for shared sacrifice from everyone in our country.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Members of Congress and Federal employees contribute .8 percent to their pensions. According to the CBO, their benefits are 48 percent higher than their average private sector counterparts. We think it's just reasonable and appropriate that they contribute about 5.8 percent to their pensions and contribute their half. It's the least we can ask of ourselves as Members of Congress and of hardworking Federal employees, that we treat ourselves like private sector workers are treated. More to the point, Mr. Speaker, if we want to have the moral authority to get spending under control, we need to ask more of ourselves.

With that, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to yield time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, back in 2010, I served on the President's debt commission, otherwise known as the Simpson-Bowles Commission. During that Commission, we heard nonpartisan, expert testimony that debts as large as ours slow economic growth by about 1 percent. In America, that translates into 1 million fewer jobs. So, to start getting our debt under control and our economy back on track, we passed the Budget Control Act, but we all know that was a blunt and ineffective tool. As a result, Republicans have stepped forward with a smarter plan.

Today, I want to highlight the more targeted, sensible reductions in spending the Ways and Means Committee has offered as part of the reconciliation process, each of which has enjoyed bipartisan support.

Our first recommendation requires exchange subsidy overpayments in the Democrats' health care law to be repaid in full. This is simple and common sense. If you aren't entitled to the benefit, you don't get to keep it. This policy will reduce the deficit by $43.9 billion over the next 10 years.

A Democrat-controlled House and a Democrat-controlled Senate first used a version of this offset in 2010 to pay for a temporary Medicare so-called ''doc fix.'' This Congress also endorsed this policy as part of the 1099 repeal legislation that became law early last year. As Secretary Sebelius has previously said, requiring the return of exchange subsidy overpayments ''makes it fairer for recipients and all taxpayers.''

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) to discuss the committee's second recommendation. He is a true American hero, as well as the chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, due to a loophole in the Tax Code, the IRS is shoveling out billions of American taxpayer dollars to those who are here illegally.

The good news is this reconciliation measure includes a commonsense solution based on legislation I've authored that would save $7.6 billion by putting a stop to this. The provision would stop illegal immigrants from getting the $1,000 refundable Child Tax Credit by simply requiring tax filers to provide their Social Security numbers.

Right now, those who are here illegally can get cash from Uncle Sam by providing an IRS-provided taxpayer ID number to claim this refundable credit. According to a recent report by NBC Indianapolis' WTHR, illegal immigrants are even filing tax returns that claim children who do not live in America.

Mr. Speaker, there really shouldn't be any controversy over this. The American people are speaking out against this. Treasury's tax IG has spoken out against this. Democrat Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL has spoken out against this. Even the administration supports through the funding of a verification program the idea of preventing illegals from receiving public benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we can fix this and put a stop to the abuse of precious taxpayer dollars by simply requiring a Social Security number. Americans want, need, and deserve the better protection of their hard-earned money, and we owe it to the United States of America to take action today.

Mr. CAMP. I now yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Human Resources Subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS), to discuss the committee's final recommendation.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, including the provision to end the duplicative Social Services Block Grant.

As chairman of the Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee, we held a hearing last year on duplicative programs such as SSBG. Despite what we have heard from some on the other side, our concern is focused squarely on the design of the SSBG program, which does not serve taxpayers well for a number of reasons.

SSBG is duplicative and unfocused. It supports 29 different types of social services with no eligibility requirements. The Federal Government already spends $446 billion per year on other social services programs, which is about 260 times the amount of SSBG spending. With no State spending requirements or accountability for results, SSBG is more akin to stimulus dollars than other more effective antipoverty programs.

With staggering deficits, we can't afford to send money to States without accountability through a program that is replicated by literally dozens of other Federal programs. That's what SSBG does today, and it is why it makes sense to end this duplicative program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CAMP. Today, the economy is down and we're out of money, so it is our responsibility to reevaluate these programs, to assess whether they're meeting their intended purposes and to determine if the American taxpayer can afford them. We must reduce the burden our debt is putting on our economy, on our families, on job creation in this country. This legislation does that. It encompasses commonsense, bipartisan policies; and I urge its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Child Tax Credit, I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter we received from the Catholic bishops on this subject. In part, it reads:

> I reiterate our strong opposition to an unfair proposal that would alter the Child Tax Credit to exclude children of hardworking immigrant families.

The bishops also talk about the devastating impacts of eliminating the Social Services Block Grant.

COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC JUSTICE AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, DC, May 8, 2012.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As you vote on a reconciliation package for the fiscal year 2013 budget, I would like to affirm the principle contained in the Committee Report that the ''budget starts with the proposition that first, Congress must do no harm.'' In this light, I urge you to ensure all policies meet the moral criteria established by the Catholic bishops of the United States to create a circle of protection around programs that serve poor and vulnerable people and communities:

1. Every budget decision should be assessed by whether it protects or threatens human life and dignity.
2. A central moral measure of any budget proposal is how it affects the lives and dignity of ''the least of these'' (Matthew 25). The needs of those who are hungry and homeless, without work or in poverty should come first.
3. Government and other institutions have a shared responsibility to promote the common good of all, especially ordinary workers and families who struggle to live in dignity in difficult economic times.

A just framework for future budgets cannot rely on disproportionate cuts in essential services to poor persons; it requires shared sacrifice by all, including raising adequate revenues, eliminating unnecessary military and other spending, and addressing the long-term costs of health insurance and retirement programs fairly.

I reiterate our strong opposition to an unfair proposal that would alter the Child Tax

Credit to exclude children of hard-working, immigrant families. The bishops' conference has long supported the Child Tax Credit because it is pro-work, pro-family, and one of the most effective antipoverty programs in our nation. Denying the credit to children of working poor immigrant families—the large majority of whom are American citizens—would hurt vulnerable kids, increase poverty, and would not advance the common good.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly known as food stamps), provides vital food security to families during tough economic times. It is estimated that cuts proposed in this bill would deny assistance to two million families, and cut the benefit for everyone else. No poor family that receives food assistance would be unaffected, constituting a direct threat to their human dignity. If savings in agricultural programs need to be achieved, subsidies and direct payments can be reduced and targeted to small and moderate-sized farms.

The Social Services Block Grant is an important source of funding for programs throughout the country that serve vulnerable members of our communities—the homeless, the elderly, people with disabilities, children living in poverty, and abuse victims. We should prioritize programs that serve ''the least of these,'' not eliminate them.

The Catholic bishops of the United States recognize the serious deficits our country faces, and we acknowledge that Congress must make difficult decisions about how to allocate burdens and sacrifices and balance resources and needs. However, deficit reduction and fiscal responsibility efforts must protect and not undermine the needs of poor and vulnerable people. The proposed cuts to programs in the budget reconciliation fail this basic moral test. The Catechism of the Catholic Church states it is the proper role of government to ''make accessible to each what is needed to lead a truly human life: food, clothing, health, work, education and culture, suitable information, the right to establish a family, and so on'' (no. 1908). Poor and vulnerable people do not have powerful lobbyists to advocate their interests, but they have the most compelling needs.

As you pursue responsible deficit reduction, the Catholic bishops join other faith leaders and people of good will urging you to protect the lives and dignity of poor and vulnerable families by putting a circle of protection around these essential programs and to refrain from cutting programs that serve them.

Sincerely,

Most Reverend STEPHEN E. BLAIRE,
Chairman, Committee on Domestic Justice and Human Development.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. WAXMAN, who has been working so hard on these issues.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill that is before us today is an unbalanced package of cuts that hurts the most vulnerable populations in our society and the working middle class.

There was a budget agreement on a bipartisan basis between the Congress and the President by which we would shield low-income programs from the cuts that are now before us today. That agreement is being rejected, and the Republicans are pushing for cuts for low-income programs such as Medicaid, SNAP—which is the food stamp program—helped by the Social Services Block Grant and which are vital to maintaining and continuing our economic recovery. These are the safety net programs. With the slashes in Medicaid, we will have hundreds of thousands of people, including 300,000 children, denied health insurance.

Is this something that we have to do when we're not letting others do their fair share?

The bill would establish a Federal medical malpractice system that tramples on the meaning of states' rights, which the Republicans have said is a central tenet of their point of view. They would undermine our future health care by cutting prevention and public health investments. They would make it harder for women to access important and life-saving preventative care, and they fail to protect Medicare from billions of dollars in cuts that would happen under the sequestration.

But we shouldn't be surprised.

This is all based on the Ryan budget that the Republicans passed on the House floor last month. Under that budget, defense spending is increased over investments in health, education, and research. Medicare, as we know it, would come to an end. The number of uninsured would rise, but millionaires and billionaires would receive enormous tax cuts.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WAXMAN. Instead of a budget that actually reduces the deficit, which this budget would not do, and that tries to do it in a balanced and fair way, the Ryan budget, and this bill specifically, targets those most in need; and it puts our Nation's financial recovery at risk. I urge a ''no'' vote on the bill.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, to say I rise in strong opposition to this bill would be an understatement. In addition to the other egregious cuts, this bill would eliminate the critically needed $6.3 billion in funding that the U.S. territories' Medicaid programs receive under the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1240

More than that, it sends a clear message to Americans in the territories that while they are American enough to defend this Nation during times of war, they are not American enough for this Nation to protect and preserve their health and well-being. This bill is un-American and it is unjust.

I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this terrible reconciliation bill.

Mr. Speaker, to say that I rise today in strong opposition to this bill would be an understatement.

The truth is that there are so many elements included in this bill that warrant everyone's strong opposition that the list reads like a dishonor roll: the attacks on Medicare and CHIP; the elimination of funding for the Exchanges that will expand health insurance to more than 30 million uninsured Americans; and the repeal of the Prevention and Public Health Fund, which expands access to preventive health care services to millions of Americans who—as a result—would have improved overall health and well-being. The list goes on for far too long.

But, it gets worse because this bill also includes a provision to eliminate the critically needed 6.3 billion dollars in funding that the U.S. Territories' Medicaid programs received under the Affordable Care Act—a funding influx that, two years ago, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both chambers deemed legitimate and necessary. And, if that is not bad enough, this bill also bumps our FMAP down from 55 to 50 percent—a percentage that every expert has agreed is far too low and unjust, given the territories' income, poverty and cost of living numbers.

I will call it like I see it: it bullies the most vulnerable Americans in the territories whose medical needs surpass their financial resources; and this bill sends the very clear message to Americans in the territories that while they are ''American enough'' to defend this nation and its honor during times of war, they are not ''American enough'' for this Nation to help protect and preserve their health, health care and thus well-being. It is un-American; it is unjust; it is an unnecessary embarrassment; and it must not pass.

We have one last chance to do the right thing; let's do it and not pass this bill.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. COLE.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, the American people know in their gut that they're not taxed too little, and they also know that the Federal Government spends too much.

This bill is an important first step in restraining spending and bringing our out-of-control deficit under control. I'm very proud of our chairman, Mr. RYAN, on our committee for bringing it to the floor. I'm even prouder of the six authorizing committees that systematically did their job of reviewing nondiscretionary spending and finding real savings that we can use to reduce the deficit and protect important investments in defense.

Taming the deficit will require that we take these steps each and every year going forward. We haven't done it since 2005. It's time to do it today. Let's take a step in the right direction.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is vivid evidence of the radicalization of the Republican Party.

I recall decades ago chairing a committee in the Michigan State Senate

and addressing a number of reforms affecting the lives of working men and women. I directly engaged in give and take and negotiated final legislation with Governor George Romney, resulting in legislation that passed on a bipartisan basis.

Today, the radicalization of the Republican Party would make that impossible. Instead, we have a bill that would take away food stamps for 2 million Americans, children, working parents, and seniors. It would threaten 280,000 school meals and end the Social Services Block Grants, which provide home care, transportation for individuals with disabilities, protection for abused children, and Meals on Wheels. All of this and much more extremism to carry out an additional tax cut of $240,000 for the very wealthiest 1 percent of taxpayers.

We can turn off the budget sequester and the damaging across-the-board cuts, but not with this extreme partisan bill. The House leadership refuses to follow a bipartisan path. This bill is sad proof of how the Republican Party of today has moved dramatically to the extreme, leaving behind most Americans, except the very wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, I now would like to enter into the RECORD letters from organizations that are opposed to this bill's drastic cuts in services for the elderly, the disabled, and children:

CATHOLIC CHARITIES USA,
Alexandria, VA, April 25, 2012.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RYAN: As the House Committee on the Budget evaluates the priorities expressed in the federal budgeting process, we urge you to reject the proposed elimination of the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) as proposed by the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Everyday thousands of individuals who are disabled, children, preschoolers, homeless, elderly, or at risk of being abused are receiving services because of SSBG funding. These funds prevent the need for more expensive and less desirable interventions. SSBG is a flexible federal funding source that allows states, local governments and non-profit organizations to support local programs and services for vulnerable children, youth, and elderly and disabled people. States have a long history of cooperation with community and faith-based organizations in the allocation of SSBG funds.

Catholic Charities USA (CCUSA) is a network of more than 1,600 social service agencies and institutions providing services to more than 10 million people annually. As one of the nation's largest social service providers, CCUSA recognizes the critical need for SSBG funding and uses these funds in almost every category of direct services.

Among those vulnerable populations that receive critical assistance from SSBG-funded programs are: Children: Local Catholic Charities agencies use SSBG funds to provide child care to low-income families; foster care support service; and prevention and protective services for neglected and abused children. Youth: Local Catholic Charities agencies utilize funds from SSBG to supplement work with expecting and parenting teens; drug counseling for troubled youth; and special services for youth involved in or at risk of involvement with criminal activity. Elderly: Local Catholic Charities rely heavily on SSBG funds to support Meals on Wheels programs that address both nutrition and isolation issues for frail elderly persons; transportation services for persons who also need assistance with their grocery shopping, doctor appointments, and during church services; adult day care; and emergency shelter and assistance for victims of elder abuse.

The following provides some examples of programs at local Catholic Charities agencies that would be affected by the elimination of SSBG funding:

New Jersey: In Newark, SSBG funds are used to support many programs and services, among them counseling and child abuse prevention services for families referred from the State child welfare system; supervised housing for youth exiting the child welfare system for independent living; The funds are used to provide services directed towards preventing, reducing or eliminating dependency; achieving or maintaining self-sufficiency; preventing neglect, abuse or exploitation of children and adults; and preventing or reducing inappropriate institutional care.

Pennsylvania: In Wilkes-Barre/Scranton SSBG funding supports activities at a homeless veterans residence, Maternity Home and Senior Citizens Housing.

Texas: In Beaumont, SSBG funds the soup kitchen, long term disaster recovery, financial education and counseling programs. In Brownsville, SSBG funds are used to assist with long-term recovery from disasters including replacing essential items for those who were rendered homeless from such disasters.

Wisconsin: In LaCrosse, SSBG funds provide services for children and adolescents in their Disabilities Services Program. Its mission is to keep these young people in their homes and prepare them for congregate or semi-independent living and provides a unique niche and without it many would not be able to be in mainstreamed into the community and would be at risk for institutional care.

We acknowledge that tough choices will be made as part of your ongoing budget discussions and that every one of these tough choices will be met with frustration, disappointment and even anger from certain segments of the population. Catholic Charities USA recognizes that social service initiatives will not be immune to those difficult decisions. However, as you look for savings within the budget, we reject the notion that those most vulnerable among us should feel the greatest impact of future reductions.

Rather than simply embracing quick answers to the immediate need to shave dollars off the federal budget by impairing local organizations' ability to deliver critical services to those in need, now is the time to work together to create a new national approach to service delivery that enable the country to permanently make a difference in the lives of those living in poverty.

Sincerely,

FR., LARRY SNYDER,
President.

MAY 5, 2012.

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: As groups of faith that provide critical support for those living on the margin, we write to urge you to reject the House Budget Committee's proposal to repeal funding for the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG).

The SSBG is a flexible federal funding source that allows states, local governments and nonprofit organizations to support and supplement programs and services on the local level for vulnerable children, youth, the elderly and people with disabilities. States have a long history of cooperation with community and faith-based organizations in the allocation of SSBG funds.

According to the Department of Health and Human Services, the SSBG helped more than 22 million individuals in 2009, 49 percent of whom were children. In 1996, funding for SSBG was cut, and while it was intended to increase to $2.8 billion in 2003, instead it was reduced to $1.7 million and has remained at this level. The flat funding level has failed to keep up with inflation, forcing states to cut back on social services or tap into funds allocated for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. In these times of economic hardship, states are dealing with budget crises and a growing number of people in need of social services. SSBG funds are critical to help states fill in gaps with the flexibility to target the funds according to their needs.

SSBG plays an important role in the types of services provided by our organizations to low-income people. The elimination of funding would disproportionately impact the most vulnerable populations by impairing our ability to provide services that help children in need of child care, youth in need of intervention and prevention services, and older Americans and persons with disabilities who might otherwise need to be placed in institutional care. The slightest reduction in funding for this vulnerable population would compromise their livelihood and possibly their lives. Therefore, we strongly urge you to protect SSBG funding so that these vital programs continue to be available to these vulnerable populations.

Sincerely,

CATHOLIC CHARITIES USA.
JEWISH COUNCIL FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS.
ASSOCIATION OF JEWISH FAMILY & CHILDREN'S AGENCIES.
THE JEWISH FEDERATIONS OF NORTH AMERICA.
LUTHERAN SERVICES IN AMERICA.

EASTER SEALS DISABILITY SERVICES,
Washington, DC, April 19, 2012.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of Easter Seals I am writing to urge you to oppose legislation that eliminates the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) and cuts the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). We urge you to vote against these proposals if they come before the full House of Representatives.

The Social Services Block Grant is a critical resource that enables Easter Seals affiliates throughout the country to provide quality services that support the independence of people with disabilities. Our affiliates work with localities to provide inclusive child care for children with disabilities, adult day services for older adults, recreational programs for people with disabilities of all ages and much more. Without SSBG, access to these critical services would be extremely limited. In addition, many of the people with disabilities we serve rely on SNAP and other federal supports to remain independent.

Easter Seals appreciates the urgency for the federal government to be fiscally responsible and to strengthen our national economy. At the same time, we know that people with disabilities disproportionately rely on government services to live, learn and work in their communities. These services were created by government because the private market place would not meet the unique needs of people with disabilities.

Again, please oppose proposals to eliminate SSBG and cut SNAP. Thank you for considering our views.

Sincerely,

KATHERINE BEH NEES,
Senior Vice President, Government Relations.

AARP,
MAY 9, 2012.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of over 38 million members and other Americans who are age 50 and older, AARP is writing to express serious concerns with the House Reconciliation proposal pursuant to the Fiscal Year 2013. While the reconciliation package offers ideas for confronting our nation's deficits and debt, AARP believes the proposal lacks balance and could jeopardize the health and economic security of older Americans, as well as their families.

STATE HEALTH INSURANCE EXCHANGES

The reconciliation proposal strikes funding for state health insurance exchanges (Exchanges), as well as rescinds obligated funds which states are relying on for future use. The establishment of the Exchanges is one of a number of initiatives in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) to improve access to affordable, quality care. AARP believes the Exchanges can promote more cost-effective care, improve pricing transparency, and increase health insurance companies' accountability for quality health care. The Exchanges' functions are critical in determining eligibility for individuals or employers seeking to purchase qualified health plans (QHPs), and in particular for determining eligibility for the premium tax credits under the rules as set out by the IRS. Exchanges are also important for facilitating a seamless eligibility system with State Medicaid programs under the rules set out for Medicaid. AARP supports innovative ways to provide access to affordable, quality care. The House proposal to defund the Exchanges by $13.5 billion dollars will make it more difficult for millions of Americans to obtain affordable and quality healthcare.

SUBSIDIES—TRUE UP

The proposal would require those who receive Exchange subsidies overpayment to repay the full amount of the overpayment. Individuals and families would still be allowed to keep the subsidies they are entitled to receive under the ACA. AARP supports health insurance Exchanges' subsidies to individuals up to 400 percent of the federal poverty level. The subsidies and their proper administration are a critical element in assuring affordability of quality healthcare coverage for individuals and families. Without these subsidies, many of our members and other Americans will not be able to afford coverage or the cost sharing for covered care. We believe that efforts to change percentage limits or decrease the subsidy levels will erode the affordability protection of the credits, and will mean that over time more people will find insurance unaffordable.

REPEAL OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH FUND

The proposal repeals the prevention and public health fund. This fund is an important component in state and community efforts to prevent illness and promote health, so that all Americans can lead longer, more productive lives. An estimated 32.5 million people with Medicare received at least one free preventive benefit in 2011, including the new Annual Wellness Visit, since the health reform law was enacted. Seventy-five percent of all health care costs in our country are spent on the treatment of chronic diseases, many of which could be easily prevented. More than 70 million Americans ages 50 and older—four out of five older adults—suffer from at least one chronic condition. More than half of older adults have more than one chronic condition, and 11 million live with five or more chronic conditions. A focus on prevention will not only lead to better health for Americans, but will also help reduce the need for costly treatment and intervention of these chronic diseases.

The prevention and Public Health Fund has also been used to bolster the health care workforce to ensure that consumers would have access to clinicians providing primary care, prevention, and wellness care. In 2010, it helped to transition 800 part time nursing students to full time status to help infuse the healthcare workforce. Without such funding, more consumers would go without necessary preventive and primary care and would end up needing more advanced interventions in acute care or chronic care institutions—thereby decreasing their quality of life, overburdening the health care delivery system, and increasing the cost of health care. AARP strongly urges the House to oppose repeal of the prevention fund.

REPEAL OF MEDICAID AND CHIP MAINTENANCE-OF-EFFORT REQUIREMENTS

AARP opposes the reconciliation provision eliminating the Medicaid Maintenance-of-Effort (MOE) requirement included as part of the ACA. We are concerned this will lead to state Medicaid cuts that could leave many older Americans, people with disabilities, and children without health care coverage.

Medicaid often covers services that other programs, such as Medicare, do not generally cover, including home health aide and personal attendant care services, as well as nursing home services. In fact, Medicaid is the largest payer of long-term care for older adults and people with disabilities. Because of the extremely high cost of long-term services and supports—the average annual cost of nursing home care is over $75,000—many older Americans, including middle income Americans, have to virtually deplete all of their personal resources to finance their ongoing care. Medicaid is a last resort for these individuals and many other Americans who find themselves uninsured or uninsurable in the private market due to a catastrophic illness such as cancer. It provides the needed long-term care services that Medicare does not cover.

Starting in 2014, the ACA expands Medicaid coverage for persons with incomes up to 133% of the federal poverty level, to ensure that people who cannot afford care on the private market still have access to core services without the inefficiencies and expense of uncompensated care. The MOE provisions included in ACA serve as a bridge to 2014, making certain that important health coverage remains in place until the new law is fully implemented. According to the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office's scoring, the MOE elimination would lead to hundreds of thousands of these vulnerable Americans losing coverage each year.

Reducing Medicaid coverage is not the solution for reining in health care costs. To be exact, cuts to Medicaid and CHIP will only result in costly uncompensated care, which in turn will result in higher health care costs in the private market. Rather than simply continue to shift costs, health care costs should be reduced by pursuing more effective ways to deliver and coordinate care; by working to prevent and treat costly chronic conditions; by carefully expanding home and community-based services; and by reining in costs associated with waste and fraud.

REPEAL OF INCREASED FEDERAL MEDICAID FUNDING CAP AND MATCH FOR TERRITORIES

AARP opposes the reconciliation provision that would replace the ACA's increased Medicaid federal match and cap for the territories with the levels in place prior to the ACA. We supported raising the cap on Medicaid funding for Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the other territories. AARP believes that quality, affordable health coverage should be available to all Americans wherever they reside, and this reconciliation provision would only serve to further increase health care inequities for Americans who live in the U.S. territories. The proposal would cut federal funding for Medicaid in the territories by 65% over the next decade. Such a drastic cut would be a crippling blow that would devastate Medicaid within the territories, as well as budgets within the territories.

ELIMINATING SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT (SSBG)

The proposal aims to eliminate the SSBG. SSBG serve a unique purpose and are not duplicative of other funding. The original intent of SSBG funds was to increase the flexibility of state governments to set social services spending priorities outside the constraints of federal program dollars. Since SSBG funds must be directed to services for low income and vulnerable persons and enable them to be more independent or gain greater economic self-sufficiency, around 23 million seniors, children and disabled persons will experience reduced or no services since many states lack the capacity to replace the funds if this proposal were to take effect. Home delivered meals (1.7 million seniors), adult protective services and transportation services are most frequently noted as services for seniors supported by the SSBG. In two recent reports by AARP and the National Association of States United for Aging and Disabilities on a wide array of supportive and long-term care services, states acknowledge that maintaining current services levels is the greatest challenge as the population ages at an increasing rate. About 1.8 million children at risk of abuse and 4.4 million kids may lose child care related care services, while an estimated 1 million disabled persons are affected by a loss of transportation funds. Given the extreme vulnerability of the populations receiving services under SSBG, AARP cannot support this approach to balancing the federal budget and urges rejection of this proposal.

BLOCK GRANT SNAP AND NARROW ELIGIBILITY

The reconciliation proposal aims to cut and block grant the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). It contradicts the evidence of the major reputable studies on nutrition programs, including the Government Accountability Office's findings that SNAP was very effective in meeting its mission and targeting goals. Further, all the major bipartisan deficit reduction proposals considered by Congress in the past two years have agreed that the safety net needs to be kept intact so those least able are not asked to bear the burden of balancing the federal budget. The House proposal cuts about $35 billion over 10 years from nutrition programs without sacrifices from farm subsidies or other agriculture spending. The result is a significant reduction in assistance to buy food. 2.7 million seniors are currently receiving SNAP benefits. Additionally, the proposal results in close to 2 million persons being eliminated from SNAP assistance as application and eligibility requirements are tightened by prohibiting coordination with the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) and other low income benefits, eliminating the Recovery Act enhancement that helped SNAP benefits gain on the inflated cost of food during the recession, and capping the amount that can be spent to provide nutrition to low income households. AARP urges Congress to reject proposals to cap or reduce SNAP funding, restrict eligibility or reduce benefits. Instead

Congress should support proposals to increase benefit adequacy so that households have the resources to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet.

On behalf of our millions of members and all older Americans, we reiterate our concerns about the harm this reconciliation proposal could cause Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries, as well as other older Americans and their families. We strongly urge you to enact a reconciliation package that will better protect the interests of our nation's seniors and their families. If you have any questions, feel free to call me, or please have your staff contact Joyce Rogers, Senior Vice President of our Government Affairs office at 202–434–3750.

Sincerely,

A. BARRY RAND,
Chief Executive Officer.

THE ARC,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2012.

Chairman DAVE CAMP,
Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Ranking Member SANDER M. LEVIN,
Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP AND RANKING MEMBER LEVIN, I am writing to express the strong opposition of The Arc of the United States (The Arc) to two proposals approved by the Committee on Ways and Means at its April 18 markup of budget reconciliation language.

The Arc is the largest national community-based organization advocating for and serving people with intellectual and developmental disabilities and their families. We have more than 140,000 members and more than 700 state and local chapters nationwide. We are concerned that the proposals to eliminate the ''safe harbor'' for individuals and families receiving premium tax credits under the Affordable Care Act (ACA) and to eliminate the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) could harm people with intellectual and developmental disabilities and their families.

''Safe Harbor'' for Premium Tax Crafts Under the Affordable Care Act

The ACA protects individuals and families from having excessive penalties if the premium tax credit paid towards insurance coverage during the year exceeds the actual amount the individual or family was due. The protection, through a ''safe harbor'' that caps the amount of the premium tax credit an individual or family under 400% of poverty will have to re-pay, recognizes that there are certain instances that cannot be easily accounted for that will change the amount of credit due.

Eliminating this ''safe harbor'' will hurt people with disabilities who have lower average incomes than non-disabled workers and often work part-time. Penalizing low income people for changes in earnings or family status that occur during the year by removing the repayment cap will leave people with disabilities vulnerable to an unaffordable tax bill. This could lead to more people refusing coverage for fear of the repayment penalty.

Social Services Block Grant

The Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) helps provide critical services to approximately 23 million people with disabilities, seniors, and children across the United States. For example, the SSBG helps provide vital services for people with disabilities and their families, including respite care and transportation; Meals on Wheels and other supportive services for seniors; child care and related assistance for children; and child protective services for at risk children.

For people with intellectual and developmental disabilities, the SSBG can provide invaluable supports and can help leverage state and local funding to deliver essential services. For example, in New Jersey the SSBG helps fund an independent Living program operated by The Arc of Bergen and Passaic Counties. The program assists low-income people with developmental disabilities who are on a waiting list for services from the State Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD) or who do not qualify for the full array of state DDD services.

Under the program, The Arc of Bergen and Passaic Counties receives referrals from homeless shelters, mental health providers, and other agencies and often provides emergency stabilization for referred individuals and families who are in crisis. The program provides people with developmental disabilities with individualized supports such as: locating and maintaining housing; landlord relations; job search and employer/employee relations; budgeting, bill paying, and other financial challenges; and accessing medical and mental health care.

SSBG funds leverage matching County contributions as well as funding from the Community Development Block Grant. Without the SSBG portion, the program would not be viable.

New Jersey's program is an example of how the SSBG can fill gaps in the service continuum and act as a lifeline for people with disabilities. Eliminating the SSBG would reduce essential funding at a time when state and local budgets are under severe pressure and people with disabilities, seniors, and families need more help.

Preserving the ''Safe Harbor'' for Premium Tax Credits and the SSBG

In closing, The Arc believes that eliminating the SSBG and the ''safe harbor'' for premium tax credits under the Affordable Care Act could harm people with disabilities and their families, and we oppose the proposed elimination of these important supports. Thank you for considering our views.

Sincerely,

MARTY FORD,
Director, Public Policy Office.

NATIONAL FOSTER
CARE COALITION,
April 23, 2012.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: We are a coalition of diverse groups opposed to the recent actions of the House Ways and Means Committee to find federal budget savings through the elimination of the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG). The actions taken on Wednesday, April 18, 2012, by the Ways and Means Committee, through budget reconciliation, will hurt some of this nation's most vulnerable families and children.

SSBG is a major funder for state and local child abuse prevention services, child protective services (CPS) and it supplements services for adoptions and for services to infants, children and youth in foster care. In some states, it is a significant source of local funding for adult protective services.

During the 1996 welfare reform debate, the Congress and Governors agreed to reduce SSBG funding to $2.38 billion temporarily and return it to its former level of $2.8 billion in 2003. The reductions were agreed to at a time when members of both parties and houses were looking for revenue to balance the federal budget. SSBG contributed to that deficit reduction. It was to be restored when the fiscal condition improved. Instead, Congress reduced SSBG further to $1.7 billion to help pay for a 1998 transportation bill in lieu of other revenue sources. During this period, deficits not only declined but were eliminated. Although this cut was intended to be temporary, SSBG was never restored. We are disappointed that some would propose to once again use SSBG for deficit reduction—despite the fact that SSBG funding contributed not a dollar to current deficits.

The champions of SSBG have included the leadership from both parties, including the bipartisan leadership of both the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. We hope these champions will remain strong.

SSBG helps to fill the numerous state budget gaps in areas as diverse as senior services, mental health services, and services to people with disabilities. While we focus on SSBG's vital importance to child abuse prevention and child welfare services, it also supports services for those adults in jeopardy of entering a nursing home or institution, it supports other low-income individuals and families including adults who have been abused; children in need of child care; and youth in need of transitional services.

Imposing these cuts to child abuse prevention funding and child welfare services at a time when state and local budgets are under severe pressure and families need more help, will create a human deficit while failing to deal with the current financial one.

The undersigned organizations ask you to reject this proposed elimination of SSBG.

Sincerely,

Alliance for Children and Families; Alliance for Children's Rights; American Academy of Pediatrics; American Association on Health and Disability; American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME); American Group Psychotherapy Association; American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children; American Psychological Association; Ampersand Families, MN; Association for Ambulatory Behavioral Healthcare; Association of University Centers on Disabilities; Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law; Bill Wilson Center, CA; Black Administrators in Child Welfare; Buncombe County, North Carolina; California Alliance of Child and Family Services; California Youth Connections; Children's Advocacy Institute; Children's Aid Society; Children and Families First, DE; Children and Families Futures; Children's Defense Fund; Children First for Oregon; Children's Home Society of America; Children's Home Society of North Carolina; Children's Rights Project, CA; Child Welfare League of America; CLASP; Clinical Social Workers Association; Coalition on Human Needs; Connecticut Association of Foster and Adoptive Parents; Council of Family and Child Caring Agencies, NY; County Welfare Directors Association of California; Dave Thomas Foundation for Adoption; Depression and Bipolar Support Alliance; Every Child Matters; Family Service Center of South Carolina; First Focus Campaign for Children; Foster Care to Success Foundation; Foster Family-Based Treatment Association; Great Circle, MO; John Burton Foundation; Larry Brown Associates; Lutheran Services in America; Mental Health America; Minnesota Association of County Social Service Administrators; Mississippi Children's Home Services; Missouri Coalition of Children's Agencies; National Adult Protective Services Association; National Alliance of Children's Trust and Prevention Funds; National Alliance to End Homelessness; National Association for Children's Behavioral Health; National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth; National Association of Area Agencies on Aging; National Association of Counsel for Children; National Association of

County Human Services Administrators; National Association of Social Workers; National Center on Shaken Baby Syndrome; National Center for Housing and Child Welfare; National Crittenton Foundation; National Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health; National Foster Parent Association; National Indian Child Welfare Association; National Respite Coalition; New York Council on Adoptable Children; New York Public Welfare Association; Nebraska Children's Home Society; Nebraska Families Collaborative; North American Council on Adoptable Children; North Carolina Association of County Directors of Social Services; NYSCCC Support, Information and Advocacy for Foster & Adoptive Families; Oklahoma Therapeutic Foster Care Association; Ohio Job and Family Services Directors' Association; Parents Anonymous; Prevent Child Abuse America; Prevent Child Abuse Indiana; Public Children Services Association of Ohio; School Social Work Association of America; Stop It Now; Three Rivers Adoption Council, PA; The Villages of Indiana; Voice for Adoption; Voices for America's Children; Weill Cornell Medical College's Division of Geriatrics and Gerontology.

CWLA

Washington, DC, April 19, 2012.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,

Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, 1102 Longworth HOB, Washington, DC.

Hon. SANDER LEVIN,

Ranking Member, House Ways and Means Committee, 1106 Longworth HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP AND RANKING MEMBER LEVIN: On behalf of the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) representing hundreds of public and private child-serving member agencies serving millions of children and families in all fifty states, I write this letter to express opposition to the Committee's proposal to eliminate the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG). At its inception, Title XX was an entitlement to fund social services. It was then restructured in 1981 into a block grant that would provide states more flexibility to support an array of services to children, youth, and families.

The Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) has long supported our most vulnerable children and continues to be a critical resource for child welfare. This flexible funding stream creates and sustains strong communities through a broad range of health and human services. SSBG represents 12% of federal funds states spend to provide child abuse prevention, adoption, foster care, child protection, independent and transitional living and residential services for children and youth. Nationwide, more than 2.6 million children received a range of child welfare services funded in part or in total by SSBG.

According to the latest data available, 39 states use SSBG funds for child abuse and neglect prevention, 22 states use them for adoption assistance, while 36 states allocate them to provide foster care services for children who may not be eligible for federal IV–E support. States also use SSBG to fund independent and transitional living services to youth aging out of the foster care system, residential treatment and other prevention and intervention services.

Unfortunately, this Committee has proposed eliminating SSBG in its entirety, despite the fact less than a decade ago this Committee shared bipartisan support for increasing funding to this vital safety net. Elimination of SSBG would place a huge, undue burden on states already facing tight budgets. At a time when states are struggling to avoid further cuts to the human service delivery systems, arguing that funding for the SSBG should be eliminated because it is duplicative disregards the underlying need for services that will not go away even if funding does.

In closing, I ask that you not turn your back on vulnerable children and families, in an attempt to reduce the deficit. CWLA appreciates your leadership in these trying times.

Sincerely,

CHRISTINE JAMES-BROWN,
President/CEO.

COALITION ON HUMAN NEEDS,

Washington, DC, April 18, 2012.

DEAR MEMBER OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: This morning, the Committee will mark up legislation making reckless and extreme cuts in assistance for poor and vulnerable people, cutting even more deeply than the House budget resolution required of you. It is particularly striking, considering that tax policy is within the jurisdiction of your Committee, that the chokes for reducing the deficit come solely by hurting low-income children and families, seniors, and the uninsured.

The Coalition on Human Needs strongly urges you to reject this course. Here are some of the reasons why the reconciliation cuts proposed are so unwise:

Denying the Child Tax Credit to millions of poor children: By eliminating the Child Tax Credit for working families who use a Taxpayer Identification Number instead of a Social Security Number, you will hurt millions of poor children by raising their families' taxes by an average of $1,800. Their incomes average $21,000 a year; four out of five of the children in these families are citizens. A decision to make poverty deeper for millions of children is reckless because it increases the chances that these children will suffer inadequate nutrition, become sick, experience developmental delays, and fall behind in school—all documented outcomes associated with child poverty. It is wrong and makes no sense to compromise children's life chances by deepening their poverty.

Permanently terminating the Social Services Block Grant: Ending this vital source of funds to programs operated by states will mean millions of low-income seniors, children, and families will do without help. In particular, this extreme cut will deny protection to millions of children and older people who are victims of abuse or neglect—a truly reckless choice. Some examples of the services that will be terminated:

Child Protective Services: 41 states used over $270 million in SSBG funds to protect children from abuse and neglect in FY 2009, providing services to more than 1.75 million children, in a year when child protective services agencies received an estimated 3.3 million reports of child abuse or neglect.

Among other services to protect children from abuse and neglect provided through SSBG:

36 states used $391 million for foster care services for more than 451,000 children.

Over the course of FY 2009, more than 700,000 children spent at least part of the year in foster, kinship, or residential care. Many states use SSBG funds to pay foster care costs for children not eligible for Title IV–E foster care assistance. 30 states used $133 million in SSBG funds in FY 2008 for prevention and intervention services for more than 640,000 children.

(Source: the National Foster Care Coalition, citing data collected by the Office of Community Services, HHS (http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/ssbg/reports/ssbg__focus__2009/child__protective__services.html)).

Adult Protective Services (for seniors); 34 states used $216 million in SSBG funds to provide adult protective services to seniors who were victims of abuse or neglect in FY 2009. These funds provided protective services to 579,465 seniors in 2009, up from 411,691 in 2005. These funds provided core protective services for older adults: investigations, interventions, and shelters for abused elders. Such services are not funded by the Older Americans Act, and so states use SSBG to carry out these essential protections. Ten states use 10 percent or more of their SSBG funds for adult protective services, among them:

New York: 37%
South Carolina: 23%
West Virginia: 18%
Texas: 16%
Oklahoma: 16%
Tennessee: 13%

A false rationale for terminating the Social Services Block Grant is that its funds are ''duplicative.'' These core protective services are not provided elsewhere. In the case of seniors, the Older Americans Act does not provide them at all. State funding in many states has been reduced, even for services to protect children and seniors from abuse and neglect. (Source: Office of Community Services, HHS, FY 2009 reports, at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/ssbg/reports/ssbg__focus__2009/child__protective____services.html.)

Child Care: 35 states used $391 million in FY 2009 to provide child care.

Six states spent more than 20 percent of their SSBG funds for child care:

California: 52%
Oregon: 43%
Connecticut: 35%
Pennsylvania: 31%
Delaware: 21%
Rhode Island: 21%
New Hampshire: 20%

(Source: Office of Community Services, HHS, SSBG focus reports, http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/ssbg/reports/ssbg__focus__2009/child__care.html)

States were struggling to provide child care in the face of severe state budget shortfalls and eroding federal assistance. According to the National Women's Law Center, 37 states reduced their child care assistance in FY 2011 below FY 2010 levels. At the federal level, even the increases proposed in the President's budget for FY 2013 will only support 1.5 million children receiving child care, down from 1.7 million children in FY 2010. (Source: http://www.nwlc.org/resource/additional-child-care-funding-essential-stop-state-cuts) To deny child care assistance to the 4 million children who make use of SSBG funds would inflict grossly irresponsible harm to low-income working families. Making work more difficult at a time when the economy remains so fragile makes no sense.

When the Social Services Block Grant was created, its stated purpose was to give states flexibility by pooling funds from previously separate funding streams so states could determine where the funds were most needed. Now to take the funding away because it is ''duplicative'' misses the point of this flexible funding source, denying states support for the services they have deemed important, because other funding sources are either nonexistent or inadequate to meet need.

Recapturing overpayments In premium subsidies under the Affordable Care Act: There have already been policy changes to get some of the overpayments back when people do not estimate their income correctly. To seek the full cost of the premium subsidies back will be a tremendous disincentive to participating in the program at

all, since many low-income families' earnings fluctuate in a way that makes it impossible to be certain what level of subsidy to claim. Having to repay the entire amount will create significant hardships for families already living on the edge.

Sincerely,

DEBORAH WEINSTEIN,
Executive Director.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a distinguished gentleman on the Budget Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we've heard a lot about fairness, which the Democrats have defined to mean taxing businesses to finance a variety of welfare programs.

The problem is businesses do not pay business taxes. Business taxes can only be paid by consumers through higher prices; by employees through lower wages; and by investors—mainly pension funds—through lower earnings. There is no other way to pay a business tax.

So the net effect of pursuing their definition of ''fairness'' is to push more consumers into debt, push more employees into unemployment, and push more retirees into poverty, which in turn requires more and more government welfare spending until their financial house of cards collapses. That's the economic spiral their policies are producing in our time.

The House budget, which this act advances, breaks that cycle and restores policies that throughout our history have lifted our Nation from times of want and despair to eras of prosperity and abundance.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, we're still waiting for this House to take up the President's jobs bill that was submitted last September. We've seen 25 consecutive months of positive private sector job growth. It was a whole lot better than where we were in January when the President was sworn in, losing 800,000 jobs a month. But we need to sustain that recovery, and we're still waiting. The clock is ticking. Let's take that legislation up so that we can accelerate the recovery.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas, representing the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, and I thank the ranking member of the full Judiciary Committee, Mr. CONYERS, who worked extensively to bring reason to this discussion.

I must remind my colleagues that this is a debate that is, of course, necessary, but it is not going anywhere. This is in essence to respond to the potential and pending sequestration and the deadlock of the committee, but the deadlock of the committee gave us an opportunity to work in a bipartisan manner.

My good friend who just spoke on the other side of the aisle talked about abundance and prosperity and talked about welfare. What I would say to the gentleman is that we're not talking about welfare. We're talking about investment in people, and we're talking about not having a siege upon our children.

On April 25, 2012, we were back in the Judiciary Committee again looking at medical malpractice for the umpteenth time. I wondered why we were there. It was because each committee was told to find a way to find money. So the directions of the Republicans for the Judiciary Committee were to oppress the sick and to be able to cap medical malpractice insurance on innocent victims such as women and children and the elderly when the medical system fails us as it relates to medical devices and other elements.

We were told to eliminate for the children of America by limiting noneconomic damages, restricting punitive damages, limiting access to courts for poor victims of medical malpractice, shortening the statute of limitations for claims, eliminating the protections of children, and prohibiting joint and several liability. We were simply told to shut the courthouse door for children that needed to be able to have the opportunity to have their lives saved, just like a little boy who needed surgery in a hospital in San Antonio. They told the family it was a serious surgery and they needed to have a cardiologist on staff. He went into surgery, and, of course, things went wrong. There was no cardiologist there; there was a mishap; there was a fault; and that little boy died. They want to deny that poor family access to the courthouse. That is what that bill does.

When my friends begin to talk about what else it does, it cuts SNAP, the nutrition program. It cuts Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, what I would say is that this bill is a siege on children. We should oppose it. It is not reconciliation. It is oppression. I would ask us to vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5652, the ''Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012'' This piece of legislation should really be entitled the ''Ryan's Replacement Sequester to Thwart the Bipartisan Budget Control Act of 2012''

Whatever anyone wants to entitle this measure, one thing will still remain true . . . this legislation is unfair. It literally takes money out of programs dedicated to serving low income families, children, seniors, the disabled, the most in need of our assistance. Why isn't the funding coming from war savings. There has been a consistent attack on the other side of the aisle on programs that are proven to be affective at combating the stresses associated with poverty, aging, and long term care. Before us is a measure that is a wolf in sheep's clothing.

In my lifetime, I have never seen such a concerted effort to ransom the American economy in order to extort the American public. While I support bipartisan efforts to decrease the debt and to resolve our differences over budgetary revenue and spending issues, I cannot support a bill that unduly robs average Americans of their economic security and ability to provide for their families while constraining the ability of Congress to deal effectively with America's economic, fiscal, and job creation troubles.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to give the American people the impression that their sentimental and unbridled concern for the military means that it is necessary to take an ax to programs for seniors and low income that is not something that our military would be proud to be connected too. Why not use, instead, war savings and a small finite tax on income over $1 million dollars.

This unbalanced bill modifies last year's bipartisan Budget Control Act to cancel the sequestration of discretionary spending currently scheduled to occur in January 2013 in order to prevent cuts to defense. That is fine but Republicans have already voted twice this year to pass their budget to end the Medicare guarantee and increase costs for seniors while giving massive tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans.

While the U.S. economy is healing, the world economy continues to be in a fragile state and all economies are linked through trade and finance. In this environment, this bill sends the economy downward. However, over the last few years the economy has been steadily growing. We are not where the American people should be but the economy has gained jobs.

According to Secretary Solis she stated ''know where our nation's unemployment rate stands. I have to report it every month. But we've now added private sector jobs to our economy for 26 months running. Since President Obama took office, we've created 4.2 million new jobs. That's no small potatoes when you consider we were bleeding 750,000 jobs a month when this President took office. I know we've got a lot more to do. But we're making progress.'' During this time of progress, this is no time to cut the social safety net for those still unemployed—no time to cut food stamps, medicaid, or medicare.

The President signed the Recovery Act which invested in mass transit, roads, and bridges to build critical infrastructure and secure construction jobs. The Recovery Act also included strong Davis-Bacon and Buy American provisions, to stimulate local economies and create high-quality jobs. In total, the Recovery Act supported up to 3.5 million jobs through the end of 2010.

It is essential that we allocate the money spent on previous wars to programs to help expand opportunities for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, if you asked the typical American family what they would need to do to balance their family budget, they would respond: spend less. But they would also be quick to acknowledge that without a job, or in the case of the federal budget, tax revenue, the budget will never balance. It is critical to address both sides of the ledger. It is also imperative for the Republicans to place the President's jobs bill on the agenda to vote on and pass.

Sure, save money but cutting benefits but without additional revenue, the budget is doomed. Moreover, you surely would not find any family in Texas that would suggest buying luxury items, while struggling to balance the family budget is a sensible approach. But Republicans insist on advocating for tax breaks for the wealthy—the luxury class.

ECONOMISTS

Economists have long pointed to investments in ''human capital''—the productive capability that is embedded in people—as one of the most important determinants of economic growth. A large and growing body of literature has examined the returns to investments in human capital from both a societal and individual perspective.

In his book, Dangerous Half-Truths & Total Nonsense, Pfeffer writes: ''There is compelling evidence that when companies use Human Resources best practices based on the best research, they trump the competition. These findings are replicable in industry after industry, from automobiles to textiles, to computer software to baseball. ''We must use our Human Resources wisely.

ENERGY AND DEFICIT REDUCTION

And speaking of saving money and reducing the deficit, I have introduced H.R. 3710 which increases the acreage to 10 percent of what is already allocable under a proposal by Interior Secretary Salazar, as announced on November 8, 2011. In other words, more land will be available for exploration, in line with two objectives: decreasing our dependence on foreign sources for oil, and plugging our budget deficit.

The monies will be deposited into the DRES Fund and invested by the Secretary of the Treasury, until the money is transferred to the Coastal and Ocean Sustainability Health Fund (COSH). Annually, the Secretary of the Interior is required to lease 20 percent of the DRES. In addition, this bill will help foment job creation in an industry that is already responsible for 9.2 million American Jobs.

The bill also establishes the Deficit Reduction Energy Security Fund, housed within the United States Treasury Department, which will receive the accrued funds that are dedicated to deficit reduction. In order to ensure that the putative funds generated from the leasing activities which derive from this bill inure to the goal of deficit reduction, the legislation also sets up the aforementioned COSH.

This bill establishes in the Department of the Treasury, the COSH, which shall fund grants for addressing coastal and ocean disasters; and programs and activities that restore, protect, maintain, manage, or understand marine resources and their habitats, and ocean, and coastal resources, including baseline scientific research, and other programs in coordination with federal and state agencies. Monies will be deposited into the COSH fund from interest accrued on OCS royalties, rents, revenues, and fees that will remain, for the period of one year, in the Fund before moving the entirety of the principle in the general Treasury. The bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to make grants for such purposes. I look forward to working with members of this Committee and our colleagues to ensure passage of this legislation.

Simply put Mr. Speaker, my bill does not rob Peter to pay Paul but actually requires that money made from the hard work of drilling by our companies is rededicated to reducing our deficit—common sense fiscal and energy policy.

As called for by the House's FY 2013 budget resolution, it replaces the $98 billion sequester in discretionary spending with a $19 billion reduction in the discretionary cap for FY 2013 and with ''reconciliation'' savings from mandatory programs recommended by six House committees. These cuts hurt the American people, children and families.

It also eliminates the separate cap on defense spending for the year to allow for higher spending levels. The measure would modify mandatory programs to save $19.7 billion through FY 2013 and about $315 billion over 10 years, including by decreasing benefits and eligibility for the food stamp program, reducing and repealing elements of the 2010 health care law, and requiring all current and future federal workers to pay an additional 5 percentage points of this salary toward their federal pensions.

President Obama and Democrats oppose the GOP measure, and say that preventing the January 2013 sequester and replacing the savings that would come through sequestration should be done in a ''balanced'' approach in which revenue is part of the solution.

Republicans must abandon their ideological agenda and join Democrats to restore fairness, opportunity, and prosperity to our budget and our economy.

TAXES AND THE BUFFETT RULE AND TAXES

Mr. Speaker, the cloud looming over this Congress is an unintended ''triple-watching hour'' of tax increases that will take effect at the beginning of 2013.

The expiration of the Bush Tax Cuts, the end of the recently extended Payroll Tax Cut, and increases in capital gains and dividends taxation will shock the conscience and wallets of the American people. That is why Congress needs to enact bi-partisan legislation that helps lower the deficit but does not wreck havoc on the financial soul of the middle class. This is a moral document and frankly, the other side is getting more than a little fresh with the American people. It is May and we are voting on a vacuous budget that will likely pass but is doomed to failure in the Senate.

But again, tax reform that lowers the rate, reduces the deficit, and does not pick winners and losers is not easy, but let's not forget, if President Reagan and then-Speaker Tip O'Neill could do it in 1986, anything is possible. But this morning we are not doing a bipartisan dance, but participating in a roller-derby, a truly zero-sum game.

In the budget, the Administration calls for individual tax reform that: cuts the deficit by $1.5 trillion, including the expiration of the high-income 2001 and 2003 tax cuts. As a matter of sound fiscal policy, I am supportive of this effort. I recognize the economic benefits that many attribute to the Bush Tax Cuts, but we must ask ourselves are they affordable at this time.

The President's budget also eliminates inefficient and unfair tax breaks for millionaires while making all tax breaks at least as good for the middle class as for the wealthy; and observes the Buffett Rule that no household making more than $1 million a year pays less than 30 percent of their income in taxes.

The individual income tax is a hodgepodge of deductions, exemptions, and credits that provide special benefits to selected groups of taxpayers and favored forms of consumption and investment. These tax preferences make the income tax unfair because they can impose radically different burdens on two different taxpayers with the same income. In essence, Congress has been picking winners and losers.

THE HOPE AND PROMISE OF THE DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE BUDGET

Preserves the Medicare guarantee and the Social Safety Net. The Democratic budget rejects any policy to end Medicare's guarantee of health care coverage for seniors and disabled workers, and ensures the social safety net remains intact.

Protects Medicare Beneficiaries. Rejects the Republican budget's proposal to end the Medicare guarantee. It supports reforms in the Affordable Care Act (ACA) to close the prescription drug ''donut hole'' for seniors with high prescription drug costs and ensure free preventive care. As a result of these measures, as well as provisions in the ACA to make Medicare spending more efficient, a person in Medicare will save an average of about $4,200 on premiums and coinsurance from 2011 through 2021. Medicare beneficiaries with high prescription drug costs will save even more—an average of nearly $16,000 over the same period.

Preserves Medicaid for Low-Income Families and Seniors. Maintains Medicaid to ensure that 57 million low-income people continue to get health care. Seniors and people with disabilities account for two-thirds of Medicaid spending, and children account for another 20 percent.

Preserves Supplemental Nutrition Assistance (SNAP). Fully funds SNAP and supports the President's proposal to continue certain benefits added because of the economic downturn. Nearly three-quarters of people served by SNAP are in families with children, and one-quarter are in households with someone who is elderly or disabled.

Protects Social Security from Privatization. Social Security is not responsible for our current deficits and should not be cut to reduce the deficit. However, many Republicans continue to advocate privatization, which would put retirees' financial security at risk and worsen the deficit for decades. Our budget affirmatively rules out privatization.

Helps Create More Jobs Now. Unlike the Republican resolution, our budget includes the President's jobs initiatives, including the following:

Transportation Jobs. $50 billion to fund jobs that address immediate surface transportation priorities and $10 billion to establish an infrastructure bank.

Tax Credits for Job Creation. A temporary 10 percent tax credit for new jobs and wage increases.

Tax Incentives for Manufacturing. Includes a number of incentives for domestic manufacturing, such as providing a tax credit for companies that return operations and jobs to the U.S. while eliminating tax breaks for companies that move opertions and jobs overseas.

Education Jobs. $80 billion to promote jobs creating the infrastructure to help students learn and create a better future workforce, including $30 billion to put hundreds of thousands of Americans back to work upgrading at least 35,000 crumbling public schools, and $25 billion to help prevent hundreds of thousands of educator layoffs.

First Responder Jobs. $5 billion to help states and localities hire police officers and firefighters and reverse previous layoffs.

Jobs for Veterans. $1 billion for the President's proposal to establish a Veterans Job Corps and employ at least 20,000 veterans.

Builds a Stronger America through Long-Term Growth. Our budget invests in research,

education, and innovation that will create a globally competitive workforce for the future.

Education Investments. Follows the President's request for increased investment in education and includes his request for $6 billion to prevent the interest rate on subsidized student loans from doubling this July.

Innovation and Research Investments. Funds science and engineering workforce development and supports innovative manufacturing processes that will reduce costs by using less energy, improving product quality, and accelerating product development.

Small Business Investments. Provides additional resources for the Small Business Administration (SBA) to ensure that the lending volume for loan programs remains the same, rather than shrinking and denying many small businesses' access to capital.

Infrastructure Investments. In addition to short-term jobs initiatives for transportation, our budget includes the President's six-year surface transportation proposal to create construction jobs and fuel long-term economic growth. It also includes additional funding to maintain America's harbors, seaports, and waterways.

Reduces the Deficit through Shared Responsibility. Congress has already reduced projected deficits by more than $1 trillion through discretionary cuts for 2011 and 2012 and enacting tight spending limits for the next nine years. Our budget further reduces the deficit with policies that balance spending cuts increased revenue.

Gets Deficits Under Control. The deficit falls from 8.7 percent of GDP in 2011 to under 3 percent of GDP by 2015, and it remains there through the ten-year budget window.

Cancels Sequestration and Replaces it with Balanced Deficit Reduction. Replaces the $1.2 trillion in deficit reduction under the scheduled Budget Control Act sequestration with greater deficit reduction from targeted spending cuts and revenue increases.

Provides Tax Relief for Working Families and Ends Tax Breaks for the Wealthy. Extends the 2001–03 tax cuts for the middle class and rejects tax increases on the middle class. Accommodates expansion of incentives for low- and middle-income families to earn income, save for retirement, and attend college. To increase fairness and reduce the deficit, this budget ends unwarranted and fiscally irresponsible Bush-era tax cuts for millionaires, closes a variety of corporate tax loopholes, and establishes a ''Buffett Rule'' to ensure that working families do not face a higher tax rate than the wealthiest Americans.

RYAN REPUBLICAN ALTERNATIVE: HURT AND PAIN—PART II

Ends the Medicare Guarantee. The Republican budget ends the Medicare guarantee, giving seniors a voucher with an artificial price cap to purchase insurance and leaving it up to them to figure out how to keep their costs down as the value of their voucher fails to keep pace with projected growth in health care costs. This plan will raise health care costs for seniors and leave traditional Medicare to ''wither on the vine.''

Reopens the Medicare ''Donut Hole'' and Increases Costs of Preventive Care Services. The budget takes away important Medicare improvements for seniors and persons with disabilities by repealing key provisions of the Affordable Care Act. The budget reduces the prescription drug health by re-opening the coverage gap, or ''donut-hole,'' and it increase costs to seniors for preventive care services. Reopening care services. Reopening the donut hole alone will increase costs for Medicare beneficiaries with high prescription drug costs by an average over $10,000 over the next ten years.

Abandons American Workers. Putting Americans back to work is the fastest and most effective way to reduce the short-term deficit-in fact, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that slow growth and under-employment account for over one-third of the projected deficit for 2012. But the Republican budget turns it back on American workers, ignoring the President's proposals for new jobs for teachers, first responders, construction workers, and veterans involved in building a better infrastructure that will boost our economy now and in the future. Independent analysts have found that the Republican budget could lead to the loss of more than 2 million jobs over two years.

Transportation Jobs. Instead of investing in infrastructure, the Republican budget reduces transportation spending by at least one-quarter over 10 years. Next year, transportation spending would be barely one-half of this year's level, a steep cut that could delay or stop projects already underway. A failure to invest in transportation will also hurt businesses' ability to transport goods and supplies in the long run, weakening future economic growth.

Tax Breaks for Outsourcing jobs. The Republican budget boosts tax incentives that encourage multinational companies to ship profits, intellectual property, and thousands of jobs overseas while costing the American economy billions of dollars.

Makes College More Expensive, Undermining U.S. Competitiveness. The budget eviscerates funding for higher education, eliminating the $104 billion that Congress has already enacted to help sustain the maximum Pell grant award and to provide for yearly inflationary increases. It adds an average of $2,800 in higher loan repayment costs to more than 7 million low-and moderate-income college students by letting the interest rate on subsidized students loans double, from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. It also eliminate $47 billion for lower-cost loans for low-income students as well as repayment plans enacted and paid for by previous Democratic Congresses. It even rejects the President's proposal to extend a $2,500 tax cut to working families to help cover the costs of college, refusing to extend the American Opportunity Tax Credit beyond December. Overall, mandatory higher education funding is cut by $166 billion over ten years versus current law levels, and by $285 billion below the President's request.

Slashes the Social Safety Net. The Republican budget shreds the social safety net for seniors, low-income children, persons with disabilities, and families struggling to get by in a challenging economy, all while cutting taxes for the very wealthy.

Slashes Medicaid for Seniors and Low-Income Families. The budget slashes Medicaid by $810 billion and converts it into a block grant to states. ''Block-granting'' Medicaid is not entitlement reform it is entitlement destruction. This is simply code for deep, arbitrary cuts in support to the most vulnerable seniors, individuals with disabilities, and low-income children.

Block-grants and Cuts Supplemental Nutrition Assistance (SNAP). The budget slashes SNAP funding by $133.5 billion over ten years, harming the million who rely on this aid to feed their families. Nearly three-quarters of people served by SNAP are in families with children, and one-quarter are in households with someone who is elderly or disabled.

Abandons Fairness. The budget provides tax breaks for the wealthy and special interests at the expense of everyone else. Republicans' refusal to ask millionaires to pay one more penny in taxes leads them to place the entire burden of reducing deficits and debts on the shoulders of middle-income families and seniors. This budget dismantles the Medicare guarantee, cuts back and nutritional assistance for low-income children and families, and severely underfunds the crucial health care safety net for more than 56 million Americans provided by Medicaid. At the same time, it showers an additional $4.6 trillion in tax cuts (over and above extending all of the Bush-era tax cuts) that primarily benefit the wealthy. Overall, millionaries can expect an average tax cut of $394,000 in this budget, which includes $129,000 just from extending all of the Bush-era tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, again I call on my colleagues to vote against H.R. 5652, an unrealistic, unpragmatic, and unPATRIOTIC so-called bill that is a punch to the gut of the most vulnerable Americans.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIRE FIGHTERS®,
Washington, DC, May 10, 2012.

MEMBER OF CONGRESS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the nation's 300,000 professional fire fighters and emergency medical personnel, I write to express my strong opposition to H.R. 5652, the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012. This legislation would rewrite the bipartisan Budget Control Act of 2011 by placing greater economic hardships on working class Americans or vulnerable populations.

Although the IAFF is deeply concerned with the impact that defense cuts will have on our federal members employed at defense installations, we cannot support unraveling the Budget Control Act through the unbalanced and draconian approach of H.R. 5652. Balancing the budget on the backs of fire fighters without requiring those who are well off in our society to share more of the burden is simply inexcusable. To solve our fiscal challenges, we must have shared sacrifice from all members in our society. Instead of shared sacrifice, H.R. 5652 just leaves fire fighters sacrificed at the altar.

One of the main ways H.R. 5652 achieves savings in the federal budget is by shifting a greater burden for funding essential services to state and local governments. Over the past five years, states already have cut nearly $300 billion from their operating budgets as a result of the Great Recession. Even as the private sector recovers, state and local governments are still struggling to balance their budgets, leading to continued job losses among fire fighters and other public sector employees. Since April 2012, the U.S. economy has lost 584,000 jobs in the public sector. Further cuts in federal aid for essential government services will only exacerbate public sector job losses and undermine core functions of government such as fire protection and emergency medical treatment.

Specifically, H.R. 5652 would completely eliminate the Social Services Block Grant, saving the federal government $18.7 billion. Originally established during the Reagan administration, these critical funds help state and local governments provide essential

services to 23 million seniors, children, and disabled Americans. Home-based services like Meals on Wheels, child-care services for low-income families, and programs to prevent child abuse and neglect all receive funding, in whole or in part, through the Social Services Block Grant.

H.R. 5652 would also cut $22.7 billion from the Medicaid program. Created along with Medicare in 1965, Medicaid represents an historic joint commitment by the federal government and our states and territories to provide essential health care to our nation's poor. Medicaid is one of our nation's core safety-net programs. As the depths of the Great Recession grew, so too did Medicaid enrollment, creating increased pressures on state budgets. The proposed cuts in H.R. 5652 to Medicaid will only add to state budget pressures. For example, nearly half of the cuts will come from a reduction in the state provider tax threshold. States can use the revenues generated from the provider tax to offset their share of Medicaid payments.

Eliminating the Social Services Block Grant and cutting Medicaid would have disastrous consequences for our local communities. State and local governments would be hard-pressed to fill the budget holes created by H.R. 5652. Without these funds, state and local governments may be forced to eliminate these programs or cut funding from other essential programs such as the fire service to balance their budgets. Either way, the consequences to our local communities would be devastating.

Furthermore, the IAFF strenuously objects to forcing drastically higher pension contributions from current and future federal employees. H.R. 5652 would require all current federal employees to contribute an additional five percent in pay toward their defined benefit pension plan, with no enhancement in benefits. Federal workers have already contributed $60 billion toward deficit reduction through a two-year pay freeze. Forcing greater economic sacrifices from federal fire fighters is particularly insulting, given the sacrifices these brave men and women already make on the job. The nation's federal fire fighters protect many of America's most vital national assets, ranging from sensitive military bases to Veterans hospitals. Federal fire fighters should not be treated like a piggy bank for Congress.

For these reasons, we urge you to reject H.R. 5652, the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012 when it comes for a vote in the U.S. House of Representatives. Thank you for your consideration of the views of America's front line domestic defenders.

Sincerely,

HAROLD A. SCHAITBERGER,
General President.

□ 1250

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting just to hear all the hyperbole. As a freshman that walks in this body, I'm not used to hearing all the back-and-forth. I am used to sitting down at a table and working things out and actually going through the facts. It's always fascinating for me to be able to hear the speeches and to be able to hear how impressive things are when there are some simple things. It reminds me again of how difficult it really is to bring down Federal spending and to actually balance our budget when we can't agree on simple things—simple things like:

Should we write a check and mail it on April 15 to people that are here in this country illegally? Yes or no.

If people do not qualify for food stamps, should we give them food stamps anyway?

If there's a TARP program that's out there that all of us, in a bipartisan manner, have said does not work—it was supposed to give home assistance for mortgages to millions of people, and it's been a miserable failure—can we close down that program and use those dollars?

The answer seems to come back, no, no, and no. And it's this repetitive statement again and again of, if we'll just tax those oil companies, everything will be all right. Well, I'm sorry, but a $4 billion tax on oil companies, which will cause prices to increase on gasoline, does not solve a $1 trillion hole.

This is a first step. This is a beginning point to say we've got to get in balance. And this is a real, practical way to begin to deal with fraud and abuse and waste in our system and duplication in government so we do not have the across-the-board sequestration, so we do not have a big hit on our defense. We've got to solve this. And we should be able to come together and say this is waste, abuse, and fraud. Let's settle that before we deal with taxes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing about waste, fraud, and abuse. We all need to do everything humanly possible to make sure there's no waste, fraud, and abuse. We keep hearing about these people who are receiving assistance under Food and Nutrition programs like they are cheating the system. They are eligible for the program. And that is why the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says that 22 million households with kids are going to see their food nutrition cut, not because they're getting it somehow fraudulently. It is because what the Republican proposal does is cut it off. Almost 2 million people will be eliminated from access to the Food and Nutrition program.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), somebody who knows a lot about these issues and is a terrific member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. MOORE. I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

It's important that the American people know the truth about this sequestration replacement bill. And no matter how many times we hear that this package is going to cut welfare programs or socialist programs, like Medicare and Medicaid, things that we call the safety net, all for the sake of reserving every last dime of military spending, ignoring the opportunity to rout out waste, fraud, and peace dividends, it doesn't add up.

The math I was taught is that what you do to one side of an equation, you have to do to the other side of the equation for it to balance out. You can't just subtract from the social safety net—Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, cut the Social Services Block Grant, stop the Wall Street bailouts; you can't just add more tax cuts for the wealthiest, add more defense spending, maintain oil subsidies, maintain expensive corporate farm subsidies and say that that's a balanced approach.

I have very limited time, but I want to say to Americans: It don't add up. This dog doesn't hunt. You can't just cut the social safety net and add billions of dollars of corporate welfare and say that that's a balanced equation. It doesn't support simple math.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds all Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the purpose of joining me in a colloquy.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if he could respond to the notion: All of us want to protect the social safety nets for the truly needy, but we also want to stop abuses within the system that take money from those programs and hurt the poor, for example, people who hide their assets to fraudulently qualify, people who misuse food stamps for alcohol and tobacco.

So I would like to ask the gentleman if he is going to be doing more to close the loopholes, to reduce waste and abuse, and reform the system, while really protecting those who qualify.

Mr. LUCAS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is exactly right. That is the goal of our language in this bill, and it will be the additional efforts that we will undergo in the comprehensive farm bill that will follow soon.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I have one additional question for the gentleman.

In fairness here, will you be bringing forward a bill to the House from the committee that's truly going to reform farm subsidies, produce savings, and result in deficit reduction?

Mr. LUCAS. I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that, when we come with our comprehensive farm bill, things that have been identified by many people as a concern, like the direct payments, will not be there. We will address all spending in all portions of the farm bill. We will make reductions in every part of agricultural spending, as we do our part in helping address this huge, tremendous national deficit.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for his responses.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to hear that last colloquy, because this Republican proposal cut the Food and Nutrition programs in the Ag Committee's jurisdiction and then

didn't ask for one penny from the ag subsidies. If our Democratic substitute had been made in order, that was one of the cuts that we made in order to prevent devastating cuts to the Food and Nutrition programs for over 22 million American families with children.

I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to achieve a very worthy goal: reduce the debt of the United States and establish a sustainable level of spending. I share that goal, but I oppose this bill for two reasons:

First, the proponents of this bill know—or they certainly should know—that there is absolutely no chance this bill will be passed by the Senate or signed by the President. That turns this into a political manifesto, not a practical proposal.

Second, and most importantly, the design of this bill guarantees that it will fail. Our budget is a three-pronged stool: domestic spending, Pentagon spending, and revenues. And if you want a strong and durable stool, you need three strong legs. This budget cuts two away. It takes revenues off the table completely, and it exempts the Pentagon, with its nearly $700 billion budget, from making any contribution to debt reduction.

Mr. Speaker, our debt problem is serious but solvable. There were 100 of us in this House—60 Democrats and 40 Republicans—who wrote to the supercommittee, and we said the obvious: Put everything on the table. By doing so, we can succeed.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, in my office, as we all do, we get emails, from time to time, from constituents, viral emails alleging, from time to time, some type of violent fraud in the system or some type of bizarre government overreach, and we actually research them in my office to find out if they are true or not.

□ 1300

And we got this one this week—in fact, we got dozens of them this week—about a program that, supposedly, was part of an investigative report by a television station in the Midwest. It said that, supposedly, illegal immigrants were able to file paperwork every April 15 and receive a thousand dollars back from the Federal Government for every child that they had, regardless of whether or not they could prove the child existed, regardless of whether or not the child actually lived in the country.

I was stunned by it, to be quite frank with you, and we gave it to my office to actually research it. And it turns out, Mr. Speaker, stunningly, it's absolutely true. Absolutely true. And it's not just the radio station or television station in the Midwest. The IRS admits that this is true. The inspector general looked into this and said we are spending $4 billion every single year—over $4 billion—on this type of program. They admit that it's true, and the IRS has asked us to act. And we have done nothing.

This is an outrage, Mr. Speaker. I'm surprised to hear anybody defend this system. This is the type of waste, fraud, and abuse that undermines confidence in the way we do business in this town. This is the type of thing that gives people concern that we don't have any idea what we're doing about anything.

The good news here is that, for a change, we actually have a chance to do something about it. We could pass the bill of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JOHNSON), but we could also do something today. We don't have to wait to fix this type of abuse. We can pass this reconciliation bill today and stop this program and at least take a small step towards restoring confidence in the way the American government provides services to its people. And I hope we do exactly that.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), who is on the Ways and Means Committee and knows a lot about this issue.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, we just heard a moment ago from the gentleman from South Carolina that there was an illicit or perhaps illegal initiative that was taking place across the country in the Midwest. So the answer in that instance is to notify the U.S. Attorney's Office if it's fraudulent. The answer there is to notify immigration authorities.

But this argument right here is not about illegal immigration. This argument today is about once again asking the wealthiest people in our society just to sacrifice a bit.

When the gentleman talks about $4 billion of fraud, there isn't anybody on the Democratic side that encourages or countenances the idea of fraud. Tell the American people where the expenditures go.

A million new veterans have been created between Afghanistan and Iraq. You're 20 years old, and you've been wounded in Iraq or Afghanistan, you're going to be in the care of the VA system for the next 50 or 60 years. We are obligated to take care of them. That's where the money goes.

We cut taxes in this country by $2.3 trillion during the Bush years, and my Republican pals were all culpable in that argument. You can fight two wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, now both north of $2 trillion, and cut taxes by $2.3 trillion, and people wonder why we're in the predicament that we're in.

Twelve successive years of tax cuts, and at the same time asking nothing of the people at the very top, who, incidentally, during the Clinton years were not even asking for a tax cut. Their argument was: Pay down the debt.

We are being asked to revisit with this budget what went awry during the Bush years. We are being asked with this budget to go back to the policies that got us into this predicament during the Bush years. We are being asked at this time, once again, to ask the poorest people in our society to shoulder the burden of tax cuts for the wealthiest in America—tax cuts that have not paid for themselves, tax cuts that will not pay for themselves, and tax cuts that do not take us on a sound path to fiscal stability in the near- or long-term future.

This conversation should be about balancing the budget, and it should be done by Democrats and Republicans, not with a sledge hammer, as is being proposed early this afternoon.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I would say, Mr. Speaker, this is not a tax cut bill, this is a spending cut bill.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5652, the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act. I commend Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN for the leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor.

This reconciliation legislation will make necessary and strategic reforms to a number of mandatory programs to better ensure that those most in need of government assistance receive it, instead of individuals who are not eligible or indeed may be gaming the system. With these reforms, we will find nearly $328 billion in savings over 10 years. Furthermore, H.R. 5652 will offset $78 billion in cuts to the Department of Defense as a result of sequestration.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that there are two provisions that I authored that have been included in H.R. 5652. The first is H.R. 5, which seeks to address the rising cost of health care through meaningful, fair, and balanced medical liability reform. The second is H.R. 1683, the State Flexibility Act, which seeks to correct a problem created by the failed stimulus and ObamaCare. This provision gives States the opportunity to root out waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicaid program.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 5652.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Democratic Whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the challenging times we live in force us to make difficult choices about our priorities. The reconciliation bill before us today is an example of choosing the wrong priorities.

While we must address our deficits and avert sequestration, the Republican reconciliation bill does it absolutely the wrong way. It places the entire burden of deficit reduction on the

most vulnerable while asking nothing of the best off. Indeed, it asks for more from those who have less, and less from those who have more. It harms seniors and children by eliminating Social Services Block Grants, which provide for programs for our communities like child protection services and Meals on Wheels.

They say they're getting rid of fraud, waste, and abuse—I've heard that for 31 years—while they added $6.4 trillion to the deficit. It slashes food stamp funding by $33.2 billion. They say that's waste, fraud, and abuse. CBO does not agree. It's real assistance to families in need. Furthermore, it cuts the pay of middle class workers who serve the public—the only workers it adversely affects.

These are the priorities we've seen throughout the Republican budget: Ending the Medicare guarantee, slashing jobs while cutting taxes for the wealthiest at the expense of seniors. The gentleman from Wisconsin says this bill doesn't do that. He's correct. His budget did that.

Middle class families and those who are the most vulnerable pay the price.

Democrats have our own proposal. Unfortunately, it wasn't made in order. As the gentleman from Maryland, my colleague said, you only had to waive one rule as opposed to the three you waived for your budget, but you wouldn't do it because you didn't want to have the American public see the real alternatives out here. I regret that. To that extent, you closed down this rule which you railed so much against.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. Unlike today's Republican bill, our proposal reduces deficits in a balanced way and prevents sequestration through a balanced combination of spending cuts and revenues.

And let me say something: Nobody is asked to make a sacrifice in the richest country on Earth; what we have to do is make appropriate contributions. Nobody is asked to make a sacrifice—and certainly not the most vulnerable in our country, as does this reconciliation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this bill. We can and should do better.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Maryland and I rise in opposition to this bill.

It should come as no surprise the Republicans in Congress do not take the budget deficit seriously. When they were in total control during 6 of the 8 Bush years, they did nothing to reduce the deficit. Quite the opposite.

Republicans say they're all for cutting spending, just not the spending they like. So here we have an attempt to replace sequestration so that they can continue to destroy the social safety net while protecting defense spending, Big Oil, and the wealthiest in this country, yet again asking the middle and lower classes to bear the cost of cutting the budget.

I said when they agreed to the sequester that they'd try to back out of the deal to protect their pet policies and gut the social safety net. And that's what we see in this document: cutting food stamps, cutting SNAP, hurting senior citizens, repealing evidence of health care reforms, hurting Federal workers.

□ 1310

I voted against the Budget Control Act because it was an unbalanced budget that put the responsibility of balancing the budget on the backs of the middle class. But at least it was an agreement that put both defense and discretionary spending up for equal cuts. It was an agreement that both parties came to, recognizing the need to cut Federal spending. Now the Republicans are trying to back out of that. And in backing out of that, they are protecting the wealthiest among us, hurting the middle class. This is the wrong way to go. It is a shameful document.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I continue to reserve.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, it's called a reconciliation act, but how do we reconcile more money for bombs while cutting money for bread? How do we reconcile our Nation helping oil companies, arms merchants, and war profiteers while cutting assistance to low- and moderate-income families?

My colleagues are worried about abuse of food stamps. I wish they would have additional concern and sympathy for the abuse of the middle class, for 10 million Americans out of work, for millions losing their homes, their retirement security.

Let's look to where the real fraud is in our government—in wars based on lies, over trillions of dollars, billions of U.S. money lost or stolen in Afghanistan. Just in the last week, $80 million for a consulate that they are not even going to use, they are going to close. And we blame poor people using food stamps?

The real deficit we're dealing with here is a moral deficit, and it's time that we face the truth.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this misguided budget that we'll vote on today. This package literally takes food off the table for millions of disadvantaged Americans by cutting $33 billion from the SNAP program.

I ask my Republican colleagues: Where are your priorities? Is it to take from the poor to give to the rich?

SNAP is a lifeline for 46 million Americans. We continue to spend hundreds of millions of dollars every year to assist foreign countries, but we don't spend money to take care of the struggling families right here at home. It's a shame.

This budget proposal not only cuts benefit levels, but it also keeps thousands of children from receiving school meals. Can you imagine going to school on an empty stomach and having to take a test? In America, this should not happen.

I understand the value of the SNAP program because I once relied on food stamps. Unless you've been in that situation, you don't know what it's like. You have no choice. You have no choice but to receive assistance to feed your family.

I ask my colleagues to make sure that we vote against this and make sure that we put food on the table for the 46 million people who are going hungry right here in the United States. Vote ''no'' on this.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

As we said at the beginning, there is no disagreement over the fact that we need to have a plan to reduce our deficit. The question has been how. And there is no dispute about whether we need to replace the sequester, the meat-ax cuts that will take place automatically January 1. Again, the question is how.

The Republican approach once again asks nothing of people who are doing so well in this country, people who are making over $1 million a year. And because they ask nothing of them, their budget hits everybody else. The figures we're talking about today, these are about real people. These are figures from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office as to the impact of their proposal: 300,000 kids will lose their health care coverage under CHIPs; 22 million kids will see their food and nutrition support under SNAP reduced; 2 million people will see all of their food and nutrition support eliminated. Those are facts.

I know people want to pretend that this doesn't impact real people. That makes it easier to say we're not going to ask big oil companies to get rid of their subsidies if we can pretend that the cuts don't have an impact, but they do. And that's why every bipartisan group that's looked at this budget challenge has said we need a combination of cuts. We did a trillion more, and we have cuts in our substitute, but you also need to get some revenue by closing some of these tax loopholes.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats had a substitute amendment. The Republicans won't even let us have a vote on

it. They waived three provisions in their rules to bring up their proposal. They wouldn't waive one to hear an alternative.

We keep hearing that it's so important to reduce the deficit; apparently, not important enough to ask for one penny from people who are making a million dollars a year.

We keep hearing that the impact of sequester is going to hit defense. But again, not one penny from the oil companies to help take a balanced approach.

I urge rejection of the Republican proposal.

I wish we could have an up-or-down vote on the Democratic substitute. That would be democracy, but maybe that's asking too much these days.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield the balance of my time to a lady who has spent her life fighting for justice and trying to make sure that is reflected in the budgets that we present to the American people, the distinguished Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to call to the attention of all of our colleagues and those who follow the work of Congress the extraordinary contribution that Ranking Member CHRIS VAN HOLLEN has made to this debate. He has led our Democratic members on the Budget Committee in a way that reflects the values of our country: how we can meet the needs of our children, their health, their education, and the economic security of their families.

When people ask me what are the three most important issues facing the Congress, I always say the same thing: our children, our children, our children. And the issues that are addressed in the budget address the needs of our children directly and the families in which they live.

I watched with great pride the debate and the strong distinction that has been made between a values-based budget, put forth by the Democrats, that supports a thriving middle class, and the Ryan Republican Tea Party budget that upholds millionaires over the middle class.

We are here today because the Republicans in the House have decided over and over again to walk away from a bipartisan, bicameral agreement that we reached to avert economic crisis and to reduce our deficit and to honor the full faith and credit of the United States of America. They are walking away and punishing the middle class, because they refuse to close even one special interest tax loophole to reduce our deficit. They are putting Big Oil and millionaires ahead of America's middle-income families.

In recent weeks, House Republicans have voted twice—not once, but twice; here we go again, in the words of a great Republican President—have voted twice to pass a budget that gives massive tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans while ending the Medicare guarantee and increasing cost for seniors in the meantime. That is an absolute fact. Today Republicans are voting to begin implementing their out-of-touch budget, and middle class people, seniors, women, and children will pay the price.

Consider these few things. I know that members of the committee have made the case, but I just want to focus on a few things that affect people very directly in their lives.

This Republican-Ryan-Tea Party budget will assault women's health by eliminating the Prevention Fund: 326,000 women would not get the breast cancer screening they're slated to receive next year; 248,000 women would not get the cervical cancer screening they're slated to receive next year. Those are big numbers, but every individual case is important to the families that those women live in.

□ 1320

So the numbers are staggering, but the specific cases are what is important, and this is hundreds of thousands.

This budget would harm children and seniors, literally taking food out of the mouths of babies, as nearly 300,000 children would lose free or reduced-cost school meals—300,000 kids. Wait a minute. We're going to give a $400,000 tax cut to people making over $1 million a year, and we're going to take food from 300,000 children to do that.

1.7 million seniors would lose Meals on Wheels—people are familiar with that in their neighborhoods, in their communities—and other services.

It would put Wall Street ahead of middle class and working families by weakening the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. In the Wall Street reform bill, we not only had the biggest changes in regulations so that the recklessness on Wall Street would no longer cause joblessness on Main Street—the recklessness of some. I don't paint everyone with the same brush. The recklessness of some on Wall Street would not create, again, massive joblessness on Main Street.

In that same legislation—and they were the biggest regulation changes in a long time, decades—the biggest change in history was in the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. This budget weakens consumer protection. That's just not right.

So, here we are again with the Republican budget, to name a few.

In contrast to this draconian Republican bill, Democrats are fighting for a balanced approach that creates jobs, expands opportunity, reduces the deficit, protects the health and economic security of America's families, and honors the entrepreneurial spirit of America.

Republicans are focused on obstruction rather than solutions. Americans have rejected Republican obstructionism and made it clear over and over again: We must work together to find solutions.

Because this legislation will have a devastating impact, it's opposed by numerous organizations, from Easter Seals, to the National Women's Law Center, to the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, and Voices for America's Children.

As the Obama administration wrote in expressing their strong opposition to this bill, the bill's unbalanced provisions fail the test of fairness and shared responsibility. At the same time the House is advancing tax cuts that benefit the most fortunate Americans, this legislation would impose deep budget cuts that cost jobs and hurt the middle class and vulnerable Americans, especially seniors, veterans, and children.

Mr. Speaker, instead of the slash-and-burn approach, let's come together in a bipartisan way, in a balanced way, to cut our deficit by growing the economy, creating growth, creating jobs, bringing in revenue to reduce the deficit, to make the priority choices that reflect the values of our country, the values of fairness and opportunity, of sustaining a thriving middle class for the middle class and all who aspire to it. It is the backbone of our democracy. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this devastating bill.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First off, Mr. Speaker, let me thank those six committees that contributed to making this possible.

Over 60 percent of the Federal budget is in a category of spending we call mandatory spending. It's a budget term of art that means that part of spending is on autopilot. Congress does not address or oversee or set the levels of that spending in any given year. Congress does address what we call discretionary spending. That's government agency budgets—about 39 percent of the budget every single year. The last time Congress actually looked at this 60 percent of spending on autopilot for savings was 2005. It's important that we make sure that we're scrutinizing how we're spending hard-earned taxpayer dollars, and it's a shame that we haven't revisited this category of spending since 2005. We're doing that here.

Now, the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Speaker of the House, the minority leader of the House, they've all said that this sequester is a mistake; it's bad, it's going to hurt. Not only does it hollow out defense, according to the Defense Secretary, but it also creates an 8 percent across-the-board cut to domestic discretionary spending, like the National Institutes of Health. We think we should prevent that. On a bipartisan basis, we think we should prevent that. That's what we're doing. This is the only plan that says, Prevent that from happening, and here's how you pay for it. Here's our plan to stop that from happening, this event that everybody says should be stopped.

Now, when we take a look at what this package does, I think we want to

look at, is our government working the way it ought to be?

In particular, we're hearing lots of comments about how this hurts people, how this hurts the poor. Let's take a look at our poverty-fighting efforts. And should we measure our poverty-fighting efforts based on inputs or based on outcomes? Should we measure our poverty-fighting efforts based on how much money we're spending and how many programs we're creating? Or should we think about how many people are we getting out of poverty?

Here's the problem: These efforts aren't working. One out of six Americans today are in poverty. We have the highest poverty rates we've had in a generation. These programs aren't working. Let's fix them. Let's pass reforms that instead decrease the poverty rate, which is happening these days, and get people back into lives of self-sufficiency.

Let's go back to the American idea of an opportunity society with a safety net that doesn't keep people in poverty but gets people out of poverty into lives of self-sufficiency. And we're not going to be able to achieve that if we don't grow our economy. We're not going to be able to achieve that if we don't have more opportunities in society so that people who are on the bottom rung of the economic ladder can't climb up and out.

We shouldn't be defining success as how many people we have on these benefit programs. We should be defining success as to how many people we are graduating from these benefit programs into lives of self-sufficiency, into jobs. That's the American idea.

So when you take a look at whether these programs are working well or not, we need to reform them. We haven't touched these programs for decades. Food stamps, we've gone from 17 million people to 45 million people in a decade, a 270 percent spending increase—$1.8 billion in overpayments last year alone. We're just saying you need to qualify for the benefit to get the benefit.

Medicaid. If we think this is such a success, then why are half the doctors filling out surveys saying they're not going to take any new Medicaid patients. If this program is working so well, then why was $15.8 billion in overpayments made just last year? Does this devastate Medicaid? Instead of increasing Medicaid by 125 percent over the next decade, this proposal increases it by 123 percent over the next decade—hardly draconian.

What we're saying is we need to make these programs work to achieve their intended results. Give States more flexibility to customize their benefits to meet the needs of the people in their States. That's what these Medicaid reforms are all about.

When we hear the other side talk about no spending cuts but more tax increases, that's going to slow down job creation. We're the first ones who came to this floor saying, ''Close these tax loopholes, but close these tax loopholes to create economic growth by reforming the Tax Code.'' Treat people fairly in the Tax Code so that a company or a person who makes the same amount of money pays the same level of tax. You do that by getting rid of tax shelters and tax loopholes, not to raise spending, but to lower tax rates so American businesses can survive, can thrive, and create jobs. Upward mobility. Economic opportunity. That's what we're trying to achieve here.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, we should not be talking to each other in this society as if we're stuck in some class, as if this person's middle class, that person's lower class, and that person's upper class. Our ancestors left those class-based societies to form this country, which should not be a class-based society. It should be a society of upward mobility, where we can make the most of our lives, based on our own God-given talent and our own effort. We should not be speaking to people as if they're stuck in their current station in life and the government is here to help them cope with it.

We need to get ourselves out of this debt crisis because, if we have a debt crisis, if we keep on this path where we're borrowing 40 cents of every dollar we spend, we're going to have a debt crisis. Europe is in a debt crisis.

And what happens when you're in a debt crisis? Immediate austerity, cutting benefits to seniors, cutting benefits to people in the safety net, raising taxes. That slows down the economy, especially for the youth.

Look what we're doing right now. Half of our Nation's college graduates are either unemployed or underemployed—half.

It's not working. We need to change these policies. We need to grow the economy. And if we have a debt crisis because of this spending, then the people who need government the most, they're the ones who get hurt the first and the worst.

We're leading. The President, no plan to fix this. The Senate, no budget since 2009. And our friends on the other side of the aisle, tax increases, spending increases, no spending cuts.

Mr. Speaker, this is a small step in the right direction. It's something Congress should do every day. I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I met with homeless individuals and families, and community leaders who advocate on their behalf. I can tell you that even in my district the wealthiest in the nation—we have real needs. While our poverty rate may be the envy of most jurisdictions across the nation, that's just a statistic. In real numbers, more than 60,000 people are struggling with poverty—hard working men and women trying to provide for themselves, and tens of thousands of children not knowing where they'll sleep tonight, or if they'll eat. In fact there are more people below the poverty line in Fairfax County than the total population of more than 100 of Virginia's 139 jurisdictions.

This sequester replacement is a short sighted and cynical action. Make no mistake; this is NOT about fiscal responsibility. It forces sacrifices on the less fortunate among us; seniors and children who will lose supplemental meal assistance; struggling single parents who will lose child care support, threatening their ability to work; lower income families who will lose their health care. What this plan does not do is ask similar sacrifices from the most wealthy in our nation. In fact, it paves the way for another tax cut for the top 1 percent. Oil and gas companies, which have seen $290 billion in profits over the last 4 years are not asked to contribute even 1 penny of the $16 billion in special tax breaks they received.

No, this Republican Reconciliation Ruse is really an attempt to fundamentally change American values at the expense of the sick, the old, the young and the disadvantaged. I would ask my colleagues to go home and talk to those individuals struggling to get by in their community, and faith leaders who work with them, and ask how these draconian cuts affect their lives. I urge my colleagues to reject this Republican Reconciliation Ruse and to work toward truly comprehensive, responsible and bipartisan deficit reduction that safeguards the less fortunate among us and is reflective of our nation's shared values.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ride in strong opposition to the draconian cuts to health care, food stamps, and other essential programs that are being proposed by the House majority in H.R. 5652.

Last summer, this Congress and the Administration agreed on a path to reduce the national deficit by over $2.1 trillion. Over half of this amount was going to come either through a bipartisan agreement by the so-called ''Super Committee'' or through sequestration.

I do not like sequestration. It is an inefficient way to make spending decisions that affect millions of Americans. However, this is what was agreed to and for the House majority to go back on that agreement and not have an open and frank debate on how this chamber can agree to reduce our national deficit while preserving essential programs and services is more than just disappointing. For millions of our fellow Americans, it is a matter of survival.

This legislation would result in cutting food stamps by over $33 billion dollars. Nearly 50 cents of every dollar into food stamps helps children get the food they need to grow and thrive.

H.R. 5652 would gut vital health care services, including ending the Prevention and Public Health Trust Fund, which is essential for finding better ways to promote wellness, prevent disease, and protect against public health emergencies.

This bill would also reduce matching state funds to Medicaid, as well as make it more difficult to qualify for the program and make devastating cuts to the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP).

It would make sharp cuts to the Social Services Block Grant program, which could result in 1.7 million children losing access to protective services, 450,000 children being denied foster care, and 640,000 children losing child abuse prevention services.

This legislation would also eliminate the FDIC's ability to unwind financial institutions

that are ''too big to fail'' in an orderly way, eliminate the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's (CFPB) funding source, and cut pension contributions to federal workers.

I stand with our nation's servicemembers and am committed to making sure that they have the tools and resources necessary to protect America from any and all threats.

However, support for our nation's heroes should not and cannot come at a cost to America's most vulnerable. We can find a better way to balance our priorities, protect those in need, and honor our servicemen and women.

I call on Members on both sides of the aisle to join me in finding a better way to reduce our deficit while protecting children, the needy, and America's men and women in uniform and vote against this legislation.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker. I rise today to express my strong support in favor of the H.R. 5652, the Sequester Replacement Act of 2012. This legislation reflects the support I have for the Republican Budget and the principles I have stood for during my almost thirty years in this House, a return to fiscal sanity and responsibility. This legislation also makes certain that the brave men and women in our Armed Forces will have the resources to protect this Nation from the many threats we face in an uncertain world.

However, I do have one concern. During my tenure here I have been an advocate for equal treatment for our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico, who have defended this Nation in record numbers in every military conflict since U.S. citizenship was conferred on them in 1917. Puerto Ricans take pride in their American citizenship and our Nation should be grateful for their service.

My dear friend and former colleague, Governor Luis Fortuno, was recently able to accomplish what other Puerto Rican Governors have tried to do for decades in lessening the disparities between the funding of federal healthcare programs in the territories and the states. Through his hard work, persistence and dedication, Governor Fortuno was able to obtain an increase in Medicaid funding for the US territories that reduces the gap. Unfortunately, the available legislative vehicle in which this could be accomplished was Obamacare, which I have been a staunch opponent of for a whole host of reasons that have nothing to do with Medicaid in Puerto Rico. I am, as a result, troubled that we have included the repeal of the expansion of Medicaid for Puerto Rico and the other territories in H.R. 4966. I believe there are other ways to cut spending that do not contribute to the perception that Puerto Ricans are less deserving U.S. citizens than residents of the states.

I want to assure our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico that the action we take today is just a step in what promises to be a long budget negotiation. As we continue to move forward to repeal Obamacare, I know I am not alone among my Republican colleagues in the belief that we should adequately fund federal healthcare programs in Puerto Rico and the other US territories. As we continue to work this year to reach an agreement on the budget with the Senate, I am hopeful that the principle of equal treatment for Puerto Rico will not be lost, and that the final budget product will bring our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico closer than ever to the parity they deserve in federal healthcare programs.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today's debate is about priorities. The Republican reconciliation bill provides a stark contrast between the measures Democrats know are necessary to get our fiscal house in order—creating jobs and encouraging investments, and those that Republicans covet—tax cuts for special interests and giveaways for millionaires.

It is high time we get serious about our fiscal situation, and I, like most Americans, am prepared to make sacrifices to put us on a sustainable path.

But this reconciliation bill sends our country in the wrong direction—reducing benefits for our children, elderly, and most vulnerable to pay for tax cuts to millionaires and subsidies for oil and gas companies. Under the Republican plan, 22 million families could see their food and nutrition assistance cut, and up to 300,000 children could lose both their health coverage and their school lunch program. Jeopardizing struggling families is not the way to get your country back on track.

I see the importance of these programs to my constituents every day. There are thousands of hard working Rhode Islanders who still can't make ends meet, who need a little help so their kids don't go to bed hungry or sleep in a cold house. The economic downturn has been a trying time for everyone, and all of us have a family member or a friend who has been forced to ask for help at one time or another. yet Republicans are trying to pull away the helping hand the government offers to those who are living on the edge.

At a time when we ought to be investing in our future, the Republican budget offers shortsighted measures that will irreparably shortchange our most critical national investments. With unemployment at 11.1 percent in my home state of Rhode Island, my number one priority is spurring job growth and development. Unfortunately, this Republican budget, which gives away $3 trillion in tax breaks to corporations and the super-wealthy, will do just the opposite.

Democrats are offering a fair and balanced approach that keeps the promises made to our seniors, preserves our social safety net, and maintains investments in our economic security. With key recommendations of the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles and Domenici-Rivlin budget commissions as a guide, it addresses both sides of the ledger—through strategic spending cuts and revenues. There is simply no other way to equitably address our fiscal challenges.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget is not what the American public wants, it is not what Rhode Islanders need, and it is not what our future generations deserve. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our Vice President, JOE BIDEN was correct when he said, ''Don't tell me what you value, show me your budget, and I'll tell you what you value''. Well Mr. Speaker, we have seen the Tea Party budget, and we sure know what their values are.

The majority values millionaires over women and children's access to healthcare. They value corporate welfare for outsourcing jobs over helping the next generation of workers afford college. And they value oil and gas companies over ensuring that our most vulnerable citizens, including seniors and children, have access to important nutrition and healthcare programs, plain and simple.

As a Member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I fought against that committee's unfair reconciliation legislation that inordinately Placed the burden of increased defense spending and tax cuts for the very wealthy on seniors, the disabled and middle class families.

Instead of asking the wealthiest amongst us to pay just a small fraction of their income more, the majority's legislation squeezes it out of the 14.5% of U.S. children living in poverty in New Jersey. This bill will snatch $1,800 from the pockets of a family earning $21,000 a year. Instead of cutting back on oil and gas subsidies for companies like Exxon, which made an almost $10 billion profit last quarter, this bill cuts $47 billion in tax credits for middle class families could to purchase health insurance.

In short, the majority's choice is to cut $75 billion from programs that directly benefit seniors, the middle class and poor, in order to protect special interests and millionaires.

We must fight back against the Tea Party assault on the middle class, women, children, and the poor, and I ask my colleagues to vote no on this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I resolutely oppose H.R. 5652, the Sequester Replacement Act of 2012. As our nation struggles to emerge from one of its worst economic crises, I am profoundly disappointed with the Republican Leadership for offering legislation that would harm tens of millions of Americans to deliver a windfall of additional wealth to already-privileged individuals and companies. Such overt protection for the wealthiest and most secure at the expense of the most vulnerable represents an affront to American values and blatant disregard of a policymaker's responsibility to protect our nation's citizens. Robbing the poor, children, elderly, and ill to further balloon the wealth of the most affluent in our country is deplorable.

The Sequester Replacement Act of 2012 clearly demonstrates the fundamental disagreement between parties at present. The Democratic lawmakers believe that the federal government has the responsibility to help it citizens during times of struggle and economic hardship. To achieve this support and revitalize our nation, the Democrats maintain that shared responsibility among the wealthy and the middle class, defense and non-defense initiatives, and spending cuts and revenues are necessary. Strengthening our national and individual economic well-being requires balance. In contrast, the Republican Leadership asserts that the responsibility for helping the poor or vulnerable falls to individual charity and the path to economic revitalization is to eviscerate federal services that support the poor, elderly, children, and ill to deliver billions of dollars in financial assistance to the wealthiest individuals, oil companies, and businesses that ship jobs overseas.

There are multiple provisions within the Republican Sequestration bill that exemplify the approach of giving massive tax breaks to the wealthiest while slashing vital services to the vulnerable.

Take the elimination of the Social Services Block Grant, which provides critical support for child care, child welfare, and elderly services. Nearly all SSBG funds serve the needs of vulnerable adults, children and disabled. Terminating the program will affect approximately 23 million people, half of them children. Cutting

SSBG means the 1.7 million seniors would lose ''Meals on Wheels'' and other home-based services. Eliminating SSBG means that 1.7 million children likely lose access to protective services, 451,000 children would be denied foster care, and 640,000 children likely lose child abuse prevention services. Stopping SSBG means that 4.4 million children would lose child care and related assistance—a loss that is especially egregious when 22 states reported considerable wait-lists for child care assistance in 2011.

Slashing $36 billion to the food assistance program for the poor would reduce aid to 47 million Americans, terminate benefits for approximately 2 million low-income individuals, and revoke the automatic eligibility for free school meals for nearly 300,000 low-income children. In my Congressional District alone, there are 40,784 households receiving benefits—with 49.2% of these families having children under 18 and 30.9% having one or more people over the age of 60. These families already are bearing the brunt of our economic hardship. They cannot sustain further cuts to their food aid.

Repealing the Medicaid and CHIP maintenance-of-effort requirements directly threatens the health coverage of millions of pregnant women, infants and children. Medicaid finances about 41% of births each year, serving as THE source of health care for 1 out of 4 children in our country—especially children with special healthcare needs. Removing the maintenance-of-effort protections of coverage would increase the number of uninsured children by at least 300,000 in 2015, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office.

Eliminating the Prevention and Public Health Fund further jeopardizes the health and well-being of women and children. Specifically, loss of the Prevention Fund means about 2.2 million fewer childhood vaccinations to prevent childhood diseases, 326,000 fewer breast cancer screenings, and 284,000 fewer cervical cancer screenings. Cutting the Prevention Fund means stopping tobacco cessation and obesity prevention programs. I have been a strong proponent of prevention my entire adult life given its proven ability to improve the quality of life for citizens with minimal financial investment. Indeed, proven community-based prevention programs yield an estimated return of $5.60 for every dollar invested. Since 2010, the state of Illinois has received $31 million from the Prevention Fund. I cannot support the loss of these funds.

Dramatically reducing the Child Tax Credit by $7.6 billion means that more than 3 million children would lose the pro-family support that their low-income families need to put food on the tables and roofs over their heads.

The Republican reconciliation bill offers an unacceptable vision for our nation that calls on the most vulnerable of our citizens to support a privileged lifestyle for the most secure. At a time in our history where more than one in five children currently lives in poverty and tens of millions of citizens struggle with unemployment, underemployment, and foreclosure, I cannot support such a vision that would undermine the well-being of millions of Americans. We must pursue a balanced approach to strengthening our nation's and our citizens' economic well-being, asking all to share in the sacrifice.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5652, ''Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012,'' which slashes $238 billion over 10 years and cancels the discretionary sequestration scheduled for 2013 to exempt defense spending from the cuts agreed upon by the Republican majority in the Budget Control Act of 2011. This bill is unfair to children, seniors, women, and working families. This abomination is unworthy of a civilized nation. Little wonder that so many faith-based and leading national organizations, from the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops to the National Education Association oppose this bill. I stand with them in strong opposition to this assault on working and middle class families.

My Democratic colleagues and I agree that the scheduled sequester, with its indiscriminate, across-the-board cuts, should be replaced with a balanced deficit reduction package that includes both spending cuts and additional revenues. Republicans disagree and would let the burden and cost of deficit reduction fall on the shoulders of children, seniors, working families, and the middle class rather than close even one special interest tax loophole or ask any sacrifice of the truly wealthy.

This bill makes cuts to critical safety-net programs that millions of people rely on, all while returning to policies that sparked the recession in the first place. They are choosing the wrong programs to cut in order to reduce the deficit. Let me highlight a few examples to illustrate just how extreme and unfair this legislation is.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5652 makes cuts in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), the program formerly known as food stamps) that would result in reducing benefits for all 46 million SNAP participants—one million of whom live in Los Angeles County—and terminate assistance for at least two million. Low-income households who do not lose benefits altogether will face monthly reductions of $50, $60, or even $90 a month. In 2010, SNAP kept 4.4 million people from being poor, 1 million of whom were lifted out of poverty just from the increase in SNAP benefits that began in 2009.

You cannot make a nation's economy healthy by impoverishing its people.

A 9-year panel study conducted by the Department of Agriculture showed that the federal food assistance program alone was responsible for lifting low-income persons purchasing power by six percent. This is a program that is proven to work, and yet the this Republican bill seeks to slash it $33.2 billion. With cuts of this magnitude, eligibility for the program will have to be scaled back dramatically, and benefits will be cut deeply for those who still qualify. This will have serious effects on millions of low-income families who rely on the program just to get by.

The bill also proposes to end the Prevention and Public Health Fund. Since the Affordable Care Act was passed in 2010, the Department of Health and Human Services has awarded more than $90.6 million in Prevention Fund grants to my home state of California. These grants are used to combat obesity, tobacco use, unhealthy nutrition practices, and to fund other programs that promote good health. If the Republican sequestration replacement were to become law, these essential programs will have to be scaled back or cut entirely.

Mr. Speaker, we need get our fiscal house in order but I will not vote to balance the budget on the backs of the poor, the vulnerable, or the middle class.

My Democratic colleagues and I supported a balanced approach to the current fiscal challenge that preserves Medicare. House Republicans favor ending Medicare as we know it, along with gutting the Children's Health Insurance Program and the Child Tax Credit.

The Republican approach is unfair, unwise, and short-sighted. For example, childhood immunizations are among the most cost effective preventative health measures available. On average each dollar invested in children's immunization saves $16.50 in medical and societal costs down the road. Given the persistent rise in the cost of treating serious health problems it makes absolutely no sense to cut programs that will lead to substantial cost reductions in the future.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would leave our most vulnerable citizens exposed and unprotected. I cannot and will not support legislation inflicts such grave hardship on the most vulnerable of our citizens while asking nothing of those who benefited most from the reckless economic policies of the previous administration.

We cannot have a serious conversation about getting our budget under control when House Republicans are taking large items like revenue and defense off the table, all while repealing programs like the Social Services Block Grant. This unique grant allows states to help their citizens become more self-sufficient by providing child care, preventing and addressing child abuse, and supporting care for the elderly and disabled. Slashing the Social Services Block Grant program in an effort to avoid the defense cuts reflects poorly upon those who propose do so.

Mr. Speaker, if House Republicans are unwilling to abide the agreement they made just last year, how can they be trusted to keep faith with promises made to seniors, children, the poor and weak, that bind us together as a nation?

What we need right now is for responsible leaders to work together to come to an agreement on a balanced long-term approach to resolve our fiscal challenges. As legislators, our constituents are looking to us to get on with, and serious about, the work that must be done to get our fiscal house in order and make the needed investments that will grow our economy and position our people to compete and with in an increasingly globalized world. That is what they sent us here to do and they deserve no less.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents did not send me to Congress to make the wrong choice for our nation. That is why I cannot support the legislation before us. It places the burden for the nation's financial crisis squarely on the shoulders of the middle class and the poor, while failing to ask anything of those most able to contribute toward economic recovery.

For these reasons, I stand in strong opposition to H.R. 5625, the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012, and urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this radical and dangerous proposal.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5652, the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012.

As the Ranking Democrat on the House Natural Resources Committee, which has jurisdiction over the various insular territories of the United States, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the adverse impact of this bill on the 4.1 million Americans who live on

the five U.S. territories—Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Marianas Islands.

Of all the cuts being proposed by this bill today, perhaps none is as cynical, thoughtless and irresponsible as the Republican proposal to repeal Section 1204 of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, which finally mitigated the profoundly unjust treatment that these Americans in the five U.S. territories have always been subject to under the Medicaid program.

If this proposal is enacted, it would cut total federal funding for Medicaid in the territories by 65% over the next decade—a crippling blow that would devastate the territories' Medicaid programs and drastically restrict the ability of millions of Americans to receive care.

The territories' Medicaid programs are already vastly underfunded. By law, they are supposed to receive a 50% federal funding match, but they get nowhere near it. Unlike the 50 states and the District of Columbia, the amount that the federal government can contribute to their Medicaid programs is capped, and so Puerto Rico, for example, receives less than a 20% match.

The 50 states and the District of Columbia, on the other hand, receive up to an 80% match. Even the wealthiest states—which receive the lowest match rates—get 50%.

If the federal match for each of the territories was calculated the same way they are calculated for the states, each of the territories would have Federal Medical Assistance Percentages, (FMAP) in the 75% to 83% range based on their poverty levels.

The results of this chronic underfunding by the federal government are both devastating and predictable: too many patients in the territories receive inadequate care and too many providers in the territories are not adequately compensated for their services.

Because the treatment of the territories under Medicaid was a travesty from both a moral and public policy perspective, the Affordable Care Act (ACA) sought to partially redress this profound inequality. It provided $6.3 billion in additional Medicaid funding to the territories between the fourth quarter of Fiscal Year 2011 and Fiscal Year 2019.

The territories have already begun to use—and will continue to use—this new funding to increase the number of low-income individuals that can receive Medicaid coverage and to provide beneficiaries with essential health services. Prior to this funding increase, the territory governments could not afford to provide many basic services or to cover many of their neediest residents under Medicaid. Every penny of this money will be used.

H.R. 5652 cuts funding that would merely narrow the inequality gap between the states and the territories. It still would not come close to eliminating it.

It is important to remember that residents of the territories are Americans who, if they are not receiving adequate health care, can relocate to the states and become eligible for fully-funded Medicaid whenever they wish. Thus, treating territory residents like second-class citizens under Medicaid is extraordinarily short-sighted.

It is also important to remember that residents of the territories serve in disproportionate numbers in the U.S. military. Residents of the territories have made tens of thousands of deployments to Iraq, Afghanistan and the Horn of Africa since 2001, and nearly 170 service members from the territories have lost their lives.

The Republicans should explain to the hundreds of thousands of soldiers and veterans from the territories why they are ''American enough'' to defend our country in combat, but somehow not ''American enough'' to receive a modicum of fair treatment under critical health care programs.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this mean-spirited bill.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act.

Today, House Republican leadership is asking low and middle income families to sacrifice their health care and basic services in order to protect bloated and wasteful Pentagon spending and to protect tax cuts for millionaires.

This out of touch budget to end the Medicare guarantee while giving massive tax breaks to Big Oil and the wealthiest is not a serious proposal, Mr. Speaker.

In these difficult times for millions of struggling families, Republicans are asking that we vote to cut $36 billion from the food stamp program and children's health services so we can spend more money on cold war weapons that do nothing to improve our national security.

Our budget should reflect our values. We should not be balancing our budget on the backs of the most vulnerable.

We do not have to make these heartless cuts that hurt our poor and struggling families so we can spend more money to build two more nuclear submarines or buy more over budget V–22 helicopters.

We do not have to make choices that abandon the needy, our seniors and the futures of our children.

We must come together to protect people who are struggling, our Nation's children and our elderly during economic downturns, not make them more vulnerable.

We must protect and invest in the futures of our most vulnerable families, not dole out more money to the Pentagon for outdated and over budget weapons programs that we don't need and doesn't make America any safer.

We should not be shortchanging the education of our children, risk the health of our seniors and allow our infrastructure to crumble beneath our feet so that bloated defense contractors can keep getting contracts.

The priorities on display in this bill are clear and shameful. Once again, the Republicans put millionaires and billionaires, subsidies for big oil and gas, and bloated Pentagon spending above everyone and everything else.

As co-chair of the Out of Poverty caucus, I urge my colleagues to reject this attack on our most vulnerable.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the legislation we are considering today is quite possibly the moral low-point of this House Republican Majority. Not only does it negate a law that was agreed to just last year to cut the deficit, it makes unconscionable cuts to safety net programs that help to feed hungry children and seniors and to protect them from abuse. It could also cause 14 million children to lose health insurance due to massive cuts to Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP).

Republican leaders are claiming that this legislation is needed to reduce the deficit. That is false. The reality is that we are voting today to protect the bloated defense budget and tax breaks for millionaires.

The choice before us could not be clearer: will you stand with families, children, and seniors? Or will you stand with special interests? Do you believe America should be a nation that cares if children have enough to eat and seniors can age with dignity? Or do believe our country should be run by and for the wealthiest among us?

The Sequester Replacement and Reconciliation Act (H.R. 5652) is designed to prevent the pending automatic spending cuts, or ''sequester,'' that Congress passed last year in the Budget Control Act. Half of the $110 billion in cuts under the sequester would come from the defense budget. That makes sense, as roughly half of our discretionary budget is dedicated to defense. Medicare and other vital programs will also take a hit under the sequester.

As an alternative to the reckless Reconciliation Act before us today, Congress could come up with a balanced approach to replace the sequester while still cutting the deficit. Such an approach should include ending taxpayer subsidies for oil companies, rolling back subsidies for agri-business, allowing the Bush tax cuts for millionaires to expire, closing tax loopholes that allow lawyers and lobbyists to avoid paying Medicare taxes. A balanced approach should also include cuts to defense, bringing the Afghan War to an end, and eliminating federal programs that do not work.

Yet Instead of trying to legislate responsibly, the Republican Majority is doubling down on their Budget and bringing legislation to the floor that only asks families, children, seniors, and federal workers to sacrifice. H.R. 5652 eliminates the Social Services Block Grant, which funds Meals and Wheels and child abuse prevention programs. It continues the assault on Health Reform by making it harder for working people to afford insurance. It undermines the new Wall Street Reform law by de-funding the Consumer Financial Protection Agency. It makes devastating cuts to Food Stamps, Medicaid, and CHIP. Our nation will be a sicker and crueler place if this legislation is allowed to become law. I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this immoral and irresponsible bill.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act.

This bill is a broken promise.

It would eliminate the Social Service Block Grant, which funds essential services like child abuse prevention and Meals on Wheels.

It would cut off food assistance for 1.8 million Americans, and leave 100,000 children and senior citizens without health insurance, so we can increase defense spending.

We spend nearly as much on defense every year as the rest of the world combined.

This includes billions maintaining a nuclear arsenal designed for the Cold War, and $500 million a year for military bands.

We can protect ourselves and our allies with a leaner, smarter defense.

Yet if we make cuts like these, our military will have little to defend.

We will only solve our debt crisis with a balanced, bipartisan approach that honors our commitments.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in regards to H.R. 5652, the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012.

Eliminating the threat of our massive national debt must be a top priority for this Congress. I am pleased that House Republicans have identified and put forward a sensible plan. This reconciliation bill will forestall the Budget Control Act's sequestration cuts to defense while, at the same time, offer alternative reductions in federal spending. This measure is a critical first step in getting our fiscal house in order and doing so in a responsible manner.

In addition to the number of spending reforms that are included in H.R. 5652, there is an important reform that was proposed—meaningful medical liability reform. Specifically, H.R. 5, the Help Accessible, Efficient, Low-cost, Timely Healthcare, which seeks to ensure that the cost of frivolous litigation is not passed on to consumers in the form of higher health-care premiums by capping non-economic damages in medical liability lawsuits. While I am supportive of these efforts, I currently own shares in multiple corporations that may benefit from its enactment.

While my participation in legislative consideration of H.R. 5652 would not appear to violate current House Rules and established precedent, as in all matters susceptible to subjective examination, there are no bright line rules to determine whether a Member should recuse himself or herself in legislation that may benefit that Member in a personal or financial manner. While this may be a gray area, I do not want to raise any potential ethical questions regarding my participation in this legislation. As a result, I have acted to dispel any appearance of conflict by recusing myself from legislative consideration of H.R. 5652 in the 112th Congress.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I commend our Leaders and Chairman RYAN for the bold budget which we are going to approve today. Many of the programs targeted for cuts in the Reconciliation Package are worthwhile initiatives that I have and will continue to support such as childhood nutrition programs and family support services. However, the future of this nation and that of our children and grandchildren depends on our resolve to address the debt crisis while making certain that our national security is protected. This is not an easy vote, but it is a necessary one.

Despite my willingness to support our Leadership in making these tough choices, I rise to express some concern over one particular provision which would eliminate the Medicaid expansion in the U.S. territories. While on this side we have all voted for the full repeal of Obamacare, this provision had very little to do with that measure. The territories provision was instead intended to close the gap between healthcare funding on the mainland and in the U.S. territories. Puerto Rico, for example, had previously funded 80% of its Medicaid, while states with similar demographics funded only 20%. The provision I am concerned about helped to close that gap.

While we will continue to pursue the full repeal of Obamacare, I will continue to stand for the closing of that gap and for fully funding healthcare in the U.S. territories. The citizens of those jurisdictions are Americans and deserve to be treated with equality.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the "Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012." While my Democratic colleagues and I are working to stimulate the economy and create jobs, protect and extend health care coverage, and promote affordable, high-quality education for all Americans, Tea Party Republicans have launched a radical, ideological, and partisan attack on American families. The "Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act" is yet another misguided attempt to eliminate critical support for middle-class Americans, seniors, veterans, and children in favor of Bush Administration policies that caused the recent economic recession. It is utterly and truly irresponsible to balance the budget on the backs of our seniors, veterans, children, and families.

This bill is a joke. The Tea Party Republicans have proposed to reduce the deficit by slashing more than $300 billion dollars from programs on which millions of ordinary Americans rely. For example, this bill cuts over $33 billion dollars in funding for nutrition programs that help millions of hard-working Americans feed their families. I am appalled that my colleagues across the aisle are more concerned with cutting taxes for millionaires and billionaires than supporting programs which ensure that our nation's children have enough to eat.

In addition, this extreme, hyper-partisan bill would eliminate the Social Services Block Grant program. This vital program provides much needed social services—including daycare and protective services, foster care and adoption services, and transportation and meals for elderly and disabled individuals—to roughly 23 million of the most vulnerable Americans. If that was not enough, this irresponsible piece of legislation would also slash funding for Medicaid, cut pension contributions for federal workers, and eliminate funding for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—an office established to protect consumers engaged in financial transactions.

Our nation's seniors, veterans, children, and families should not be forced to bear the burden of fiscal austerity measures while millionaires and billionaires are not asked to pay their fair share in taxes. I urge my colleagues to stand together in opposition to yet another right-wing attack on programs that have a significant impact on the residents of my district and millions of ordinary Americans. I remain committed to working with my colleagues to fight against fundamentally flawed bills like the "Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012," and to support a budget proposal that creates jobs, expands health care coverage, and promotes access to affordable education.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 648, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. LOEBSACK. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Me. Loebsack moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5652 to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 504. PROHIBITION ON TAXPAYER-FUNDED PENSIONS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS WHO BECOME HIGHLY-PAID LOBBYISTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any former Member of Congress who is registered as a lobbyist, and whose annual income from lobbying activities exceeds $1,000,000, shall not be eligible to receive benefits under either the Civil Service Retirement System or the Federal Employees' Retirement System for the period of time during which such former Member is employed as such a lobbyist and receiving from lobbying activities an annual income that exceeds $1,000,000.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "former Member of Congress" means an individual who becomes a former Member of Congress after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 505. ENSURING THAT MEMBERS OF CONGRESS PAY THEIR FAIR SHARE FOR RETIREMENT BENEFITS.

(a) CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

(1) INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 8334(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking "(c) Each" and inserting "(c)(1) Each"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the applicable percentage of basic pay under this subsection shall, for purposes of computing an amount with respect to a Member for Member service—

"(A) for a period in calendar year 2013, be equal to the applicable percentage under this subsection for calendar year 2012, plus an additional 2.5 percentage points;

"(B) for a period in calendar year 2014, 2015, 2016, or 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this subsection for the preceding calendar year (as determined under subparagraph (A) or this subparagraph, as the case may be), plus an additional 1.5 percentage points; and

"(C) for a period in any calendar year after 2017, be equal to the applicable percent age under this subsection for calendar year 2017 (as determined under subparagraph (B)).".

(2) GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 8334(a)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking "Except as provided in clause (ii)," and inserting "Except as provided in clause (ii) or (iii),"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(iii) In the case of a Member, the amount to be contributed under clause (i) shall, with respect to a period in any year beginning after December 31, 2012, be equal to—

"(I) the amount which would otherwise apply under clause (i) with respect to such period, reduced by

"(II) the amount by which, with respect to such period, the withholding under subparagraph (A) exceeds the amount which would otherwise have been withheld from the basic pay of the Member involved under subparagraph (A) based on the percentage applicable under subsection (c) for calendar year 2012.".

(b) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

(1) INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 8422(a)(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

"(B) Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the applicable percentage under this subsection shall, for purposes of computing an amount with respect to a Member (other than an individual who is a

revised annuity employee by virtue of becoming a Member after December 31, 2012)—

''(i) for a period in calendar year 2013, be equal to the applicable percentage under this paragraph for calendar year 2012, plus an additional 2.5 percentage points;

''(ii) for a period in calendar year 2014, 2015, 2016, or 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this paragraph for the preceding calendar year (as determined under clause (i) or this clause, as the case maybe), plus an additional 1.5 percentage points; and

''(iii) for a period in any calendar year after 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this paragraph for calendar year 2017 (as determined under clause (ii)).''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated by subparagraph (A)), in the line relating to a Member, by striking ''9.3'' and inserting ''12''.

(2) GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 8423(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''(2)'' and inserting ''(2)(A)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B)(i) Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii), for purposes of any period in any year beginning after December 31, 2012, the normal-cost percentage under this subsection for Members shall be determined and applied as if section 505(b)(1)(B) of the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012 had not been enacted.

''(ii) Any contributions under this subsection with respect to Members in excess of the amounts which (but for clause (i)) would otherwise have been payable shall be applied toward reducing the unfunded liability of the Civil Service Retirement System.

''(iii) After the unfunded liability of the Civil Service Retirement System has been eliminated, as determined by the Office, Government contributions under this subsection shall be determined and made disregarding this subparagraph.''.

SEC. 506. ANNUITY SUPPLEMENT TERMINATION APPLICABLE TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ONLY.

Section 8421(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''paragraph (3)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (3) and (4)'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''paragraph (3)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (3) and (4)''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) No annuity supplement under this section shall be payable in the case of any individual who, after December 31, 2012, first becomes subject to this chapter by virtue of being a Member.''.

SEC. 507. EXCLUSION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FROM PROVISIONS ALLOWING CONTRIBUTIONS TO THRIFT SAVINGS FUND OF PAYMENTS FOR ACCRUED OR ACCUMULATED LEAVE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, nothing in section 503 or any amendment made by section 503 shall apply with respect to a Member (within the meaning of section 8331 or 8401 of title 5, United States Code).

Mr. LOEBSACK (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the inquiry.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, is it not the case that if my final amendment is adopted, the underlying bill is amended and we immediately vote on final passage of the bill, as amended?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If a motion to recommit with forthwith instructions is adopted, the amendment is reported by the chair of the committee and is immediately before the House.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, while I oppose the underlying bill, I am offering this amendment to prohibit former Members of Congress who cash in to become million-dollar lobbyists from collecting their pensions. My amendment also stops Members of Congress from getting a better deal than everyone else by asking them to contribute the same amount to their pensions as other Federal employees.

We all know that Americans' faith in their government has been severely damaged. If Congress does not take action to stop the revolving door between Capitol Hill and Washington lobby firms, there is little chance that that faith can be restored. It is time we take action and put a stop to these practices.

Members of Congress who choose to take this route, especially those making exorbitant salaries as millionaire lobbyists, should forego their pensions. It's that simple. It is patently ridiculous that these Members are finding a way to have their cake and eat it, too. It is just another example of special Washington privileges for out-of-touch elites, privileges that I have promised not to take and that should be ended.

I have vowed never to use my public service for personal gain to become a lobbyist. I first ran for office because, having grown up in poverty, I know that Iowa families need a strong voice and an advocate who will ensure that their voices are heard over the voices of the special interests who dominate Washington.

I came here for one reason: to serve the people of Iowa. I go back to Iowa every weekend and visit with my constituents so that I know what's on their minds and what they want to happen here in Washington.

Sadly, some people come to Washington to cash in, and I think we can all agree that this is unacceptable. I believe that former Members of Congress who become millionaire lobbyists should never be able to collect their pensions. It's that simple.

My final amendment would make sure that millionaire lobbyists aren't using their status as former Members to line their pockets at the expense of middle class Americans.

In these tough economic times, we have had to make difficult choices in order to improve our Nation's fiscal status. While I might not like all the cuts that have been made or are being proposed, I know that we need to be on better footing if our economy is to recover.

□ 1340

The unemployment rate remains far too high, and we need to get the economy moving again and get people back to work. Americans need jobs. That is my number one priority here in Congress, and it is something I think about each and every day.

With all of the sacrifices that Iowa families are making as a result of the economic downturn and as a result of all of the cuts that are affecting their communities, Members of Congress also need to find ways to tighten their belts. Maintaining special benefits for Members of Congress at a time like this is both intolerable and inexplicable. That is why my final amendment would also increase the contributions that Members of Congress make to their pensions by the same amount that the underlying bill increases them for Federal employees.

This is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill, as amended, would be immediately voted upon. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in putting the interests of the American people before those of the lobbyists and special interest groups by supporting my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for bringing this to our attention. We just received the legislation about 3 or 4 minutes ago, and there are a couple of observations I want to make.

Number one, I think this is an intriguing policy with respect to denying pensions to the Members who become lobbyists. I think the gentleman should introduce legislation and send it to committee, like the legislation should be passed, and we should give it proper review instead of springing it at the last minute.

The second point I would make is on an area where we completely agree, which is that Members of Congress should bear an even higher burden than we're asking of other Federal employees. This bill does that. The underlying bill does that. The underlying bill says:

In addition to Federal employees going from paying .8 percent to their

pensions, they go to 5.8 percent from their paychecks to contribute to their pensions so that they pay half of their pension benefits as is required through most private sector arrangements. Members of Congress will pay 9.8 percent to their pensions under this bill. This bill has an 8.5 percent pay cut to Members of Congress, and it only has a 5 percent pay cut to all other Federal employees.

So we are already incorporating the idea, which we agree with. Members of Congress, in order to exercise moral authority, are the ones who should take the biggest pay cuts and have the biggest pension contributions relative to anybody else. That's why we have it in this bill already. While I understand the gentleman's interest—I appreciate it—it is something that we are already accommodating in this bill. As a result, I would urge a ''no'' vote.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 170, nays 232, answered ''present'' 11, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 246]

YEAS—170

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NAYS—232

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
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
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.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—11

Brown (FL)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Fudge
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sensenbrenner
Watt
Waxman

NOT VOTING—18

Berman
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Donnelly (IN)
Duncan (SC)
Filner
Flores
Heinrich
Johnson (GA)
Mack
Meeks
Napolitano
Noem
Paul
Paulsen
Sires
Slaughter
Stutzman

□ 1406

Messrs. GUTHRIE, HUNTER, BENISHEK, KINZINGER of Illinois, HALL, WOODALL, and LAMBORN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. NEAL, Ms. HOCHUL, Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, RICHMOND, and Mrs. DAVIS of California changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

Messrs. CLEAVER, JACKSON of Illinois, RUSH, and Ms. BROWN of Florida changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''present.''

Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. WATT, ROHRABACHER, and WAXMAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''present.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 246, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 10th, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 246 in order to attend my grandson's graduation. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Motion to Recommit with Instructions H.R. 5652, To provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 199, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 247]

AYES—218

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor

Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
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
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—199

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

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—13

Berman
Burgess
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Heinrich
Mack
McIntyre
Napolitano
Noem
Paul
Paulsen
Slaughter
Stutzman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1415

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 247, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 10, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 247 in order to attend my grandson's graduation. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on final passage of H.R. 5652, To provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEST). Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. NADLER. I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Nadler moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5326 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 17, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,500,000)''.

Page 21, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 37, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $20,500,000)''.

Page 38, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 39, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 39, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $4,500,000)''.

Page 39, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

Page 40, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Page 40, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 65, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,000,000)''.

Page 70, line 6, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,000,000)''.

Mr. NADLER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Parliamentary Inquiry

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, if the final amendment I am offering were to be adopted, is it not the case that the bill will be amended and that the House will then proceed to final passage right away?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair stated earlier today, if a motion to recommit with forthwith instructions is adopted, the amendment is reported by the chair of the committee and is immediately before the House.

Mr. NADLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, whether it is an attempt to deny women reproductive or other health services, or a refusal to support efforts to achieve equal pay for equal work, many women in America today feel under siege. Indeed, many women across the country feel a war is being waged upon them by policymakers.

Today, with this final amendment to the CJS Appropriations bill, Members of the House will have a chance to say where they stand.

□ 1420

This is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill,

as amended, will proceed to final passage.

This amendment would increase, by $20 million, money spent on grants under the Violence Against Women Act, or VAWA.

Passed in 1994, VAWA is a landmark piece of legislation that has helped an incalculable number of women and families avoid or recover from crimes of violence. Grant programs under VAWA target domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sexual assault, and rape. These are crimes many women know all too well.

Indeed, violence against women remains a pervasive problem and a national tragedy. In 2008, about 1.8 million women over the age of 12 were subjected to a crime of violence. In that same year, almost 3,000 women were murdered, many by someone close to them. Every year, 1.3 million women over the age of 18 are assaulted by intimate partners. We need to do more to stop this epidemic; we need to do more for America's women.

I want to acknowledge what I expect the opponents of this motion may say—that funding for the VAWA grant programs in the underlying bill is a few million dollars above last year's level and above the President's request. I would point out, as a response, that the money in this bill is hundreds of millions of dollars below the last authorized amount and $15 million below the appropriation for fiscal year 2010. Additionally, this is not the last stop for this bill. When we conference with the Senate, which has a higher total funding level for CJS, we should have the highest possible funding level for VAWA from which to negotiate.

The amendment offsets the $20 million increase for VAWA by cuts to administrative accounts. We have heard from our colleagues of the need to cut government spending, to cut administrative expenses, to prevent the types of excesses we have seen recently in the GSA and other agencies with Las Vegas conference extravaganzas. Well, now is our chance to put our money where our mouth is and shift funding from these types of administrative expenses to preventing violence against women.

This is a question of values and priorities. What kind of message do we want to send to women across the country? Do we want GSA-style wild party, extravagant conferences or do we want to safeguard the lives of women? Do we value women's safety? Are we willing to make sure that we have the resources needed?

I ask all Members today: Stand up for your mothers; stand up for your wives; stand up for your daughters and for women everywhere. Stop the violence. Pass this motion to recommit.

I now yield to the sponsor of a truly meaningful bill to reauthorize VAWA based on bipartisan legislation which has already passed the Senate and a former victim of domestic violence herself, the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please see this request through the eyes of a child who was assaulted by a family member and comes forward at school to confide in a beloved teacher; the woman in an isolated rural area, where local law enforcement is under-resourced and transportation or legal services may be lacking or nonexistent; the women on college campuses, where rates of intimate partner violence are among the highest. Please, Mr. Speaker, see this through the eyes of victims with disabilities who are at high risk of abuse and are often dependent on their abusers for care.

In short, this VAWA funding means that a woman—and even men—who have been victimized can step out of the shadows away from their abusers and get access to counseling, legal services, or other services. And, Mr. Speaker, every single day, for three women, this VAWA funding is a difference between life and death.

It is so true that the CJS legislation before us has provided the requested level of support for victims and their families; but it's been chronically underfunded since the day they opened their doors, and there are thousands of men, women, and children who are not being served.

Please, this is an opportunity to provide a small increase to fill the gap between available resources and the desperate need to serve folks. We must commit adequate resources toward these effective, lifesaving programs. And, Mr. Speaker, we must do it now.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, to summarize, we can devote $20 million to Las Vegas-style conferences and administrative expenses or to services to prevent violence against women. That's the choice. Vote ''yes'' on the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. WOLF. You know, Mr. NADLER, you could have offered an amendment last night. We had a whole total open process. And Mr. RUNYAN—where is Mr. RUNYAN?—Mr. RUNYAN added money to this project, to Violence Against Women.

Secondly, this is a bipartisan bill. There's been no political shenanigans at all. And let me tell you something—I wasn't going to mention it; we didn't make it a big deal—this bill has $420 million. We're $7.5 million above the current fiscal year for this issue. Also, we're $7.5 million above President Obama's request for Violence Against Women. We're above it. And then with Mr. RUNYAN, we are even higher above it.

Also, this administration has not been good on sexual trafficking. We have language in this bill to direct the Attorney General to have a task force at every U.S. attorney's office for sexual trafficking. We are above the administration on sexual trafficking. So, I mean, it is kind of political. We are above the administration, and we have a task force on this issue. And so I could go on and on and on.

But last night, we had a whole, totally open, and we accepted a number of amendments. You could have come down here up to midnight last night.

There is no disagreement about the importance of these programs and need to stop it. It is very important. This is a good bill, a solid bill, bipartisan support. Members on both sides of the aisle had ample opportunity to have their amendments considered. In fact, on floor consideration, 63 amendments were offered and 36 were adopted.

We were above the President's request on Violence Against Women. We were above the President's request on the issue of sexual trafficking. Also, and I know some of you were concerned about it, the NICS background check, we were above the administration on that, and also have language directing the Attorney General to deal with that NICS issue. The Brady Commission, the Brady people support it, and the NRA supports it. So on all of those issues, we were above the administration.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. ADAMS. I thank you, and I would again ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to quit making politics with an issue so near and dear to all of us.

We are above what the President put in. Just like the chairman said, we have constantly been above what the President has asked for. And you, as well as I, know that this has become a political issue when it should never have been a political issue. We can no longer allow politics to take control over good policy. We can no longer allow misrepresentation about amounts and this and that over good policy.

We have a bill coming to the floor. We know that we need to address this issue, and it has been addressed even more than the administration has asked for. So with that, I would ask that you do not—do not—approve this motion to recommit.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I think we have actually said enough. I think it is a good bill. I want to thank again Mr. FATTAH and all the Members on both sides of the aisle. It was a good, bipartisan bill. I urge rejection of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 181, nays 233, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]

YEAS—181

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

NAYS—233

Adams
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
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
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
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—17

Aderholt
Berman
Burgess
Cardoza
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Heinrich
Mack
Markey
McIntyre
Napolitano
Noem
Paul
Paulsen
Royce
Slaughter
Stutzman

□ 1445

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 248, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 248 on H.R. 5326, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "nay" when I should have voted "yea."

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 248, I was unavoidably detained, but had I voted I would have voted "yea."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 10th, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 248 in order to attend my grandson's graduation. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Motion to Recommit with Instructions H.R. 5326, Making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

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

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 163, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 249]

YEAS—247

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hochul
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
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
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
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
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
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)

Turner (OH)
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—163

Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Flake
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
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
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
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
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Baca
Barton (TX)
Berman
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Cooper
Costello
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Gallegly
Heinrich
Mack
McIntyre
Napolitano
Noem
Paul
Paulsen
Slaughter
Stutzman

□ 1451

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 249, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote No. 249 today. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 10th, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 249 in order to attend my grandson's graduation. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on final passage of H.R. 5326, Making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote Nos. 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, and 249. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote Nos. 246 and 248. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote Nos. 244, 245, 247 and 249.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4004

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor of H.R. 4004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SOUTHERLAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, for the purpose of inquiring as to the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House is not in session. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and at noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. The last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. Among next week's suspensions will be H.R. 365, the National Blue Alert Act, sponsored by Congressman MICHAEL GRIMM, which will coincide with National Police Week and will help deter the threat of violence against our Nation's law enforcement officers.

In addition, the House will consider two important bills under a rule. The first is H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization, sponsored by Congresswoman SANDY ADAMS, herself a former sheriff. Our second rule bill, which will take up the remainder of the week, is H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act, sponsored by Chairman BUCK MCKEON. This bipartisan bill provides for the funding of our armed services prior to Memorial Day, as is the House's appropriate custom.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

On the Violence Against Women Act, a very important piece of legislation which we have reauthorized in the past in a bipartisan fashion, it is under a rule. Does the gentleman know whether it will be an open rule or whether there will be, perhaps, a modified open rule with amendments being printed? Will the gentleman tell us? I have a lot of folks on my side of the aisle who are very interested in dealing with certain portions of that bill, and they'd be interested to know whether or not they will be able to offer amendments.

Mr. CANTOR. I will just tell the gentleman, as he knows, the Rules Committee is the one to decide the process by which bills come to the floor and the rules for those bills; and the Rules Committee will be meeting on Tuesday.

Mr. HOYER. I would tell the majority leader, for the purposes of his planning and anticipation, as he may well know, the bill that has been reported out of the Judiciary Committee is controversial. There was a bill that passed through the other Chamber, which passed overwhelmingly—more than 2–1—and it is not like this bill.

□ 1500

There are Members that would like to incorporate the Senate's provisions in the House bill, and I know we would appreciate it if we would be given that opportunity to offer that on the floor as an alternative. If the gentleman would take that into consideration, perhaps talk to Mr. DREIER about making such amendments in order, we would very much appreciate that. Of course we would also appreciate, perhaps, if you wanted to take up the Senate bill as a substitute. We think we would have overwhelming votes for that on this side of the aisle. In light of the fact that you and I have been working in such a bipartisan fashion lately, perhaps that would be a good way to continue that process.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. It has certainly been an improved sense of cooperation, and I appreciate that on the gentleman's part in trying to deliver results and trying to make sure we get America back to work.

I would say to the gentleman, as he rightly noted, that this bill has traditionally been reauthorized. The approach that we tried to focus on was to do what it is that the gentleman and I have been trying to do the last couple

of weeks, and that is to separate out things that divide us and try to unite us around the central focus of a particular piece of legislation.

VAWA is a program that calls for the commitment of taxpayer dollars to fund the appropriate services for abused women. This is a bill that is much needed, and it is one that I think deserves our bipartisan support. We tried to stay away from issues that divide us, and we tried to listen to the GAO in terms of its recommendations under this program to make sure that taxpayer dollars are spent at their most efficient levels so that we can get more out of the dollars being spent. That is the spirit with which we will bring this bill to the floor.

Again, I know it's an important bill. We all care deeply about making sure that abused women receive the necessary services that they need.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his observations, and clearly he and I agree on the importance of this piece of legislation.

Certainly we're concerned about violence perpetrated against all women who happen to be in this country and subject to violent acts by others. So we want to make sure that we can, in fact, protect all women who are subject to abuse. Hopefully we can pursue that objective.

Mr. Leader, the appropriation bill we just passed was somewhat more controversial than I had hoped it would have been, in part because of the riders that were adopted to that bill, which were strongly opposed by many on this side of the aisle, and in part because we do not believe it complied with the agreement that we reached with reference to funding levels.

There are now 11 more appropriation bills to go. Can the gentleman tell me the next appropriation bill that he expects to have on the floor?

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman that we are looking to accommodate the needs of the committee as they move forward and with their bills and their agenda. It is our intention to continue with the kind of debate that we had on the CJS bill this week.

As you know, it's been some time since this House was able to see an appropriations process work in a very open fashion like we had this week. We intend to continue to do that with the bills. It's the Speaker's commitment that this be an open process and that Members have a right to air their views, and that those issues and amendments can come to a vote.

I say to the gentleman that we look forward to working with him and looking to the committee to bring forward the bill that they think is ready next to be brought to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

As I said, one concern we had on our side of the aisle was the riders, many of which we thought were inappropriate. They were adopted, but we did not favor them. The second was, of course, the level of funding. The Appropriations Committee clearly articulated very early in this process they thought the monies available to them under the Ryan constrictions on 302(a) were too low to meet some of the commitments that they had.

First of all, pursuant to what he says the Speaker wants to do and he wants to do, and I think we ought to do—we didn't always get that done lamentably—does the gentleman believe that we're going to have the time to bring each one of the appropriation bills to the floor between now and the August break so that the Senate might consider them and we might consider them individually, as opposed to in some omnibus piece of legislation?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, all I would say to the gentleman is it is certainly the intention and the commitment we have to bring these bills forward for an open and fair debate.

I know the gentleman has expressed now twice the fact that his side didn't like some of the votes that occurred on the specific provisions of some bills. This is a democratic process, as he knows. Twenty-three Members on his side of the bill ended up supporting the CJS bill. Again, this is the House's will at work, and we hope to be able to work with him in this very new environment in which we're operating on appropriations bills.

The commitment that we have is still that we want to bring these bills forward under a very challenging fiscal time in our country and do so without earmarks. This does represent a new construct within which we are operating. Again, we look forward to the gentleman's participation towards that end in a successful way.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I want to make it clear that clearly I understand it is the democratic process that riders are offered and the House does its will. There it is. The gentleman is absolutely correct, that's the process.

But I want to emphasize that we still have great concerns about the agreement that we reached not being carried out pursuant to what we believed the agreement was in terms of funding levels and 302(a) allocations; that is, the general allocation to the Appropriation Committee. I know the gentleman knows that we have that concern. I know the gentleman has also made the observation that that was a cap and not an agreed number. I will tell my friend again—I think I said this a couple of weeks ago—that undermines our willingness to make agreements if what we make an agreement on is the most that you'll do, but then come in at levels substantially below that which we think we agreed to, and in fact is in the law.

I want to make it clear that was my major concern and continues to be my major concern. I understand, as all of us do on this floor, that the majority will rule on the amendments, and what amendments are adopted are adopted. There were a lot of them on the floor, as you know better than I, because there were a lot from your side, and that's appropriate.

Let me ask you about the transportation conference, Mr. Leader. We are very concerned about this. We think this is a jobs bill. We think it's an important bill. This bill, as you know, was adopted overwhelmingly by some 74 Senators. Half of the Republican Conference in the Senate is voting for the transportation bill. We're in conference now. We've been in conference for some time. Can the gentleman tell me what he thinks the status of the conference is and when we might adopt this bill? Obviously, we have it extended until the end of June, but we must act before then. Can the gentleman tell me the status of the conference?

Mr. CANTOR. As the gentleman rightly suggests, we are in conference with the Senate. Deliberations are ongoing. We are very mindful, as he indicates, of the expiration of the existing authorization of the program at the end of June, knowing that is our deadline.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I want to say as we close this colloquy—which some people will say was one of our more tame colloquies—perhaps that's appropriate. On a week that we did have an opportunity to come together, I want to thank the gentleman. I want to again say that Neil Bradley did an excellent job working with John Hughes and my staff and the Financial Services staff of Mr. FRANK, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MILLER's staff, and the Senate.

□ 1510

I think we've done what we ought to do more of. And we passed a bill which, as you know, my party supported unanimously because we believe it does, in fact, make us more competitive in the international marketplace and will help keep and grow jobs. So I want to thank the gentleman for his work on that and, again, thank Mr. Bradley and Mr. Hughes for their work on that. And hopefully the Senate will act on that with dispatch.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I will join the gentleman in thanking both of our staffs. They did tremendous work, as well as Mr. MILLER on the Financial Services Committee and the staff there, Mr. BACHUS' staff. Your office can be instrumental, I think, in helping move the Senate along. But everyone from the chief of staff on down in your office—and we want to thank you as well for your team's commitment to working, again, in a very difficult equation where there were a lot of differences that we tried to work through but, in the end, didn't want to unilaterally disarm American business in the name of competitiveness in our country.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I want to apologize to

your chief of staff for not mentioning him.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, May 15, 2012, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

RURAL POST OFFICES

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, this week the postal service announced a new strategy to keep rural post offices open. My district in Arkansas could have lost as many as 100 post offices.

This new plan from the postal service is not perfect. The retail window at many post offices will have limited operating hours. However, access to the retail lobby and post office boxes will remain unchanged. More importantly, towns will keep their ZIP codes, and community identities will be preserved.

In November of 2011, I introduced H.R. 3370, Protecting Our Rural Post Offices Act, which prohibits the postal service from closing rural post offices that do not have an alternative office within 8 miles. Now that the postal service has announced plans to keep all post offices open, Congress can enact reforms that will ensure rural Americans no longer have to worry about access to mail services.

So many of the challenges we face in Washington are not Democrat versus Republican; rather, urban versus rural interests. In small communities across Arkansas and across the country, the post office represents the town identity and lets the world know the community exists. If post offices were to completely close and small communities no longer had their own ZIP codes, cities' identities would be lost. For my part, I will continue efforts to ensure rural Arkansas communities keep access to postal services.

HONORING OUR NATION'S MOTHERS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to pay tribute to the Nation's mothers and to be able to wish them a wonderful and happy Mother's Day.

This morning I had the privilege of going to the women's war memorial at Arlington Cemetery to lay a wreath for our fallen women who fell in battle and in service to their Nation; many of them were mothers. I stand today to say to them, even in the loss of life, we thank you. We honor you.

I honor my mother, who lost her life in 2010, Ivaleta Jackson, along with my aunt, Valerie Bennett, along with my living aunt, Vickie Bennett, and as well Audrey Bennett and some of the mothers of my community: Ruby Mosley, Dany Simmons, Sylvia Gonzalez, Ester Campos. So many mothers who have served their communities. The late Beulah Shepard. So many of them.

But I want to say to the Nation's mothers that we have an obligation to ensure that your children are protected and that the lives of women are protected and that we recognize and respect all of the service, all of you that are stay-at-home mothers who take care of the children at home; those who work; those who work and have children. To those who do so many things, I am so honored to be able to say, you are, in fact, America's sheroes. We honor you this weekend. But, actually, as we're taught, we honor you every day of the year.

God bless you. God bless the United States of America.

VOTER PHOTO ID LAWS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when people fraudulently vote, they infringe on the rights of lawful voters. One solution is to require valid photo IDs. The Supreme Court has upheld photo IDs to vote, but some object.

Attorney General Eric Holder is investigating Texas' photo voter ID laws even though such IDs will be free to those who need them. A person needs an ID to open a bank account, to use a credit card, to check into a hotel, to drive, to buy a lottery ticket, to buy alcohol, cash a check, board a plane, or even visit a public school. When Eric Holder spoke in Austin recently, it was reported that people had to present a valid photo ID to enter the building he was speaking in. Isn't that ironic.

A local D.C. paper printed an editorial claiming photo ID laws disenfranchised voters. But to enter the paper's facilities, a person must present a photo ID. Ironic again. It would seem the only ones who would be disenfranchised by voter photo ID laws would be unlawful voters.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT TRAVIS MILLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's always my privilege and honor to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

Today, I come before you with a humble heart and an appreciation for a young American whom I believe this Congress needs to honor. I will be reading into the RECORD a poem in honor of an American hero, Staff Sergeant Travis Mills, Bravo Troop 4, 73rd Cav, 82nd Airborne, United States Army, North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor this remarkable young man, Staff Sergeant Travis Mills. On April 10, 2012, while out on patrol with his troops in Mialand province, Afghanistan, Staff Sergeant Mills almost lost his life during an IED explosion.

He is known for leading his men in combat. Where they go, he goes. After the explosion, while being airlifted on the bird, an extraordinary moment was noted by the medic onboard. While bravely wounded, he did not shed even a tear, and he asked how his men were doing, who were also wounded. He then smiled at them, gave them a wink to reassure them—this is a man who lost four limbs, Mr. Speaker. It was impressive, to say the least.

Staff Sergeant Travis Mills lost three of those limbs initially and later a fourth limb. In two short weeks, already his progress and courage was an inspiration, to say the least. And now he embarks upon his recovery. It's clear that nothing is going to slow his recovery down.

□ 1520

I will now read a poem, penned by Albert Caswell, titled: ''They'll Not Take That From You.''

And what can these, our brief lives so make?
All out upon our life's wait?
All within these, our short lives await . . .
So then which steps must we all so take?
All in our times worth, not to forsake . . .
All in which we so create . . .
For the path is straight my friend . . .
And our journey is but a long and hard one, so then!
For its all in our hearts depends . . .
If its up in Heaven we wish to wake . . .
Travis, no they'll not take that from you!
They may take your strong arms and legs . . .
They may even make you cry out in pain, as do they!
Until, it's for death you beg!
But there are a few most magnificent things, Travis,
so they . . .
That, they'll not so take from you . . .
All because of what you so gave!
The word of hero,
now comes before, and after, your fine name this day!
And Heaven for you Travis one day, awaits!
As from you, this they'll not so take!
They'll not take that from you!
For it's that most splendid word, of ''Honor'' . . .
That which so courses all through your magnificent veins!
For you were one of those most gallant ones of all . . .
Who, like all of those other fine souls before you,
who so stood tall!
Who so selflessly marched off to war,

to hear that clarion call!
Leaving behind all that they so loved . . .
All of your most precious loves,
who you held so very high above . . .
All for The Greater Good!
With tears all in your most magnificent eyes,
as you so left and so said your last goodbyes . . .
With your heart of gold comprised,
marching off to war so ready to die . . .
Travis, no they'll not take that from you!
With all your most splendid valor, and grace . . .
With all of your most magnificent courage so all in place,
as you so heroically stared all in death's face!
As with smell of death upon you so wafted,
and yet with each new step somehow you still kept pace!
As such heartache upon your fine soul was placed . . .
As all for your Brothers In Arms You So Led The Way!
As so boldly you so stood all there in uniform . . .
As why now you so hold such a special place!
All in our hearts so very warm . . .
All in this our human race.
No . . . No . . . They will not take that from you!
For Travis,
yours will always be a heart of such honor and faith!
One of such most splendid grace!
As we so look upon your magnificent face . . .
And so see what you so gave . . .
As there we all so find such a fine soul as comprised . . .
Who above all others we must now so place . . .
With but your most heroic will,
as Travis you climbed mountains and so climbed hills . . .
As your own blood was so spilled,
and still you did not lose pace!
And now your new battle has just begun!
As your fine heart,
now so shines all like that morning sun!
As you rebuild with each new step, all one by one!
No Fine One,
You're Airborne and They'll not take that from you!
For it was you,
who so chose to answer freedom's most noble call . . .
As our Lord God your great valor saw . . .
They'll Not Take That From You!
For in these, our most troubled times,
all in these our most shortest of all lives . . .
Only, but one thing so lives on . . . so shines's!
As not so gone, as out into eternity so survives!
As is what we so do upon this earth!
Do we in the darkness so reside?
Or is it with our goodness,
that we so make even the Angels too cry?
For if all in our most noble deeds,
that we so succeed to fight evil's needs . . .
Then, it's Heaven we shall all so see.
For these are such things,
that which only our magnificence can so bring!
And that no one else can so take from you Travis . . . sing!
No Travis, They Will Never So Take That From You!
And now the time has so come!
To mount up Cav, my son!
To go Airborne to recovery, to get up and run!
To win one more battle,
like all of those other ones you've won!
Because, Travis you are Army Strong!
You Are America's Heart and Son!
They may have taken your strong arms and legs!
But, your fine heart and soul they can not so touch,
can they!
And that's what you run with this very day . . .
Bravo my son, you are Airborne in every way!
As once again, you are out on point leading the way!
For Travis, SSG Mills you have so many lives to touch!
So many hearts to fill as such!
And so many years from now,
Heaven is yours one day so don't rush!
And your family and this world,
so needs men like you as such!
Travis, They'll Not Take That From You!

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMERICAN VALUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 52 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We are really blessed here in the Capitol with some of the greatest people that work around here and touch the lives of so many. So many come from around the country to admire our great national Capitol, and the people that work around here touch them one way or another.

Albert Caswell is one of those great folks. It seems every day we see him with wounded warriors, in addition to his regular duties as a tour guide. He's taken them through the Capitol, doing poems for them, having them signed by Members of Congress, getting them entered in the RECORD, getting them to individual warriors. He just does great work, so I'm quite pleased my friend STEVE KING read that into the RECORD.

The truth is, freedom is not free, and we're surrounded by people who have given a great deal—given limbs, given so much. I was standing by a Gold Star mom in Texas this past week, and I really wasn't sure who gave the most. Her son gave everything—gave his life. But his mother gave her son.

We're told by Jesus, Greater love has no one than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.

This Nation has experienced so much love by people who have laid down their lives for their country, but at the same time millions of parents have given their children proper teaching to love the things that make this country the greatest country in the world. Instill those values in their children for them to be willing to show the greatest love that anyone can have.

I do know, from being so close to parents who have given their children, that that is an unfathomable love. To care about your country and its freedoms so much that you're willing to risk a child's life for the good of others, and ultimately give that child for the good of the country.

□ 1530

It is so terribly difficult.

So we have people on foreign soil who are risking their lives; some have given their lives for this country. We have law enforcement. We have intelligence agents, agents from all parts of State, local, and Federal Government who put their lives at risk every day so we can enjoy the freedoms we have. We owe them not to be stupid about the way we carry out the government's business and the way in which we protect the citizens of this country, the people in this country, from all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Now, we have some very noble patriots that serve at the various levels of our Federal entities that are charged with keeping us safe. Having visited with Secretary Panetta, who called me a few weeks ago, having had multiple conversations with Director Mueller as Director of the FBI, so many others in our Federal law enforcement, our Federal intelligence, justice, we have a great lot of noble people. But here again, we cannot be foolish about the way we go about protecting America.

There are people who have been at war with the United States since 1979. President Carter hailed the Ayatollah Khomeini as a man of peace as he came back from exile and for the first time in so many years gave a foothold for radical terrorizing Islam to have a country in Iran. Americans soon found out the price of bad judgment in international affairs.

Not too long thereafter, there was an attack against the American Embassy in Tehran. I know at Fort Benning, Georgia, where I was, a lot of folks were put on alert that it may be necessary for us to go and defend this Nation because an attack against a country's embassy is an attack against that country. It is an act of war. So there was an act of war committed in Iran in 1979, and our response was so benign that it is still being used as a recruiting tool by radical Islamists today to show how Americans are not very smart, they don't have the stomach for a strong fight so we can still prevail.

We had a benign response in 1983 after the attack on our marines and lost around 300 precious marine lives in Beirut. The response was to pull them out without a fight.

So many times we've been attacked in the last 30 years, acts of war, and we failed to recognize what they were until 2001 when most of America woke up at that point, that there are people who want to destroy America. When bin Laden wrote that they had spent around $500,000 to train those people and to carry out the mission of crashing planes into American buildings to destroy buildings and to kill thousands of Americans—apparently they were hoping for more, in the range of 50,000 or so to be killed in the Twin Towers. But as bin Laden has pointed out, an investment, from their standpoint, the way they saw it, of around $500,000 cost America trillions and trillions of dollars. And even before he was taken out,

it was clear to him that they helped put America on track to be bankrupt. From his standpoint, that was a tremendous investment. Invest $500,000 in an act of war and cost your enemy not only thousands of lives but trillions of dollars, not only in damage but in the money spent to try to secure the Nation.

That's why it is so important that we be smarter about the way our money is spent, that we utilize a little bit more discernment, a little more wisdom in the way that we take on those who are bent on our destruction. They are still there. And the Taliban's strength, as both Senator FEINSTEIN and Representative ROGERS, the two chairs from the Senate and House, respectively, of our Intelligence, our Homeland Security—I guess, Intelligence—they understand and they believe the Taliban is stronger now than it was before. It is growing in strength. We have not been very wise about the way we took on an enemy that wants to take this country down.

Now, there are some who have been a little oversensitive, and it seems that some who are our Muslim friends who have been more defensive about any questions about radical Islam than they have been about condemning the radicals that have hijacked their religion. And it would be helpful for those of us who know there are moderate Muslims who just want to live in peace, to have their help in condemning radical Islam instead of condemning those of us who stand up against and condemn radical Islam.

America, one of our great traits is we don't want to really offend people around the world. There have been some ugly Americans over the years who give us a bad name, but all in all, Americans are loving, caring, forgiving people. And the only nation in the history of the world that has ever sent treasure in the form of money and our greatest assets, our individuals, to fight and die on behalf of people in another nation over which we want no control, we want no territory, we just want freedom to reign in the world so we can live in peace and help extend that freedom to others around the world.

That's why, over the years, as stories have unfolded about high-handed leaders in other countries who say, We want Americans out; we don't like you. And the response has come in some situations, Do you want us to remove all of the dead bodies of Americans who gave their lives so you could have the freedom to tell us where to go and what to do?

Americans have had a place in history like no other nation.

Ironically, as one general recently said in conversation, virtually every deployment he has had into harm's way, he has been sent there by the United States on behalf of Muslims who were being mistreated by others, including Christians. So, for some of us it gets a little discouraging that our Muslim friends who want to live in peace will not take notice of the fact that this country has stood up against tyranny, against moderate Muslims around the world, and we continue to do that.

□ 1540

We are doing that in Afghanistan and we get no credit for that. Instead, we get condemned because we want to protect what we have, and we get so caught up in political correctness that we're afraid to call things as they are.

Now, I mentioned before, but that line in the ''Patton'' movie may or may not have actually been said. But it is a fact for military strategists, as Patton looked over the carnage from a battle in which his tanks took on the tanks of that incredible German Field Marshal Rommel, and reportedly Patton said something like, paraphrasing, Rommel, you glorious, childless son—or apparently, son—I read your book.

Going through military science, we were taught that if you want to be able to fight effectively on behalf of your country, you have to know your enemy. We would prefer we have no enemies. As Christians—those of us who are—we're taught to love your neighbor as yourself. Jesus, himself, said, when he was asked by a lawyer, What's the most important commandment? He said, Love God. The second is like it, Love your neighbor. And on those two things, those two laws, hang all the law and the prophets.

The full face of Moses depicted above the door in the center back in the gallery is there because he was considered perhaps the greatest lawgiver of all time. Of all the lawgivers who have side profiles, Moses has the one full face. And if you were to outline the Ten Commandments that Moses was used to provide, you could outline them under two headings: number one, love God; number two, love each other. They all fall under those two commands.

Since we have a very rich Judeo-Christian heritage here in America, for at least the first 130, 140 years of our country's history people have been proud to constantly quote the Bible here on the House floor as the ultimate authority for reasoning behind good legislation. As one goes right out those doors, straight down the halls a matter of feet, you come to Statuary Hall. It is the place where the House of Representatives met for most of the 1800s. And except for after the fire in 1814 that the British set, a fire which was put out by what insurance policies would call an act of God, a deluging rain that put out the fire, preserved this Capitol's shell so that it didn't implode and become a bunch of ruins, right down the hall in Statuary Hall—formerly, the House of Representatives—for most of the 1800s, it was a place of nondenominational Christian worship services.

I hope one day we'll have a plaque down there so that the 15,000 or so people a day that come through can read and understand that the man, Thomas Jefferson, who coined the phrase ''separation of church and State''—not in the Constitution, as most Americans apparently believe, but in a letter to the Danbury Baptists about why, really, we shouldn't have an official denomination of the Christian religion—Jefferson attended church virtually every Sunday he was in Washington just down the hall. They had nondenominational Christian worship services.

So it is amazing the lack of education that has occurred in recent generations so that you can have one of the cable channels—is it BSNBC or something like that? They reported that in the past week there was some kind of a prayer service in Statuary Hall by a bunch of right-wingers, when what was actually done was not nearly as stout in Christian nature as what Thomas Jefferson used to do as President when he attended church down there, and the Speaker's podium was used as the pulpit each Sunday for most of the 1800s.

Most people credit Madison with having more to do with the Constitution than anyone else of our Founders. Madison also attended church, a nondenominational Christian church, in Statuary Hall—back then, the House of Representatives—and he found no affront to the Constitution to attend church in the U.S. Capitol. For much of the 1800s, the largest Christian church in the Nation's capital was here at the Capitol in the House of Representatives where they attended church each Sunday.

The Congressional Research Service did some research on material that we provided to see what they believed was documented and what wasn't. They said Jefferson normally came down Pennsylvania Avenue on horseback by himself. One story is of Jefferson coming down Pennsylvania Avenue with a big Bible under his arm, and one of the citizens said, Mr. President, where are you going? Well, it was Sunday morning, and he said, I'm going to church up in the Capitol. He said, Sir, you don't believe everything those Christians do up there. And he said, Sir, I am the highest elected magistrate in this country. It is imperative that I set the proper example.

So he came to church, and he did not find attending church down in the House of Representatives as offending the notion that he dreamed up of a separation of church and State—his words.

He's also the person that coined the phrase having a ''wall of separation'' that the Supreme Court has many, many years later misconstrued because they didn't know their history, weren't properly taught. But Jefferson did not find it an affront to his concept of separation of church and State to bring the United States Marine Band into the Capitol to play Christian hymns for the Christian worship services.

So what to some cable channel may have been this strange, weird thing

that happened because they have not been properly educated, to Thomas Jefferson, to James Madison was just a matter of propriety and course. Certainly, there's nothing wrong with bringing the Marine Band to play hymns in the House of Representatives for a nondenominational church Christian worship service, because it was nondenominational. They weren't putting emphasis on any particular denomination.

When Randolph, during the 1787 Constitutional Convention, saw that things were falling apart and heard this inspirational speech by Benjamin Franklin, how Franklin, in his words—we have his words because he wrote them down in his own handwriting—said:

> I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth: God governs in the affairs of man. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it possible an empire could rise without His aid?

Franklin went on to say:

> We've been assured, sir, in the sacred writing that, unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.

Some of us were taught he was a deist, but in his own words, in his own handwriting, the speech that he gave to the other members at the Constitutional Convention, he urged them by saying, Firmly believe this. He said:

> I also firmly believe without His concurring help, we shall succeed in our political building no better than the builders of Babel.
> We'll be confounded by our local partial interests and we, ourselves, shall become a byword down through the ages.

□ 1550

Well, Randolph, his proposal, after Franklin, was we basically have had so much disagreement, such a spirit of anger in here, I move that we all go to church. Here we are, the end of June, we're about to celebrate the country's anniversary. I move that we all go to church together, and all of us—the irony of this, all of us, as part of the Constitutional Convention, that are going to give this Nation the Constitution that will one day cause the Supreme Court to say we don't think that you can constitutionally do what the Founders and the writers of the Constitution did, he said, we all ought to go to church together in celebration of the anniversary and then come back and pick this up.

One wrote that there was a new spirit. They all went to the Reformed Calvinistic Church. They all went to the same church. They all heard the same sermon. And it evoked a spirit of unity and collaboration, that although there were differences, they were able to come together thereafter and give us the Constitution.

So it's part of our heritage. And as part of our heritage, we welcome people from all faiths, or no faiths. But just because you don't have a faith, don't come in and tell us we can't have and enjoy what the Founders provided and assured in the First Amendment that we could have.

Don't try to mis-educate any more Supreme Court Justices, so that although they're brilliant of intellect, they're ignorant of our history and what the Constitution means so they do not really understand the freedoms that we were provided and that there is a prohibition against our practicing our religion.

Some have twisted those words, the language, our Constitution, and political correctness to the point that it is exposing us to unnecessary danger. And although these people that we have in authority here in this town mean well, and they all want to see the country do well and thrive, we can't be stupid about the way we go around helping protect the country.

So, we have people in America that are more concerned with political correctness and more concerned that someone does not get offended while we are fighting for our Nation's life, fighting for the Nation's existence against powers that want to destroy us. They're concerned we might offend somebody, we might offend those who want to kill and destroy us, and, what's worse, we might offend someone who is a moderate and practices under the name of the same religion of those who want to destroy us.

And just like Patton was pointing out, you can't defend yourself unless you know the enemy that wants to destroy you.

9/12 was a day like I've not experienced in my lifetime. We were scared. Americans across the country came together. We prayed. We didn't care about political correctness. Courthouse squares around the country, we grabbed hands. We did in Tyler, Texas. They did all around the country, people holding hands and singing hymns, singing ''Amazing Grace,'' singing ''God Bless America,'' people praying for God's protection once again, just like Ben Franklin told us we would have to have or we would succeed no better than the builders of Babel.

We came together, and for that day, and for a time thereafter, there was no such thing as a hyphenated American. There was no Euro-American, there was no African-American, no Asian-American, Native-American. There were Americans here in America, and we were concerned about having a future for us and our children and, hopefully, their children and their children. And we were smart for a short time, and in a bipartisan way, this Chamber came together.

I was on the bench at the time as a judge. I was qualifying a jury panel when the Twin Towers were hit. Nobody was concerned about hyphenated Americans because we were Americans. And what this Chamber did, in coming together with the Senate and saying, You know what? Let's study where we went wrong. And a bipartisan commission was put together to study, in complete candor, what had gone wrong. How did the worst attack against America on its own soil occur without us realizing what was coming?

We had the 9/11 Commission report that came out of that, and the 9/11 Commission report used words like ''enemy'' 39 times, ''jihad'' 126 times, ''Muslim'' 145 times because those who wanted to destroy us and tried used that term about themselves. That's who they said they were before the attack. They used terms in the report 32 two times like ''Islam'' because those who attacked us in the worst attack in our history on our soil used that term about themselves.

And I am very sorry for our moderate Islamic friends who want to live in peace with all Americans because they're Americans. And I'm sorry if people are offended that those who hated us so much they would bring down the World Trade Centers, try to wipe out the Pentagon, try to wipe out what some say is the most recognized building in the world, this Capitol, I'm sorry if they're offended that those people call themselves Muslim. They call themselves Islamists.

''Muslim Brotherhood'' was mentioned five times in the 9/11 Commission report because it was important. There was an interwoven nature to what was going on in the attack. They used ''religious,'' that word, 65 times. They mentioned ''Hamas'' four times. They mentioned ''Hezbollah'' two times. They mentioned ''al Qaeda'' 36 times. They mentioned ''caliph'' seven times. They mentioned ''shari'a'' twice.

But apparently we have leaders who mean well, I know that, who think they're protecting America, who are more concerned about not offending people who don't want to hurt us than they are about just speaking truth. And how can you deal with an enemy unless you're willing to recognize them in truth?

So now, because in the very recent months, the FBI counterterrorism lexicon, this effort by our FBI that's going on in the Justice Department, it's going on in the Intelligence Department, it's going on in the State Department, it's going on in the White House, itself—they're leading the charge—we don't want to offend anyone.

□ 1600

So no longer is an FBI agent who is new, someone who may barely remember what occurred on 9/11, allowed to be taught what the enemy who attacked us said about themselves. They're not allowed to be taught what they said motivated our enemy. How can you deal with your enemy? How can you take them on and win that fight and come out victorious unless you recognize what motivates them? Because, when you know what motivates them, you can predict more likely what they will do next.

That's why there are novelists in America who do a better job of projecting where we will be hit next than

our own government intelligence agencies, other than our own government FBI. It's why some noticed that there was a soldier on al Jazeera who was saying exactly what Major Hasan had said: in essence about how, with his being a Muslim, if he were sent to a Muslim country where he might accidentally kill another Muslim for one of the unrecognized allowances to kill another Muslim, then they would have to act up and kill Americans to avoid having to risk going to a Muslim country and killing a Muslim.

The guy is saying basically the same things Hasan did before he killed 13 of our precious servicemembers in an act that in our political correctness this administration now refers to as ''workplace violence.''

I came to know and love some Pearl Harbor survivors. They had no idea that what they experienced at Pearl Harbor, according to the thinking of this administration, was an act of workplace violence, where someone came into the workplace of all of these civilians and all of these soldiers and sailors and marines in Pearl Harbor and killed them in their workplace. They didn't understand that because that's not what it was—nor was it workplace violence at Fort Hood. It was an act of war against our military.

I am grateful we have Members of the House and Senate who had the foresight to file a bill to make sure that they should have Purple Hearts, because it was not workplace violence. They died for their country. They died for freedom. They laid down their lives, which they knew were at risk from the moment they took the oath, which is just like all of us who have been in the service have taken.

Political correctness must be set aside so that we can speak candidly and truthfully. So, if there really is nothing to fear from the radical Islamists who have hijacked the name of a religion away from the mass moderate Muslims, it is time for more than just three or four or a handful of moderate Muslims to step forward and help us in calling it what it is.

Now, I recognize that, for any Muslim to step forward and condemn another Muslim, it is a very, very risky proposition. It's far more risky for them to do that than for a considered infidel like me to step up and condemn radical jihadist Islamists, because I'm already an infidel in their eyes; but moderates know that if they speak out publicly they could be targeted for turning on their own religion. Among the radicals—crazies—who are trying to highjack the religion, they get angrier at a moderate Muslim than they do at an infidel for speaking against another Muslim. So it is very risky for a moderate to step up and join those of us who want to recognize accurately what our enemy is.

But, in the name of political correctness, not only have we cleansed our National Intelligence Strategy, which is becoming a misnomer—how can you have intelligence if you're not allowed to recognize your enemy for what your enemy calls himself?—our FBI counterterrorism lexicon, how it has been cleansed of the terms that those at war with us call themselves.

It is important that we learn from our mistakes because, if we refuse to learn from our mistakes, we're going to keep making them. Most people have been taught the old adage: ''Those who refuse to learn from history are destined to repeat it.'' We should not have to experience another major attack on our own soil and the loss of thousands of American lives before we have another heartbreaking day like September 12 of 2001 on which we come together, embrace, and say we're not hyphenated Americans—we're Americans. We are one people, and we will stand together. We shouldn't have to have more Americans killed as they were on 9/11 to bring us together like that.

But I beg, Mr. Speaker, of my colleagues: Let's help educate our Federal Government that it's okay to call people ''radical Islamists'' if they have called themselves that and that it's okay to describe people in our FBI counterterrorism lexicon and in our intelligence materials what the terrorists, themselves, call themselves. It's okay, and we won't be mad at each other when we do that.

What happens when we try to become too politically correct is that we have things like the FBI and a wonderful Director who, I believe, unintentionally has hurt the FBI by his 5-year up-or-out policy, which we now know has cost us thousands and thousands and thousands of years of experience by running off our more experienced FBI agents in favor of agents in charge, who may go from having 26 years of experience to having 5 or 6 years of experience, who may not even have been out of college at the time of 9/11 and who are now in charge as the most experienced people we have in our offices around the country. That has hurt us.

At the same time, for example, in June of 2002, our FBI Director took fire for giving a speech to the American Muslim Council, which the Director's spokesman described as ''the most mainstream Muslim group in the United States.'' But, at the time of the speech in 2002, the head of the American Muslim Council was a man named al-Amoudi, who was videotaped in October of 2000 delivering a speech just yards away from the White House, proclaiming:

> I have been labeled by the media in New York as being a supporter of Hamas. We are all supporters of Hamas. I wish they'd added that I'm also a supporter of Hezbollah.

That was also the same year, 2002, that the AMC, the American Muslim Council, board adviser and former acting president, Jamil al-Amin, was arrested for murdering a Georgia police officer. Al-Amoudi was arrested in 2003 in a Libyan assassination plot targeting the Saudi Crown Prince, and was later identified by the U.S. Treasury as one of al Qaeda's top fund-raisers in the United States.

At the time of our FBI Director's speech in 2002, al-Amoudi had been under investigation by the FBI for almost a decade for funneling money between Osama bin Laden and the ''Blind Sheikh.''

In October of 2003, just days before the ceremony honoring a Detroit Muslim leader, Imad Hamad, and bestowing on him the FBI Director's award for exceptional public service, the FBI had to contact Hamad and tell him he wasn't going to receive the reward.

□ 1610

The FBI initially claimed they had decided to give the award to a victim of the 9/11 terror attacks, but later an FBI spokesman revealed that unflattering information about Hamad had been made public during the deportation proceedings for one of his close associates. In fact, the INS fought for two decades to deport Hamad for his suspected support for the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, a designated terrorist organization by this government. That information came to light not due to any checking or vetting by the FBI, but thanks to an article published by the New York Post.

It brings me back to the point about a young soldier after the 13 military members were killed at Fort Hood by Major Hasan who was on al-Jazeera saying the same things Hasan did before he went to kill. We had people that actually noticed that, but it would have been politically incorrect to do anything about it. You know, they say those things. If it had not been for a gun dealer in Texas who found this young private suspicious, if it had not been for that gun dealer calling in local authorities and alerting them, we would have had another Fort Hood shooting and lost other precious members of our military. They were saved not because of the intelligence community, the FBI counterterrorism, or the Homeland Security countering violent extremism, because we don't want to use the term jihad or Islamic jihad. So it's countering violent extremists. No, none of those picked it up. There were people who noticed and reported it, but nothing was done because it might be politically incorrect. They risked the lives of our precious military in political correctness. If not for the work of a gun dealer in Texas and local law enforcement jumping right on top of it, we could have lost military members.

Here are some other examples. Palestinian Islamic Jihad leader Sami al-Arian had meetings and conversations with high-ranking officials at the Justice Department and the Homeland Security Department despite being the subject of FISA wiretap warnings since the early 1990s and having his home raided in 1995. He was still having meetings at the DOJ, Homeland Security, and having access to our government's inner sanctum. As part of a plea agreement, al-Arian admitted to being

a part of the leadership structure of the terrorist group, and they were meeting with him.

In 2008, our FBI director handed one of his Director's Community Leadership Awards to Imam Yahya Hendi, who had testified during al-Arian's trial as a defense witness. Hendi had served as a moderator during a 2000 fundraiser for the Benevolence International Foundation, which was shut down in November 2002 by the U.S. Government and designated a terrorist organization for its support of al Qaeda and a number of other Islamic terrorist groups.

An FBI agent testified during the Holy Land Foundation trial that CAIR was a front for the terrorist group Hamas, and the FBI was publicly forced to sever its ties with CAIR. They had all this information, and yet they continued to, as their own information says, partner with CAIR, though CAIR—they knew we had evidence—was partnering with terrorists.

In September of 2010, known Hamas cleric, Mustapha, who was a part of a 6-week FBI Citizen's Academy, was treated to guided tours at the top-secret National Counterterrorism Center, FBI headquarters, and the FBI Academy at Quantico. Mustapha's participation in the FBI program came after he was personally named a coconspirator in the Holy Land Foundation trial and after his appointment as a Muslim chaplain to the Illinois State Police had been revoked. Illinois had already figured out what he was and what he believed before he was given tours of our top-secret National Counterterrorism Center.

Time magazine featured a profile of Mohamed Majid, imam of the All Dulles Area Muslim Society—or they call themselves ADAMS for short. I'm sure John Adams appreciates that. He is the current president of the Islamic Society of North America, which also was a named coconspirator to fund terrorism in the Holy Land Foundation trial. And both the district court and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals examined the record and said there is plenty of evidence here to support their being named specifically as supporters of terrorism.

But in November 2005, Majid was awarded by the FBI for the imam's cooperation in the war on terror, claiming, ''Majid regularly tips off the Bureau.'' But in a letter to the ADAMS center community the very next day, Majid told his mosque Members he did no such thing. Majid made clear that he never reported on anyone in the Muslim community and that his relationship with the FBI was one-sided, and the outreach meetings, ''are solely to create avenues to work with law enforcement to preserve our civil liberties and civil rights.'' Majid has met with top DOJ officials urging the criminalization of criticism of Islam. It's okay to burn a Bible; it's okay to criticize Christianity and Judaism; and police allowed people to scream and cuss obscenities about God during a prayer at a Tea Party, but it's not okay to be critical of these people.

It's time to wake up. It's time to set political correctness aside. And Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this letter, signed by 22,000 Americans begging us to end political correctness that risks our liberty, be made a matter of the RECORD.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HEINRICH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after noon.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 1 p.m. on account of attending her grandson's graduation.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2224. An act to require the President to report to Congress on issues related to Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2668. An act to designate the station of the United States Border Patrol located at 2136 South Naco Highway in Bisbee, Arizona, as the ''Brian A. Terry Border Patrol Station''.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 11, 2012, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5945. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Thiamethoxam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-1079; FRL-9331-8] received February 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5946. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Trifloxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0138; FRL-9336-5] received February 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5947. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Trinexapac-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0524; FRL-9337-9] received February 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5948. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Evaluation of the TRICARE Program for Fiscal Year 2012, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1073 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5949. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report presenting the specific amounts of staff-years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense Federally Funded Research and Development Center during fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5950. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report presenting the specific amounts of staff-years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense Federally Funded Research and Development Center during fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5951. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2010-2018 Strategic Workforce Plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5952. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, ''State High Risk Pool Grant Program for Federal Fiscal Year 2010''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5953. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Lead Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0100; FRL-9641-8] received February 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5954. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia; Atlanta; Fine Particulate Matter 2002 Base Year Emissions Inventory [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0050-201207(a); FRL-9639-4] received February 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5955. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia; Macon; Fine Particulate Matter 2001 Base Year Emissions Inventory [EPA-R04-OAR-2011-0850-201154(a); FRL-9639-8] received February 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5956. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste Exclusion [FDMS Docket No.: EPA-R08-RCRA-2011-0823; FRL-9640 2] received February 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5957. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District and Mojave Desert Quality Management District

[EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0990; FRL-9626-4] received February 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5958. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Feather River Air, Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0900; FRL-9626-3] received February 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5959. A letter from the Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2011 Annual Report pursuant to Section 203, Title II of the Notification and Federal Antidiscrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5960. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Amendment 11; Correction [Docket No.: 0808041037-1649-02] (RIN: 0648-AX05) received April 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5961. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 111220786-1781-01] (RIN: 0648-XB026) received April 16, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5962. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trip Limit Adjustments for the Common Pool Fishery [Docket No.: 0910051338-0151-02] (RIN: 0648-XB059) received April 16, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5963. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the Office's report entitled, ''2011 Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5964. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report of obligations and unobligated balances of funds provided for Federal-aid highway and safety construction programs for Fiscal Year 2011 as of September 30, 2011; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5965. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; South Bend, IN [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0250; Airspace Docket No. 11-AGL-6] received April 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5966. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Considerations for Lavatory Oxygen Systems [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0186; Amdt. Nos. 21-94,25-133, 121-354, 129-50; SFAR 111] (RIN: 2120-AJ92) received April 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5967. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Category IIIa, IIIb, and IIIc Definitions [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0019; Amdt. No. 1-67] (RIN: 2120-AK03) received April 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5968. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests to be enacted during the second session of the 112th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

5969. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests to be enacted during the second session of the 112th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2621. A bill to establish the Chimney Rock National Monument in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112–473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2745. A bill to amend the Mesquite Lands Act of 1986 to facilitate implementation of a multispecies habitat conservation plan for the Virgin River in Clark County, Nevada; with an amendment (Rept. 112–474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3874. A bill to provide for the conveyance of eight cemeteries that are located on National Forest System land in Black Hills National Forest, South Dakota; with amendments (Rept. 112–475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. BOUSTANY (for himself and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 5708. A bill to prevent the evasion of antidumping and countervailing duty orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 5709. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the public disclosure of charges for certain hospital and ambulatory surgical center treatment episodes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WESTMORELAND (for himself, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. COLE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. KINGSTON):

H.R. 5710. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to establish minimum efficiency standards for self-contained commercial refrigerators and freezers, and to direct the Department of Energy to establish standards for other related products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARNAHAN (for himself, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 5711. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants for treatment of heroin, cocaine, methamphetamine, 3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine (ecstasy), and phencyclidine (PCP) abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 5712. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Labor to establish a pilot program to have community business leaders mentor members of the Armed Forces under the Transition Assistance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. WATT, and Mr. KISSELL):

H.R. 5713. A bill to amend the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century to ensure that the highest priority consideration is given to local comments when selecting a toll pilot project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MILLER of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 5714. A bill to provide for a safe, accountable, fair, and efficient banking system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 5715. A bill to amend the Pension Protection Act of 2006 to extend special funding rules for certain plans maintained by commercial airlines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILBRAY (for himself and Mrs. MALONEY):

H.R. 5716. A bill to establish a Skin Cancer Research Fund to increase funding for the conduct or support of research relating to skin cancer by the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Mr. BERG):

H.R. 5717. A bill to require the Army Corps of Engineers to notify the public of certain flood predictions regarding the Missouri River System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 5718. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to revise the new market tax credit rules for population census tracts with low populations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5719. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction allowed for student loan interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. DOLD):

H.R. 5720. A bill to establish procedures for the presentation and expedited consideration by Congress of the recommendations in the Federal Regulatory Reform Report prepared by the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5721. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain electric cooktops; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5722. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on strontium europium halophosphate for use in the production of fluorescent lamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5723. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Yttrium europium oxide for use in the production of fluorescent lamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5724. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on on Barium magnesium aluminum oxide for use in the production of fluorescent lamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5725. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Calcium chloride phosphate activated by manganese and/or antimony for use in the production of fluorescent lamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5726. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Lanthanum phosphate for use in the production of fluorescent lamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa):

H.R. 5727. A bill to rebuild the American middle class by creating jobs, investing in our future, building opportunity for working families, and restoring balance to the tax code; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, Science, Space, and Technology, Small Business, the Judiciary, Rules, Oversight and Government Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 5728. A bill to extend the temporary reduction of duty on Acephate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HANABUSA:

H.R. 5729. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to permit Native Hawaiian Organizations to have status as HUBZone small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 5730. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make publicly available on the official Medicare Internet site medicare payment rates for frequently reimbursed hospital inpatient procedures, hospital outpatient procedures, and physicians' services; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PITTS, Mr. JONES, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. COLE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KELLY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia):

H.R. 5731. A bill to prohibit Federal assistance for telemedicine abortions and to ban interstate abortions using telemedicine technology; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 5732. A bill to authorize a competitive grant program to implement and evaluate digital learning in rural locales; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 5733. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on instant print film for analog photography; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 5734. A bill to provide compensation for the deadly acts by elements of the Pakistani military and intelligence services against United States citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 5735. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Tomb of Remembrance at Arlington National Cemetery for interment of cremated fragments of the remains of members of the Armed Forces killed in Afghanistan, Iraq, or a subsequent conflict when the fragments are unidentifiable by use of DNA testing or other means because of the condition of the fragments, are unclaimed, or are identified and authorized by the person designated to direct disposition of the remains for internment in such memorial; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 5736. A bill to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to authorize the domestic dissemination of information and material about the United States intended primarily for foreign audiences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CANSECO (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.J. Res. 108. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rules submitted by the Department of the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service relating to the reporting requirements for interest that relates to deposits maintained at United States offices of certain financial institutions and is paid to certain nonresident alien individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WATERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HAHN, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution recognizing the potential for the virtual elimination of pediatric HIV and AIDS and keeping HIV positive mothers alive; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARROW:

H. Res. 649. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should work to eliminate the facilitated sexual exploitation and trafficking of minors over the Internet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Res. 650. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia should work within the framework of the United Nations process with Greece to achieve longstanding United States and United Nations policy goals of finding a mutually acceptable name, for all uses, for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Ms. CHU, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. MORAN):

H. Res. 651. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the illicit ethnic and religious profiling and surveillance of Muslim American communities by the New York Police Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACA:

H. Res. 652. A resolution recognizing the need to pursue research into the causes, a treatment, and an eventual cure for rhabdomyosarcoma, supporting the goals and ideals of the Claire Frick Rhabdomyosarcoma Awareness Month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H. Res. 653. A resolution recognizing the goals of National Travel and Tourism Week and honoring the valuable contributions of travel and tourism to the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. RICHARDSON):

H. Res. 654. A resolution recognizing the immense impact that Bruce Jun Fan Lee had on American and global popular culture and the important role he played in creating a bridge between cultures, championing values of self-respect, self-discipline, and tolerance in our Nation, and pioneering and cultivating the genres of martial arts, martial arts films, fitness and philosophy in the United States and the world; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. REYES, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. NORTON):

H. Res. 655. A resolution expressing support for the designation of June 7, 2012, as National Hunger Awareness Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

202. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming, relative to Joint Resolution No. 1 urging the Congress to pass a comprehensive and aggressive budget resolution; to the Committee on the Budget.

203. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming, relative to Joint Resolution No. 5 calling all Americans to defend our freedom of religion by opposing this mandate; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

204. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Senate Resolution urging the Congress and the President to make the Republic of Poland eligible for the United States Department of State's Visa Waiver Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

205. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona, relative to Senate Concurrent Memorial 1007 urging the Congress to adopt a Veterans Remembered Flag; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 5708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1; Section 8; Clauses 1 & 3:

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;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 5709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 5710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact legislation pertaining to the rules and regulations for property owned by the United States pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 5711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1. ''All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.''

By Ms. BALDWIN:

H.R. 5712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 5713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution. Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress may make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution its powers and all—powers vested by the Constitution in the government of United States.

By Mr. MILLER of North Carolina:

H.R. 5714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 5715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 5716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I Section 8 Clause 8 of the U.S. Constitution which reads that Congress has the power ''To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts.''

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 5717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14: To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 5718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted under the constitutional authority of Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 5719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article XVI of the Constitution—Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes . . .

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 5720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV,

Clause 8 of Section 8 of Article I,

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I,

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I,

Clause 6 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5722.

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. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5723.

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. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5724.

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. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5725.

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. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5726.

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 Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause land Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 5728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HANABUSA:

H.R. 5729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 5730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which states Congress has the power to ''regulate Commerce . . . among the several states.''

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 5731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Because this legislation provides limitations for how the federal government spends money, it is authorized by the Constitution under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress its spending power.

Because this legislation prohibits a certain interstate commercial activity, it is authorized by the Constitution under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 which grants Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 5732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution which grants Congress the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 5733.

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. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 5734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 5735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 5736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CANSECO:

H.J. Res. 108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has authority to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the constitution. Should this IRS rule go into effect, commerce will likely be significantly impacted as deposits are pulled from U.S. financial institutions, thereby decreasing capital available for lending.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 139: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 157: Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 436: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 459: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California and Mr. WEBSTER.
H.R. 668: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 750: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 860: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 931: Mr. FLEMING and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1005: Mr. FILNER and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1068: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1085: Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 1092: Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 1116: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 1167: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1219: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1260: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1327: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1342: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 1370: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 1375: Ms. HAHN and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1416: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1417: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1648: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1653: Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 1756: Mr. TURNER of New York.
H.R. 1802: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1810: Mr. NEAL and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 1867: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1956: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. BARTLETT.
H.R. 1960: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2028: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 2077: Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 2082: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 2140: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 2152: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 2187: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2197: Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 2245: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2268: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2304: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2315: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2368: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2595: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2654: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2697: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2962: Ms. BUERKLE.
H.R. 2964: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 3168: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 3187: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 3192: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 3199: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 3238: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 3269: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 3307: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 3316: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3317: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3364: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 3423: Mr. BONNER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 3435: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3487: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 3506: Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 3511: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 3596: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3599: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 3600: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 3612: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 3619: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3656: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 3665: Ms. WATERS and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 3679: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 3713: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3798: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3811: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 3839: Mr. WELCH and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3855: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 3856: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 3862: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 3863: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 3993: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 4017: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4045: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4046: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 4055: Mr. OWENS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 4066: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 4093: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 4107: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 4120: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. TURNER of New York.
H.R. 4134: Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 4156: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 4160: Mr. FLAKE.
H.R. 4169: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 4174: Mr. YODER and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 4176: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 4180: Mr. LANCE, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 4228: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4232: Mr. FORBES and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 4234: Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 4237: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 4238: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 4256: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 4269: Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 4271: Mr. DINGELL, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 4278: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H.R. 4286: Mr. OLVER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 4287: Mr. BACA, Mr. TOWNS, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 4298: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H.R. 4318: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4330: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 4336: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 4343: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 4350: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4367: Mr. POSEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 4380: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 4385: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4386: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 4390: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 4399: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 4402: Mr. HECK, Mr. LONG, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4405: Ms. JENKINS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 4406: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KELLY, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 4454: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 4534: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 4711: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 4712: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 4713: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 4714: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 4826: Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 4972: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 4976: Mr. HECK, Mr. LONG, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 4978: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 5044: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 5050: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 5144: Mr. LONG and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

H.R. 5188: Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 5303: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 5542: Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 5544: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 5647: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut and Mr. POLIS.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.J. Res. 92: Mr. CONYERS.

H.J. Res. 104: Mr. PETERSON.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Con. Res. 115: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 111: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. MICA.

H. Res. 521: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. LEVIN.

H. Res. 560: Mr. CICILLINE.

H. Res. 568: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H. Res. 618: Mr. WITTMAN.

H. Res. 644: Mr. FARR, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. POSEY.

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. 4004: Mr. COLE.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

43. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Representative Joe Gibbons of the Florida House of Representatives, Florida, relative to urging the Congress to review and act on recommendations made by the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future (BRC); which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 5652

OFFERED BY: MR. VAN HOLLEN

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Balanced Approach to Replace the Sequester Act of 2012 for Fiscal Year 2013''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
TITLE I—BUDGET PROCESS AMENDMENTS TO REPLACE FISCAL YEAR 2013 SEQUESTRATION
Sec. 101. Repeal and replace the 2013 sequester.
Sec. 102. Protecting veterans programs from sequester.
TITLE II—AGRICULTURAL SAVINGS
Sec. 201. One-year extension of agricultural commodity programs, except direct payment programs.
TITLE III—FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM
Sec. 301. Short title.
Sec. 302. Extensions.
Sec. 303. Mandatory purchase.
Sec. 304. Reforms of coverage terms.
Sec. 305. Reforms of premium rates.
Sec. 306. Technical Mapping Advisory Council.
Sec. 307. FEMA incorporation of new mapping protocols.
Sec. 308. Treatment of levees.
Sec. 309. Privatization initiatives.
Sec. 310. FEMA annual report on insurance program.
Sec. 311. Mitigation assistance.
Sec. 312. Notification to homeowners regarding mandatory purchase requirement applicability and rate phase-ins.
Sec. 313. Notification to members of congress of flood map revisions and updates.
Sec. 314. Notification and appeal of map changes; notification to communities of establishment of flood elevations.
Sec. 315. Notification to tenants of availability of contents insurance.
Sec. 316. Notification to policy holders regarding direct management of policy by FEMA.
Sec. 317. Notice of availability of flood insurance and escrow in RESPA good faith estimate.
Sec. 318. Reimbursement for costs incurred by homeowners and communities obtaining letters of map amendment or revision.
Sec. 319. Enhanced communication with certain communities during map updating process.
Sec. 320. Notification to residents newly included in flood hazard areas.
Sec. 321. Treatment of swimming pool enclosures outside of hurricane season.
Sec. 322. Information regarding multiple perils claims.
Sec. 323. FEMA authority to reject transfer of policies.
Sec. 324. Appeals.
Sec. 325. Reserve fund.
Sec. 326. CDBG eligibility for flood insurance outreach activities and community building code administration grants.
Sec. 327. Technical corrections.
Sec. 328. Requiring competition for national flood insurance program policies.
Sec. 329. Studies of voluntary community-based flood insurance options.
Sec. 330. Report on inclusion of building codes in floodplain management criteria.
Sec. 331. Study on graduated risk.
Sec. 332. Report on flood-in-progress determination.
Sec. 333. Study on repaying flood insurance debt.
Sec. 334. No cause of action.
Sec. 335. Authority for the corps of engineers to provide specialized or technical services.
TITLE IV—OIL AND GAS SUBSIDIES
Sec. 401. Limitation on section 199 deduction attributable to oil, natural gas, or primary products thereof.
Sec. 402. Prohibition on using last-in, first-out accounting for major integrated oil companies.
Sec. 403. Modifications of foreign tax credit rules applicable to major integrated oil companies which are dual capacity taxpayers.
TITLE V—THE BUFFETT RULE
Sec. 501. Fair share tax on high-income taxpayers.
TITLE VI—RETIREMENT CONTRIBUTIONS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS
Sec. 601. Retirement contributions.

TITLE I—BUDGET PROCESS AMENDMENTS TO REPLACE FISCAL YEAR 2013 SEQUESTRATION

SEC. 101. REPEAL AND REPLACE THE 2013 SEQUESTER.

(a) ELIMINATION OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 SEQUESTRATION FOR DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.—Section 251A(7)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is repealed.

(b) ELIMINATION OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 SEQUESTRATION FOR DIRECT SPENDING.—Any sequestration order issued by the President under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to carry out reductions to direct spending for fiscal year 2013 pursuant to section 251A of such Act shall have no force or effect.

(c) SAVINGS.—The savings set forth by the enactment of title II shall achieve the savings that would otherwise have occurred as a result of the sequestration under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 102. PROTECTING VETERANS PROGRAMS FROM SEQUESTER.

Section 256(e)(2)(E) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is repealed.

TITLE II—AGRICULTURAL SAVINGS

SEC. 201. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROGRAMS, EXCEPT DIRECT PAYMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Except as provided in subsection (b) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorities provided by each provision of title I of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1651) and each amendment made by that title (and for mandatory programs at such funding levels), as in effect on September 30, 2012, shall continue, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out the authorities, until September 30, 2013.

(b) TERMINATION OF DIRECT PAYMENT PROGRAMS.—

(1) COVERED COMMODITIES.—The extension provided by subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the direct payment program under section 1103 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8713).

(2) PEANUTS.—The extension provided by subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the direct payment program under section 1303 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7953).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the earlier of—

(1) the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) September 30, 2012.

TITLE III—FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012''.

SEC. 302. EXTENSIONS.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 1319 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4026) is amended by striking ''the earlier of the date of the enactment into law of an Act that specifically amends the date specified in this section or May 31, 2012'' and inserting ''September 30, 2016''.

(b) EXTENSION OF FINANCING.—Section 1309(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)) is amended by striking ''the earlier of the date of the enactment into law of an Act that specifically amends the date specified in this section or May 31, 2012'' and inserting ''September 30, 2016''.

SEC. 303. MANDATORY PURCHASE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO TEMPORARILY SUSPEND MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) AUTHORITY TO TEMPORARILY SUSPEND MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) FINDING BY ADMINISTRATOR THAT AREA IS AN ELIGIBLE AREA.—For any area, upon a request submitted to the Administrator by a local government authority having jurisdiction over any portion of the area, the Administrator shall make a finding of whether the area is an eligible area under paragraph (3). If the Administrator finds that such area is an eligible area, the Administrator shall, in the discretion of the Administrator, designate a period during which such finding shall be effective, which shall not be longer in duration than 12 months.

''(2) SUSPENSION OF MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.—If the Administrator makes a finding under paragraph (1) that an area is an eligible area under paragraph (3), during the period specified in the finding, the designation of such eligible area as an area having special flood hazards shall not be effective for purposes of subsections (a), (b), and (e) of this section, and section 202(a) of this Act. Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to prevent any lender, servicer, regulated lending institution, Federal agency lender, the Federal National Mortgage Association, or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, at the discretion of such entity, from requiring the purchase of flood insurance coverage in connection with the making, increasing, extending, or renewing of a loan secured by improved real estate or a mobile home located or to be located in such eligible area during such period or a lender or servicer from purchasing coverage on behalf of a borrower pursuant to subsection (e).

''(3) ELIGIBLE AREAS.—An eligible area under this paragraph is an area that is designated or will, pursuant to any issuance, revision, updating, or other change in flood insurance maps that takes effect on or after the date of the enactment of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, become designated as an area having special flood hazards and that meets any one of the following 3 requirements:

''(A) AREAS WITH NO HISTORY OF SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARDS.—The area does not include any area that has ever previously been designated as an area having special flood hazards.

''(B) AREAS WITH FLOOD PROTECTION SYSTEMS UNDER IMPROVEMENTS.—The area was intended to be protected by a flood protection system—

''(i) that has been decertified, or is required to be certified, as providing protection for the 100-year frequency flood standard;

''(ii) that is being improved, constructed, or reconstructed; and

''(iii) for which the Administrator has determined measurable progress toward completion of such improvement, construction, reconstruction is being made and toward securing financial commitments sufficient to fund such completion.

''(C) AREAS FOR WHICH APPEAL HAS BEEN FILED.—An area for which a community has appealed designation of the area as having special flood hazards in a timely manner under section 1363.

''(4) EXTENSION OF DELAY.—Upon a request submitted by a local government authority having jurisdiction over any portion of the eligible area, the Administrator may extend the period during which a finding under paragraph (1) shall be effective, except that—

''(A) each such extension under this paragraph shall not be for a period exceeding 12 months; and

''(B) for any area, the cumulative number of such extensions may not exceed 2.

''(5) ADDITIONAL EXTENSION FOR COMMUNITIES MAKING MORE THAN ADEQUATE PROGRESS ON FLOOD PROTECTION SYSTEM.—

''(A) EXTENSION.—

''(i) AUTHORITY.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in the case of an eligible area for which the Administrator has, pursuant to paragraph (4), extended the period of effectiveness of the finding under paragraph (1) for the area, upon a request submitted by a local government authority having jurisdiction over any portion of the eligible area, if the Administrator finds that more than adequate progress has been made on the construction of a flood protection system for such area, as determined in accordance with the last sentence of section 1307(e) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014(e)), the Administrator may, in the discretion of the Administrator, further extend the period during which the finding under paragraph (1) shall be effective for such area for an additional 12 months.

''(ii) LIMIT.— For any eligible area, the cumulative number of extensions under this subparagraph may not exceed 2.

''(B) EXCLUSION FOR NEW MORTGAGES.—

''(i) EXCLUSION.—Any extension under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph of a finding under paragraph (1) shall not be effective with respect to any excluded property after the origination, increase, extension, or renewal of the loan referred to in clause (ii)(II) for the property.

''(ii) EXCLUDED PROPERTIES.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'excluded property' means any improved real estate or mobile home—

''(I) that is located in an eligible area; and

''(II) for which, during the period that any extension under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph of a finding under paragraph (1) is otherwise in effect for the eligible area in which such property is located—

''(aa) a loan that is secured by the property is originated; or

''(bb) any existing loan that is secured by the property is increased, extended, or renewed.

''(6) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to affect the applicability of a designation of any area as an area having special flood hazards for purposes of the availability of flood insurance coverage, criteria for land management and use, notification of flood hazards, eligibility for mitigation assistance, or any other purpose or provision not specifically referred to in paragraph (2).

''(7) REPORTS.—The Administrator shall, in each annual report submitted pursuant to section 1320, include information identifying each finding under paragraph (1) by the Administrator during the preceding year that an area is an area having special flood hazards, the basis for each such finding, any extensions pursuant to paragraph (4) of the periods of effectiveness of such findings, and the reasons for such extensions.''.

(2) NO REFUNDS.—Nothing in this subsection or the amendments made by this subsection may be construed to authorize or require any payment or refund for flood insurance coverage purchased for any property that covered any period during which such coverage is not required for the property pursuant to the applicability of the amendment made by paragraph (1).

(b) TERMINATION OF FORCE-PLACED INSURANCE.—Section 102(e) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''insurance.'' and inserting ''insurance, including premiums or fees incurred for coverage beginning on the date on which flood insurance coverage lapsed or did not provide a sufficient coverage amount.'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (5) and 6), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraphs:

''(3) TERMINATION OF FORCE-PLACED INSURANCE.—Within 30 days of receipt by the lender or servicer of a confirmation of a borrower's existing flood insurance coverage, the lender or servicer shall—

''(A) terminate the force-placed insurance; and

''(B) refund to the borrower all force-placed insurance premiums paid by the borrower during any period during which the borrower's flood insurance coverage and the force-placed flood insurance coverage were each in effect, and any related fees charged to the borrower with respect to the force-placed insurance during such period.

''(4) SUFFICIENCY OF DEMONSTRATION.—For purposes of confirming a borrower's existing flood insurance coverage, a lender or servicer for a loan shall accept from the borrower an insurance policy declarations page that includes the existing flood insurance policy number and the identity of, and contact information for, the insurance company or agent.''.

(c) USE OF PRIVATE INSURANCE TO SATISFY MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.—Section 102(b) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''lending institutions not to make'' and inserting ''lending institutions—

''(A) not to make'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), as designated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, by striking ''less.'' and inserting ''less; and''; and

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

''(B) to accept private flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under subparagraph (A) if the coverage provided by such private flood insurance meets the requirements for coverage under such subparagraph.'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting after ''provided in paragraph (1).'' the following new sentence: ''Each Federal agency lender shall accept private flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under the preceding sentence if the flood insurance coverage provided by such private flood insurance meets the requirements for coverage under such sentence.'';

(3) in paragraph (3), in the matter following subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation shall accept private flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under the preceding sentence if the flood insurance coverage provided by such private flood insurance meets the requirements for coverage under such sentence.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'private flood insurance' means a contract for flood insurance coverage allowed for sale under the laws of any State.''.

SEC. 304. REFORMS OF COVERAGE TERMS.

(a) MINIMUM DEDUCTIBLES FOR CLAIMS.—Section 1312 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4019) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Director is'' and inserting the following: ''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator is''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) MINIMUM ANNUAL DEDUCTIBLES.—

''(1) SUBSIDIZED RATE PROPERTIES.—For any structure that is covered by flood insurance under this title, and for which the chargeable rate for such coverage is less than the

applicable estimated risk premium rate under section 1307(a)(1) for the area (or subdivision thereof) in which such structure is located, the minimum annual deductible for damage to or loss of such structure shall be $2,000.

''(2) ACTUARIAL RATE PROPERTIES.—For any structure that is covered by flood insurance under this title, for which the chargeable rate for such coverage is not less than the applicable estimated risk premium rate under section 1307(a)(1) for the area (or subdivision thereof) in which such structure is located, the minimum annual deductible for damage to or loss of such structure shall be $1,000.''.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL COVERAGE LIMITS.—Section 1306(b) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''in the case of any residential property'' and inserting ''in the case of any residential building designed for the occupancy of from one to four families''; and

(B) by striking ''shall be made available to every insured upon renewal and every applicant for insurance so as to enable such insured or applicant to receive coverage up to a total amount (including such limits specified in paragraph (1)(A)(i)) of $250,000'' and inserting ''shall be made available, with respect to any single such building, up to an aggregate liability (including such limits specified in paragraph (1)(A)(i)) of $250,000''; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking ''in the case of any nonresidential property, including churches,'' and inserting ''in the case of any nonresidential building, including a church,''; and

(B) by striking ''shall be made available to every insured upon renewal and every applicant for insurance, in respect to any single structure, up to a total amount (including such limit specified in subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), as applicable) of $500,000 for each structure and $500,000 for any contents related to each structure'' and inserting ''shall be made available with respect to any single such building, up to an aggregate liability (including such limits specified in subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), as applicable) of $500,000, and coverage shall be made available up to a total of $500,000 aggregate liability for contents owned by the building owner and $500,000 aggregate liability for each unit within the building for contents owned by the tenant''.

(c) INDEXING OF MAXIMUM COVERAGE LIMITS.—Subsection (b) of section 1306 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and'';

(3) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (7); and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) each of the dollar amount limitations under paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) shall be adjusted effective on the date of the enactment of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, such adjustments shall be calculated using the percentage change, over the period beginning on September 30, 1994, and ending on such date of enactment, in such inflationary index as the Administrator shall, by regulation, specify, and the dollar amount of such adjustment shall be rounded to the next lower dollar; and the Administrator shall cause to be published in the Federal Register the adjustments under this paragraph to such dollar amount limitations; except that in the case of coverage for a property that is made available, pursuant to this paragraph, in an amount that exceeds the limitation otherwise applicable to such coverage as specified in paragraph (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6), the total of such coverage shall be made available only at chargeable rates that are not less than the estimated premium rates for such coverage determined in accordance with section 1307(a)(1).''.

(d) OPTIONAL COVERAGE FOR LOSS OF USE OF PERSONAL RESIDENCE AND BUSINESS INTERRUPTION.—Subsection (b) of section 1306 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013(b)), as amended by the preceding provisions of this section, is further amended by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

''(5) the Administrator may provide that, in the case of any residential property, each renewal or new contract for flood insurance coverage may provide not more than $5,000 aggregate liability per dwelling unit for any necessary increases in living expenses incurred by the insured when losses from a flood make the residence unfit to live in, except that—

''(A) purchase of such coverage shall be at the option of the insured;

''(B) any such coverage shall be made available only at chargeable rates that are not less than the estimated premium rates for such coverage determined in accordance with section 1307(a)(1); and

''(C) the Administrator may make such coverage available only if the Administrator makes a determination and causes notice of such determination to be published in the Federal Register that—

''(i) a competitive private insurance market for such coverage does not exist; and

''(ii) the national flood insurance program has the capacity to make such coverage available without borrowing funds from the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1309 or otherwise;

''(6) the Administrator may provide that, in the case of any commercial property or other residential property, including multifamily rental property, coverage for losses resulting from any partial or total interruption of the insured's business caused by damage to, or loss of, such property from a flood may be made available to every insured upon renewal and every applicant, up to a total amount of $20,000 per property, except that—

''(A) purchase of such coverage shall be at the option of the insured;

''(B) any such coverage shall be made available only at chargeable rates that are not less than the estimated premium rates for such coverage determined in accordance with section 1307(a)(1); and

''(C) the Administrator may make such coverage available only if the Administrator makes a determination and causes notice of such determination to be published in the Federal Register that—

''(i) a competitive private insurance market for such coverage does not exist; and

''(ii) the national flood insurance program has the capacity to make such coverage available without borrowing funds from the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1309 or otherwise;''.

(e) PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS IN INSTALLMENTS FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.—Section 1306 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS IN INSTALLMENTS FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.—

''(1) AUTHORITY.—In addition to any other terms and conditions under subsection (a), such regulations shall provide that, in the case of any residential property, premiums for flood insurance coverage made available under this title for such property may be paid in installments.

''(2) LIMITATIONS.—In implementing the authority under paragraph (1), the Administrator may establish increased chargeable premium rates and surcharges, and deny coverage and establish such other sanctions, as the Administrator considers necessary to ensure that insureds purchase, pay for, and maintain coverage for the full term of a contract for flood insurance coverage or to prevent insureds from purchasing coverage only for periods during a year when risk of flooding is comparatively higher or canceling coverage for periods when such risk is comparatively lower.''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE OF POLICIES COVERING PROPERTIES AFFECTED BY FLOODS IN PROGRESS.—Paragraph (1) of section 1306(c) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013(c)) is amended by adding after the period at the end the following: ''With respect to any flood that has commenced or is in progress before the expiration of such 30-day period, such flood insurance coverage for a property shall take effect upon the expiration of such 30-day period and shall cover damage to such property occurring after the expiration of such period that results from such flood, but only if the property has not suffered damage or loss as a result of such flood before the expiration of such 30-day period.''.

SEC. 305. REFORMS OF PREMIUM RATES.

(a) INCREASE IN ANNUAL LIMITATION ON PREMIUM INCREASES.—Section 1308(e) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(e)) is amended by striking ''10 percent'' and inserting ''20 percent''.

(b) PHASE-IN OF RATES FOR CERTAIN PROPERTIES IN NEWLY MAPPED AREAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''or notice'' after ''prescribe by regulation'';

(B) in subsection (c), by inserting ''and subsection (g)'' before the first comma; and

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

''(g) 5-YEAR PHASE-IN OF FLOOD INSURANCE RATES FOR CERTAIN PROPERTIES IN NEWLY MAPPED AREAS.—

''(1) 5-YEAR PHASE-IN PERIOD.—Notwithstanding subsection (c) or any other provision of law relating to chargeable risk premium rates for flood insurance coverage under this title, in the case of any area that was not previously designated as an area having special flood hazards and that, pursuant to any issuance, revision, updating, or other change in flood insurance maps, becomes designated as such an area, during the 5-year period that begins, except as provided in paragraph (2), upon the date that such maps, as issued, revised, updated, or otherwise changed, become effective, the chargeable premium rate for flood insurance under this title with respect to any covered property that is located within such area shall be the rate described in paragraph (3).

''(2) APPLICABILITY TO PREFERRED RISK RATE AREAS.—In the case of any area described in paragraph (1) that consists of or includes an area that, as of date of the effectiveness of the flood insurance maps for such area referred to in paragraph (1) as so issued, revised, updated, or changed, is eligible for any reason for preferred risk rate method premiums for flood insurance coverage and was eligible for such premiums as of the enactment of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, the 5-year period referred to in paragraph (1) for such area eligible for preferred risk rate method premiums shall begin upon the expiration of the period during which such area is eligible for such preferred risk rate method premiums.

''(3) PHASE-IN OF FULL ACTUARIAL RATES.—With respect to any area described in paragraph (1), the chargeable risk premium rate for flood insurance under this title for a covered property that is located in such area shall be—

''(A) for the first year of the 5-year period referred to in paragraph (1), the greater of—

''(i) 20 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property; and

''(ii) in the case of any property that, as of the beginning of such first year, is eligible for preferred risk rate method premiums for flood insurance coverage, such preferred risk rate method premium for the property;

''(B) for the second year of such 5-year period, 40 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property;

''(C) for the third year of such 5-year period, 60 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property;

''(D) for the fourth year of such 5-year period, 80 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property; and

''(E) for the fifth year of such 5-year period, 100 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property.

''(4) COVERED PROPERTIES.—For purposes of the subsection, the term 'covered property' means any residential property occupied by its owner or a bona fide tenant as a primary residence.''.

(2) REGULATION OR NOTICE.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall issue an interim final rule or notice to implement this subsection and the amendments made by this subsection as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) PHASE-IN OF ACTUARIAL RATES FOR CERTAIN PROPERTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1308(c) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(c)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (7); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraphs:

''(2) COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES.—Any nonresidential property.

''(3) SECOND HOMES AND VACATION HOMES.—Any residential property that is not the primary residence of any individual.

''(4) HOMES SOLD TO NEW OWNERS.—Any single family property that—

''(A) has been constructed or substantially improved and for which such construction or improvement was started, as determined by the Administrator, before December 31, 1974, or before the effective date of the initial rate map published by the Administrator under paragraph (2) of section 1360(a) for the area in which such property is located, whichever is later; and

''(B) is purchased after the effective date of this paragraph, pursuant to section 345(c)(3)(A) of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012.

''(5) HOMES DAMAGED OR IMPROVED.—Any property that, on or after the date of the enactment of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, has experienced or sustained—

''(A) substantial flood damage exceeding 50 percent of the fair market value of such property; or

''(B) substantial improvement exceeding 30 percent of the fair market value of such property.

''(6) HOMES WITH MULTIPLE CLAIMS.—Any severe repetitive loss property (as such term is defined in section 1366(j)).''.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''the limitations provided under paragraphs (1) and (2)'' and inserting ''subsection (e)''; and

(ii) in paragraph (1), by striking '', except'' and all that follows through ''subsection (e)''; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking ''paragraph (2) or (3)'' and inserting ''paragraph (7)''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE AND TRANSITION.—

(A) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply beginning upon the expiration of the 12-month period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, except as provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph.

(B) TRANSITION FOR PROPERTIES COVERED BY FLOOD INSURANCE UPON EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(i) INCREASE OF RATES OVER TIME.—In the case of any property described in paragraph (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6) of section 1308(c) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection, that, as of the effective date under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, is covered under a policy for flood insurance made available under the national flood insurance program for which the chargeable premium rates are less than the applicable estimated risk premium rate under section 1307(a)(1) of such Act for the area in which the property is located, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall increase the chargeable premium rates for such property over time to such applicable estimated risk premium rate under section 1307(a)(1).

(ii) AMOUNT OF ANNUAL INCREASE.—Such increase shall be made by increasing the chargeable premium rates for the property (after application of any increase in the premium rates otherwise applicable to such property), once during the 12-month period that begins upon the effective date under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph and once every 12 months thereafter until such increase is accomplished, by 20 percent (or such lesser amount as may be necessary so that the chargeable rate does not exceed such applicable estimated risk premium rate or to comply with clause (iii)).

(iii) PROPERTIES SUBJECT TO PHASE-IN AND ANNUAL INCREASES.—In the case of any pre-FIRM property (as such term is defined in section 578(b) of the National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1974), the aggregate increase, during any 12-month period, in the chargeable premium rate for the property that is attributable to this subparagraph or to an increase described in section 1308(e) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 may not exceed 20 percent.

(iv) FULL ACTUARIAL RATES.—The provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of such section 1308(c) shall apply to such a property upon the accomplishment of the increase under this subparagraph and thereafter.

(d) PROHIBITION OF EXTENSION OF SUBSIDIZED RATES TO LAPSED POLICIES.—Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015), as amended by the preceding provisions of this subtitle, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by inserting ''or subsection (h)'' after ''subsection (c)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) PROHIBITION OF EXTENSION OF SUBSIDIZED RATES TO LAPSED POLICIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to chargeable risk premium rates for flood insurance coverage under this title, the Administrator shall not provide flood insurance coverage under this title for any property for which a policy for such coverage for the property has previously lapsed in coverage as a result of the deliberate choice of the holder of such policy, at a rate less than the applicable estimated risk premium rates for the area (or subdivision thereof) in which such property is located.''.

(e) RECOGNITION OF STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING FOR CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENT OF FLOOD PROTECTION SYSTEMS IN DETERMINATION OF RATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1307 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014) is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking ''construction of a flood protection system'' and inserting ''construction, reconstruction, or improvement of a flood protection system (without respect to the level of Federal investment or participation)''; and

(ii) in the second sentence—

(I) by striking ''construction of a flood protection system'' and inserting ''construction, reconstruction, or improvement of a flood protection system''; and

(II) by inserting ''based on the present value of the completed system'' after ''has been expended''; and

(B) in subsection (f)—

(i) in the first sentence in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''(without respect to the level of Federal investment or participation)'' before the period at the end;

(ii) in the third sentence in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting '', whether coastal or riverine,'' after ''special flood hazard''; and

(iii) in paragraph (1), by striking ''a Federal agency in consultation with the local project sponsor'' and inserting ''the entity or entities that own, operate, maintain, or repair such system''.

(2) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall promulgate regulations to implement this subsection and the amendments made by this subsection as soon as practicable, but not more than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. Paragraph (3) may not be construed to annul, alter, affect, authorize any waiver of, or establish any exception to, the requirement under the preceding sentence.

SEC. 306. TECHNICAL MAPPING ADVISORY COUNCIL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a council to be known as the Technical Mapping Advisory Council (in this section referred to as the ''Council'').

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall consist of—

(A) the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (in this section referred to as the ''Administrator''), or the designee thereof;

(B) the Director of the United States Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior, or the designee thereof;

(C) the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, or the designee thereof;

(D) the commanding officer of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, or the designee thereof;

(E) the chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, or the designee thereof;

(F) the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, or the designee thereof;

(G) the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the Department of Commerce, or the designee thereof; and

(H) 14 additional members to be appointed by the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, who shall be—

(i) an expert in data management;

(ii) an expert in real estate;

(iii) an expert in insurance;

(iv) a member of a recognized regional flood and storm water management organization;

(v) a representative of a State emergency management agency or association or organization for such agencies;

(vi) a member of a recognized professional surveying association or organization;

(vii) a member of a recognized professional mapping association or organization;

(viii) a member of a recognized professional engineering association or organization;

(ix) a member of a recognized professional association or organization representing flood hazard determination firms;

(x) a representative of State national flood insurance coordination offices;

(xi) representatives of two local governments, at least one of whom is a local levee flood manager or executive, designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency as Cooperating Technical Partners; and

(xii) representatives of two State governments designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency as Cooperating Technical States.

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—Members of the Council shall be appointed based on their demonstrated knowledge and competence regarding surveying, cartography, remote sensing, geographic information systems, or the technical aspects of preparing and using flood insurance rate maps. In appointing members under paragraph (1)(H), the Administrator shall ensure that the membership of the Council has a balance of Federal, State, local, and private members, and includes an adequate number of representatives from the States with coastline on the Gulf of Mexico and other States containing areas identified by the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency as at high-risk for flooding or special flood hazard areas.

(c) DUTIES.—

(1) NEW MAPPING STANDARDS.—Not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning upon the date of the enactment of this Act, the Council shall develop and submit to the Administrator and the Congress proposed new mapping standards for 100-year flood insurance rate maps used under the national flood insurance program under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. In developing such proposed standards the Council shall—

(A) ensure that the flood insurance rate maps reflect true risk, including graduated risk that better reflects the financial risk to each property; such reflection of risk should be at the smallest geographic level possible (but not necessarily property-by-property) to ensure that communities are mapped in a manner that takes into consideration different risk levels within the community;

(B) ensure the most efficient generation, display, and distribution of flood risk data, models, and maps where practicable through dynamic digital environments using spatial database technology and the Internet;

(C) ensure that flood insurance rate maps reflect current hydrologic and hydraulic data, current land use, and topography, incorporating the most current and accurate ground and bathymetric elevation data;

(D) determine the best ways to include in such flood insurance rate maps levees, decertified levees, and areas located below dams, including determining a methodology for ensuring that decertified levees and other protections are included in flood insurance rate maps and their corresponding flood zones reflect the level of protection conferred;

(E) consider how to incorporate restored wetlands and other natural buffers into flood insurance rate maps, which may include wetlands, groundwater recharge areas, erosion zones, meander belts, endangered species habitat, barrier islands and shoreline buffer features, riparian forests, and other features;

(F) consider whether to use vertical positioning (as defined by the Administrator) for flood insurance rate maps;

(G) ensure that flood insurance rate maps differentiate between a property that is located in a flood zone and a structure located on such property that is not at the same risk level for flooding as such property due to the elevation of the structure;

(H) ensure that flood insurance rate maps take into consideration the best scientific data and potential future conditions (including projections for sea level rise); and

(I) consider how to incorporate the new standards proposed pursuant to this paragraph in existing mapping efforts.

(2) ONGOING DUTIES.—The Council shall, on an ongoing basis, review the mapping protocols developed pursuant to paragraph (1), and make recommendations to the Administrator when the Council determines that mapping protocols should be altered.

(3) MEETINGS.—In carrying out its duties under this section, the Council shall consult with stakeholders through at least 4 public meetings annually, and shall seek input of all stakeholder interests including State and local representatives, environmental and conservation organizations, insurance industry representatives, advocacy groups, planning organizations, and mapping organizations.

(d) PROHIBITION ON COMPENSATION.—Members of the Council shall receive no additional compensation by reason of their service on the Council.

(e) CHAIRPERSON.—The Administrator shall serve as the Chairperson of the Council.

(f) STAFF.—

(1) FEMA.—Upon the request of the Council, the Administrator may detail, on a non-reimbursable basis, personnel of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to assist the Council in carrying out its duties.

(2) OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon request of the Council, any other Federal agency that is a member of the Council may detail, on a non-reimbursable basis, personnel to assist the Council in carrying out its duties.

(g) POWERS.—In carrying out this section, the Council may hold hearings, receive evidence and assistance, provide information, and conduct research, as the Council considers appropriate.

(h) TERMINATION.—The Council shall terminate upon the expiration of the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(i) MORATORIUM ON FLOOD MAP CHANGES.—

(1) MORATORIUM.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, or the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, during the period beginning upon the date of the enactment of this Act and ending upon the submission by the Council to the Administrator and the Congress of the proposed new mapping standards required under subsection (c)(1), the Administrator may not make effective any new or updated rate maps for flood insurance coverage under the national flood insurance program that were not in effect for such program as of such date of enactment, or otherwise revise, update, or change the flood insurance rate maps in effect for such program as of such date.

(2) LETTERS OF MAP CHANGE.—During the period described in paragraph (1), the Administrator may revise, update, and change the flood insurance rate maps in effect for the national flood insurance program only pursuant to a letter of map change (including a letter of map amendment, letter of map revision, and letter of map revision based on fill).

SEC. 307. FEMA INCORPORATION OF NEW MAPPING PROTOCOLS.

(a) NEW RATE MAPPING STANDARDS.—Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning upon submission by the Technical Mapping Advisory Council under section 346 of the proposed new mapping standards for flood insurance rate maps used under the national flood insurance program developed by the Council pursuant to section 346(c), the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (in this section referred to as the ''Administrator'') shall establish new standards for such rate maps based on such proposed new standards and the recommendations of the Council.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The new standards for flood insurance rate maps established by the Administrator pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

(1) delineate and include in any such rate maps—

(A) all areas located within the 100-year flood plain; and

(B) areas subject to graduated and other risk levels, to the maximum extent possible;

(2) ensure that any such rate maps—

(A) include levees, including decertified levees, and the level of protection they confer;

(B) reflect current land use and topography and incorporate the most current and accurate ground level data;

(C) take into consideration the impacts and use of fill and the flood risks associated with altered hydrology;

(D) differentiate between a property that is located in a flood zone and a structure located on such property that is not at the same risk level for flooding as such property due to the elevation of the structure;

(E) identify and incorporate natural features and their associated flood protection benefits into mapping and rates; and

(F) identify, analyze, and incorporate the impact of significant changes to building and development throughout any river or costal water system, including all tributaries, which may impact flooding in areas downstream; and

(3) provide that such rate maps are developed on a watershed basis.

(c) REPORT.—If, in establishing new standards for flood insurance rate maps pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator does not implement all of the recommendations of the Council made under the proposed new mapping standards developed by the Council pursuant to section 346(c), upon establishment of the new standards the Administrator shall submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate specifying which such recommendations were not adopted and explaining the reasons such recommendations were not adopted.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Administrator shall, not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning upon establishment of the new standards for flood insurance rate maps pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, commence use of the new standards and updating of flood insurance rate maps in accordance with the new standards. Not later than the expiration of the 10-year period beginning upon the establishment of such new standards, the Administrator shall complete updating of all flood insurance rate maps in accordance with the new standards, subject

to the availability of sufficient amounts for such activities provided in appropriation Acts.

(e) TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN PROPERTIES.—

(1) SUBMISSION OF ELEVATION CERTIFICATE.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, subsections (a), (b), and (e) of section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a), and section 202(a) of such Act, shall not apply to a property located in an area designated as having a special flood hazard if the owner of such property submits to the Administrator an elevation certificate for such property showing that the lowest level of the primary residence on such property is at an elevation that is at least three feet higher than the elevation of the 100-year flood plain.

(2) REVIEW OF CERTIFICATE.—The Administrator shall accept as conclusive each elevation certificate submitted under paragraph (1) unless the Administrator conducts a subsequent elevation survey and determines that the lowest level of the primary residence on the property in question is not at an elevation that is at least three feet higher than the elevation of the 100-year flood plain. The Administrator shall provide any such subsequent elevation survey to the owner of such property.

(3) DETERMINATIONS FOR PROPERTIES ON BORDERS OF SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREAS.—

(A) EXPEDITED DETERMINATION.—In the case of any survey for a property submitted to the Administrator pursuant to paragraph (1) showing that a portion of the property is located within an area having special flood hazards and that a structure located on the property is not located within such area having special flood hazards, the Administrator shall expeditiously process any request made by an owner of the property for a determination pursuant to paragraph (2) or a determination of whether the structure is located within the area having special flood hazards.

(B) PROHIBITION OF FEE.—If the Administrator determines pursuant to subparagraph (A) that the structure on the property is not located within the area having special flood hazards, the Administrator shall not charge a fee for reviewing the flood hazard data and shall not require the owner to provide any additional elevation data.

(C) SIMPLIFICATION OF REVIEW PROCESS.—The Administrator shall collaborate with private sector flood insurers to simplify the review process for properties described in subparagraph (A) and to ensure that the review process provides for accurate determinations.

(4) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—This subsection shall cease to apply to a property on the date on which the Administrator updates the flood insurance rate map that applies to such property in accordance with the requirements of subsection (d).

SEC. 308. TREATMENT OF LEVEES.

Section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) TREATMENT OF LEVEES.—The Administrator may not issue flood insurance maps, or make effective updated flood insurance maps, that omit or disregard the actual protection afforded by an existing levee, floodwall, pump or other flood protection feature, regardless of the accreditation status of such feature.''.

SEC. 309. PRIVATIZATION INITIATIVES.

(a) FEMA AND GAO REPORTS.—Not later than the expiration of the 18-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Comptroller General of the United States shall each conduct a separate study to assess a broad range of options, methods, and strategies for privatizing the national flood insurance program and shall each submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate with recommendations for the best manner to accomplish such privatization.

(b) PRIVATE RISK-MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency may carry out such private risk-management initiatives under the national flood insurance program as the Administrator considers appropriate to determine the capacity of private insurers, reinsurers, and financial markets to assist communities, on a voluntary basis only, in managing the full range of financial risks associated with flooding.

(2) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall assess the capacity of the private reinsurance, capital, and financial markets by seeking proposals to assume a portion of the program's insurance risk and submit to the Congress a report describing the response to such request for proposals and the results of such assessment.

(3) PROTOCOL FOR RELEASE OF DATA.—The Administrator shall develop a protocol to provide for the release of data sufficient to conduct the assessment required under paragraph (2).

(c) REINSURANCE.—The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended—

(1) in section 1331(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 4051(a)(2)), by inserting '', including as reinsurance of insurance coverage provided by the flood insurance program'' before '', on such terms'';

(2) in section 1332(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 4052(c)(2)), by inserting ''or reinsurance'' after ''flood insurance coverage'';

(3) in section 1335(a) (42 U.S.C. 4055(a))—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(a)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The Administrator is authorized to secure reinsurance coverage of coverage provided by the flood insurance program from private market insurance, reinsurance, and capital market sources at rates and on terms determined by the Administrator to be reasonable and appropriate in an amount sufficient to maintain the ability of the program to pay claims and that minimizes the likelihood that the program will utilize the borrowing authority provided under section 1309.'';

(4) in section 1346(a) (12 U.S.C. 4082(a))—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting '', or for purposes of securing reinsurance of insurance coverage provided by the program,'' before ''of any or all of'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''estimating'' and inserting ''Estimating''; and

(ii) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''receiving'' and inserting ''Receiving''; and

(ii) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period;

(D) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''making'' and inserting ''Making''; and

(ii) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period;

(E) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''otherwise'' and inserting ''Otherwise''; and

(ii) by redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (5); and

(F) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) Placing reinsurance coverage on insurance provided by such program.''; and

(5) in section 1370(a)(3) (42 U.S.C. 4121(a)(3)), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', is subject to the reporting requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, pursuant to section 13(a) or 15(d) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)), or is authorized by the Administrator to assume reinsurance on risks insured by the flood insurance program''.

(d) ASSESSMENT OF CLAIMS-PAYING ABILITY.—

(1) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than September 30 of each year, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall conduct an assessment of the claims-paying ability of the national flood insurance program, including the program's utilization of private sector reinsurance and reinsurance equivalents, with and without reliance on borrowing authority under section 1309 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016). In conducting the assessment, the Administrator shall take into consideration regional concentrations of coverage written by the program, peak flood zones, and relevant mitigation measures.

(2) REPORT.—The Administrator shall submit a report to the Congress of the results of each such assessment, and make such report available to the public, not later than 30 days after completion of the assessment.

SEC. 310. FEMA ANNUAL REPORT ON INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Section 1320 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4027) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT'' and inserting ''ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS'';

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''biennially'';

(B) by striking ''the President for submission to''; and

(C) by inserting ''not later than June 30 of each year'' before the period at the end;

(3) in subsection (b), by striking ''biennial'' and inserting ''annual''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) FINANCIAL STATUS OF PROGRAM.—The report under this section for each year shall include information regarding the financial status of the national flood insurance program under this title, including a description of the financial status of the National Flood Insurance Fund and current and projected levels of claims, premium receipts, expenses, and borrowing under the program.''.

SEC. 311. MITIGATION ASSISTANCE.

(a) MITIGATION ASSISTANCE GRANTS.—Section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: ''Such financial assistance shall be made available—

''(1) to States and communities in the form of grants under this section for carrying out mitigation activities;

''(2) to States and communities in the form of grants under this section for carrying out mitigation activities that reduce flood damage to severe repetitive loss structures; and

''(3) to property owners in the form of direct grants under this section for carrying out mitigation activities that reduce flood damage to individual structures for which 2 or more claim payments for losses have been made under flood insurance coverage under

this title if the Administrator, after consultation with the State and community, determines that neither the State nor community in which such a structure is located has the capacity to manage such grants.''.

(2) by striking subsection (b);

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''flood risk'' and inserting ''multi-hazard'';

(B) by striking ''provides protection against'' and inserting ''examines reduction of''; and

(C) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (b);

(4) by striking subsection (d);

(5) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking the paragraph designation and all that follows through the end of the first sentence and inserting the following:

''(1) REQUIREMENT OF CONSISTENCY WITH APPROVED MITIGATION PLAN.—Amounts provided under this section may be used only for mitigation activities that are consistent with mitigation plans that are approved by the Administrator and identified under subparagraph (4).'';

(B) by striking paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(2) REQUIREMENTS OF TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY, COST EFFECTIVENESS, AND INTEREST OF NFIF.—The Administrator may approve only mitigation activities that the Administrator determines are technically feasible and cost-effective and in the interest of, and represent savings to, the National Flood Insurance Fund. In making such determinations, the Administrator shall take into consideration recognized benefits that are difficult to quantify.

''(3) PRIORITY FOR MITIGATION ASSISTANCE.—In providing grants under this section for mitigation activities, the Administrator shall give priority for funding to activities that the Administrator determines will result in the greatest savings to the National Flood Insurance Fund, including activities for—

''(A) severe repetitive loss structures;

''(B) repetitive loss structures; and

''(C) other subsets of structures as the Administrator may establish.'';

(C) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking all of the matter that precedes subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(4) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Eligible activities may include—'';

(ii) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (H);

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (D), (F), and (G) as subparagraphs (E), (G), and (H);

(iv) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

''(D) elevation, relocation, and floodproofing of utilities (including equipment that serve structures);'';

(v) by inserting after subparagraph (E), as so redesignated by clause (iii) of this subparagraph, the following new subparagraph:

''(F) the development or update of State, local, or Indian tribal mitigation plans which meet the planning criteria established by the Administrator, except that the amount from grants under this section that may be used under this subparagraph may not exceed $50,000 for any mitigation plan of a State or $25,000 for any mitigation plan of a local government or Indian tribe;'';

(vi) in subparagraph (H); as so redesignated by clause (iii) of this subparagraph, by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(vii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(I) other mitigation activities not described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) or the regulations issued under subparagraph (H), that are described in the mitigation plan of a State, community, or Indian tribe; and

''(J) personnel costs for State staff that provide technical assistance to communities to identify eligible activities, to develop grant applications, and to implement grants awarded under this section, not to exceed $50,000 per State in any Federal fiscal year, so long as the State applied for and was awarded at least $1,000,000 in grants available under this section in the prior Federal fiscal year; the requirements of subsections (d)(1) and (d)(2) shall not apply to the activity under this subparagraph.'';

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) ELIGIBILITY OF DEMOLITION AND REBUILDING OF PROPERTIES.—The Administrator shall consider as an eligible activity the demolition and rebuilding of properties to at least base flood elevation or greater, if required by the Administrator or if required by any State regulation or local ordinance, and in accordance with criteria established by the Administrator.''; and

(E) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (c);

(6) by striking subsections (f), (g), and (h) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(d) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—The Administrator may provide grants for eligible mitigation activities as follows:

''(1) SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURES.—In the case of mitigation activities to severe repetitive loss structures, in an amount up to 100 percent of all eligible costs.

''(2) REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURES.—In the case of mitigation activities to repetitive loss structures, in an amount up to 90 percent of all eligible costs.

''(3) OTHER MITIGATION ACTIVITIES.— In the case of all other mitigation activities, in an amount up to 75 percent of all eligible costs.'';

(7) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''certified under subsection (g)'' and inserting ''required under subsection (d)''; and

(ii) by striking ''3 times the amount'' and inserting ''the amount''; and

(B) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (e);

(8) in subsection (j)—

(A) by striking ''Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994'' and inserting ''Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012'';

(B) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (f); and

(9) by striking subsections (k) and (m) and inserting the following new subsections:

''(g) FAILURE TO MAKE GRANT AWARD WITHIN 5 YEARS.—For any application for a grant under this section for which the Administrator fails to make a grant award within 5 years of the date of application, the grant application shall be considered to be denied and any funding amounts allocated for such grant applications shall remain in the National Flood Mitigation Fund under section 1367 of this title and shall be made available for grants under this section.

''(h) LIMITATION ON FUNDING FOR MITIGATION ACTIVITIES FOR SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURES.—The amount used pursuant to section 1310(a)(8) in any fiscal year may not exceed $40,000,000 and shall remain available until expended.

''(i) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

''(1) COMMUNITY.—The term 'community' means—

''(A) a political subdivision that—

''(i) has zoning and building code jurisdiction over a particular area having special flood hazards, and

''(ii) is participating in the national flood insurance program; or

''(B) a political subdivision of a State, or other authority, that is designated by political subdivisions, all of which meet the requirements of subparagraph (A), to administer grants for mitigation activities for such political subdivisions.

''(2) REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURE.—The term 'repetitive loss structure' has the meaning given such term in section 1370.

''(3) SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURE.—The term 'severe repetitive loss structure' means a structure that—

''(A) is covered under a contract for flood insurance made available under this title; and

''(B) has incurred flood-related damage—

''(i) for which 4 or more separate claims payments have been made under flood insurance coverage under this title, with the amount of each such claim exceeding $15,000, and with the cumulative amount of such claims payments exceeding $60,000; or

''(ii) for which at least 2 separate claims payments have been made under such coverage, with the cumulative amount of such claims exceeding the value of the insured structure.''.

(b) ELIMINATION OF GRANTS PROGRAM FOR REPETITIVE INSURANCE CLAIMS PROPERTIES.—Chapter I of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by striking section 1323 (42 U.S.C. 4030).

(c) ELIMINATION OF PILOT PROGRAM FOR MITIGATION OF SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS PROPERTIES.—Chapter III of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by striking section 1361A (42 U.S.C. 4102a).

(d) NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND.—Section 1310(a) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (8) and (9).

(e) NATIONAL FLOOD MITIGATION FUND.—Section 1367 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) in each fiscal year, from the National Flood Insurance Fund in amounts not exceeding $90,000,000 to remain available until expended, of which—

''(A) not more than $40,000,000 shall be available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section only for assistance described in section 1366(a)(1);

''(B) not more than $40,000,000 shall be available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section only for assistance described in section 1366(a)(2); and

''(C) not more than $10,000,000 shall be available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section only for assistance described in section 1366(a)(3).''.

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''section 1366(i)'' and inserting ''section 1366(e)'';

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''sections 1366 and 1323'' and inserting ''section 1366'';

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsections:

''(d) PROHIBITION ON OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, amounts made available pursuant to this section shall not be subject to offsetting collections through premium rates for flood insurance coverage under this title.

''(e) CONTINUED AVAILABILITY AND REALLOCATION.—Any amounts made available pursuant to subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(1) that are not used in any fiscal year shall continue to be available for the purposes specified in such subparagraph

of subsection (b)(1) pursuant to which such amounts were made available, unless the Administrator determines that reallocation of such unused amounts to meet demonstrated need for other mitigation activities under section 1366 is in the best interest of the National Flood Insurance Fund.''.

(f) INCREASED COST OF COMPLIANCE COVERAGE.—Section 1304(b)(4) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), respectively.

SEC. 312. NOTIFICATION TO HOMEOWNERS REGARDING MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT APPLICABILITY AND RATE PHASE-INS.

Section 201 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4105) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) ANNUAL NOTIFICATION.—The Administrator, in consultation with affected communities, shall establish and carry out a plan to notify residents of areas having special flood hazards, on an annual basis—

''(1) that they reside in such an area;

''(2) of the geographical boundaries of such area;

''(3) of whether section 1308(g) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 applies to properties within such area;

''(4) of the provisions of section 102 requiring purchase of flood insurance coverage for properties located in such an area, including the date on which such provisions apply with respect to such area, taking into consideration section 102(i); and

''(5) of a general estimate of what similar homeowners in similar areas typically pay for flood insurance coverage, taking into consideration section 1308(g) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968.''.

SEC. 313. NOTIFICATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OF FLOOD MAP REVISIONS AND UPDATES.

Section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101), as amended by the preceding provisions of this subtitle, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(l) NOTIFICATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OF MAP MODERNIZATION.—Upon any revision or update of any floodplain area or flood-risk zone pursuant to subsection (f), any decision pursuant to subsection (f)(1) that such revision or update is necessary, any issuance of preliminary maps for such revision or updating, or any other significant action relating to any such revision or update, the Administrator shall notify the Senators for each State affected, and each Member of the House of Representatives for each congressional district affected, by such revision or update in writing of the action taken.''.

SEC. 314. NOTIFICATION AND APPEAL OF MAP CHANGES; NOTIFICATION TO COMMUNITIES OF ESTABLISHMENT OF FLOOD ELEVATIONS.

Section 1363 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104) is amended by striking the section designation and all that follows through the end of subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 1363. (a) In establishing projected flood elevations for land use purposes with respect to any community pursuant to section 1361, the Administrator shall first propose such determinations—

''(1) by providing the chief executive officer of each community affected by the proposed elevations, by certified mail, with a return receipt requested, notice of the elevations, including a copy of the maps for the elevations for such community and a statement explaining the process under this section to appeal for changes in such elevations;

''(2) by causing notice of such elevations to be published in the Federal Register, which notice shall include information sufficient to identify the elevation determinations and the communities affected, information explaining how to obtain copies of the elevations, and a statement explaining the process under this section to appeal for changes in the elevations;

''(3) by publishing in a prominent local newspaper the elevations, a description of the appeals process for flood determinations, and the mailing address and telephone number of a person the owner may contact for more information or to initiate an appeal;

''(4) by providing written notification, by first class mail, to each owner of real property affected by the proposed elevations of—

''(A) the status of such property, both prior to and after the effective date of the proposed determination, with respect to flood zone and flood insurance requirements under this Act and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973;

''(B) the process under this section to appeal a flood elevation determination; and

''(C) the mailing address and phone number of a person the owner may contact for more information or to initiate an appeal; and''.

SEC. 315. NOTIFICATION TO TENANTS OF AVAILABILITY OF CONTENTS INSURANCE.

The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by inserting after section 1308 (42 U.S.C. 4015) the following new section:

''SEC. 1308A. NOTIFICATION TO TENANTS OF AVAILABILITY OF CONTENTS INSURANCE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall, upon entering into a contract for flood insurance coverage under this title for any property—

''(1) provide to the insured sufficient copies of the notice developed pursuant to subsection (b); and

''(2) require the insured to provide a copy of the notice, or otherwise provide notification of the information under subsection (b) in the manner that the manager or landlord deems most appropriate, to each such tenant and to each new tenant upon commencement of such a tenancy.

''(b) NOTICE.—Notice to a tenant of a property in accordance with this subsection is written notice that clearly informs a tenant—

''(1) whether the property is located in an area having special flood hazards;

''(2) that flood insurance coverage is available under the national flood insurance program under this title for contents of the unit or structure leased by the tenant;

''(3) of the maximum amount of such coverage for contents available under this title at that time; and

''(4) of where to obtain information regarding how to obtain such coverage, including a telephone number, mailing address, and Internet site of the Administrator where such information is available.''.

SEC. 316. NOTIFICATION TO POLICY HOLDERS REGARDING DIRECT MANAGEMENT OF POLICY BY FEMA.

Part C of chapter II of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4081 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 1349. NOTIFICATION TO POLICY HOLDERS REGARDING DIRECT MANAGEMENT OF POLICY BY FEMA.

''(a) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 60 days before the date on which a transferred flood insurance policy expires, and annually thereafter until such time as the Federal Emergency Management Agency is no longer directly administering such policy, the Administrator shall notify the holder of such policy that—

''(1) the Federal Emergency Management Agency is directly administering the policy;

''(2) such holder may purchase flood insurance that is directly administered by an insurance company; and

''(3) purchasing flood insurance offered under the National Flood Insurance Program that is directly administered by an insurance company will not alter the coverage provided or the premiums charged to such holder that otherwise would be provided or charged if the policy was directly administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

''(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'transferred flood insurance policy' means a flood insurance policy that—

''(1) was directly administered by an insurance company at the time the policy was originally purchased by the policy holder; and

''(2) at the time of renewal of the policy, direct administration of the policy was or will be transferred to the Federal Emergency Management Agency.''.

SEC. 317. NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF FLOOD INSURANCE AND ESCROW IN RESPA GOOD FAITH ESTIMATE.

Subsection (c) of section 5 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2604(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Each such good faith estimate shall include the following conspicuous statements and information: (1) that flood insurance coverage for residential real estate is generally available under the national flood insurance program whether or not the real estate is located in an area having special flood hazards and that, to obtain such coverage, a home owner or purchaser should contact the national flood insurance program; (2) a telephone number and a location on the Internet by which a home owner or purchaser can contact the national flood insurance program; and (3) that the escrowing of flood insurance payments is required for many loans under section 102(d) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, and may be a convenient and available option with respect to other loans.''.

SEC. 318. REIMBURSEMENT FOR COSTS INCURRED BY HOMEOWNERS AND COMMUNITIES OBTAINING LETTERS OF MAP AMENDMENT OR REVISION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101), as amended by the preceding provisions of this subtitle, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(m) REIMBURSEMENT.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT UPON BONA FIDE ERROR.—If an owner of any property located in an area described in section 102(i)(3) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, or a community in which such a property is located, obtains a letter of map amendment, or a letter of map revision, due to a bona fide error on the part of the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Administrator shall reimburse such owner, or such entity or jurisdiction acting on such owner's behalf, or such community, as applicable, for any reasonable costs incurred in obtaining such letter.

''(2) REASONABLE COSTS.—The Administrator shall, by regulation or notice, determine a reasonable amount of costs to be reimbursed under paragraph (1), except that such costs shall not include legal or attorneys fees. In determining the reasonableness of costs, the Administrator shall only consider the actual costs to the owner or community, as applicable, of utilizing the services of an engineer, surveyor, or similar services.''.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall issue the regulations or notice required under section 1360(m)(2) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as added by the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 319. ENHANCED COMMUNICATION WITH CERTAIN COMMUNITIES DURING MAP UPDATING PROCESS.

Section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101), as amended by the preceding provisions of this subtitle, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(n) ENHANCED COMMUNICATION WITH CERTAIN COMMUNITIES DURING MAP UPDATING PROCESS.—In updating flood insurance maps under this section, the Administrator shall communicate with communities located in areas where flood insurance rate maps have not been updated in 20 years or more and the appropriate State emergency agencies to resolve outstanding issues, provide technical assistance, and disseminate all necessary information to reduce the prevalence of outdated maps in flood-prone areas.''.

SEC. 320. NOTIFICATION TO RESIDENTS NEWLY INCLUDED IN FLOOD HAZARD AREAS.

Section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101), as amended by the preceding provisions of this subtitle, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(o) NOTIFICATION TO RESIDENTS NEWLY INCLUDED IN FLOOD HAZARD AREA.—In revising or updating any areas having special flood hazards, the Administrator shall provide to each owner of a property to be newly included in such a special flood hazard area, at the time of issuance of such proposed revised or updated flood insurance maps, a copy of the proposed revised or updated flood insurance maps together with information regarding the appeals process under section 1363 (42 U.S.C. 4104).''.

SEC. 321. TREATMENT OF SWIMMING POOL ENCLOSURES OUTSIDE OF HURRICANE SEASON.

Chapter I of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 1325. TREATMENT OF SWIMMING POOL ENCLOSURES OUTSIDE OF HURRICANE SEASON.

''In the case of any property that is otherwise in compliance with the coverage and building requirements of the national flood insurance program, the presence of an enclosed swimming pool located at ground level or in the space below the lowest floor of a building after November 30 and before June 1 of any year shall have no effect on the terms of coverage or the ability to receive coverage for such building under the national flood insurance program established pursuant to this title, if the pool is enclosed with non-supporting breakaway walls.''.

SEC. 322. INFORMATION REGARDING MULTIPLE PERILS CLAIMS.

Section 1345 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4081) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) INFORMATION REGARDING MULTIPLE PERILS CLAIMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), if an insured having flood insurance coverage under a policy issued under the program under this title by the Administrator or a company, insurer, or entity offering flood insurance coverage under such program (in this subsection referred to as a 'participating company') has wind or other homeowners coverage from any company, insurer, or other entity covering property covered by such flood insurance, in the case of damage to such property that may have been caused by flood or by wind, the Administrator and the participating company, upon the request of the insured, shall provide to the insured, within 30 days of such request—

''(A) a copy of the estimate of structure damage;

''(B) proofs of loss;

''(C) any expert or engineering reports or documents commissioned by or relied upon by the Administrator or participating company in determining whether the damage was caused by flood or any other peril; and

''(D) the Administrator's or the participating company's final determination on the claim.

''(2) TIMING.—Paragraph (1) shall apply only with respect to a request described in such paragraph made by an insured after the Administrator or the participating company, or both, as applicable, have issued a final decision on the flood claim involved and resolution of all appeals with respect to such claim.''.

SEC. 323. FEMA AUTHORITY TO REJECT TRANSFER OF POLICIES.

Section 1345 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4081) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) FEMA AUTHORITY TO REJECT TRANSFER OF POLICIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Administrator may, at the discretion of the Administrator, refuse to accept the transfer of the administration of policies for coverage under the flood insurance program under this title that are written and administered by any insurance company or other insurer, or any insurance agent or broker.''.

SEC. 324. APPEALS.

(a) TELEVISION AND RADIO ANNOUNCEMENT.—Section 1363 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104), as amended by the preceding provisions of this subtitle, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) by notifying a local television and radio station,''; and

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (b), by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and shall notify a local television and radio station at least once during the same 10-day period''.

(b) EXTENSION OF APPEALS PERIOD.—Subsection (b) of section 1363 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b) The Director'' and inserting ''(b)(1) The Administrator''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The Administrator shall grant an extension of the 90-day period for appeals referred to in paragraph (1) for 90 additional days if an affected community certifies to the Administrator, after the expiration of at least 60 days of such period, that the community—

''(A) believes there are property owners or lessees in the community who are unaware of such period for appeals; and

''(B) will utilize the extension under this paragraph to notify property owners or lessees who are affected by the proposed flood elevation determinations of the period for appeals and the opportunity to appeal the determinations proposed by the Administrator.''.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to any flood elevation determination for any area in a community that has not, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, been issued a Letter of Final Determination for such determination under the flood insurance map modernization process.

SEC. 325. RESERVE FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Chapter I of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by inserting after section 1310 (42 U.S.C. 4017) the following new section:

''SEC. 1310A. RESERVE FUND.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF RESERVE FUND.—In carrying out the flood insurance program authorized by this title, the Administrator shall establish in the Treasury of the United States a National Flood Insurance Reserve Fund (in this section referred to as the 'Reserve Fund') which shall—

''(1) be an account separate from any other accounts or funds available to the Administrator; and

''(2) be available for meeting the expected future obligations of the flood insurance program.

''(b) RESERVE RATIO.—Subject to the phase-in requirements under subsection (d), the Reserve Fund shall maintain a balance equal to—

''(1) 1 percent of the sum of the total potential loss exposure of all outstanding flood insurance policies in force in the prior fiscal year; or

''(2) such higher percentage as the Administrator determines to be appropriate, taking into consideration any circumstance that may raise a significant risk of substantial future losses to the Reserve Fund.

''(c) MAINTENANCE OF RESERVE RATIO.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall have the authority to establish, increase, or decrease the amount of aggregate annual insurance premiums to be collected for any fiscal year necessary—

''(A) to maintain the reserve ratio required under subsection (b); and

''(B) to achieve such reserve ratio, if the actual balance of such reserve is below the amount required under subsection (b).

''(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In exercising the authority under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall consider—

''(A) the expected operating expenses of the Reserve Fund;

''(B) the insurance loss expenditures under the flood insurance program;

''(C) any investment income generated under the flood insurance program; and

''(D) any other factor that the Administrator determines appropriate.

''(3) LIMITATIONS.—In exercising the authority under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall be subject to all other provisions of this Act, including any provisions relating to chargeable premium rates and annual increases of such rates.

''(d) PHASE-IN REQUIREMENTS.—The phase-in requirements under this subsection are as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in fiscal year 2012 and not ending until the fiscal year in which the ratio required under subsection (b) is achieved, in each such fiscal year the Administrator shall place in the Reserve Fund an amount equal to not less than 7.5 percent of the reserve ratio required under subsection (b).

''(2) AMOUNT SATISFIED.—As soon as the ratio required under subsection (b) is achieved, and except as provided in paragraph (3), the Administrator shall not be required to set aside any amounts for the Reserve Fund.

''(3) EXCEPTION.—If at any time after the ratio required under subsection (b) is achieved, the Reserve Fund falls below the required ratio under subsection (b), the Administrator shall place in the Reserve Fund for that fiscal year an amount equal to not less than 7.5 percent of the reserve ratio required under subsection (b).

''(e) LIMITATION ON RESERVE RATIO.—In any given fiscal year, if the Administrator determines that the reserve ratio required under

subsection (b) cannot be achieved, the Administrator shall submit a report to the Congress that—

''(1) describes and details the specific concerns of the Administrator regarding such consequences;

''(2) demonstrates how such consequences would harm the long-term financial soundness of the flood insurance program; and

''(3) indicates the maximum attainable reserve ratio for that particular fiscal year.

''(f) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—The reserve ratio requirements under subsection (b) and the phase-in requirements under subsection (d) shall be subject to the availability of amounts in the National Flood Insurance Fund for transfer under section 1310(a)(10), as provided in section 1310(f).''.

(b) FUNDING.—Subsection (a) of section 1310 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017(a)), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(10) for transfers to the National Flood Insurance Reserve Fund under section 1310A, in accordance with such section.''.

SEC. 326. CDBG ELIGIBILITY FOR FLOOD INSURANCE OUTREACH ACTIVITIES AND COMMUNITY BUILDING CODE ADMINISTRATION GRANTS.

Section 105(a) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (24), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (25), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

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

''(26) supplementing existing State or local funding for administration of building code enforcement by local building code enforcement departments, including for increasing staffing, providing staff training, increasing staff competence and professional qualifications, and supporting individual certification or departmental accreditation, and for capital expenditures specifically dedicated to the administration of the building code enforcement department, except that, to be eligible to use amounts as provided in this paragraph—

''(A) a building code enforcement department shall provide matching, non-Federal funds to be used in conjunction with amounts used under this paragraph in an amount—

''(i) in the case of a building code enforcement department serving an area with a population of more than 50,000, equal to not less than 50 percent of the total amount of any funds made available under this title that are used under this paragraph;

''(ii) in the case of a building code enforcement department serving an area with a population of between 20,001 and 50,000, equal to not less than 25 percent of the total amount of any funds made available under this title that are used under this paragraph; and

''(iii) in the case of a building code enforcement department serving an area with a population of less than 20,000, equal to not less than 12.5 percent of the total amount of any funds made available under this title that are used under this paragraph,

except that the Secretary may waive the matching fund requirements under this subparagraph, in whole or in part, based upon the level of economic distress of the jurisdiction in which is located the local building code enforcement department that is using amounts for purposes under this paragraph, and shall waive such matching fund requirements in whole for any recipient jurisdiction that has dedicated all building code permitting fees to the conduct of local building code enforcement; and

''(B) any building code enforcement department using funds made available under this title for purposes under this paragraph shall empanel a code administration and enforcement team consisting of at least 1 full-time building code enforcement officer, a city planner, and a health planner or similar officer; and

''(27) provision of assistance to local governmental agencies responsible for floodplain management activities (including such agencies of Indians tribes, as such term is defined in section 4 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4103)) in communities that participate in the national flood insurance program under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), only for carrying out outreach activities to encourage and facilitate the purchase of flood insurance protection under such Act by owners and renters of properties in such communities and to promote educational activities that increase awareness of flood risk reduction; except that—

''(A) amounts used as provided under this paragraph shall be used only for activities designed to—

''(i) identify owners and renters of properties in communities that participate in the national flood insurance program, including owners of residential and commercial properties;

''(ii) notify such owners and renters when their properties become included in, or when they are excluded from, an area having special flood hazards and the effect of such inclusion or exclusion on the applicability of the mandatory flood insurance purchase requirement under section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a) to such properties;

''(iii) educate such owners and renters regarding the flood risk and reduction of this risk in their community, including the continued flood risks to areas that are no longer subject to the flood insurance mandatory purchase requirement;

''(iv) educate such owners and renters regarding the benefits and costs of maintaining or acquiring flood insurance, including, where applicable, lower-cost preferred risk policies under this title for such properties and the contents of such properties;

''(v) encourage such owners and renters to maintain or acquire such coverage;

''(vi) notify such owners of where to obtain information regarding how to obtain such coverage, including a telephone number, mailing address, and Internet site of the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (in this paragraph referred to as the 'Administrator') where such information is available; and

''(vii) educate local real estate agents in communities participating in the national flood insurance program regarding the program and the availability of coverage under the program for owners and renters of properties in such communities, and establish coordination and liaisons with such real estate agents to facilitate purchase of coverage under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 and increase awareness of flood risk reduction;

''(B) in any fiscal year, a local governmental agency may not use an amount under this paragraph that exceeds 3 times the amount that the agency certifies, as the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall require, that the agency will contribute from non-Federal funds to be used with such amounts used under this paragraph only for carrying out activities described in subparagraph (A); and for purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'non-Federal funds' includes State or local government agency amounts, in-kind contributions, any salary paid to staff to carry out the eligible activities of the local governmental agency involved, the value of the time and services contributed by volunteers to carry out such services (at a rate determined by the Secretary), and the value of any donated material or building and the value of any lease on a building;

''(C) a local governmental agency that uses amounts as provided under this paragraph may coordinate or contract with other agencies and entities having particular capacities, specialties, or experience with respect to certain populations or constituencies, including elderly or disabled families or persons, to carry out activities described in subparagraph (A) with respect to such populations or constituencies; and

''(D) each local government agency that uses amounts as provided under this paragraph shall submit a report to the Secretary and the Administrator, not later than 12 months after such amounts are first received, which shall include such information as the Secretary and the Administrator jointly consider appropriate to describe the activities conducted using such amounts and the effect of such activities on the retention or acquisition of flood insurance coverage.''.

SEC. 327. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) FLOOD DISASTER PROTECTION ACT OF 1973.—The Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4002 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Director'' each place such term appears, except in section 102(f)(3) (42 U.S.C. 4012a(f)(3)), and inserting ''Administrator''; and

(2) in section 201(b) (42 U.S.C. 4105(b)), by striking ''Director's'' and inserting ''Administrator's''.

(b) NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1968.—The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Director'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Administrator''; and

(2) in section 1363 (42 U.S.C. 4104), by striking ''Director's'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Administrator's''.

(c) FEDERAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1956.—Section 15(e) of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 (42 U.S.C. 2414(e)) is amended by striking ''Director'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Administrator''.

SEC. 328. REQUIRING COMPETITION FOR NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM POLICIES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning upon the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, in consultation with insurance companies, insurance agents and other organizations with which the Administrator has contracted, shall submit to the Congress a report describing procedures and policies that the Administrator shall implement to limit the percentage of policies for flood insurance coverage under the national flood insurance program that are directly managed by the Agency to not more than 10 percent of the aggregate number of flood insurance policies in force under such program.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—Upon submission of the report under subsection (a) to the Congress, the Administrator shall implement the policies and procedures described in the report. The Administrator shall, not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning upon submission of such report, reduce the number of policies for flood insurance coverage that are directly managed by the Agency, or by the Agency's direct servicing contractor that is not an insurer, to not more than 10 percent of the aggregate number of flood insurance policies in force as of the expiration of such 12-month period.

(c) CONTINUATION OF CURRENT AGENT RELATIONSHIPS.—In carrying out subsection (b), the Administrator shall ensure that—

(1) agents selling or servicing policies described in such subsection are not prevented from continuing to sell or service such policies; and

(2) insurance companies are not prevented from waiving any limitation such companies could otherwise enforce to limit any such activity.

SEC. 329. STUDIES OF VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY-BASED FLOOD INSURANCE OPTIONS.

(a) STUDIES.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Comptroller General of the United States shall each conduct a separate study to assess options, methods, and strategies for offering voluntary community-based flood insurance policy options and incorporating such options into the national flood insurance program. Such studies shall take into consideration and analyze how the policy options would affect communities having varying economic bases, geographic locations, flood hazard characteristics or classifications, and flood management approaches.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than the expiration of the 18-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Comptroller General of the United States shall each submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate on the results and conclusions of the study such agency conducted under subsection (a), and each such report shall include recommendations for the best manner to incorporate voluntary community-based flood insurance options into the national flood insurance program and for a strategy to implement such options that would encourage communities to undertake flood mitigation activities.

SEC. 330. REPORT ON INCLUSION OF BUILDING CODES IN FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT CRITERIA.

Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall conduct a study and submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate regarding the impact, effectiveness, and feasibility of amending section 1361 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4102) to include widely used and nationally recognized building codes as part of the floodplain management criteria developed under such section, and shall determine—

(1) the regulatory, financial, and economic impacts of such a building code requirement on homeowners, States and local communities, local land use policies, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(2) the resources required of State and local communities to administer and enforce such a building code requirement;

(3) the effectiveness of such a building code requirement in reducing flood-related damage to buildings and contents;

(4) the impact of such a building code requirement on the actuarial soundness of the National Flood Insurance Program;

(5) the effectiveness of nationally recognized codes in allowing innovative materials and systems for flood-resistant construction;

(6) the feasibility and effectiveness of providing an incentive in lower premium rates for flood insurance coverage under such Act for structures meeting whichever of such widely used and nationally recognized building code or any applicable local building code provides greater protection from flood damage;

(7) the impact of such a building code requirement on rural communities with different building code challenges than more urban environments; and

(8) the impact of such a building code requirement on Indian reservations.

SEC. 331. STUDY ON GRADUATED RISK.

(a) STUDY.—The National Academy of Sciences shall conduct a study exploring methods for understanding graduated risk behind levees and the associated land development, insurance, and risk communication dimensions, which shall—

(1) research, review, and recommend current best practices for estimating direct annualized flood losses behind levees for residential and commercial structures;

(2) rank such practices based on their best value, balancing cost, scientific integrity, and the inherent uncertainties associated with all aspects of the loss estimate, including geotechnical engineering, flood frequency estimates, economic value, and direct damages;

(3) research, review, and identify current best floodplain management and land use practices behind levees that effectively balance social, economic, and environmental considerations as part of an overall flood risk management strategy;

(4) identify examples where such practices have proven effective and recommend methods and processes by which they could be applied more broadly across the United States, given the variety of different flood risks, State and local legal frameworks, and evolving judicial opinions;

(5) research, review, and identify a variety of flood insurance pricing options for flood hazards behind levees which are actuarially sound and based on the flood risk data developed using the top three best value approaches identified pursuant to paragraph (1);

(6) evaluate and recommend methods to reduce insurance costs through creative arrangements between insureds and insurers while keeping a clear accounting of how much financial risk is being borne by various parties such that the entire risk is accounted for, including establishment of explicit limits on disaster aid or other assistance in the event of a flood; and

(7) taking into consideration the recommendations pursuant to paragraphs (1) through (3), recommend approaches to communicating the associated risks to community officials, homeowners, and other residents.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the National Academy of Sciences shall submit a report to the Committees on Financial Services and Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate on the study under subsection (a) including the information and recommendations required under such subsection.

SEC. 332. REPORT ON FLOOD-IN-PROGRESS DETERMINATION.

The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall review the processes and procedures for determining that a flood event has commenced or is in progress for purposes of flood insurance coverage made available under the national flood insurance program under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 and for providing public notification that such an event has commenced or is in progress. In such review, the Administrator shall take into consideration the effects and implications that weather conditions, such as rainfall, snowfall, projected snowmelt, existing water levels, and other conditions have on the determination that a flood event has commenced or is in progress. Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning upon the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit a report to the Congress setting forth the results and conclusions of the review undertaken pursuant to this section and any actions undertaken or proposed actions to be taken to provide for a more precise and technical determination that a flooding event has commenced or is in progress.

SEC. 333. STUDY ON REPAYING FLOOD INSURANCE DEBT.

Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall submit a report to the Congress setting forth a plan for repaying within 10 years all amounts, including any amounts previously borrowed but not yet repaid, owed pursuant to clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 1309 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)(2)).

SEC. 334. NO CAUSE OF ACTION.

No cause of action shall exist and no claim may be brought against the United States for violation of any notification requirement imposed upon the United States by this subtitle or any amendment made by this subtitle.

SEC. 335. AUTHORITY FOR THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS TO PROVIDE SPECIALIZED OR TECHNICAL SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the request of a State or local government, the Secretary of the Army may evaluate a levee system that was designed or constructed by the Secretary for the purposes of the National Flood Insurance Program established under chapter 1 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011 et seq.).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—A levee system evaluation under subsection (a) shall—

(1) comply with applicable regulations related to areas protected by a levee system;

(2) be carried out in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, may establish; and

(3) be carried out only if the State or local government agrees to reimburse the Secretary for all cost associated with the performance of the activities.

TITLE IV—OIL AND GAS SUBSIDIES

SEC. 401. LIMITATION ON SECTION 199 DEDUCTION ATTRIBUTABLE TO OIL, NATURAL GAS, OR PRIMARY PRODUCTS THEREOF.

(a) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION.—Paragraph (4) of section 199(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN OIL AND GAS INCOME.—In the case of any taxpayer who is a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)) for the taxable year, the term 'domestic production gross receipts' shall not include gross receipts from the production, transportation, or distribution of oil, natural gas, or any primary product (within the meaning of subsection (d)(9)) thereof.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2012.

SEC. 402. PROHIBITION ON USING LAST-IN, FIRST-OUT ACCOUNTING FOR MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 472 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)) may not use the method provided in subsection (b) in inventorying of any goods.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND SPECIAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2012.

(2) CHANGE IN METHOD OF ACCOUNTING.—In the case of any taxpayer required by the amendment made by this section to change its method of accounting for its first taxable year ending after December 31, 2012—

(A) such change shall be treated as initiated by the taxpayer,

(B) such change shall be treated as made with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, and

(C) the net amount of the adjustments required to be taken into account by the taxpayer under section 481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be taken into account ratably over a period (not greater than 8 taxable years) beginning with such first taxable year.

SEC. 403. MODIFICATIONS OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT RULES APPLICABLE TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

''(n) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.—

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, any amount paid or accrued by a dual capacity taxpayer which is a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)) to a foreign country or possession of the United States for any period shall not be considered a tax—

''(A) if, for such period, the foreign country or possession does not impose a generally applicable income tax, or

''(B) to the extent such amount exceeds the amount (determined in accordance with regulations) which—

''(i) is paid by such dual capacity taxpayer pursuant to the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession, or

''(ii) would be paid if the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession were applicable to such dual capacity taxpayer.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to imply the proper treatment of any such amount not in excess of the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

''(2) DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'dual capacity taxpayer' means, with respect to any foreign country or possession of the United States, a person who—

''(A) is subject to a levy of such country or possession, and

''(B) receives (or will receive) directly or indirectly a specific economic benefit (as determined in accordance with regulations) from such country or possession.

''(3) GENERALLY APPLICABLE INCOME TAX.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'generally applicable income tax' means an income tax (or a series of income taxes) which is generally imposed under the laws of a foreign country or possession on income derived from the conduct of a trade or business within such country or possession.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include a tax unless it has substantial application, by its terms and in practice, to—

''(i) persons who are not dual capacity taxpayers, and

''(ii) persons who are citizens or residents of the foreign country or possession.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxes paid or accrued in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CONTRARY TREATY OBLIGATIONS UPHELD.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to the extent contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States.

TITLE V—THE BUFFETT RULE

SEC. 501. FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

"PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS

''Sec. 59B. Fair share tax.

"SEC. 59B. FAIR SHARE TAX.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—

''(1) PHASE-IN OF TAX.—In the case of any high-income taxpayer, there is hereby imposed for a taxable year (in addition to any other tax imposed by this subtitle) a tax equal to the product of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2), and

''(B) a fraction (not to exceed 1)—

''(i) the numerator of which is the excess of—

''(I) the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, over

''(II) the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1), and

''(ii) the denominator of which is the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1).

''(2) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax determined under this paragraph is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the tentative fair share tax for the taxable year, over

''(B) the excess of—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) for the taxable year,

''(II) the tax imposed by section 55 for the taxable year, plus

''(III) the payroll tax for the taxable year, over

''(ii) the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than sections 27(a), 31, and 34).

''(b) TENTATIVE FAIR SHARE TAX.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tentative fair share tax for the taxable year is 30 percent of the excess of—

''(A) the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer, over

''(B) the modified charitable contribution deduction for the taxable year.

''(2) MODIFIED CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION DEDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The modified charitable contribution deduction for any taxable year is an amount equal to the amount which bears the same ratio to the deduction allowable under section 170 (section 642(c) in the case of a trust or estate) for such taxable year as—

''(i) the amount of itemized deductions allowable under the regular tax (as defined in section 55) for such taxable year, determined after the application of section 68, bears to

''(ii) such amount, determined before the application of section 68.

''(B) TAXPAYER MUST ITEMIZE.—In the case of any individual who does not elect to itemize deductions for the taxable year, the modified charitable contribution deduction shall be zero.

''(c) HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'high-income taxpayer' means, with respect to any taxable year, any taxpayer (other than a corporation) with an adjusted gross income for such taxable year in excess of $1,000,000 (50 percent of such amount in the case of a married individual who files a separate return).

''(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2013, the $1,000,000 amount under paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2012' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $10,000.

''(d) PAYROLL TAX.—For purposes of this section, the payroll tax for any taxable year is an amount equal to the excess of—

''(1) the taxes imposed on the taxpayer under sections 1401, 1411, 3101, 3201, and 3211(a) (to the extent such taxes are attributable to the rate of tax in effect under section 3101) with respect to such taxable year or wages or compensation received during the taxable year, over

''(2) the deduction allowable under section 164(f) for such taxable year.

''(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—For purposes of this section, in the case of an estate or trust, adjusted gross income shall be computed in the manner described in section 67(e).

''(f) NOT TREATED AS TAX IMPOSED BY THIS CHAPTER FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The tax imposed under this section shall not be treated as tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter (other than the credit allowed under section 27(a)) or for purposes of section 55.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 26(b)(2) of such Code is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (X) as subparagraphs (D) through (Y), respectively, and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) section 59B (relating to fair share tax),''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts for subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012.

TITLE VI—RETIREMENT CONTRIBUTIONS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

SEC. 601. RETIREMENT CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

(1) INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 8334(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''(c) Each'' and inserting ''(c)(1) Each''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the applicable percentage of basic pay under this subsection shall, for purposes of computing an amount with respect to a Member for Member service—

''(A) for a period in calendar year 2013, be equal to the applicable percentage under this subsection for calendar year 2012, plus an additional 2.5 percentage points;

''(B) for a period in calendar year 2014, 2015, 2016, or 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this subsection for the preceding calendar year (as determined under subparagraph (A) or this subparagraph, as the case may be), plus an additional 1.5 percentage points; and

''(C) for a period in any calendar year after 2017, be equal to the applicable percent age under this subsection for calendar year 2017 (as determined under subparagraph (B)).''.

(2) GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 8334(a)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''Except as provided in clause (ii),'' and inserting ''Except as provided in clause (ii) or (iii),''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) In the case of a Member, the amount to be contributed under clause (i) shall, with respect to a period in any year beginning after December 31, 2012, be equal to—

''(I) the amount which would otherwise apply under clause (i) with respect to such period, reduced by

''(II) the amount by which, with respect to such period, the withholding under subparagraph (A) exceeds the amount which would otherwise have been withheld from the basic pay of the Member involved under subparagraph (A) based on the percentage applicable under subsection (c) for calendar year 2012.''.

(b) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—

(1) INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 8422(a)(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the applicable percentage under this subsection shall, for purposes of computing an amount with respect to a Member (other than an individual who is a revised annuity employee by virtue of becoming a Member after December 31, 2012)—

''(i) for a period in calendar year 2013, be equal to the applicable percentage under this paragraph for calendar year 2012, plus an additional 2.5 percentage points;

''(ii) for a period in calendar year 2014, 2015, 2016, or 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this paragraph for the preceding calendar year (as determined under clause (i) or this clause, as the case maybe), plus an additional 1.5 percentage points; and

''(iii) for a period in any calendar year after 2017, be equal to the applicable percentage under this paragraph for calendar year 2017 (as determined under clause (ii)).''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated by subparagraph (A)), in the line relating to a Member, by striking ''9.3'' and inserting ''12''.

(2) GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 8423(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''(2)'' and inserting ''(2)(A)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B)(i) Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii), for purposes of any period in any year beginning after December 31, 2012, the normal-cost percentage under this subsection for Members shall be determined and applied as if section 601(b)(1)(B) of the Balanced Approach to Replace the Sequester Act of 2012 for Fiscal Year 2013 had not been enacted.

''(ii) Any contributions under this subsection with respect to Members in excess of the amounts which (but for clause (i)) would otherwise have been payable shall be applied toward reducing the unfunded liability of the Civil Service Retirement System.

''(iii) After the unfunded liability of the Civil Service Retirement System has been eliminated, as determined by the Office, Government contributions under this subsection shall be determined and made disregarding this subparagraph.''.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 10, 2012 No. 66

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 protector of nations, hallowed be Your Name. Give this day to the Members of this legislative body such self-discipline that they will choose not what they wish but what they ought. Give them also the strength of will so that they may accept the right, however difficult it is, and refuse the wrong, however attractive it may be. Lord, give them the wisdom to pray for each other, not only for those with whom they agree but also for those with whom they might disagree. Impart to them a unity of spirit as they deal with the diversity of ideas.

We pray in Your gracious 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, May 10, 2012.

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 of New Mexico thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SECURING AMERICAN JOBS THROUGH EXPORTS ACT OF 2012—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of the motion to proceed to calendar No. 396, H.R. 2072.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to calendar No. 396, H.R. 2072, a bill to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are now on the motion to proceed to the Ex-Im bill. I hope we can pass the bill today. I haven't had an opportunity today to speak to the Republican leader, but I will do that shortly, and we will decide if there is a way forward.

I ask unanimous consent that the next hour be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the second half.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on a strong bipartisan vote yesterday, the House passed a piece of commonsense, job-creating legislation—the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. We refer to it as the Ex-Im Bank legislation.

For many years this legislation has helped American companies grow and sell their products overseas, creating tens of thousands of jobs. And for years the bank has enjoyed broad bipartisan support. It passed by unanimous consent on one occasion and by voice vote on another occasion. It is the perfect example of the kinds of smart investments Congress should be making to spur job growth.

I hope the Senate will be able to quickly approve the House-passed measure today and do it by unanimous consent. I am optimistic that the 330-to-93 vote in the House yesterday will be enough to convince Senate Republicans they shouldn't hold up this legislation any longer—330 to 93. The process of reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank has taken too long. I hope we don't have to file cloture on this matter, but I will if we must.

Let me remind my colleagues that the Senate considered reauthorizing this important legislation in March, 2 months ago. Senate Republicans had an opportunity to support the measure then. Instead, all but three opposed it and the measure failed. American exporters have already waited in limbo for 2 months to see whether Republicans will come around in backing this business-friendly, job-creating measure. Businesses shouldn't have to wait

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

any longer. We can't afford more of the partisan obstruction we saw on this commonsense legislation last March. To get this to the President's desk this Congress—and every piece of legislation we pass must get to his desk or it doesn't become law—we need Democratic votes and Republican votes. That is just a reality. It means we absolutely must work together if we want to get anything done.

SENATOR RICHARD LUGAR

One man who has always been willing to extend a hand to colleagues across the aisle is the senior Senator from Indiana, Senator RICHARD LUGAR. His first priority has always been getting things done for the American people, whether that means keeping the world safe from nuclear war or looking out for the Hoosiers back home. One of the most historic pieces of legislation is known as Nunn-Lugar. It is an effort to reduce the number of nuclear weapons in our country and in the Soviet Union. It is a very important piece of bipartisan legislation, authored by Senators LUGAR of Indiana and Nunn of Georgia. It is important legislation.

Senator LUGAR has been a great advocate for the people of Indiana as well as a dedicated student of international affairs. I have the opportunity to call meetings with foreign dignitaries, and he is always there, seated at the table. He has always put the American people, in my estimation, first and his political party second. I was elected to the Senate to serve each and every Nevadan—not only Democrats, though I am proud to be one—and Senator LUGAR was elected to serve every Hoosier, regardless of political affiliation, and he has done that so well; it is why he has been in the Senate for more than three decades.

Throughout the history of this country, even in the most trying of times, times of great social and political unrest, our elected representatives have worked together despite their differences to do what is right for all Americans. So I worry when I see dedicated patriots such as Senator LUGAR drummed out by tea party zealots for being too willing to cooperate. But that is what happened on Tuesday. I worry when I hear a candidate for the U.S. Senate campaigning against bipartisanship and compromise between the two parties. That is really what he said, that there is too much compromise in Congress. That is what happened on Tuesday. I worry when a candidate for the U.S. Senate says clearly that he will put political party and partisanship before country and compromise. But that is what happened on Tuesday. That is nothing to be proud of.

That kind of attitude is why longtime political observers Thomas Mann and Norman Ornstein described today's GOP as ''ideologically extreme'' and ''scornful of compromise.'' And it is why my friend Senator LUGAR said the following yesterday in his concession speech:

> Bipartisanship is not the opposite of principle. One can be very conservative or very liberal and still have a bipartisan mindset. Such a mindset acknowledges that the other party is also patriotic and may have some good ideas.

I want to repeat that. This is what Senator LUGAR said in his concession speech yesterday:

> Bipartisanship is not the opposite of principle. One can be very conservative or very liberal and still have a bipartisan mindset. Such a mindset acknowledges that the other party is also patriotic and may have some good ideas.

We should all remember, regardless of what our party affiliation is, that compromise has been the hallmark of this country for more than 200 years, especially in the U.S. Senate—compromise.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I certainly share my friend the majority leader's views about Senator LUGAR's record, but he has 8 more months to be among us and to serve this country. I think an appropriate time to celebrate his outstanding career would be when it comes to an end here in the Senate.

TIME FOR ACTION

With regard to what has been going on here in the Senate, the problem clearly is the majority, which seems not to be interested in accomplishing anything but, rather, turning the Senate floor into an opportunity for show votes for the President and his campaign.

Earlier this week the President repackaged a list of old ideas into a Post-it note checklist for Congress. He said he did not want to ''overload'' Congress. Unfortunately, besides the weekly political show votes to which I just referred to coincide with the President's campaign schedule, the work that needs to be done isn't—no budget, nothing to prevent the largest tax hike in history, and House-passed bills sitting in the hopper.

While the President is trying to manufacture arguments he can run on, House Republicans have spent the last year and a half voting on and passing energy and jobs bills. In fact, more than two dozen jobs proposals are currently collecting dust on the majority leader's desk. One after another, the House has passed a budget, a small business tax bill, bills to expand domestic energy production, and bills to reduce burdensome, job-killing regulations. Despite some saying nothing can get done in an election year, they are not done yet over in the House. I commend my House colleagues for their leadership, energy, and good work.

I have a suggestion. Instead of focusing on his political Post-it note checklist, the President and Senate Democrats should show some leadership and work with Republicans to move on critical progrowth bills. These proposals will help provide certainty and provide a much needed boost to our economy. They would allow businesses to plan for the future and to begin to hire again.

Common ground can be achieved on these jobs bills, and Republicans stand ready to work with Democrats to get them passed. With nearly 13 million Americans unemployed and millions more underemployed or giving up looking for work altogether, inaction and political gimmicks and games are really just not acceptable. Action is required by this President and this Congress now, not after the election or by some future Congress or administration. The country's problems are far too pressing. The American people expect us to work together for the good of our country.

This year the Senate should pass a budget. Three years without a budget is completely unacceptable. Congress should also move on comprehensive tax reform, a true all-of-the-above energy policy, and the elimination of burdensome regulations that are hurting businesses and hindering job creation. And we can't stop there. Congress must act swiftly to put forth a plan to deal with the largest tax increase in U.S. history that is only—only—8 months away.

These are issues that can't be dealt with overnight. We need to start now. And anyone who says there is no time to get these things done either hasn't been watching the Senate floor lately or does not believe this country is headed toward a fiscal cliff. Where is the Democratic-led Senate and the President? Where are they? What are they waiting for? What is the reason for the delay? The President giving another speech loaded with the same old ideas that have failed before is not going to cut it anymore. The President's Post-it note checklist is insufficient to handle the challenges we face as a nation, and, frankly, it is completely counterproductive.

Yesterday the majority leader said Democrats are willing to make the tough choices. Well, we are waiting. We are waiting. And with all due respect, we have a tough time believing our friends across the aisle when the only issues they care about these days are show votes coordinated with the White House for political gain. So today let's stop the show votes that are designed to fail. Let's stop the blame games. Let's come together and do what the American people expect us to do. As I said yesterday, our offer still stands. We are ready when you are.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

There will now be 60 minutes of debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2072 equally divided between the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes.

The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the motion to proceed to the passage of the Export-Import Bank, legislation that has come over from the House and passed the House with a vote of 330 to 93, a pretty resounding vote in favor of moving forward on the Export-Import Bank, which is a major tool to financing manufacturing in the United States when they have products to be sold around the globe.

We hear the President talk all the time about the fact that we need to increase our exports. This is a very important tool that has existed for decades in helping businesses across our country produce product and get sales into overseas markets, so the fact this legislation passed the House again with an overwhelmingly positive vote—and, I should point out to my colleagues here in the Senate, without amendment. It was not amended on the floor. That is, my colleagues on the House side, both Republicans and Democrats, worked out such a positive proposal that it went to the House floor without amendment.

Now we have the chance to bring it up here and pass this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do so very quickly because this legislation and this authorization for the Export-Import Bank is expiring at the end of this month.

So, yes, here we are again at the eleventh hour. Instead of giving predictability and certainty to a very important program, we are down to the last minutes about whether it is going to continue to operate in the normal way that it does. I am here to ask my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle to move forward, do as your House colleagues did, agree to the legislation, and let's get it out of here so people know in and across America that this program will continue.

I toured Washington State, which has many companies that benefit from the Export-Import Bank. One of them was a company in Spokane, WA, SCAFCO, which happens to be one of the largest makers of grain silos in the world and they export these grain silos. They are used in the United States, but they are used all over the world. I saw 200 workers there who know firsthand how important it is to get this legislation adopted and moved forward, because it means sales of those grain silos all around the world. They have used this financing mechanism to expand overseas sales to 11 new countries and to make sure they were continuing to compete on an international basis.

If you look over the last 5 years, this bank has supported over $64 billion of sales and exports in Washington State. Yes, some of those jobs are related to aviation, but 83,000 related jobs in Washington State are small businesses, companies such as Sonoco in Moses Lake which is a machine shop, and they do repair parts for aircraft for 40 different clients spread across the globe.

We were at another company in Yakima, a music company. If anybody has heard of Manhasset Music Stands, it is an unbelievable story of a success of a company that has sales of over $1 million to various countries around the globe; and people definitely like the fact that Made in America means quality and that they have been able to access all of these markets.

We saw a company in the Everett area, Esterline, which has built airplane parts and employs over 600 people, and has used this agreement. Basically, they build the overhead cockpit part of airplanes and they sell those to a variety of businesses all around the globe.

Without the financing of the Ex-Im Bank, these companies lose out on an international basis to the financing mechanisms that other countries have, whether that is Canada, Europe, or other places. This program is very successful and, I might add, adds billions of dollars back to the U.S. Government. This is not a program that costs us money. This is a program that basically generates revenue back to the Federal Government.

I want to say to my colleagues, there were several things that were added in the House bill—a GAO report on evaluating the banks and capital market conditions, making sure they do an annual report on due diligence and the purpose of the loan, additional requirements by Treasury, making sure we continue to oversee the Ex-Im Bank; so lots of language in making sure there is transparency in the Ex-Im Bank financing mechanism.

This is a good resolution. I applaud my colleagues in the House, Representatives HOYER, CANTOR, and BOEHNER, who all worked on this agreement, and I hope my colleagues move quickly on it.

There is one thing we know right now. We need to do everything we can to help our economy and to help jobs. The Ex-Im Bank has been a proven job creator in the United States, helping U.S. companies compete internationally. It has helped us pay down the deficit in the past. Now all we need to do is give it the certainty that it will continue to operate as of May 31 this year. So let's get on with this business of making sure we are focusing on the economy, and make sure, for the Ex-Im Bank, we proceed to this measure and pass it as soon as possible.

I thank the President, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, let me associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from the State of Washington, Ms. CANTWELL.

I heard the Republican leader talk about a progrowth agenda. There is nothing more progrowth than exporting American goods and services overseas to the growing markets all over the world, and the Ex-Im Bank has a long record of providing the foundation on which our businesses, small, medium, and large, can do that. So let's bring up what the House has passed and move it through this Chamber as fast as possible.

STOP THE STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATE HIKE OF 2012

Mr. President, I mentioned I wanted to stand this morning and speak on behalf of students all across America.

In my home State of Colorado, students and recent college graduates are literally struggling with a mountain of loan debt. As a mountain climber myself, I understand that mountains can be overcome. But in an economy such as this one, where recent college graduates are struggling to find work, we need to do more. We need to do everything we possibly can to make college more affordable. And that is where we, the Congress, come in.

The interest rate, as we all know, on the federally subsidized Stafford loans is set to double on July 1, barring congressional action, so we don't have much time to play political games here before the mountain of debt facing our students begins to grow even higher.

Student loans play a crucial role in making higher education possible for millions of Americans. For many Americans, higher education is the gateway to their future careers and to better paying jobs. That is a good thing for our families and it is a good thing for our economy, again referencing the Republican leader's concerns about a progrowth agenda.

More specifically, let me talk about what the federally subsidized Stafford loans do. They are designed for American students from low- to middle-income families so that they too can afford to go to college. At a time when students are facing escalating tuition costs and an uncertain job market after graduation, it would truly be irresponsible for us not to act as soon as possible. But I have to report to you and our colleagues that we are being blocked from doing just that.

There is a commonsense proposal before us that would prevent these student loan interest rates from doubling, but it is being filibustered. All these students want—all the young people we all know want—is an opportunity to better themselves and contribute to our Nation's economic growth. We have a chance to offer them that opportunity, but we have got to end the political games here and get to work. We can't let partisanship stand in the way of a college education for young Americans. It doesn't make sense, certainly out in my State of Colorado. Coloradans understand this, and they are telling me—as I think they are in the Presiding Officer's State, and States all across the country—just get it done. There is no time left to just get it done.

I asked Colorado students through my Facebook page to contact me with their concerns so I could share them here on the Senate floor, and I wanted

to bring their voices directly to the Congress so we would all understand better what is at stake in Colorado and all over our country so it might give us some additional motivation. So I wish to share a couple of stories here on the floor of the Senate.

Justyne Espinal is from Aurora. She is a single mother of two children. She is currently enrolled in nursing school after being displaced from her job in the mortgage industry. She enrolled in nursing school so she could provide for her family and contribute to the workforce. She said:

> I am just barely making ends meet and need the help of student loans. Please don't double my interest rate.

Then there is Nicholas Collins, a senior communications major at the University of Colorado. He is in the middle of preparing for final exams this week, but he took time to write to me, and he wrote:

> Senator Udall, I will be graduating two weeks from today. I could not imagine a future where students would be forced to pay up to $1,000 more per year to pay off their loans . . . I would not be in the position I am today if it wasn't for federal aid.

The concerns that are expressed by Justyne and Nicholas are just a couple of vivid examples of the concerns facing millions of American students.

As you know, and we all know, there is a broad consensus that we have to prevent these Stafford loans from doubling on July 1. However, many of our friends on the other side want to raid the Prevention and Public Health Fund to offset the cost of these student loans. This fund is aimed at preventing chronic disease and it was implemented as a part of the Affordable Care Act. The Prevention and Public Health Fund helps to reduce chronic diseases, including diabetes and heart disease, while also providing much-needed dollars toward immunization for children.

I understand that the health bill was controversial. But to continue attacking it, especially when students' futures are on the line, is puzzling, to say the least. While we could be closing unfair tax loopholes, as the underlying bill proposes, the Republicans here in the Senate are telling us we have to choose between a bright future for our students or preventing chronic disease for millions of Americans. That doesn't make sense. This is about providing opportunity. To say we can no longer care for the sick or help prevent chronic disease if we want to help students is a false and, I might say, political choice.

There are plenty of tax loopholes, big oil subsidies and other savings, that don't leave students, the sick, or hard-working Americans out in the cold. We owe it to people such as Justyne and Nicholas to come together to find a way to ensure that American students continue to have access to affordable loans. I look forward to working with you and our colleagues here in the Senate to make sure we do right by our Nation's students on this. I would urge all of us to end this impasse and, instead, work together. Let's roll up our sleeves, literally and figuratively, and find the right solution. Let's prove to Coloradans, to the students in Colorado and to all the students across our country, that the Senate can accomplish something important for our Nation's education system, our country, and our way of life.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR RICHARD LUGAR

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I rise to just say a few words about my good friend and my mentor in the Senate, Senator RICHARD LUGAR. I heard both leaders this morning mention Senator LUGAR, and I thought I would rise for a minute to talk about him because I have been lucky to have him as a mentor since I arrived in the Senate. Senator MARK PRYOR organized for our class, when we came in, mentors, usually a senior Democrat, senior Republican, and Senator LUGAR was that mentor for me. As a result of that, I have spent a great deal of time with him, both in the Foreign Relations Committee and in a variety of meetings and he has always given me very valuable advice. Above all, his advice was to urge bipartisanship, not for its own sake but because it is what makes the Senate work and what allows us to move forward.

As one of the leaders pointed out, he is going to be with us for 8 more months, but I think there was something very important in the statement he made and I will read a few words and ask unanimous consent the full statement be printed in the RECORD thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I want to read a few words from what he said after he suffered this electoral loss. These are words we should all listen to in the Senate because they are so wise. They give us advice and put us on a path we should be on. These are Senator LUGAR's words.

> Legislators should have an ideological grounding and strong beliefs identifiable to their constituents. I believe I have offered that throughout my career. But ideology cannot be a substitute for a determination to think for yourself, for a willingness to study an issue objectively, and for the fortitude to sometimes disagree with your party or even your constituents. Like Edmund Burke, I believe leaders owe the people they represent their best judgment.
>
> Too often bipartisanship is equated with centrism or deal cutting. Bipartisanship is not the opposite of principle. One can be very conservative or very liberal and still have a bipartisan mindset. Such a mindset acknowledges that the other party is also patriotic and may have some good ideas. It acknowledges that national unity is important, and that aggressive partisanship deepens cynicism, sharpens political vendettas, and depletes the national reserve of good will that is critical to our survival in hard times. Certainly this was understood by President Reagan, who worked with Democrats frequently and showed flexibility that would be ridiculed today—from assenting to tax increases in the 1983 Social Security fix, to compromising on landmark tax reform legislation in 1986, to advancing arms control agreements in his second term.
>
> I don't remember a time when so many topics have become politically unmentionable in one party or the other. Republicans cannot admit to any nuance in policy on climate change. Republican members are now expected to take pledges against any tax increases. For two consecutive Presidential nomination cycles, GOP candidates competed with one another to express the most strident anti-immigration view, even at the risk of alienating a huge voting bloc. Similarly, most Democrats are constrained when talking about such issues as entitlement cuts, tort reform, and trade agreements. Our political system is losing its ability to even explore alternatives. If fealty to these pledges continues to expand, legislators may pledge their way into irrelevance. Voters will be electing a slate of inflexible positions rather than a leader.
>
> I hope that as a nation we aspire to more than that. I hope we will demand judgment from our leaders.

Those are the words of Senator LUGAR. I think they are very wise words. I think we should all read his whole speech and try to put the Senate on a better path.

EXHIBIT 1

Sen. Richard Lugar:

I would like to comment on the Senate race just concluded and the direction of American politics and the Republican Party. I would reiterate from my earlier statement that I have no regrets about choosing to run for office. My health is excellent, I believe that I have been a very effective Senator for Hoosiers and for the country, and I know that the next six years would have been a time of great achievement. Further, I believed that vital national priorities, including job creation, deficit reduction, energy security, agriculture reform, and the Nunn-Lugar program, would benefit from my continued service as a Senator. These goals were worth the risk of an electoral defeat and the costs of a hard campaign.

Analysts will speculate about whether our campaign strategies were wise. Much of this will be based on conjecture by pundits who don't fully appreciate the choices we had to make based on resource limits, polling data, and other factors. They also will speculate whether we were guilty of overconfidence.

The truth is that the headwinds in this race were abundantly apparent long before Richard Mourdock announced his candidacy. One does not highlight such headwinds publically when one is waging a campaign. But I knew that I would face an extremely strong anti-incumbent mood following a recession. I knew that my work with then-Senator Barack Obama would be used against me, even if our relationship were overhyped. I also knew from the races in 2010 that I was a likely target of Club for Growth, FreedomWorks and other Super Pacs dedicated to defeating at least one Republican as a purification exercise to enhance their influence over other Republican legislators.

We undertook this campaign soberly and we worked very hard in 2010, 2011, and 2012 to overcome these challenges. There never was a moment when my campaign took anything for granted. This is why we put so much effort into our get out the vote operations.

Ultimately, the re-election of an incumbent to Congress usually comes down to whether voters agree with the positions the incumbent has taken. I knew that I had cast recent votes that would be unpopular with some Republicans and that would be targeted by outside groups.

These included my votes for the TARP program, for government support of the auto industry, for the START Treaty, and for the confirmations of Justices Sotomayor and Kagan. I also advanced several propositions that were considered heretical by some, including the thought that Congressional earmarks saved no money and turned spending power over to unelected bureaucrats and that the country should explore options for immigration reform.

It was apparent that these positions would be attacked in a Republican primary. But I believe that they were the right votes for the country, and I stand by them without regrets, as I have throughout the campaign.

From time to time during the last two years I heard from well-meaning individuals who suggested that I ought to consider running as an independent. My response was always the same: I am a Republican now and always have been. I have no desire to run as anything else. All my life, I have believed in the Republican principles of small government, low taxes, a strong national defense, free enterprise, and trade expansion. According to Congressional Quarterly vote studies, I supported President Reagan more often than any other Senator. I want to see a Republican elected President, and I want to see a Republican majority in the Congress. I hope my opponent wins in November to help give my friend Mitch McConnell a majority.

If Mr. Mourdock is elected, I want him to be a good Senator. But that will require him to revise his stated goal of bringing more partisanship to Washington. He and I share many positions, but his embrace of an unrelenting partisan mindset is irreconcilable with my philosophy of governance and my experience of what brings results for Hoosiers in the Senate. In effect, what he has promised in this campaign is reflexive votes for a rejectionist orthodoxy and rigid opposition to the actions and proposals of the other party. His answer to the inevitable roadblocks he will encounter in Congress is merely to campaign for more Republicans who embrace the same partisan outlook. He has pledged his support to groups whose prime mission is to cleanse the Republican Party of those who stray from orthodoxy as they see it.

This is not conducive to problem solving and governance. And he will find that unless he modifies his approach, he will achieve little as a legislator. Worse, he will help delay solutions that are totally beyond the capacity of partisan majorities to achieve. The most consequential of these is stabilizing and reversing the Federal debt in an era when millions of baby boomers are retiring. There is little likelihood that either party will be able to impose their favored budget solutions on the other without some degree of compromise.

Unfortunately, we have an increasing number of legislators in both parties who have adopted an unrelenting partisan viewpoint. This shows up in countless vote studies that find diminishing intersections between Democrat and Republican positions. Partisans at both ends of the political spectrum are dominating the political debate in our country. And partisan groups, including outside groups that spent millions against me in this race, are determined to see that this continues. They have worked to make it as difficult as possible for a legislator of either party to hold independent views or engage in constructive compromise. If that attitude prevails in American politics, our government will remain mired in the dysfunction we have witnessed during the last several years. And I believe that if this attitude expands in the Republican Party, we will be relegated to minority status. Parties don't succeed for long if they stop appealing to voters who may disagree with them on some issues.

Legislators should have an ideological grounding and strong beliefs identifiable to their constituents. I believe I have offered that throughout my career. But ideology cannot be a substitute for a determination to think for yourself, for a willingness to study an issue objectively, and for the fortitude to sometimes disagree with your party or even your constituents. Like Edmund Burke, I believe leaders owe the people they represent their best judgment.

Too often bipartisanship is equated with centrism or deal cutting. Bipartisanship is not the opposite of principle. One can be very conservative or very liberal and still have a bipartisan mindset. Such a mindset acknowledges that the other party is also patriotic and may have some good ideas. It acknowledges that national unity is important, and that aggressive partisanship deepens cynicism, sharpens political vendettas, and depletes the national reserve of good will that is critical to our survival in hard times. Certainly this was understood by President Reagan, who worked with Democrats frequently and showed flexibility that would be ridiculed today—from assenting to tax increases in the 1983 Social Security fix, to compromising on landmark tax reform legislation in 1986, to advancing arms control agreements in his second term.

I don't remember a time when so many topics have become politically unmentionable in one party or the other. Republicans cannot admit to any nuance in policy on climate change. Republican members are now expected to take pledges against any tax increases. For two consecutive Presidential nomination cycles, GOP candidates competed with one another to express the most strident anti-immigration view, even at the risk of alienating a huge voting bloc. Similarly, most Democrats are constrained when talking about such issues as entitlement cuts, tort reform, and trade agreements. Our political system is losing its ability to even explore alternatives. If fealty to these pledges continues to expand, legislators may pledge their way into irrelevance. Voters will be electing a slate of inflexible positions rather than a leader.

I hope that as a nation we aspire to more than that. I hope we will demand judgment from our leaders. I continue to believe that Hoosiers value constructive leadership. I would not have run for office if I did not believe that.

As someone who has seen much in the politics of our country and our state, I am able to take the long view. I have not lost my enthusiasm for the role played by the United States Senate. Nor has my belief in conservative principles been diminished. I expect great things from my party and my country. I hope all who participated in this election share in this optimism.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. 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. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STUDENT LOANS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, in just 2 weeks, similar to many proud parents, I will be watching as my youngest daughter walks across the graduation stage. For some students, this important milestone marks the end of their college days and the beginning of a professional career. This achievement should be filled with hope for a great future, but for many it will be a story saddled with student loan debt and uncertainty about the economy, their job prospects, and their future.

As I have listened to many of my Democratic colleagues discussing the extension of a special interest rate for the subsidized Stafford loans, I continue to hear false statements that would lead one to believe Republicans don't support extending this interest rate for students. This is simply not true.

In my State of South Dakota, nearly 30,000 students received subsidized Stafford loans during the 2010–2011 school year. While I support alleviating financial pressure on students, I did not support the partisan legislation brought forward by Majority Leader REID that would extend subsidized Stafford loans while raising taxes on some employers, not because the goal of the legislation is misguided but because the way the majority leader proposed to pay for the legislation is misguided.

Majority Leader REID's legislation, similar to its Republican counterpart, would extend the special rate of 3.4 percent for subsidized Stafford loans that existed for the 2011–2012 school year to the 2012 and 2013 school year. I agree with the extension of this special rate and would simply ask the majority leader to allow a vote on the Republican alternative, which I might add, passed the House of Representatives by a bipartisan vote on April 27. I voted against moving to the majority leader's bill because I disagree on two grounds with the way my Democratic colleagues proposed to pay for the temporary 1-year extension.

First, I fundamentally disagree with the idea of a permanent tax increase on certain job creators to pay for a temporary 1-year extension. We are talking about permanent tax changes to pay for temporary spending. That is bad policy. I furthermore believe any discussion about raising taxes should be addressed in a comprehensive tax reform discussion, not in a student loan bill.

Second, I disagree with diverting the payroll tax revenue away from the Medicare and Social Security trust funds, where it would ordinarily be directed. We saw this done during the health care bill a couple years ago, where Medicare reductions and revenue increases that were supposed to go to

extend the lifespan of Medicare were, in fact, used to pay for new spending. We cannot continue to try to fool the American people that we are somehow extending the lifespan of Medicare when we are spending that money on new programs.

We are essentially double counting revenue and spending the same money twice. We cannot do that. We cannot do that anywhere else in the country, in this economy. Yet in Washington, DC, that has become the practice. What this would do is take changes in the Tax Code that would ordinarily go into the payroll tax fund or Medicare trust fund and now that is going to be used to pay for something else. This is a practice we cannot continue; we cannot sustain. We all know our trust funds are headed toward bankruptcy and continuing to raid them and use them for other purposes is simply a recipe for disaster.

I agree with the 37 business groups that wrote a letter to Leaders REID and MCCONNELL strongly opposing the $9 billion tax increase on small businesses proposed in the majority leader's legislation. These groups represent millions of employers, and they range from the National Federation of Independent Business to the Independent Community Bankers, to the National Restaurant Association. These 37 business groups all oppose the tax increases that would be included to pay to keep the interest rate at 3.4 percent.

I believe there could be bipartisan support for a proposal that has been put forward by Senators ENZI and ALEXANDER, who are both leaders on education policy in the Senate. They proposed an alternative that pays for a temporary 1-year extension of a 3.4-percent interest rate by taking money from a slush fund created by ObamaCare in 2010. The President and Democrats have supported taking money from the slush fund in the past, so it seems odd that now they are suddenly up in arms in support of a slush fund that is supposedly aimed at prevention.

The President's own fiscal year 2013 budget proposal recommends using the prevention slush fund for other Federal priorities. My Democratic colleagues in the Senate supported taking $5 billion from the fund merely 11 weeks ago. So there is broad support for the idea of prevention, but the recent record of the use of prevention dollars shows these dollars are not being spent wisely. Funds in the prevention slush fund can be used on almost anything in the name of prevention and wellness. For example, jungle gyms, bike paths, farmers' markets, those are the types of things this so-called prevention slush fund is being used for. Keep in mind that in 2010, my Democratic colleagues used the $9 billion in savings in Federal student program aid to pay for part of ObamaCare instead of using that money to address the looming issue of the scheduled return to these higher interest rates on student loans.

It only seems rational and fitting to use the money that came from the student loan industry to address the interest rates for subsidized Stafford loans. At least it strikes me as very logical that since these funds were diverted from the student aid fund in the first place to pay for ObamaCare, we ought to recapture some of those funds to help keep student loan interest rates at the lower 3.4 percent level.

It is particularly interesting that the President suddenly has taken such a deep interest in this issue, when in 2007 he didn't even show up in the Senate to vote for the original legislation that created the temporary phased-down interest rate for subsidized Stafford loans. So despite the President's rhetoric, the greatest threat to young people looking for a job isn't the loan rates but the Obama economy.

This year's crop of college students looking for jobs is confronting an economy in which unemployment has remained above 8 percent for 39 straight months. A recent Associated Press report found that one out of every two recent graduates is jobless or underemployed within 1 year of finishing school. Graduates who are lucky enough to find a job will earn 9 percent less than if they had graduated just a few years ago.

A Gallup poll released this week gives even more bad news for young adults. According to Gallup, underemployment for 18- to 29-year-olds has hovered around 30 percent for most of the past year. Those graduates lucky enough to find employment are more likely to find jobs as waitresses and bartenders than as engineers, physicists, chemists, and mathematicians.

On Tuesday, the President was out touting his to-do list for Congress. That is particularly interesting since the President had 3½ years to put policies in place that would strengthen the economy. Here is what our graduates are getting. Here is what that Obama economy has brought about: Long-term unemployment is up 89 percent; the number of Americans who are on food stamps is up 45 percent; gas prices have doubled; college tuition is up 25 percent; worker health insurance costs are up 23 percent; and the Federal debt we are passing on to future generations is up 47 percent. The only thing that has gone down on his watch is home values, which is down 14 percent.

Our country and our college graduates have had enough of the Obama economy. Instead of the to-do list the President has put forward, we have a to-stop list for you. Stop job-killing regulations that are hurting our small businesses' ability to create jobs, stop trying to raise taxes on small businesses and job creators who are the people who are going to hire our college graduates, stop blocking the Keystone XL Pipeline which would help wean our country from the dependence we have on foreign sources of energy, and stop the divisive use of class warfare that does nothing but divide Americans.

It is time for the President and Congress to come to the realization that we have to shift our focus away from election-year standoffs and come together to focus on changing the course of our lagging economy so we can once again put our young people back to work, which is the real objective that should be our focus. These other issues, which are a lot of campaign gimmicks, a lot of opportunities to politicize this issue or that issue, are counterproductive in the long run. The floor of the Senate is being used, it seems more and more these days, to make campaign points, political points, rather than to address the fundamental issues that are affecting Americans and our economy.

I would hope we can come together to work in a constructive way on policies that will get Americans back to work, and that means doing something about these regulations which are crushing the ability of our small businesses to create jobs. We hear about it every single day.

When I travel my State of South Dakota or elsewhere around the country, I hear from businesses, the people out there trying to create jobs, about regulations, about taxes, about the cost of things, their inputs going up. Those are the issues we ought to be addressing. We ought to figure out how to reform the Tax Code, how to reduce Federal spending and reform the entitlement programs so we can save Social Security and Medicare.

We ought to look at what we can do to put in place a real all-the-above energy strategy that would help keep energy costs affordable for people out there creating jobs. In my view, those are the types of things on which we ought to be focusing.

Frankly, we have seen a lot of action and activity in the other body, in the House of Representatives, many bills they have sent to the Senate that are small business bills that would address these very issues, such as the high cost of regulations, the issue of taxation, the issue of energy independence—all these things that we believe would lead us toward a stronger economy that would get Americans back to work and offer more opportunity to young people, to our college graduates as they emerge from their programs of study this year and in years to come.

Yet we continue to have the rhetoric on the floor of the Senate suggesting that somehow Republicans are not in favor of keeping interest rates low for student loans. Think about that. It is illogical to even suggest that. However, we do have a fundamental difference of finance as to how we ought to pay for that. The other side suggests we could pay for that by raising taxes on people who create jobs.

We believe we ought to go back and take the funds out of the prevention slush fund, which in the first place was created out of dollars that were allegedly saved when the Federal Government took over the student loan program, which happened as a part of

ObamaCare. Not a lot of people realize that because it got buried in the whole debate over health care.

The student loan program, which used to be administered out of private lenders where they originated and serviced the loans, has now been taken over by the government. In doing so, savings were counted that were then used to pay for the cost of the health care bill. So all we are simply doing is saying the slush fund that was created by the funds that supposedly were saved by moving the student loan program into the government ought to be used for student loan fund programs to actually keep the funds that ought to be used to fund keeping the interest rate low, down at 3.4 percent for college students today. As I said, it seems very fitting to me, very logical, and very intuitive that would be the way we would fund this.

But to suggest for a minute that somehow Republicans in the Senate are not in favor of keeping interest rates at as low a rate as possible for our college students is completely missing the point. It is massive election-year politics, and I hope we can get away from that and focus on not only a solution in the near term with this issue but also the bigger issue.

The bigger issue is the fact that I just mentioned, that literally one-half of all college students who are coming out are either not finding jobs or are underemployed. Those who are finding jobs are making significantly less than those who graduated just a few years ago. That is an economic problem. That is a problem that needs to be addressed not by simply having a debate about student loans but what we are going to do to get this economy growing again and get American businesses creating jobs.

We need to make it less expensive and less difficult for American businesses to create jobs, not more expensive and more difficult, which is precisely what is happening as a result of the policies coming out of this administration in the form of regulations and many of the legislative initiatives that are coming out of the Congress or at least proposed to come out of the Senate.

I wish to work with my colleagues on solutions that will put Americans back to work and give our college graduates greater opportunity, greater hopes for a higher standard of living and higher quality of life, something many of us have inherited from those who came before us. These opportunities are increasingly at risk and in jeopardy because of the amount of spending and the amount of debt and the policies coming out of Washington that are making it increasingly difficult for us to come out from underneath an economy that has anemic growth and chronic high unemployment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. First, I wish to thank the Senator from South Dakota for his leadership in this area and very much agree with the comments he just made. Last week, while home in Arkansas, I had the opportunity to visit some of our State's excellent universities. While spending an afternoon at the University of Central Arkansas, I saw firsthand the innovative ways that UCA promotes undergraduate education in all areas, including science, arts, nursing, and business. For instance, the university's nursing program has entered into a partnership with a local hospital that will dramatically help address our State's growing nursing shortage.

One day later I was at the University of Arkansas-Little Rock to see its brandnew nanotechnology center. It is quite amazing. It is a state-of-the-art center that prepares students for a future in the exciting new world of nanotechnology, which in layman's terms is working with matter on an atomic and molecular scale.

Arkansas is well poised to take advantage of this exciting new world of economic opportunities and capitalize on nanotechnology breakthroughs discovered in UALR and other universities throughout the State. By pooling the brain power of academic and corporate partners throughout the State, the center's research is sure to lead to advances in the field of nanotechnology.

These innovative programs at UCA and UALR are perfect examples of how Arkansas' universities are moving forward with the future in mind. Our higher education institutions are in an elite class. We are blessed with topnotch facilities and premier educators. But that comes at a price.

The increasing mandates that Arkansas—and every State for that matter—are facing as a result of ObamaCare hurts our ability to fund our State schools. The extra burden placed on the State's Medicaid Program means much less money to spend for education. Our universities are forced to raise their tuition to cover the shortfall. Higher tuition puts the dream of college out of reach for many young Americans. This is why the Stafford student loan program is so important. Loans help students overcome obstacles they face when it comes to accessing a quality, affordable education. My three daughters attended college, so I am well aware of the financial toll tuition takes on a family's finances.

So we have to fix this issue concerning the interest rate increases before July 1. These interest rates should not be allowed to double. But the troubles facing young Americans are greater than rising interest rates for student loans.

For our graduates, it doesn't matter from where one gets one's degree if there are no jobs to be had once a person has a diploma in hand, and that is the problem with the job market our young people are graduating into today.

The reality is it is a tough time to be young. We have the lowest employment-to-population ratio for young adults since 1948. Over half of Americans under 25 who hold a bachelor's degree are unemployed or underemployed. Nearly 25 million adults live at home with their parents not out of choice but because they can't find work or earn enough to survive on their own. Any way we cut it, college graduates ready to chase the American dream have a huge roadblock awaiting them in this economy. We have to stop this trend. We have to work together.

While giving Arkansas students access to the very best education possible at an affordable rate, we must also work to ensure there is a healthy job market awaiting them upon graduation.

Earlier this week, the Senate majority brought forth its bill to extend the lower interest rate on federally subsidized Stafford college loans. I think everyone in this body agrees this needs to be done, and I am confident we will find a way to accomplish it before the deadline. But the reason the Senate majority's proposal failed is that it is the wrong approach.

Their proposal funded the extension by raising taxes on our small businesses. This idea of taxing and spending our way out of our fiscal mess is why the economy has not rebounded. Continuing down this path will only make it harder for graduates to enter the workforce.

Let's do what we all agree needs to be done and extend the low-rate loans, but let's be smart about how it is paid for. The proposal supported on this side of the aisle is identical to the version that passed the House in a bipartisan manner. It freezes the rate for 1 year by using money from an unused ObamaCare account to pay for it. This money is just sitting there, obligated for a program that is not operating, and the President already proposed cutting it in his own budget. It is likely this money will never be spent. So let's use it for a reason we all support: protecting student loans.

Student loans are supposed to increase access to college by helping millions of Americans earn a college degree. The student loan program should be a gateway to the workforce, not a barrier. Any extension of the low-rate loans paid for by tax increases is simply that—a barrier—because tax increases stifle job creation. Let's fix the problem without making our economic situation worse and get America working again.

With that, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. 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. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 2072, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012. I believe this jobs legislation will help provide U.S. exporters and workers with an important tool to compete in the global marketplace.

The Export-Import Bank is the official export credit agency of the United States, and it assists in financing the export of U.S. goods and services to international markets. Following the financial crisis, the bank experienced a dramatic increase in its activities as many companies struggled to find financing in the private market. Last year, the bank committed almost $33 billion in support of U.S. exports, a new record.

The bank has been self-funding since 2008, returning nearly $2 billion to the Treasury. In fiscal year 2011 alone, the bank generated $400 million to offset Federal spending and bring down the budget deficit. When other countries are helping their own companies with export financing, we cannot afford to unilaterally disarm in the face of this global competition.

The Export-Import Bank's charter directs it to use exports to support American jobs, and last year the Export-Import Bank supported almost 290,000 Americans jobs. These are jobs in cities and towns across the Nation, at large companies as well as small businesses. In fact, last year the Export-Import Bank financed more than $6 billion in exports by small businesses. In my home State of South Dakota, Ex-Im has worked with large and small businesses to help export goods all over the world.

Last September, there was unanimous bipartisan support when we passed a 4-year reauthorization bill out of the Banking Committee. Unfortunately, that measure was blocked on the Senate floor in March.

The legislation before us today reflects a bipartisan compromise developed in the House. While this bill is not perfect, I believe it is important to pass this legislation and ensure that the Export-Import Bank is able to continue providing financing assistance to American exporters and workers.

This is a jobs bill. Earlier this week, the House passed this bill by an overwhelming majority, 330 to 93. This bill extends the authorization of the bank until 2014. Like the Senate bill, this legislation will increase the bank's lending authority to $140 billion. This is a significant improvement over earlier drafts in the House to only increase the cap to $113 billion. Adopting the Senate's proposed lending authority limit helped to improve this bill. There are also additional provisions in the House bill similar to provisions in the Senate bill that will add transparency and accountability requirements for the bank, improve the bank's information technology infrastructure, extend the bank's Sub-Saharan African Advisory Panel, and provide for greater oversight of the bank's financing and any risks it might have to taxpayers.

I am also pleased the House included language that strengthens restrictions against companies doing business with Iran. These provisions, which reflect an earlier agreement by the House and Senate committees of jurisdiction, are vital to our efforts to increase the pressure on Iran's illicit nuclear program. I believe they are important provisions that strengthen the bill, and I am glad the House included them.

Lastly, the legislation includes the Senate's language on domestic content. This language, which is supported by labor groups, has important protections in it to ensure that goods exported by the bank continue to be made in America. Although there were efforts in the House to weaken this provision, I am pleased to see the House accepted the Senate's position on this important issue.

After multiple short-term extensions, I am relieved to see that this Congress will finally reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. I believe by reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank, we are taking an important step in supporting American businesses and workers. I commend Minority Whip HOYER and Majority Leader CANTOR in the House for coming to an agreement. I also thank Majority Leader REID for his tireless efforts in working to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank.

As chairman of the Banking Committee over the next few years, I will continue to closely monitor the efforts of the Ex-Im Bank to ensure that it is effectively and efficiently supporting American exporters and workers. Today I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. LEAHY are printed in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, 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. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN of Ohio). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PASSWORD PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, privacy is a fundamentally and almost uniquely American value. It is the reason the Colonies rebelled—one of the major reasons they rebelled—against the British. The invasion of our homes by British soldiers without court approval, the lodging of those soldiers in our homes without permission—the invasion of the fundamental rights of privacy was one of the basic reasons this Nation sought independence from the British. So throughout our history, privacy has been a value, a fundamental right affirmed again and again in our courts, enshrined in our Constitution and ingrained in our way of life.

That is the reason so many of us were offended and regarded as reprehensible and repugnant a practice that was revealed recently—a practice involving employers coercing and compelling the disclosure of log-in information, user names, and passwords to private accounts and private systems by job applicants. And the same kind of coercion and compulsion applied to current or existing employees as a condition of their continuing in their jobs. That kind of practice is abhorrent, and it is the reason that yesterday I, along with a number of my colleagues from both this body and others from the House of Representatives, introduced the Password Protection Act of 2012.

These practices are unacceptable for a number of reasons. An employer has plenty of ways other than accessing private accounts—Gmail, storage data, and accounts on Facebook or other social networking sites—to obtain information that is relevant to employer needs and interests in offering a position to someone. There are other means that are adequate and acceptable. What is not acceptable is coercing and compelling access to an applicant's e-mail account, which could contain all kinds of personal information that is inappropriate and unnecessary for an employer to know, information that is irrelevant, in fact, to the terms and duties of a person's employment.

Second, the disclosure itself endangers the security of that applicant's personal data as well as the Web sites themselves. Too many careless companies too often have lost customer data or employee information, allowing it to be breached through poor security practices. That is the reason I have proposed a measure that would require safeguards of that data—a separate measure that is before this Chamber now—to ensure adequate remedies when there are breaches and to require systems in place by employers to guard that information. An applicant who takes care to use encrypted networks or other personal safeguards may find his or her personal information—financial data, medical information—breached through no fault of his or her own simply because the company fails to take adequate steps to safeguard it.

There is another reason these practices are abhorrent; that is, identity theft by the employer itself—a continuing danger. That kind of potential danger is a real one that certainly raises this interest very squarely.

But maybe as important as any of these other interests is the danger of compromising the security of third parties—loved ones, family, friends—who have entrusted the person who is

applying for a job or who is employed by a company that breaches its responsibility by demanding this information. When an employer logs in to an employee's personal account, he sees that employee's e-mails with his or her spouse or Facebook pictures of siblings and children. Those parties are completely unaware that one of their friends' or family members' employers may be reading their correspondence or looking at their pictures. Imagine a daughter who tells her mother of a pregnancy, a son who acknowledges an addiction to a parent, a father who speaks of his wife's illness in confidence to his children. Each has an expectation of privacy that is betrayed and violated when an employer demands log-in information, user names, or passwords from a job applicant or a current employee. The impact is not only on that employee or job applicant but on innocent loved ones—friends, family—whose confidential information, e-mails, and other data may be exposed.

Of course, when information is exposed in this way, there is the danger of discrimination based on marital status, sex, gender, and other kinds of prohibited categories. So barring the compelled disclosure of this information actually is an aid to the employer because it ensures that none of these hiring or firing decisions is based on a prohibited category or discrimination.

The Password Protection Act addresses all these concerns and prohibits employers from forcing prospective or current employees to hand over personal, private financial information that has no place in the hiring process. The bill prohibits an employer from compelling or coercing an employee or prospective employee to provide access to a private system as a condition of employment. This means an employer cannot compel a prospective or current employee to provide his Gmail password, and an employer cannot force an employee or prospective employee to log on to a password-protected account so the employer may browse the account's content.

The Password Protection Act also very importantly prohibits retaliation, which is a danger with current employees. That retaliation could take all kinds of forms, but the demand for log-in information, user names, or passwords certainly creates a kind of presumption that the refusal to do so prompts action that can be regarded as retaliation. An employer who violates these legally required duties is subject to a penalty of $10,000 per violation.

This act will protect employees from unreasonable invasions of their privacy—unreasonable invasions that have no commonsense basis—and it prevents unintended consequences. It doesn't prohibit social networking within the office on a voluntary basis, it does not bar employers from conducting valid investigations of misconduct, it does not prevent an employer from controlling the company's own system—its own Facebook account, for example—and it provides that States may exempt certain categories of employees, such as individuals who deal with children who are under 13 years of age or Federal employees who may have access to classified or secure national security information. The bill also provides for reasonable exemptions that State law may make for State employees who are involved, for example, in law enforcement or corrections.

Like so many in this body, I have heard from countless Connecticut citizens who are not only offended but outraged by these practices reported in the press. Fortunately, many employers have shown they get it, they understand this deeply held value, and they have rejected these possible practices. Many who might have been contemplating engaging in them have likewise retreated and reversed their decisions. So merely shining a light, pointing the spotlight, and raising the issue has brought many employers to understand the commonsense force of objections to these practices.

I wish to thank grassroots groups, such as the 57,000 citizens at Bold Progressives, who signed a petition at ProtectOurPasswords.org to let Washington know—57,000 of them strong—they reject the idea that their employers will force them to hand over this personal, private information. I thank the activists at Access Now, who are similarly generating a groundswell of support for this initiative and working to protect employees' rights on the job. I also wish to thank companies such as Facebook, Twitter, Microsoft, and Google, which have cooperated and support this effort because they have an interest in preventing invasions of privacy, demands for information that are unnecessary, repugnant, reprehensible, and unacceptable. I thank all of them for working with us on this legislation.

Finally, I thank Senators SCHUMER, KLOBUCHAR, SHAHEEN, WYDEN, SANDERS, and AKAKA, as well as Representatives HEINRICH and PERLMUTTER on the other side of this body, for working with me in introducing this bill. I am hopeful the Congress will consider it promptly and successfully because I think it sets a marker and provides a milestone in protecting individual privacy against abhorrent invasions in the workplace and elsewhere that have no place in American life.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Rhode Island.

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, unless we act quickly, students across the country will face the largest increase of subsidized student loan interest rates in more than 40 years. In the last 40 years, the interest rates on subsidized student loans have never doubled from one year to the next. Yet that is what is happening unless we act before July 1—just 52 days from now.

Unless my colleagues on the other side of the aisle relent and allow legislation to fix this problem to come to a vote, we will see a doubling of the student loan interest rate from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent for all borrowing going forward for education in the United States related to the subsidized Stafford loan program. I know the Presiding Officer of the Senate, Senator BROWN of Ohio, has been taking an active leadership role on this front, along with Senator HARKIN, to ensure we can move effectively to prevent this doubling of the interest rate.

We are now in a time where, if you look across the financial industry, borrowing rates are at historical lows. We are essentially providing banks, through the Federal Reserve, with near zero percent interest loans. So it is incomprehensible that at this time, we would actually double the loan rates we would charge students who are going to college. Students and families cannot absorb these increases. It is a tough economy, and they are facing rising tuition and dwindling State support for higher education, making it more difficult and more complicated. To add to their burden by doubling this loan rate is bad public policy.

This will not only directly affect middle-income Americans, but in the longer run, it will affect the competitiveness, the productivity, and the success of our economy in a very competitive global economy.

We have to ensure also that we are not piling more and more debt on students. We have reached a point where student debt is becoming so extraordinarily difficult to bear that it inhibits people from going to school and it inhibits them from pursuing various professions after they graduate from college. If we add to this mountain of debt, we will create a huge financial problem going forward not just for the individual borrowers, the student borrowers, but for our economy.

According to Georgetown University's Center on Education and the Workforce, over 60 percent of jobs going forward will require some post-secondary education by 2018.

That underscores the essential need to go to college. In 2010, only 38.3 percent of working-age adults had a 2-year or 4-year degree. So we are looking at a gap of the prepared individuals with a college education versus those jobs in the not-too-distant future that will require a college education. In order to fill that gap, we have to get more and more young people into school, into higher education and beyond, and by doubling the rate we will not be achieving that goal and that objective.

That is why I introduced the Student Loan Affordability Act in January to permanently keep the interest rate low, and that is why I was joined by Senator BROWN of Ohio and Senator HARKIN and many others, to step up and to make it quite clear that we cannot afford—for our country's sake and for the sake of many working-class

families across the country—to double this rate.

We should be debating today the Stop the Student Loan Interest Rate Hike Act. This is a fully paid-for 1-year extension of the current rate, to extend it for a year so we can look for a more permanent fix. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle insist they agree that we have to do this, yet they continue to filibuster this legislation. They continue to prevent us from bringing it to a vote. It is clear they have an alternative view in terms of how we pay for it. Well, let's put that to a vote, but let's not stop dead in its tracks a policy that both sides claim has to be fixed and that we have to avoid the doubling of this interest rate.

What we have done is propose to fix this problem and pay for it in a fiscally responsible manner by closing a glaring, egregious loophole in the Tax Code that enables certain wealthy individuals to shirk their responsibility to pay payroll taxes. This loophole predominantly benefits professional service providers such as accountants, lobbyists, and lawyers who derive all of their income from their professional labor. But because they choose to mischaracterize their income as a distribution from a subchapter S corporation instead of wages, they avoid paying payroll taxes.

In 2005, the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration issued an audit report calling for action on this loophole which was described as a ''multibillion dollar tax shelter.''

The report also described a disturbing trend of businesses changing their status to the subchapter S corporation for the purpose of avoiding payroll taxes—not for the purposes of expanding employment, not for the purposes of a new or more efficient way to use capital, but essentially a tax dodge to avoid payroll taxes.

The inspector general reported:

> In fact, advising small businesses to shelter earnings from self-employment taxes through the formation of S corporations has become a cottage industry. A search of the Internet yields multiple sites that offer advice, assistance, and encouragement to sole proprietors to convince them to become S corporations. The sole proprietors are advised that they can save thousands of dollars a year in employment taxes simply by incorporating. It is also possible on the Internet to gauge the size of the savings using computer-generated savings amounts based on the user's entries for anticipated profits and chosen salary levels. Not surprisingly, the lower the salary chosen, the higher the savings become, reaching maximum savings at a salary level of $0.

Essentially what is being done in these professional corporations—or at least professional partnerships, these professional associations—is that they have glommed onto a very clever tax shelter. You incorporate as a subchapter S; you have your employer pay the subchapter S corporation; that subchapter S corporation pays you a modest minimal salary, and the rest is dividends taxed at a different rate and not subject to the payroll tax. We are trying to close the tax loophole. Following the indications of the inspector general, a simple Internet search confirms this finding.

For example, one Web site has a section entitled ''How to Reduce Your FICA Taxes If You Own an S-Corporation.'' That section provides a step-by-step instruction on how to use this loophole and even provides advice on how to avoid being caught up in an audit. The Web site advises owners of S corporations to pay themselves the lowest possible salary to reduce their FICA taxes—even if the distributions they take are a product of their labor.

Here is how the Web site explains how to take advantage of this loophole: It explains that as an employee of your S corporation, your salary is subject to Social Security and Medicare taxes, but the net profit of the S corporation is not subject to payroll taxes. The Web site goes on to explain:

> . . . the idea is to pay yourself the lowest possible salary to minimize social security and Medicare taxes. Then you take the remaining net profit as a distribution, which is not subject to payroll tax.

This is a loophole we are trying to fix. This loophole should be fixed regardless of how we use the proceeds; but, frankly, we have a situation now where we have a pressing need to help families across this country avoid a doubling of the interest rate on student loans, and we have an egregious loophole that will allow us to responsibly pay for the maintenance of the lower interest rates. This seems to be an issue where public policy is well balanced.

We are told by our colleagues they agree with us you can't double the interest rate. They should also agree with us you can't continue to tolerate this loophole; and this is not only an appropriate way, but, indeed, it seems to me the best way to achieve our objective of preventing the increase to doubling of the student interest rate.

We are working very hard to try to get this bill up for a vote. If there are other proposals with respect to tax loopholes or the ways in which we can pay for this other than the proposal the House has suggested—which is go into the prevention funds for health care reform, which to me is adding to and compounding not only our fiscal problems but also going forward to our health care problems we are open to discussing them.

We are right now recognizing that unless we aggressively have prevention programs, our health care costs will explode going forward. Every day, people talk about the increasing cost of obesity in this society. Well, how do you get essentially a handle on that? You have to have resources for prevention, for counseling, for education, for nutritional programs. When we take those funds away, we run up the bill for health care. That bill ultimately is being paid, in many cases, by the same families who are struggling to find a way to send their children to college.

I urge all of my colleagues to move to get this bill on the floor. If we want to debate about different methods about payment, that is fine; let's take votes, and let's move on to passage.

I think we understand that time is running out. On July 1, the interest rate will double. We have seen progress going back a few months. Our colleagues on the other side were proposing budgets that recognized—indeed, supported—the doubling of this interest rate. In March and throughout the spring, they were assuming and they were supporting measures to double the interest rate. The good news now is they have said, no, you can't do that, we have got to keep the rate at 3.4 percent at least for the next year.

We are one step closer to a solution, but the final step is going to have to be responsibly paying for this proposal. And we have—Senator BROWN, Senator HARKIN, myself, Senator HARRY REID, and so many others—not only a responsible way to pay for it, but we have underscored and highlighted what is an egregious loophole, a tax shelter, a very clever ploy to avoid paying taxes on your wages through the mechanism of a subchapter S corporation magically converting them into dividends.

I think we can accomplish two important public policy goals in this legislation: keeping interest rates on student loans at the current level, helping families send their children to school; and closing a glaring loophole for tax dodgers in our tax system.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, I want to join Senator REED of Rhode Island, who just spoke very persuasively about the need to freeze interest rates for Stafford loans for college students in America. He also spoke, I thought very convincingly, about closing a tax loophole that has clearly been used to avoid—legally—taxes by lobbyists, consulting groups, lawyers—all of whom are using this tax loophole to the tune of tens of thousands of dollars, in many cases. The case of former Senator John Edwards and his law firm—not like most law firms but in his law firm—and former Speaker Newt Gingrich, one a Democrat and one a Republican, have shown the size of this loophole and how it can turn into tens of thousands of dollars. I am not accusing either of these gentlemen of doing anything illegally—

only taking advantage of a loophole we should close.

I come to the floor to make the case how important these subsidized Stafford loans are to college students. In my State of Ohio—as in the State of the Presiding Officer, the State of North Carolina—we have hundreds of thousands of students using these Stafford subsidized loans; in Ohio, some 380,000; in North Carolina I assume it is not too far off that. Students have enjoyed, if that is the right word, 3.4 percent interest rates on their loans rather than something higher.

What is discouraging is that this was a bipartisan effort. In 2007, the year I came to the Senate, President Bush and Democrats, the majority in both Houses, joining with many of my Republican colleagues in this body and the House of Representatives, locked in the subsidized Stafford student loan rate of 3.4 percent for 5 years from 2007 until this July. That expires in July. It was bipartisan then; it should be bipartisan now. But a couple days ago the Republicans filibustered. I am hopeful today or whenever this next vote is taken they will not.

I am going to, for 3 or 4 minutes, read a small number of letters, stories I have gotten from students in my State of Ohio who have come to my Web site and told us their stories. I urge people in Ohio to come to this Web site, brown.senate.gov/collegeloanstories. Just tell us your story.

I am not so cynical, but I think when my colleagues start listening to people at home, listening to students—I was at Wright State College near Dayton the other day and the University of Cincinnati and Cuyahoga in Cleveland. I met with students and I listened to their stories. Several of them stood and talked about what these student loans mean. Already, the average student who graduates from an Ohio 4-year university graduates with debt of about $27,000. That means it is much harder for them to start a family, to buy a car, to buy a home, to start a business. That is why it is so important not to heap more burdens on them, put more debt on them.

I will close by reading three letters. Cody from Delphos, OH, northwest Ohio:

> I graduated high school with the goal in mind to get my doctorate in pharmacy. After five years of hard work I am 9 months of practice rotations away from achieving my goal.
>
> Along with that achievement comes a paralyzing amount of college debt from attending a private university.
>
> In addition, I have hopes of doing an additional two years of residencies after I graduate to specialize in critical care/trauma, but since residencies pay less than half of a pharmacists salary I may not be able to go further and reach my goal of becoming a clinical pharmacist specialized in critical care/trauma.
>
> Help me reach my goals by keeping interest rates low and helping create affordable means by which those from low income families can attend college without have to accumulate the debt I have had to.
>
> Allow youth to reach their full potential and be able to serve society in their best capacity by finding a solution to the rising cost of an education.

Nonya from Wooster, OH, east of where I grew up in Mansfield, about 30 miles away, writes:

> Going to College changed my life and my whole families lives. The only reason I even considered going to college was because my mom did. The only reason she was able to go was student loans. And because my oldest daughter saw my mom and I doing it she is now attending college.
>
> My family had a rough beginning, my mother and I both survived sexual abuse and the disease of addiction before finding a solution. School has been our way out. My mother now has a bachelors and is working as a licensed social worker. I am on my way to a bachelors as well.
>
> How could I in good conscience say to my daughter ''go to college'' if I know she'll never be able to pay off her loans. I have never had a job as long as I have had the one I have today.
>
> I am a student assistant at Wayne College and if it weren't for the availability of school loans I would have never stepped foot in the building that is now the center of my world and my daughters.
>
> We go to school to make a better life for ourselves . . . .

Rebecca from Lorain, where I lived for many years, near Lake Erie:

> When I matriculated at Lawrence University, a private liberal arts college in Appleton, Wisconsin, my family could not afford to contribute more than a few hundred dollars a year to my tuition, fees, and other expenses. I was Pell grant eligible. I took out Stafford loans. I also took out a private loan from my parents' credit union and committed to the full number of hours of federal work-study that I was eligible for. Even as a college freshman, I was deeply aware that the Pell grant, Stafford loans, and federal work-study programs were giving me access to an excellent education that otherwise would have been beyond my reach.
>
> I worked hard in my classes, graduating Phi Beta Kappa and summa cum laude in two majors: Chemistry and English. I worked hard in my co-curricular activities, editing the college literary magazine and serving as president of the campus feminist organization. I also worked hard in my on-campus jobs: grading papers for the French department, tutoring in the Writing Center, mixing reagents in the Chemistry stockroom, and washing dishes in the student union diner.
>
> With the outstanding education I had obtained—and a manageable amount of student loan debt to repay—I chose to go to graduate school in Chemistry. I earned a Ph.D. from Stanford University in 2003 and am now a tenured professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry at Oberlin College in Oberlin, OH. I teach bright young people who are interested in making the world a better place. I also conduct research on ovarian cancer detection that has been funded by the NIH. This is my dream job, and it began with the access to an excellent education.
>
> It breaks my heart to think that if I were a high school senior today, I might not have the same opportunities to achieve. The Stafford loans, Pell grant, and federal work-study programs helped me become the educated person I am today.

These three letters were not different from the others. I just picked the top three my staff gave me from stories we have gotten because of our Web site. I will repeat the Web site: brown.senate.gov/collegeloanstories.

This tells us about work ethic. It tells about opportunity.

I will illustrate it in one other way. I cannot do it as well as Nonya and Rebecca and Cody did, but we all remember, if we paid attention to our history, in the forties and fifties, the GI bill gave literally millions of young American men and women returning from serving their country the opportunity to go to school. What the GI bill did was help millions of individual Americans, one at a time. But what that did collectively is it raised all boats. It created a huge amount of prosperity for our country because all these people went to college.

A lot of these people bought homes. Colleges were growing and expanding, creating more jobs. These people started businesses. These people were productive workers. These people invented things because they had the education, from going to college.

With these Stafford loans, it is not just helping Cody and Rebecca and Nonya and students today, it is helping all of us as a society, whether one goes to college or not. Some people don't want to go to college. Fine. We have career centers and trade schools and community colleges to learn welding, to learn carpentry, to learn how to be a health care worker, to learn rad tech, whatever people want to do, or go to a 4-year college. Give them the opportunity because we don't just help millions of Americans or millions of individual young people, we help society as a whole when we do this.

I pray and beg my colleagues, please pass this, keep student loan rates manageable, interest rates manageable so we can have more Rebeccas and Nonyas and Codys in our country. We will all benefit.

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. BENNET. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, during the worst recession since the Great Depression, which we are now fortunately coming out of, the highest the unemployment rate we ever got, even at the depths of that recession, for people with a college degree was 4.5 percent. We saw unemployment rates of 18 percent, 20 percent for certain groups of people—4.5 percent if one is a college graduate. It seems to me, first of all, that is an incredible stress test of the value of a college degree in this 21st century in which we are living. We ought to be making it easier, not harder, for students to go to college. However, as we know, interest rates on Federal student loans are scheduled to double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent on July 1, unless Congress can get out of its own way and do what is right. For the life of me, I don't know why we

cannot come to an agreement. This is not a Democratic or Republican issue.

The cost of college has increased 550 percent since 1985. Two-thirds of students in this country rely on loans to afford college. In the past decade, average student loan debt has increased by more than 25 percent.

This, by the way, is not a function of people not doing the right thing. It is a function of the fact that median family income has continued to decline in this country for the first time in this country's history, while the cost of college has escalated like crazy. If this increase goes through, it would add thousands of dollars of debt to the more than 166,000 Coloradans who currently receive Federal student loans. Increasing the cost of loans for students already struggling to repay their loans harms both individual students and our fragile economy.

When I visited the University of Colorado at Denver just last month, I heard firsthand from students about how important low-interest rates are to that ability to afford college. Many of the students I heard from were worried their student loan debt would prevent them from achieving their career goals or buying a house or making other decisions they are confronting. In Colorado, the average student graduates with more than $23,500 in debt. Just in the last hour, Jeremiah shared the following story with me on Facebook. This is less than an hour ago. He wrote:

> I am studying geography and environmental science with an emphasis on urban studies and planning at the University of Colorado, Denver. I am the first of my family to attend college and 100 percent of my schooling is paid for by grants and student loans. I worry about the interest rate hike that is bound to happen this summer, and with the economy not in full recovery I worry even more about securing a job after graduation and how to afford repayment of my loans, especially if interest rates are to increase.

As the Presiding Officer probably knows, in her State and my State, college attendance is actually at a record high because there are young people all over this country—certainly in my State—who have sought refuge on our university campuses from an economy that doesn't have jobs for them—which is a great place for them to be. It is a great investment in them and a great investment in our future. But for Jeremiah and thousands of others, millions of other students just like them, we are threatening, through our inaction, to actually drive up the cost of college when that is where they need to be. That is the reason why, in the last 2 weeks, more than 1,300 Coloradans have written to my office to demand Congress act to prevent the student loan interest rate from doubling.

Here is one letter I received from Kim Haas, who is from Granby, CO. She wrote:

> While I try to keep informed, I don't generally make a point to contact my representatives. On the issue of student loan rates doubling, I had to speak up.
>
> My husband and I live in rural Colorado. I have been working toward becoming a professional counselor. Because of our remote location, I have done most of this online while staying home with my son. This takes a lot of self-motivation and time management skills. It also means taking on a lot of debt. Please take the actions necessary to prevent my rates from doubling. It is imperative to our financial, vocational, and life success.

Her life success. I suspect that most of these students are not all that interested in what party affiliation they are in. I think if they were here on this floor, which is empty today, they could use some Colorado common sense to actually get this done. In the Senate and in Washington today we are facing a filibuster even though we know in the end we are going to find a way to do what is right and keep these interest rates from rising.

Also, our Facebook page is continually updated. This is from Phil Townsend who wrote in—and I thought this was a pressing question about what we are focused on today.

Here is how Phil put it:

> If you had a loan that would take you a decade to pay off even if you lived as cheap as possible and only ate ramen noodles, would you want its rates doubled?

This is real life for the people we represent, and we should get this sorted out.

Once again, I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to come together and give our students all across the country the security they need to pursue their education. For them this isn't a game. For the people who came to the University of Colorado at Denver a month ago and shared their thoughts with me, this isn't a game. This is real life. It is their lives. It is their futures. They are relying on us to sort this out and get it done, and we should.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I want to take the opportunity to discuss the importance of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank. Last month while in Colorado I had an opportunity to visit innovative businesses such as Coolerado, which creates energy-efficient air conditioners, Sandhill Scientific, which manufactures medical devices, and Leitner-Poma, which builds gondolas for ski resorts. They are building the gondola that is being installed in Vail this year to mark Vail's 50th anniversary. It was fun to see those American jobs being created for that great American industry.

All of these companies rely on financing options from the Export-Import Bank to help them compete in the international marketplace. In fact, while visiting Coolerado, I actually saw an 18-wheel truck back up to the loading dock at Coolerado to load a bunch of their devices to be shipped to Europe as a consequence of the work they had done with the Ex-Im Bank.

These are manufacturing jobs right here in the United States, stamped ''Made in America'' on the outside of these devices, and we have been unable to get this through the Senate. Coolerado used credit insurance from the Export-Import Bank to help enter the international market.

As we emerge from the worst recession since the Great Depression, we should look for more opportunities to support the next Coolerado, Sandhill Scientific, or Leitner-Poma. Instead, we have been in this prolonged debate about the very existence of the bank, and now we are weeks away from the expiration of the bank's charter.

I am quite sure there is not a single one of our international competitors around the world that is engaged in this debate. In fact, they are engaged in absolutely the reverse, which is the question of how to create more exports for their domestic industries, and we should be doing the same.

As we look to strengthen and to reverse that curve I talked about earlier of median family income falling and to see rising wages again in this country and create more jobs, we should be looking for opportunities to increase exports at small businesses like the ones I saw in Colorado.

We face a profound structural issue in the economy today in this country. As I said on the Senate floor before, our gross domestic product is now higher than it was before we went into this recession, and productivity has been going off like a skyrocket since the early 1990s. As we responded to competition from China and India, the use of technology to make businesses more efficient and the recession itself drove productivity through the roof because firms had to figure out how to get through these difficult times with fewer people.

Median family income has fallen, and we have 23 or 24 million people in this economy who are either unemployed or underemployed. Wage growth and job growth—for the first time in the country's history—has decoupled from GDP growth. That happened during our last recovery under the previous administration. I make this statement not as a partisan observation; that is just the time that it happened. We saw economic growth, but we didn't see wage growth and we didn't see job growth. Now I fear we are seeing the same sort of trend in our economy.

There are two important solutions. One I mentioned earlier, which is that education is vitally important because if people are educated, they are more likely to get a job in this 21st-century economy. Remember, the worst that the unemployment rate ever got for people with a college degree was 4.5 percent.

The other part of that equation is innovation. It is businesses that start tomorrow, next week, and the week after that are actually going to create jobs that are going to lift wages. This is one of the reasons I have been so glad to work with the Presiding Officer as we think of new ways of approaching regulations at the FDA to ask the question: Are we driving bioscience in the United

States or are we driving venture capital offshore to look for other opportunities? We should be up day and night thinking about this in the Senate because that is how we are going to bring an alignment back between the economic growth the economists tell us we are having and the job growth and the wage growth the people at home want to see.

There is a lot of talk in this Chamber about winners and losers and how the government shouldn't pick winners and losers—we hear that a lot here—as if the current Tax Code isn't full of choices that have already been made about winners and losers. A lot of those choices that have been made have been made for the benefit of incumbents—not here but incumbent enterprises. However, it is the innovators that we are leaving behind.

As we think about comprehensive tax reform, which I hope we get to sooner rather than later, I think on every one of these questions we should be asking ourselves: Is this credit or is this incentive or is this inducement more or less likely to drive job growth in the United States, to drive incomes up in the United States, or to drive exports from the United States? If the answer to that is no, we should stop doing it. This has to be more thoughtful than a fight between one narrow interest and another narrow interest. I think the American people are demanding that, and we should respond.

In the short term, the work in front of us now is to get this Export-Import Bank bill to the floor, to get it voted on, and to pass it as they did in the House of Representatives yesterday.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I know we are on the motion to proceed to legislation dealing with the Ex-Im Bank. I rise today to urge my colleagues to proceed to this bill and to move forward and pass H.R. 2072, which would reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. We have a lot of debate on this floor on how we can grow our economy and grow jobs. One of the areas where there is agreement is that if America is going to be truly competitive in the 21st century, we have got to grow our export market.

Many American companies over the 20th century were blessed with the world's largest, most vibrant domestic market. But that market is maturing. On a going-forward basis, literally 95 percent of all the world's customer base lies outside the boundaries of the United States. So while maybe some of my colleagues may disagree with many of the President's goals, I think we would all agree that doubling of exports in a 5-year timeframe the President laid out at the beginning of his administration is an area where there is great agreement.

If we are going to do that, we have to use all the tools we have available because, unfortunately, right now American exports as a percentage of GDP rank behind Germany, Canada, China, Italy, France, the UK, India, Brazil. We are way down in the middle of the pack. As the Chair of the Banking Committee's International Trade and Financing Subcommittee, I have spent a lot of time and effort trying to get into the details to see how we can make the Export-Import Bank one of the tools we have to help American businesses grow their exports, grow that percentage of GDP that depends upon trade, grow that ability to reach that 95 percent of the customer base around the world, and to make sure that this tool, which has been a successful tool for close to 45 years, gets reauthorized but also is reauthorized in a way that brings more transparency and more accountability to this institution.

The bill we will have before us, hopefully later today, does that, because if we fail to act, the authorization for the Export-Import Bank expires at the end of this month, and this tool that is so important to growing exports, growing jobs, candidly will be lost.

The bill we will take up, hopefully later today or shortly, reauthorizes the Export-Import Bank for 3 years. While I would have preferred a longer extension and a higher limit, higher absolute total loan limit, I am glad the bill we will deal with increases the bank's lending limit from $100 billion to $140 billion.

Remember, our Export-Import Bank is so much smaller than any of our competitors'. Even taking the lending cap up to $140 billion will still mean we will pale in comparison to our competitors. These other nations are who we are competing with. I think it is important that we compare how our Export-Import Bank—which again in this last year made a profit, returned money to the taxpayers, and has been profitable year in and year out—how our institution compares with those of our competitors: Canada, our largest trading partner, the Canada that has a population size about one-tenth—actually smaller than one-tenth the size of the United States—has their equivalent Export-Import Bank three times the size of our Export-Import Bank.

Every day our Export-Import Bank and the American companies it supports face aggressive competition, as I mentioned, from China, Brazil, India, which all have very large export financing banks in their own right. In 2010 alone China did $45 billion in lending, two-thirds of that to a single company, lending that was supported by their exporting financing operations, while our domestic Export-Import Bank did just $13 billion in total. So China, close to over 3 times, supporting their institutions, one of our largest competitors, versus our support for our American industry at one-third the size.

That same year, Brazil, a country much smaller than ours, provided $18 billion in export finance; Germany, more than $22 billion; France, more than $17 billion; all much more than what we do. Each of them only has, as I mentioned, in total about one-fifth of our population.

So why would we, if we all agree that growing trade, growing exports, trying to access that 95 percent of the customer base that would then support American companies that are going to hire American workers, why would we unilaterally disarm and remove this tool from our toolbox as some in this Chamber have suggested?

Ironically, because in our country, we do not provide, I believe, adequate export financing, many American companies have gone to foreign export agencies, the result being if they get that foreign export support, oftentimes the price of that foreign export support means that subcontractors to those American companies then have to come from those respective countries, whether it is Canada, Brazil, India, et cetera, again costing American jobs.

I think this is a commonsense tool. It is a tool that has had a solid track record. It is a tool that has never cost the American taxpayers a dime. It is one that needs our immediate attention. Again, I hope we will get a large, overwhelming bipartisan majority of Senators who will reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, will reauthorize it at this $140 billion level, will reauthorize it with the new transparency provisions that I was proud to add to this legislation, will reauthorize it with some of the new requirements in which the Export-Import Bank puts together a more comprehensive business plan, all additions that I worked on with my colleagues and added to this legislation.

That is, again, one more example where we can demonstrate to the American people we can come and work together, trying to spur that kind of job growth and export growth we are all looking for.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. McCASKILL.) The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. I ask that I be allowed to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORALITY OF FREE ENTERPRISE: CHARITABLE GIVING

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I have been coming to the floor to discuss why

free enterprise is morally superior to all other economic systems. I have explored how free enterprise promotes the pursuit of happiness properly understood, by emphasizing earned success, and how it lifts up the poor by raising living standards.

Today, I want to look at another way free enterprise lifts up the poor—by promoting the moral principles that make people more charitable and more socially responsible.

This perspective sharply contrasts with President Obama's campaign narrative about social responsibility. He and many of his supporters paint free enterprise as a system that inherently clashes with social responsibility. In his telling, free enterprise is a system that mainly promotes Gordon Gekko-style ''greed'' and riches for those who least deserve them—a system that must be reformed through higher taxes and larger government.

Most of the policies he has supported during the last 3 years demonstrate this perspective. The size and scope of the Federal Government has increased dramatically during his presidency. As he campaigns to get reelected, his main theme is that the only way some Americans can do better is if the government makes others worse off.

There is an important counterargument to this negative narrative. In a new book, The Road to Freedom, American Enterprise Institute President Arthur Brooks provides a comprehensive explanation of the morality of free enterprise and how it makes everyone better off by creating a more positive society. As Brooks writes, the principles that underpin free enterprise are moral principles, such as honesty, industriousness, thrift, and opportunity. Those principles make people more virtuous, not less.

Participants in free enterprise, for example, must be able to trust that those with whom they do business—that they will honor their contracts. By promoting greater trust and integrity, free markets promote the social and psychological linchpin of democratic prosperity.

Brooks elaborates:

> The free enterprise system requires a culture of optimism and trust to function correctly—a positive sum, win-win mentality, and a desire for everyone to be better off. For many people, it produces more prosperity than they need to meet their daily requirements, a surplus that they will choose to direct to charitable purposes.

The prosperity and positive outlook that stem from free enterprise encourages people to help the neediest and most vulnerable members of society. Indeed, it is no coincidence that the United States is a more charitable country than those with bigger welfare states. Those who believe in and have benefited from the free-enterprise system believe that everyone should have the opportunity to prosper, and they are willing to help take responsibility for lifting others up. ''Charitable giving appears to be part of most Americans' DNA,'' Brooks writes.

Americans are remarkably generous not only toward our fellow citizens, but also toward those suffering abroad. On a per capita basis, we give 3½ times as much to causes and charities as the French, 7 times as much as Germans, and 14 times as much as Italians. These findings correlate to volunteering as well.

Seventy to eighty percent of Americans donate money to charity each year. These donations add up to about $300 billion annually. The money goes to religious causes and also secular activities, such as education, health care, and social welfare. Americans also donate large amounts of their time to help the less fortunate.

Indeed, there is a strong correlation between beliefs about the size of government and attitudes toward giving. As Brooks shows, those who believe in limited government give more to charity than those who hold more statist views. That makes sense. After all, a statist might argue that paying high levels of taxation is the equivalent of giving a lot to charity, since the government spends a large portion of its total revenue on social programs. By contrast, free-marketers would argue that government spending tends to crowd out private charity in ways that are both socially and fiscally harmful.

Americans can take well-justified pride in their charitable giving. Both in aggregate and relative terms, we are the most generous society the world has ever known.

As budget and tax debates move forward, we must remember that raising the top marginal tax rates could conceivably reduce charitable giving, because the biggest philanthropists would have less money to donate. This is just one of the many unintended—and undesirable—consequences that could result from the massive tax hike scheduled to take effect at the end of this year. If excessively high rates of taxation were the best way to cultivate a more generous and socially conscious citizenry, then Europeans would give more to charity than Americans. But that is simply not the case.

America's record on charitable giving demonstrates that free enterprise is the best way to boost charitable giving and foster the civic virtues that underpin a broadly shared prosperity.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. 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. PAUL. Mr. President, the ordinary middle-class family is struggling to get a home loan. Tens of thousands of homeowners have lost their homes or are struggling to make payments on their home loans.

Meanwhile, Congress steadily dishes out billions of dollars in taxpayer-subsidized loans to large profitable companies. Eighty percent of these export-import loans are given to companies that are in the Fortune 500. So we are giving taxpayer loans to very profitable companies.

I am a great believer in capitalism, in the jobs corporations create. I defend profit and the benefits that accrue from leaving that profit largely in the private sector. I am not one who clamors for punitive taxes. I am not someone who thinks we need to punish corporations. But at the same time, I do not want my colleagues to construe that to mean I believe we should be subsidizing profitable corporations. I don't think taxpayer-subsidized loans should go to profitable companies.

President Obama has been passing out loans to his campaign donors. He has been using a campaign trough that he has set up over at the Department of Energy. Very wealthy multimillionaires and billionaires are getting loans through the Department of Energy, including Solyndra and BrightSource. People heavily involved in the President's campaign have been getting subsidized loans.

Republicans have been rightly criticizing the President for these Department of Energy loans to Solyndra, BrightSource, and others. Republicans have been correct in criticizing the President for trying to pick the winners and losers in energy production. Yet now a majority of Republicans are poised to vote for their own set of subsidized export-import loans. In fact, they want to increase the export-import loans by nearly 50 percent and pick the winners and losers in the export business. The Horse traders may disdain consistency, but the American people value principled and consistent opposition to deficit spending. The American people know hypocrisy when they see it. The American people know corporate welfare when they see it.

The Export-Import Bank, in fact, provided an $18 million loan to a steel mill in China. Our steel industry has been in decline for decades and we loan $18 million to our competitors? Who in their right mind would subsidize our Chinese competitors with loans? It makes no sense. Can we think of anything more insulting than loaning money to our competitors? Come to think of it, I might. We actually give foreign aid to China. We actually send China economic development assistance. Is it any wonder Congress has an 11-percent approval rating?

Many Americans are trying to hang on to their homes, struggling to make the payments on their own home mortgage, while very profitable big business is being given subsidized loans by the government. It makes no sense. What gives?

To add insult to injury, we are borrowing money from the same countries we are lending the money to. So we borrow money from India because we

run a deficit of over $1 trillion a year—we borrow money from India—and then we are sending it back to them in the form of taxpayer-subsidized loans. It makes no sense.

Ex-Im loans, such as the loans to Solyndra and BrightSource, are simply forms of crony capitalism. With trillion-dollar annual deficits, surely we can vote to end corporate welfare. If companies are making billions of dollars in profits, can we at least end the welfare we are sending to these corporations?

I urge a vote against reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank, and I hope my Republican colleagues will see the inconsistency of criticizing the President on one hand for his crony capitalism and then turning around and doing the same thing.

I support not reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank, admitting it is corporate welfare, and trying to save the taxpayers some of their hard-earned money.

Thank you very much, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WEST ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Western Economic Security Today Act, the WEST Act, which I recently introduced with my good friend and colleague from Wyoming, Senator BARRASSO. This bill is an outgrowth of our work with the Senate Western Caucus and the Congressional Western Caucus. These groups, which include my good friend from Utah, Congressman ROB BISHOP, and Congressman STEVE PEARCE from New Mexico, are truly leading the way. We have been doing the hard work of identifying solutions that will promote job creation, boost America's energy production, and put our Nation on a better fiscal footing by encouraging economic growth.

We keep hearing from the Democratic leadership that Congress is dysfunctional. That may be. But it is not because of a lack of good ideas. It is because—in an effort to help the President in his reelection and shield vulnerable Democrats—the decision was made to promote politically motivated show votes rather than sound job-creating legislation.

Americans do not want higher taxes in the name of redistribution and government-dictated fairness. They do not want bureaucrats in Washington figuring out how to spread the wealth around, as then-candidate Obama put it in 2008.

What they want is economic opportunity and the security that comes with it. They want the freedom and opportunity to pursue new ventures, start new businesses, and save for their retirement and for their children's education.

If the Democratic leadership ever decides to listen to the American people and advance reasonable legislation to grow the economy and create jobs, they could start with this WEST Act.

The WEST Act is a sound and solid bill, one that puts together some of the best ideas identified by the Western Caucuses, and my hope is it will meet with bipartisan support in the Senate.

This bill could not come at a better time. The proposals in the WEST Act will go a long way toward generating the employment and economic growth that citizens and taxpayers are longing for.

The proposals in the WEST Act should not be controversial in the Senate. The President claimed his $½ trillion stimulus would create or save millions of American jobs. As it turned out, this was a hallow promise. But the WEST Act is the real deal. If the President and his party are serious about stimulating the economy, this legislation is a good way to do it and a good place to start.

The eight bills that Senator BARRASSO and I have included in this WEST Act have all passed the House of Representatives. They are commonsense, progrowth policies, and I am confident these proposals, if put to the vote of the American people, would pass overwhelmingly. They certainly would in my home State of Utah. They should pass the Senate as well.

The bill has three main objectives.

First, we are going to put America back to work by producing more American energy. Our bill ends the Obama administration's de facto moratorium on drilling in the Gulf of Mexico in a safe, responsible, and transparent manner. We set firm timelines for considering permits to drill, and we require the administration to move forward promptly to conduct offshore lease sales that have been delayed or cancelled in the gulf and Outer Continental Shelf.

The WEST Act sets a production goal of 3 million barrels of oil per day by 2027, reducing foreign imports by nearly one-third. At a time when every job counts, our bill would produce thousands of high-paying jobs.

Second, our bill will help bring down energy prices, making it easier for Americans to drive their cars and heat their homes. We could produce over 1 million barrels of oil a day with our bill's elimination of confusion and uncertainty surrounding the EPA's decisionmaking process for clean air permits.

The bill prohibits the EPA Administrator from promulgating any regulation that takes into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas in order to address climate change using the Clean Air Act.

And, third, our bill will protect agriculture by reducing unnecessary regulatory burdens. It amends the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, or FIFRA, to ensure that National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits are not needed for the application of pesticides that are currently registered and regulated under FIFRA.

This provision of the bill will also ensure that diseases such as the West Nile Virus can be managed through mosquito abatement. It is very important for communities in Utah to be able to address these issues without constantly seeking approval from Federal overlords.

The bill also stops the EPA from imposing more stringent dust standards for 1 year. Additionally, it would afford States and localities the flexibility to address any rural dust issues before the Federal Government would have the authority to do so.

For the life of me, I do not understand the administration's stance on energy production. The Department of Energy claims there are more than 800 billion barrels of recoverable oil in oil shale in Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado. This is more than the proven reserves of Saudi Arabia. If we were able to develop this resource the way we are capable of doing, we could have a major impact on the jobless rate as well as the cost of energy in our country.

Last month, one of largest oil companies in the world announced a $200 million investment in a commercial demonstration project for oil shale. The project will be in my home State, using technology developed by a Utah company.

Another major company that has been successfully developing commercial oil shale for more than 80 years is opening offices in Salt Lake City and seeking permits for a very large facility in my home State of Utah.

The State of Utah, local governments, and the business community support the development of these resources. Yet the President and his administration are working to stop this at all costs. The most recent roadblock was the rewriting of the final 2008 three-State programmatic impact statement to cut back by more than 70 percent the Federal lands available for oil shale and oil sands development. Well, I believe strongly that Interior Secretary Salazar has no authority whatsoever to take that action.

I recently heard from an energy company in Utah that it is easier to do business in Somalia than it is in the United States. Unfortunately, that is not a surprising sentiment. But that is what we have come to expect from President Obama. He talks a big game about fairness when it comes to raising taxes, but his energy policies are both regressive and elitist.

In the interest of appealing to the environmental interests of his wealthy supporters, the administration leaves middle-class people behind. Obstructing domestic energy production prevents the creation of high-paying jobs that provide good wages for families,

and it fails to bring down the high cost of fuel that hits middle and lower income families the hardest.

In fact, President Obama's energy agenda tops the list of pernicious policies that hurt American families, hinder economic growth, and harm businesses by dramatically raising the costs of everyday life. The administration's position is clear. The President wants to drive up the cost of gasoline and drive Americans out of their cars.

In 2008, when the President still harbored grandiose plans of changing the course of world history, his Energy Secretary, Secretary Chu, said his goal was to ''boost the price of gasoline to the levels in Europe.''

In the meantime, the President and his party suffered a humiliating defeat in the 2010 elections. Now, faced with the prospect of going the way of President Carter this fall, the administration is trying to walk back this position.

With voters facing $4-a-gallon gasoline, Secretary Chu now claims he is doing everything he can to reduce the price of energy, and the President's advisers are suggesting that this is just a gotcha quote. It is not. It represents the real view of the President and those in his bubble.

The price of gasoline was no big deal to the President prior to being elected to the Senate and the White House. His short commute from his Hyde Park house to the University of Chicago might not even have required a car. His wealthiest supporters, those being appealed to with his anti-energy agenda, do not spend a significant amount of their income on gasoline. When Warren Buffett flies in his private jet to meet with the President to discuss plans for raising taxes on small businesses, he is not worried about the cost of jet fuel.

But for families who are now spending nearly $100 to fill up their cars, the cost of gasoline is a big deal. Members of the President's party seem to get this. Even in the Senate, we see Democratic support for the President's decision to hold up the Keystone Pipeline collapsing, and for good reason.

The President's unilateral decision to kill that project might play well at Midtown Manhattan fundraisers where wealthy elites have the luxury of supporting a radical environmental agenda without worrying about the real-world consequences of that agenda for the middle class. But it was bad for jobs, bad for the economy, and bad for American families.

President Obama has said he wants to find an ''all-of-the above'' approach to energy production. He need look no further than the WEST Act.

Having said that, I would like to personally compliment my dear friend and colleague, Senator BARRASSO from Wyoming. He is the leader of our Western Caucus. Frankly, we could not have a better leader. He understands these issues very well. We in the West understand that we have an obligation and we have the ability to be able to help this country from an energy standpoint in ways that it needs help. We have the ability to be able to help save this country, and we intend to do so. This WEST Act would be a very good step in that direction.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I rise to echo the comments made by my colleague, Senator ORRIN HATCH of Utah.

Throughout Senator HATCH's distinguished career, he has served this Senate and this Nation in a number of major leadership capacities. I am most grateful for his ongoing leadership and the position he has taken in the Senate Western Caucus—that of being chairman of the caucus's Subcommittee on Public Lands.

Senator HATCH, along with Senator MORAN and I, has laid out a clear path to energy security and job creation. The bill is called the Western Economic Security Today Act, or the WEST Act.

President Obama told Congress he would ''keep trying every new idea that works.'' He went on to say he would ''listen to every good proposal, no matter which party comes up with it.''

Well, last year Western Republicans laid out a clear path to energy security and job creation for the Western United States and for the country. The report is entitled ''Jobs Frontier, Breaking Down Washington's Barriers to America's Red, White and Blue Jobs.''

President Obama should listen to and embrace the findings in this report. The House of Representatives has passed key pieces of legislation over the past year from this Jobs Frontier Report. These are pieces of legislation that will begin to generate quality jobs and increase U.S. energy production.

These bills tackle key critical issues, such as encouraging energy exploration and production and removing unnecessary EPA regulations. This legislation would create thousands—thousands—of jobs for Americans.

The WEST Act contains language from eight of these bills already passed by the House that were part of the Jobs Frontier original report. This legislation accomplishes many of the goals of the Jobs Frontier Report. It does it by increasing affordable American energy. It does it by promoting agriculture and ranching. And it does it by overturning Washington's regulatory overreach.

The bottom line is this act is ready to create jobs now, today, and to set the Nation on the path to becoming more energy secure.

So I am here to congratulate Senator HATCH for bringing this important bill forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Wyoming. He has been such a great addition to the Senate. He has an intimate knowledge of western lands and their productivity and what they could do if we were given the opportunity. He is just an all around good human being. I feel very grateful for his leadership, and I express my support for his leadership of the Western Caucus. He is one of the finest people here, and I personally want to thank him for the kind remarks he has just made.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, earlier this week, the conference committee on the surface transportation reauthorization—more commonly known as the highway bill—met for its initial meeting. In the opening remarks that were made on Tuesday, it was encouraging that there seemed to be a general agreement on how important that Transportation bill is to our Nation.

As I will describe later, it is 2.9 million jobs that are associated with this bill. I should be specific and say 2.9 million jobs a year, since those jobs do not extend for eternity. But it is the most important piece of jobs legislation we could consider. I appreciated hearing from the Senator from Utah about the jobs concern of his energy proposal. Those are real jobs, they are immediate jobs. They are jobs that everybody understands, building our roads, highways, and bridges.

These local construction jobs are not only important in and of themselves, but they also help to maintain the transportation infrastructure that lowers the cost of goods and helps our economy across the board. We have had to close a bridge where I–95 crosses over the Blackstone River in Pawtucket. It is reopening. In the meantime people have to drive around 295. That costs time and fuel for shippers—and delays. It was an economic cost.

This is the real jobs bill that we can do something about. It is pending right now in conference. So it is imperative not only that the conference get this bill done but that they get it done as soon as possible.

Why do I say that? Well, there was a deadline of March 31 to get a new bill done, and the House of Representatives, unfortunately, did not pass a highway bill by the March 31 deadline. So on the eve of the expiration of that deadline, they passed an extension, and we are operating under that and a subsequent extension right now. The effect of that is not good for jobs. State departments of transportation and the private sector companies that provide the services that rebuild our roads and highways cannot make long-range plans when funding is based on short-

term extensions. Particularly in this economy, our States, our counties, and the companies that do this business simply cannot afford to extend themselves on contracts and on work where they do not know that the highway funding is going to be there to backstop them when it comes time to make the payments.

In many instances, for many products, a short-term extension actually requires the underlying construction project to be dropped. In Rhode Island, our State department of transportation, led by transportation director Michael Lewis, who is a very capable and experienced individual, has shown me their list of 96 major projects that they plan to do this year. But because of the uncertainty here on the highway bill, because the conference has not produced a result yet, because we are still operating under the extension, he says that about 40 of those projects may have to be shelved because until we get the bill done, he cannot count on Federal funds being there to help pay for them.

So every day, every week that goes by without a highway bill costs us jobs. It does not just postpone the jobs, it actually costs us jobs. The at-risk projects range from things as simple as lane striping to road repaving to major bridge repairs.

What they all have in common is that each one of those transportation projects means jobs for the construction workers who build them, the engineers who design them, and the companies that supply the materials. It is not just me saying this. Standard & Poor's recently published a report warning us that unpredictable Federal funding could stall our national transportation projects. A quote from the report:

> As construction season begins in the northern half of the country, this continuing uncertainty in funding could force states to delay projects rather than risk funding changes or political gridlock come July. Once a long-term authorization is approved, we believe it will provide an impetus for transportation agencies to reconsider high-priority projects that had been shelved because of lack of funding. But if the authorization is extended by even more continuing resolutions, such high-priority projects will remain in limbo.

As time goes by, jobs evaporate. Continuing delays in transportation funding are putting this year's construction season at risk and are making it impossible for States to keep their construction projects moving. So it is not enough that we pass a highway bill out of this conference; it is imperative that we pass it soon. There have been enough delays already. We were supposed to have had it done on March 31, except that the House never actually passed a highway bill.

The Senate bill, fortunately, provides a solid framework for action, and for rapid action. This Senate transportation bill, called MAP–21, first passed out of the Environment and Public Works Committee last year, and it passed out of the Environment and Public Works Committee on a bipartisan basis—indeed on a unanimous basis. There is not a lot that every member of the Environment and Public Works Committee agrees on. There is not a lot, frankly, that our chairman BARBARA BOXER and our ranking member JIM INHOFE agree on. But we all agreed that this was an important piece of legislation and reported it out of the committee on a unanimous basis. Then the bill came to the floor. There were no fast tracks, no ''hide the ball.'' This bill spent 5 weeks on the Senate floor. There were a great number of amendments that were considered during that period of deliberation. I believe the total is at 40 which were accepted either by vote or by agreement. And after that long, open, transparent, robust, regular legislative process in which Republicans and Democrats both contributed, the bill passed with strong bipartisan support of 75 Senators. That is pretty unusual around here.

MAP–21 is projected to save or create 1.9 million jobs. As I said, those are not jobs that last for eternity. The conjecture, I believe, is that they last for a year. This is 1.9 million jobs with a potential to create an additional million jobs through the increased investment in the TIFIA financing program, so a total of 2.9 million jobs.

In Rhode Island, that means the bill is expected to save or create up to 9,000 jobs. If its provisions for projects of national and regional significance are incorporated in the final bill, and if funding is provided through our appropriations process, that number actually goes up, because some additional projects can be added that are overdue in Rhode Island for work.

So MAP–21, the Senate highway bill, is a true compromise bill. It reflects the hard work of Chairman BOXER and Senator INHOFE, and it is a strong bipartisan signal from this body as to what our transportation bill should look like. Procedurally, the conference committee is reconciling this Senate bipartisan compromise bill with basically an empty envelope of a bill, a 90-day extension passed by the House, with an authorization to go to conference. Some controversial provisions were thrown in, unfortunately, that will make things more difficult and slower to get done, and more difficult and slower is not good when you are talking about passing the highway bill and the construction season is already beginning to get underway.

The most acceptable action and the one in the best interests of our country, the one in the best interests of our economy, the one in the best interests of our infrastructure, the one in the best interests of jobs in these construction projects, would be for the conference committee to report out the bipartisan Senate bill without a lot of controversial riders so that we can get a long-term reauthorization signed into law while there is still a full construction season ahead and get hard-working Americans back to work rebuilding—as every American knows we need to do—our Nation's beat-up and decrepit transportation infrastructure.

I am pleased the conference is off to a good start. I am sorry we had to wait this long to get to this point. It would have been nice to have had this done on March 31 when the deadline came. But now that we are here, I urge all of the conferees to come to a quick resolution that honors the extensive bipartisan work that went into the Senate bill which has gotten us to this point.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN.) The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I am here to speak, I believe, for the great majority of Americans who believe the time is long overdue for the Federal Government to fulfill its commitment and its responsibility to end the lawlessness at our borders. Only then can we put this matter, the deep frustrations that are occurring, behind us and move our country forward in a positive and united way.

Immigration security is especially important in these economic times. Illegal labor does, in fact, depress wages and makes it more difficult for out-of-work Americans to find good-paying jobs. Immigration security is also vital to stopping cartels that are creating violence around our borders and in our cities. The Federal Government has a duty to protect those living in communities which suffer every day from preventable drug and gang violence.

There is nothing compassionate about looking the other way when we can take concrete actions to make our schools and communities safer in every part of the country. There is nothing compassionate about a policy which makes it harder to protect not only Americans but immigrants who live in our country from gang violence that occurs in cities and at our border today.

Unfortunately, instead of compelling sanctuary jurisdictions, such as the city of Chicago, to cooperate with Federal law enforcement officers, the administration has gone after those States that are trying to assist the Federal Government to end the lawlessness in our country. Under the administration's new ''prosecutorial discretion'' guidelines, if the Department of Homeland Security doesn't consider someone a priority, that individual's deportation proceedings are closed and they are allowed to remain in the country. So far, the administration has granted this form of backdoor amnesty to almost 17,000 aliens illegally in the country, some of whom have been convicted of crimes.

The administration has also been resistant to the popular E-Verify program, never once including it in any of its jobs or economic plans. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, has effectively ended worksite enforcement operations, meaning employers can continue to hire illegal workers rather than out-of-work Americans.

A determined President could take meaningful steps to stem the tide of illegality. I have been encouraged by Governor Romney's commitments on this issue. This is something I have worked at for some time, and I am absolutely convinced that with consistent, smart, effective leadership and a commitment on behalf of this country to end the lawlessness, it can be done and done quicker and with less difficulty than most people realize.

For example, Governor Romney recounted the following conversation he had with a Border Patrol agent, and it is so similar to ones I have had with Mr. BONNER, who headed the National Border Patrol Council. This is the conversation as Governor Romney recounted it:

> They said, when employers are willing to hire people who are here illegally, that's a magnet, and it draws them in. And sanctuary cities, giving tuition breaks to the kids of illegal aliens . . . those things also have to be stopped. If we want to secure the border, we have to make sure we have a fence, determining where people are, enough agents to oversee it, and turn off that magnet. We can't talk about amnesty, we cannot give amnesty to those who have come here illegally.

That is what Governor Romney said he was told by the agents who have to deal with this every day and who try to do their job professionally, and I think that is correct. That is what they are telling me. That is what law enforcement officers have told me for some time.

Another example of how our country is so out of control is this government's failure to follow the rule of law with regard to Child Tax Credits.

The Treasury Department's own inspector general for Tax Administration, who analyzes problems within the agency and issues reports, reported that in 2010 the Internal Revenue Service paid illegal aliens a staggering $4.2 billion in child tax credits for dependents, a great deal of whom don't even live in the country. This has been going on for years. This cannot continue. It must be stopped, and fixing it can't be delayed.

The Treasury IG report states:

> Although the law prohibits aliens residing without authorization in the United States from receiving most Federal public benefits, an increasing number of these individuals are filing tax returns claiming the Additional Child Tax Credit, a refundable tax credit intended for working families. The payment of Federal funds through this tax benefit appears to provide an additional incentive for aliens to enter, reside, and work in the United States without authorization, which directly contradicts Federal law and policy to remove such incentives.

That is from the inspector general for Tax Administration at the U.S. Treasury Department, not my language. Of course, that is exactly correct. That is exactly correct. How could it be otherwise?

In a press report from Indiana, one of the illegal aliens admitted his address was used to file tax returns by four other undocumented workers who don't even live there. Those four workers claimed 20 children live inside that one residence, and as a result the Internal Revenue Service sent the illegal immigrants tax refunds totaling $29,608. A tax credit is not a tax deduction, it is a direct payment, a direct transfer of wealth through the tax system to an individual—$29,608.

The Treasury inspector general's report further stated:

> Millions of people are seeking this tax credit who, we believe, are not entitled to it. We have made recommendations to the IRS as to how they could address this issue, and they have not taken sufficient action, in our view, to solve the problem.

Well, that is not acceptable. Now, $4 billion is a great deal of money. Four billion dollars a year is about $10 million a day. They found that $4 billion was doled out to people who received this one benefit illegally. No wonder we have people taking vacations to Las Vegas on the government's dime. No wonder we are giving $½ billion loans to failed companies like Solyndra. What are we doing here in Washington?

So I say it is time to end this. I would note that the House of Representatives has voted to end this, and so it is now time to see what this Senate will do. We need to act to end it also.

I have been in the Senate for 15-plus years, and being on the Judiciary Committee, we have seen the debate over immigration move forward, sometimes encouragingly and sometimes discouragingly. But every few years, it seems that the Washington masters of the universe who have willfully and deliberately failed to follow through on consistent promises to end immigration illegality begin to discuss some form of amnesty. They continue to incentivize the illegality but remain unwilling to take the necessary steps—not impossible steps—to secure the border on behalf of all citizens.

For example, just this week my good friend and able Senator, Mr. DURBIN, said that the DREAM Act is a bill that says: If you graduate high school and you have no serious problems when it comes to criminal convictions or moral issues and you either complete service in the military or 2 years in college, we will put you on a path to becoming legal and becoming a citizen.

But we have examined that legislation in its most recent version, and it would really in effect grant amnesty to millions of people here illegally regardless of whether they go on to finish high school, finish college, or serve in the military. That is what the legislation does. And the bill is certainly not limited to children. It would apply to illegal immigrants who are in their thirties now. Because the bill has no cap, no limit, no sunset, no ending, it would allow people to remain eligible for the rest of their lives, at any age, to claim this benefit. Once they are naturalized, those granted DREAM Act amnesty would then have the right to legally petition for entry into the United States of their family members, including their adult brothers and sisters and the parents who caused their illegal presence in the United States to begin with, easily tripling the number of green card holders.

This is a big issue. We need to be careful about these things. We need to consider what we are doing here.

The bill's provisions are so broad, they are open to those who have even multiple misdemeanor criminal convictions that could include drunk driving and certain sexual offenses. But the bill goes further, offering safe harbor protection to those here illegally, those who have pending deportation proceedings against them. Those deportation proceedings have to stop even when the individual might pose a risk to Americans when that deportation may be based on the commission of serious crimes.

This is especially dangerous because the safe harbor would also apply to those from terror-prone regions in the Middle East. In fact, the DREAM Act altogether ignores the lessons of 9/11, going so far as to open eligibility to those who previously defrauded immigration authorities, as did many of those 9/11 hijackers.

So you say: Well, JEFF, what are we going to do? What can we do here? You say no, no, but we need to have a plan. We need to do something.

Please, colleagues, think this through. The way forward for our country, the right way, the way to end the bitterness and develop common solutions for all residents is, first, secure the border, as Americans have asked their government to do year after year and this Congress and this administration have failed to do so.

We must rebuild the trust, the trust of the American people, before other actions are taken. How commonsensical is that? People have a right to believe we will promise enforcement and give amnesty. That has been the pattern. We give the amnesty but don't do the enforcement. That is why people are upset with Washington. Why shouldn't they be? It has gone on for several decades. It has gone on since I have been in the Senate. We have to follow through on the commitments that have been made to the American people to do what we promised. It is time to end the lawlessness, not surrender to it.

With determined leadership from the White House and support in the Congress, we can, in just a few years, I am totally convinced, solve the problem at our border, restore the rule of law, put an end to the border violence, and create a sane, just, and lawful system of

immigration for America—a system that we can be proud of, a system that befits a nation as great as ours.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and 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.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM WEEK

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, with summer approaching, the travel season will soon be in full swing, and this week we celebrate National Travel and Tourism Week. It is a time to call attention to the importance that travel and tourism play in our national economy and in the creation of jobs.

I know the Presiding Officer understands this issue very clearly because, for his State of Alaska, like the State of New Hampshire, travel and tourism is a very important industry. The fact is that the travel and tourism industry is one of the top 10 industries in 48 States, and it supports over 14 million American jobs. In New Hampshire, travel and tourism is our second largest industry, and it supports over 60,000 jobs in New Hampshire.

The Travel Promotion Act, which Congress passed in 2010, and of which I was very proud to be one of the cosponsors, will help the United States compete for foreign travelers. This year we will begin to see the impact of this landmark legislation.

For most of our history, the United States has been one of a very few developed countries that did not advertise overseas. The Travel Promotion Act changes all of that because it created what is called Brand USA. It is a low-cost public-private partnership, and Brand USA has just started rolling out an advertising campaign for America. Brand USA is going to leverage millions of dollars in contributions to the private sector to help encourage more foreign travelers to bring their dollars to the United States. This is important because what we have learned in New Hampshire is that overseas visitors tend to stay longer when they get to America and they tend to spend more money. For the first time we are going to be advertising overseas to attract visitors to come to the United States.

But there is even more we can and should do working together to support the travel sector. Traveling and tourism rely on a good infrastructure, on keeping our highways, our bridges, and our airports running. That is essential for the travel industry to grow. That is why it was so important that this year—after many years of trying—we finally reauthorized the FAA, and with that legislation are putting in place a new NextGen system of air traffic control that is going to allow our airplanes to get from point to point faster and more efficiently.

That is why it is so critical that we pass the highway bill that is pending in Congress, which is at a committee of conference. We passed that bill in the Senate on an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, and now we need to get this bill out of the Congress.

We also need to look at ways to improve our visa system so we can make it easier for foreign travelers to come to the United States. We need to pass legislation—and there are several bills that have been introduced—that will help us clear the backlog of visa applications so we can make sure those travelers who want to come to the United States are going to be able to do so, again bearing in mind that those overseas visitors tend to stay longer and spend more money.

I want to conclude by highlighting what is an exciting new campaign in New Hampshire to help build New Hampshire's reputation as a world-class travel destination with something to offer for everyone. I know a lot of people have been to New Hampshire every 4 years as part of our Presidential primary. A lot of people are familiar with our State's slogan, ''Live Free or Die.'' This slogan actually captures what was uttered by GEN John Stark, who was a Revolutionary War general talking about the British during the Revolution. A few days ago our State Division of Travel and Tourism Development launched a new campaign to promote New Hampshire to show the world what we have to offer as a unique travel destination, and that campaign very cleverly plays on our famous State slogan. We can see in this advertisement ''Live Free and Explore.'' It is one of our beautiful lakes. We can see the family out canoeing.

We also have another one, ''Live Free and Reconnect.'' Here is a family out hiking. We can see some of our mountains in the background. They are not quite as high as the mountains in Alaska, but we think they are a great place for families to come and explore. Hikers can enjoy and reconnect and relax.

This one is ''Live Free and Discover.'' Again, kids getting ready to jump into one of our lakes. We can see the wilderness in the background. This is another great example of one of the opportunities New Hampshire has to enjoy our beautiful State.

We are very proud of what New Hampshire has to offer. We have a new logo that shows how you can visit our travel and tourism site on the Web and see what New Hampshire has to offer. We hope all of those who come to experience our Presidential primary will come back every 4 years and maybe in the meantime look at what we have to offer for enjoying the natural beauty and activities of the State. We would like that, but I understand that all of us here in Washington have very busy schedules and sometimes finding time to travel is difficult. Fortunately, soon we are going to have a great opportunity for everyone on the Hill to experience what New Hampshire has to offer without even leaving the building. On June 6, the New Hampshire State Society and our office are going to be hosting a reception called ''Experience New Hampshire.'' It is a great opportunity to experience New Hampshire's signature hospitality, our history, our culture, and our scenic beauty. I invite all of my colleagues to enjoy New Hampshire beverages, to taste some of the menus from our historic grand homes, our charming inns, and to come and celebrate with us.

As we celebrate travel and tourism this week, I hope all of us will take a few minutes to reflect on the importance of this industry to our State and local economies and to the country.

I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 396, H.R. 2072, which is an act to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States be adopted; that there be no amendments, motions or points of order in order to the bill other than budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive; that there be 1 hour of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to a vote on passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. I would ask the majority leader to modify his request to accommodate a few amendments.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the request be modified to allow the following amendments: Corker No. 2102, financing for transactions subsidized by export credit agencies; Vitter No. 2103, prohibitions on funds used for energy development outside of the United States; Toomey No. 2104, a $40 billion increase contingency; Lee No. 2100, phaseout; and Paul No. 2101, limitation on Ex-Im support.

I further ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the listed amendments, the bill be read three times and the Senate proceed to vote on the passage of the bill with a 60-vote threshold. Before the Chair rules, I would say the sponsors of the amendments would be prepared to enter into short time agreements in order to facilitate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, these amendments that have just been listed, we are familiar with three of them. The other

two I have not had the chance to review nor has my staff, and I do not think anyone else has. We will be happy to continue to study these. I will take a look at them—happy to do that.

The only thing I would say is that—and I have other things to say, and I know my friend the assistant Republican leader has places to go, so I would give a statement later. But based on what I have just said and what I am going to say, I object.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I appreciate that. I hope we can continue to work together. As to the original request then, we would have to pose an objection as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to both requests.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday, the House sent the Senate a bipartisan reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. The bill the House passed reflects the negotiated agreement that was struck between Republican and Democratic leaders. They worked hard to come up with an agreement.

As one would expect with an agreement of that nature, the House passed it with a very strong vote. The vote was 330 to 93. Every single Democrat voted for the measure. Only the far right tea party wing of the House Republican caucus voted against the bill—93 of them. So it was 330 to 93.

The House considered no amendments. The House passed the bill on a suspension calendar. For those of us who served in the House, that is a bill that comes up and there is almost no debate. It takes a two-thirds vote to pass it. They do it for noncontroversial items. This measure is noncontroversial. It should have never been controversial. We brought it up 2 months ago, and we were stunned when the Republicans would not let us move forward on it.

So the House did the right thing yesterday. This is the sort of bill the Senate should now simply pass without amendment. It is so unusual here. I have been in Congress 30 years. But this is a new one. Even bills that they agree on they want to mess around with. In years past, this would have gone through just like this. Forget about what took place 2 months ago. But now the House passed something 330 to 93, and we are here playing around with it. It should be done. We should have passed it yesterday. This thing is going to expire.

It is hard to comprehend what the new mantra of the Republicans in the Senate is. I do not get it. As I indicated in earlier days, the Senate would have passed this bill by unanimous consent, as we have done before, this same legislation. But these days, the far right tea party wing of the Senate Republican caucus—I used to just talk about the House wing of the tea party, but it is over here now—thinks everything has to be a fight—everything.

So we are going to have to have a vote on this rather than do it by unanimous consent. The bank will hit its lending limit any day. Its current authorization ends at the end of this month, May. So it will be very important we work to pass the House bill as quickly as possible. If we amend the bill and send it back to the House, we have to start all over again. The House is basically not in session this month, under their very difficult schedule of working 2 weeks on and 1 week off and then sometimes longer than that. I do not know when they are going to be here. It would be so much better, on a noncontroversial, very important piece of legislation—last year, 300,000 jobs—not 30,000 but 300,000.

We understand the Senate Republican caucus wants to offer amendments. The amendments are—I do not know for sure, but just glancing at them, I think they may be relevant. We will take a close look at them. There is no question the ones I am familiar with are efforts to gut the program. One of the amendments just eliminates it. How about that?

So we are going to continue looking at the amendments we have and those we have not studied and look at them. I will try to be reasonable. So as we do that, we are going to vote on this. I am going to file cloture in just a second, which I hate to do—another motion to proceed. Boy, if there were ever a time when TOM UDALL and JEFF MERKLEY were prophetic, it is tonight. These two young, fine Senators said it was time to change the rules in the Senate. We did not. They were right. The rest of us were wrong or most of us anyway. What a shame.

Here we are wasting time because of the Republicans. This week we have accomplished a lot. We had a vote on a judge and we voted on cloture on the Republicans defeating our ability to get something done with student loans. That is our workload this week. I know it has been tough.

That was sarcastic, of course, but it is just absolutely mindless what is going on. Then, to top it off, one of the finest Members of the Senate we have ever had was defeated yesterday by a man—listen to this—who campaigned on the platform that there is too much compromise in the Senate. He is going to come back here and not compromise with anybody on anything. Now that is what we need in the Senate, more people who are willing to do nothing but fight.

I am going to do whatever I have to do to take the steps to keep this measure moving forward. I hope we can do it next week. I hope we can do it without a lot of trouble, of which we already have too much.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 396, H.R. 2072, an Act to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes.

Maria Cantwell, Tim Johnson, Harry Reid, Mark Begich, Mark Udall, Tom Udall, Patrick J. Leahy, Sherrod Brown, Jack Reed, Charles E. Schumer, Richard Blumenthal, Richard J. Durbin, Kay R. Hagan, Daniel K. Inouye, Michael F. Bennet, Kent Conrad, Benjamin L. Cardin.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I am finished. But I wish to say again for those who are listening here or watching, Senator UDALL and Senator MERKLEY wanted to do something to change the rules regarding filibusters. If there was anything that ever needed changing in this body, it is the filibuster rule.

It has been abused, abused, and abused by my Republican colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the majority leader's actions on trying to move us forward on a very important jobs bill. The Export-Import Bank is a way to fund manufacturers in the United States so their products can be sold around the globe. It is kind of similar to a Small Business Administration finance program for exports.

We know the President has said we need to increase exports. This is a program that has been in place for decades, never controversial at this degree. Now all of a sudden we are, weeks before the authorization expires, sitting here arguing over whether we can move forward on this bill.

I have great respect for the Senate. But there are some times when the Senate does not get to work out a deal, and we are presented with something that has been worked out by the House of Representatives. We can go back to what the majority leader said, how we got in this spot; that is, objecting to every motion to proceed, objecting to every motion to proceed. Pretty soon all the work stacks up. We try to move legislation and every motion is objected to. So the consequence is we run out of time and we run out of a way to get to a compromise.

In this case, guess what happened. The House came up with a compromise. The House, even to the degree that some of the amendments that some of my colleagues wanted to offer, got implemented into the House compromise bill that now passed the House of Representatives with, whatever, 300-plus votes to 93.

With my colleagues, basically, continuing to just try to derail the normal process, we have had to take now a House bill that I think encompasses many of the things people wanted to

see either in reforms or ways to make the bank more transparent or ways to make sure we are focusing on things that are going to help U.S. manufacturers win the day in a very competitive market.

So I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, yes; Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. CANTOR worked out a compromise. So now we can again take more time here and analyze it and see whether you agree with that. I certainly like when the Senate works out agreements, and oftentimes we have asked our House colleagues to vote on them. But we now have the student loan bill that needs to be done, this Export-Import Bank that needs to be done, and many other important economic agenda items we should get to for this country.

I hope when the cloture motion comes forward, my colleagues will realize the only thing people are trying to do now—they can vote no on the program if they don't like it because they are primarily amendments to defund the bank. These are not perfecting amendments to a compromise that has been worked out. They want to express their opposition. They will have a chance to do that.

I hope for the sake of thousands of jobs in the United States, for the sake of U.S. competitiveness in a global market, where these companies are competing with other companies around the globe, my colleagues will realize this is a compromise piece of legislation. Let's get it done next week and onto the President's desk so we can go about winning more jobs in a very competitive global economy. That is what we need to do. Holding out 1 more, 2 more, or 3 more days, or another week just to get an amendment saying you hate the Ex-Im Bank, that is not the way to get things done for America.

I hope my colleagues will support moving ahead so we can get this onto the President's desk.

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. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AWARDING A CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO MEMBERS OF THE CIVIL AIR PATROL

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Banking Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 418 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 418) to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read the third time and passed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; and that any statements related to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 418) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 418

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The volunteer members of the Civil Air Patrol (hereafter in this Act referred to as the ''CAP'') during World War II, civilian men and women ranging in age from 18 to 81, provided extraordinary public and combat services during a critical time of need for the Nation.

(2) During the war, CAP members used their own aircraft to perform a myriad of essential tasks for the military and the Nation within the United States, including attacks on enemy submarines off the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico coasts of the United States.

(3) This extraordinary service set the stage for the post-war CAP to become a valuable nonprofit, public service organization chartered by Congress and the Auxiliary of the United States Air Force that provides essential emergency, operational, and public services to communities, States, the Federal Government, and the military.

(4) The CAP was established, initially as a part of the Office of Civil Defense, by air-minded citizens one week before the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, on December 1, 1941, ''out of the desire of civil airmen of the country to be mobilized with their equipment in the common defense'' of the Nation.

(5) Within days of the start of the war, the German Navy started a massive submarine offensive, known as Operation Drumbeat, off the east coast of the United States against oil tankers and other critical shipping that threatened the overall war effort.

(6) Neither the Navy nor the Army had enough aircraft, ships, or other resources to adequately patrol and protect the shipping along the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico coasts of the United States, and many ships were torpedoed within sight of civilians on shore, including 52 tankers sunk between January and March 1942.

(7) At that time General George Marshall remarked that ''[t]he losses by submarines off our Atlantic seaboard and in the Caribbean now threaten our entire war effort''.

(8) From the beginning CAP leaders urged the military to use its services to patrol coastal waters but met with great resistance because of the nonmilitary training and status of CAP pilots.

(9) Finally, in response to the ever-increasing submarine attacks, the Tanker Committee of the Petroleum Industry War Council urged the Navy Department and the War Department to consider the use of the CAP to help patrol the sea lanes off the coasts of the United States.

(10) While the Navy initially rejected this suggestion, the Army decided it had merit, and the Civil Air Patrol Coastal Patrol began in March 1942.

(11) Oil companies and other organizations provided funds to help pay for some CAP operations, including vitally needed shore radios that were used to monitor patrol missions.

(12) By late March 1942, the Navy also began to use the services of the CAP.

(13) Starting with three bases located in Delaware, Florida, and New Jersey, CAP aircrews immediately started to spot enemy submarines as well as lifeboats, bodies, and wreckage.

(14) Within 15 minutes of the first Coast Patrol flight, the pilot had sighted a torpedoed tanker and was coordinating rescue operations.

(15) Eventually 21 bases, ranging from Bar Harbor, Maine, to Brownsville, Texas, were set up for the CAP to patrol the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico coasts of the United States, with 40,000 volunteers participating.

(16) The CAP used a wide range of civilian-owned aircraft, mainly light-weight, single engine aircraft—manufactured by Cessna, Beech, Waco, Fairchild, Stinson, Piper, Taylorcraft, and Sikorsky, among others—as well as some twin engine aircraft such as the Grumman Widgeon.

(17) These aircraft were painted in their civilian prewar colors (red, yellow, blue, etc.) and carried special markings (a blue circle with a white triangle) to identify them as CAP aircraft.

(18) Patrols were conducted up to 100 miles off shore, generally with 2 aircraft flying together, in aircraft often equipped with only a compass for navigation and a single radio for communication.

(19) Due to the critical nature of the situation, CAP operations were conducted in bad weather as well as good, often when the military was unable to fly, and in all seasons (including the winter) when ditching an aircraft in cold water would likely mean certain death to the aircrew.

(20) Personal emergency equipment was often lacking, particularly during early patrols where inner tubes and kapok duck hunter vests were carried as flotation devices since ocean worthy wet suits, life vests, and life rafts were unavailable.

(21) The initial purpose of the CAP was to spot submarines, report their position to the military, and force them to dive below the surface, which limited their operating speed and maneuverability and reduced their ability to detect and attack shipping.

(22) It soon became apparent that there were opportunities for CAP pilots to attack submarines, such as when a Florida CAP aircrew came across a surfaced submarine that quickly stranded itself on a sand bar. However, the aircrew could not get any assistance from armed military aircraft before the submarine freed itself.

(23) Finally, after a number of these instances, a decision was made by the military to arm CAP aircraft with 50 and 100 pound bombs, and to arm some larger twin engine aircraft with 325 pound depth charges.

(24) The arming of CAP aircraft dramatically changed the mission for these civilian aircrews and resulted in more than 57 attacks on enemy submarines.

(25) While CAP volunteers received $8 a day flight reimbursement, their patrols were accomplished at a great economic cost to many of the members of the CAP who—

(A) used their own aircraft and other equipment in defense of the Nation;

(B) paid for much of their own aircraft maintenance and hangar use; and

(C) often lived in primitive conditions along the coast, including old barns and chicken coops converted for sleeping.

(26) More importantly, the CAP Coastal Patrol service came at the high cost of 26 fatalities, 7 serious injuries, and 90 aircraft lost.

(27) At the conclusion of the 18-month Coastal Patrol, the heroic CAP aircrews would be credited with the following:

(A) 2 submarines destroyed or damaged.

(B) 57 submarines attacked.

(C) 82 bombs dropped against submarines.

(D) 173 radio reports of submarine positions (with a number of credited assists for kills made by military units).

(E) 17 floating mines reported.

(F) 36 dead bodies reported.

(G) 91 vessels in distress reported.

(H) 363 survivors in distress reported.

(I) 836 irregularities noted.

(J) 1,036 special investigations at sea or along the coast.

(K) 5,684 convoy missions for the Navy.

(L) 86,685 missions flown.

(M) 244,600 total flight hours logged.

(N) More than 24,000,000 miles flown.

(28) At least one high-level German Navy Officer credited the CAP with being the primary reason that submarine attacks were withdrawn from the Atlantic coast of the United States in 1943, when he said that ''[i]t was because of those damned little red and yellow planes!''.

(29) The CAP was dismissed from coastal missions with little thanks in August 1943 when the Navy took over the mission completely and ordered the CAP to stand down.

(30) While the Coastal Patrol was ongoing, the CAP was also establishing itself as a vital wartime service to the military, States, and communities nationwide by performing a wide range of missions including—

(A) border patrol;

(B) forest fire patrol;

(C) courier flights for mail, repair and replacement parts, and urgent deliveries;

(D) emergency transportation of personnel;

(E) target towing (with live ammunition being fired at the targets and seven lives being lost) and searchlight tracking training missions;

(F) missing aircraft and personnel searches;

(G) rescue of aircraft crash survivors;

(H) radar training flights;

(I) aerial inspections of camouflaged military and civilian facilities;

(J) aerial inspections of city and town blackout conditions;

(K) mock bombing attacks on cities and facilities to test air defenses;

(L) aerial searches for scrap metal materials;

(M) support of war bond drives;

(N) airport guard duties;

(O) support for State and local emergencies such as natural disasters;

(P) recruiting for the Army Air Force; and

(Q) a cadet youth program which provided aviation and military training.

(31) The CAP flew more than 500,000 hours on these additional missions, including—

(A) 20,500 missions involving target towing (with live ammunition) and gun/searchlight tracking which resulted in 7 deaths, 5 serious injuries, and the loss of 25 aircraft;

(B) a courier service involving 3 major Air Force Commands over a 2-year period carrying more than 3,500,000 pounds of vital cargo and 543 passengers;

(C) southern border operations flying more than 30,000 hours, with 7,000 reports of unusual sightings including a vehicle (that was apprehended) with 2 enemy agents attempting to enter the country;

(D) a week in February 1945 during which CAP units found seven missing Army and Navy pilots; and

(E) a State in which the CAP flew 790 hours on forest fire patrol missions and reported 576 fires to authorities during a single year.

(32) On April 29, 1943, the CAP was transferred to the Army Air Forces, thus beginning its long association with the United States Air Force.

(33) Hundreds of CAP-trained women joined military women's units including the Women's Air Force Service Pilots (WASP) program.

(34) Many members of the Women's Air Force Service Pilots program joined or rejoined the CAP during the post-war period because it provided women opportunities to fly and continue to serve the Nation that were severely lacking elsewhere.

(35) Due to the exceptional emphasis on safety, unit discipline, and pilot discipline, and the organization of the CAP, by the end of the war only 64 members of the CAP had died in service and only 150 aircraft had been lost (including its Coastal Patrol loses from early in the war).

(36) There were more than 60,000 adult civilian members of the CAP in wide range of positions, and CAP aircrews flew a total of approximately 750,000 hours during the war, most of which were in their personal aircraft and often at real risk to their lives.

(37) After the war, at a CAP dinner for Congress, a quorum of both Houses attended with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President thanking the CAP for its service.

(38) While air medals were issued for those participating in the Coastal Patrol, little other recognition was forthcoming for those efforts or for the other services the CAP volunteers provided during the war.

(39) Despite efforts to end the organization at the end of the war, the CAP had proved its capabilities and strengthened its ties with the Air Force and Congress.

(40) In 1946, Congress chartered the CAP as a nonprofit, public service organization and in 1948 as the Auxiliary of the United States Air Force.

(41) Today the CAP conducts many of the same missions it performed during World War II, including a vital role in homeland security.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD.—

(1) AUTHORIZED.—The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall make appropriate arrangements for the award, on behalf of Congress, of a single gold medal of appropriate design in honor of the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol collectively, in recognition of the military service and exemplary record of the Civil Air Patrol during World War II.

(2) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purposes of the award referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Treasury shall strike the gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

(3) SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Following the award of the gold medal referred to in paragraph (1) in honor of the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol, the gold medal shall be given to the Smithsonian Institution, where it shall be displayed as appropriate and made available for research.

(B) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Smithsonian Institution should make the gold medal received under this paragraph available for display elsewhere, particularly at other locations associated with the Civil Air Patrol.

(b) DUPLICATE MEDALS.—Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under this Act, at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dyes, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

(c) NATIONAL MEDALS.—Medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund, an amount not to exceed $30,000 to pay for the cost of the medal authorized under section 2.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals under section 2(b) shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I will speak about S. 418, which we just passed. I thank all my colleagues for allowing it to go through on a unanimous consent basis.

This bill awards a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol. I introduced this legislation last year, and it currently has 85 cosponsors.

This legislation will offer long overdue recognition to a small group of people who answered the call to duty at our Nation's time of maximum danger.

Seventy years ago, during the height of World War II, Civil Air Patrol members in small aircraft began searching for German U-boats off the Atlantic Coast. This was a time of great peril for the Nation when over 400 ships were sunk in U.S. waters, many in view of Americans on shore, and the military didn't have enough aircraft and ships to stop this carnage. That is why the Civil Air Patrol answered the call.

Their mission was highly unusual because these pilots were civilian volunteers flying their own airplanes in combat operations, often at their own expense. The mission was for Civil Air Patrol aircraft to force the U-boats below the surface of the water, making their attacks on shipping much more difficult and time consuming. As soon as the Civil Air Patrol pilots took to the air, they spotted so many U-boats that the military quickly armed their aircraft with small bombs and depth charges. From Maine to Texas, Civil Air Patrol aircraft flew these missions in pairs up to 100 miles offshore, in all seasons, often in bad weather. These CAP, as they are known, put themselves at great risk, flying over water at low levels with only a compass, one radio, and minimal survival gear to help if they got into trouble. Many pilots had to ditch in the water. Twenty-six pilots lost their lives and 90 aircraft were lost.

During an 18-month period, the Civil Air Patrol flew over 24 million miles on its antisubmarine coastal patrols. It spotted 173 U-boats, attacked 57, and sank or damaged 2. It also escorted over 5,600 convoys and reported 17 floating mines, 36 bodies, 91 ships in distress, and 363 survivors in the water. Most importantly, CAP's constant

presence over the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico was a major factor in pushing enemy operations away from the coast and protecting vital shipping and cargo up and down our coastlines.

In 1943 German U-boat attacks ceased off the Atlantic coast of the United States. One high-level German officer credited the Civil Air Patrol with being the primary reason for withdrawal, saying, ''It was because of those damned little red and yellow airplanes.''

As the U-boat threat ended, Civil Air Patrol expanded its homeland security and emergency operations to include search and rescue, border patrol, forest fire patrol, and disaster relief in every State in the Nation.

By war's end, nearly 60,000 members had participated in the Civil Air Patrol and flew 75 million miles over 750,000 hours in support of critical homefront missions. Its volunteers ranged in age from 18 to over 80. Many served for the entire war, while others, most of whom later joined the military, served for shorter periods. A substantial number received ''belligerent'' certificates indicating they had participated in combat-related duty with the Civil Air Patrol.

The individual accounts of Civil Air Patrol pilots' performance and heroism are too numerous to recount, but just a few examples can illustrate the valor with which they served.

For instance, Maj. Hugh Sharp and Lt. Eddie Edwards from Rehoboth, DE, landed their Sikorsky amphibian in high seas to rescue two other CAP airmen who had to ditch their plane. They found one crew member who was badly hurt, but they were unable to take off due to a pontoon damaged during a rough landing in 10-foot seas. They made a decision to taxi the aircraft back to land, but they quickly discovered that the damaged amphibian listed too far to the left and it didn't make much progress. It just sort of went around in circles. So Eddie volunteered to climb to the end of the right wing to keep the plane in balance. The next day, when a Coast Guard ship met the aircraft, Eddie had to be carried from the wing after holding on tightly for 11 hours in freezing and wet conditions. Both pilots were awarded the first Air Medals of the war by President Roosevelt.

Capt. Francis ''Mac'' McLaughlin flew coastal patrol missions from Daytona Beach, FL, for 17 months. During that time, he, along with Albert Crabtree, ditched a Fairchild 24 aircraft in the Atlantic and floated in a life raft for several hours until the Coast Guard picked them up. They quickly became members of the ''Duck Club,'' an exclusive organization that recognized those who survived a CAP ditching. There would soon be many in that club, as I mentioned. When the coastal patrol ended, Mac went to Massachusetts to tow aerial targets, the CAP's second most dangerous duty after the coastal patrol. Seven CAP pilots and observers would be shot down and killed during gunnery practice. Mac, who served the entire war on Active Duty with the Civil Air Patrol, passed away at the end of 2011.

Another CAP veteran was Lt. Charles Compton, who flew from Coastal Patrol Base 1 at Atlantic City, NJ, on antisubmarine and convoy escort missions. He recently noted:

> Convoys could be attacked at any time. We had a war going on and the threat of German submarines off the east coast. Our job was to make it less easy for the German submarines to surface without being detected.

Charles, who lives near Chicago and turned 95 last summer, remembers that during these dangerous missions, pilots often used sunken ships as points of reference to help them navigate when over water. He added that, unfortunately, sunken ships were plentiful at that time. Recently recognized for his service with Civil Air Patrol's Distinguished Service Award, he credits the exceptional efforts of his fellow Atlantic City squadron members for the honor he received.

These are just three stories, but they are illustrative of Civil Air Patrol's many World War II heroes. More importantly, these stories serve as a powerful reminder of the dedication and service that all gave to our Nation.

When the war ended, Civil Air Patrol members received the recognition they deserved. Over time, however, their story was lost to much of the Nation. This Congressional Gold Medal will ensure that this story is told over and over to future generations and recognizes the Civil Air Patrol and its World War II members for their critically important service to our Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant 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.

CARBON POLLUTION

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I want to speak about the ongoing and deliberately overlooked problem of carbon pollution and what it is doing to our planet.

In the context of these remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled ''Game Over for the Climate,'' written by Jim Hansen and published in yesterday's New York Times.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The New York Times, May 9, 2012]

GAME OVER FOR THE CLIMATE

(By James Hansen)

GLOBAL warming isn't a prediction. It is happening. That is why I was so troubled to read a recent interview with President Obama in Rolling Stone in which he said that Canada would exploit the oil in its vast tar sands reserves ''regardless of what we do.''

If Canada proceeds, and we do nothing, it will be game over for the climate.

Canada's tar sands, deposits of sand saturated with bitumen, contain twice the amount of carbon dioxide emitted by global oil use in our entire history. If we were to fully exploit this new oil source, and continue to burn our conventional oil, gas and coal supplies, concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere eventually would reach levels higher than in the Pliocene era, more than 2.5 million years ago, when sea level was at least 50 feet higher than it is now. That level of heat-trapping gases would assure that the disintegration of the ice sheets would accelerate out of control. Sea levels would rise and destroy coastal cities. Global temperatures would become intolerable. Twenty to 50 percent of the planet's species would be driven to extinction. Civilization would be at risk.

That is the long-term outlook. But near-term, things will be bad enough. Over the next several decades, the Western United States and the semi-arid region from North Dakota to Texas will develop semi-permanent drought, with rain, when it does come, occurring in extreme events with heavy flooding. Economic losses would be incalculable. More and more of the Midwest would be a dust bowl. California's Central Valley could no longer be irrigated. *Food prices* would rise to unprecedented levels.

If this sounds apocalyptic, it is. This is why we need to reduce emissions dramatically. President Obama has the power not only to deny tar sands oil additional access to Gulf Coast refining, which Canada desires in part for export markets, but also to encourage economic incentives to leave tar sands and other dirty fuels in the ground.

The *global warming* signal is now louder than the noise of random weather, as I predicted would happen by now in the journal Science in 1981. Extremely hot summers have increased noticeably. We can say with high confidence that the recent heat waves in Texas and Russia, and the one in Europe in 2003, which killed tens of thousands, were not natural events—they were caused by human-induced climate change.

We have known since the 1800s that carbon dioxide traps heat in the atmosphere. The right amount keeps the climate conducive to human life. But add too much, as we are doing now, and temperatures will inevitably rise too high. This is not the result of natural variability, as some argue. The earth is currently in the part of its long-term orbit cycle where temperatures would normally be cooling. But they are rising—and it's because we are forcing them higher with fossil fuel emissions.

The concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has risen from 280 parts per million to 393 p.p.m. over the last 150 years. The tar sands contain enough carbon—240 gigatons—to add 120 p.p.m. Tar shale, a close cousin of tar sands found mainly in the United States, contains at least an additional 300 gigatons of carbon. If we turn to these dirtiest of fuels, instead of finding ways to phase out our addiction to fossil fuels, there is no hope of keeping carbon concentrations below 500 p.p.m.—a level that would, as earth's history shows, leave our children a climate system that is out of their control.

We need to start reducing emissions significantly, not create new ways to increase them. We should impose a gradually rising carbon fee, collected from fossil fuel companies, then distribute 100 percent of the collections to all Americans on a per-capita

basis every month. The government would not get a penny. This market-based approach would stimulate innovation, jobs and economic growth, avoid enlarging government or having it pick winners or losers. Most Americans, except the heaviest energy users, would get more back than they paid in increased prices. Not only that, the reduction in oil use resulting from the carbon price would be nearly six times as great as the oil supply from the proposed pipeline from Canada, rendering the pipeline superfluous, according to economic models driven by a slowly rising carbon price.

But instead of placing a rising fee on carbon emissions to make fossil fuels pay their true costs, leveling the energy playing field, the world's governments are forcing the public to subsidize fossil fuels with hundreds of billions of dollars per year. This encourages a frantic stampede to extract every fossil fuel through mountaintop removal, longwall mining, hydraulic fracturing, tar sands and tar shale extraction, and deep ocean and Arctic drilling.

President Obama speaks of a ''planet in peril,'' but he does not provide the leadership needed to change the world's course. Our leaders must speak candidly to the public—which yearns for open, honest discussion—explaining that our continued technological leadership and economic well-being demand a reasoned change of our energy course. History has shown that the American public can rise to the challenge, but leadership is essential.

The science of the situation is clear—it's time for the politics to follow. This is a plan that can unify conservatives and liberals, environmentalists and business. Every major national science academy in the world has reported that global warming is real, caused mostly by humans, and requires urgent action. The cost of acting goes far higher the longer we wait—we can't wait any longer to avoid the worst and be judged immoral by coming generations.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. The article begins with two simple sentences: ''Global warming isn't a prediction. It is happening.''

He talks about the dangers of the Canada tar sands and what that means for us if we go ahead with that project. His conclusion is this:

If Canada proceeds, and we do nothing, it will be game over for the climate.

Canada's tar sands, deposits of sand saturated with bitumen, contain twice the amount of carbon dioxide emitted by global oil use in our entire history.

He looks at the recent extreme weather that people—not only across the country but across the world—have been noticing. He concludes:

We can say with high confidence that the recent heat waves in Texas and Russia, and the one in Europe in 2003, which killed tens of thousands, were not natural events—they were caused by human-induced climate change.

So the risk we face is a real one, and we are actually seeing it begin to happen in present time. He says:

The tar sands contain enough carbon—240 gigatons—to add 120 parts per million to our atmosphere. As I have said before on the Senate floor, we have lived for 8,000 centuries within a range between 170 and 300 parts per million of carbon in our atmosphere. That is the bandwidth within which the human species has lived on this planet, and we have gone rocketing out of that bandwidth in recent years. We are now at 390 parts per million out of a bandwidth, for 800,000 years, between 170 and 300 parts per million. The tar sands would add 120 parts per million to that. That would take us to 510, if my math is right.

Tar shale—a close cousin of tar sands found mainly in the United States—contains at least an additional 300 gigatons of carbon.

This shows the folly of what Dr. Hansen describes:

. . . as a frantic stampede to extract every fossil fuel through mountaintop removal, longwall mining, hydraulic fracturing, tar sands and tar shale extraction, and deep ocean and Arctic drilling.

Jim Hansen is somebody who is worth listening to. He has been writing about this now for more than 30 years,

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a posting by Neil Wagner entitled ''Hansen Had It Right in 1981 Climate Report.''

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANSEN HAD IT RIGHT IN 1981 CLIMATE REPORT

(By Neil Wagner)

A recently rediscovered 1981 paper, written by NASA atmospheric physicist James Hansen and others, has been analyzed and found to be impressively accurate about the course of climate change since its publication.

The 10-page paper (available at this link), which was published in the journal Science, had been overlooked for decades when researchers Geert Jan van Oldenborgh and Rein Haarsma from the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute uncovered it and began scouring its contents.

The paper's impressive prognostication is the best kind of vindication for Hansen, who has suffered more than his share of the slings and arrows from climate deniers in the media, such as Fox News, Rush Limbaugh, and Andrew Breitbart. He's also taken hits from ''climate confusionist'' Physicist Freeman Dyson, and has charged that the Bush administration tried to silence his warnings about global warming's urgency.

Deniers of climate change often look for boogeymen in their attempts to disprove the phenomenon's existence. As a means of putting a face on the ''global warming hoax,'' an individual is often singled out for attack. In his new book, The Hockey Stick and the Climate Wars, scientist Michael E. Mann calls this technique the Serengeti Strategy, since the technique is akin to lions singling out vulnerable prey from a herd.

The links below provide current information about some of the paper's projections: Atmospheric carbon increase, Formation of drought prone regions, Sea level rise, Antarctic ice erosion, Opening of the Northwest Passage.

The complex world of climate science rarely enjoys such clear and simple validation. When such an opportunity presents itself, we owe it to ourselves to make some noise about it. Haarsma and van Oldenborgh's findings should be shouted from the rooftops.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. He says:

A recently rediscovered 1981 paper, written by NASA atmospheric physicist Jim Hansen and others, has been analyzed and found to be impressively accurate about the course of climate change since its publication.

The 10-page paper . . . which was published in the journal Science, had been overlooked for decades when researchers Geert Jan van Oldenborgh and Rein Haarsma from the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute, uncovered it and began scouring its contents.

The paper's impressive prognostication is the best kind of vindication for Hansen, who has suffered more than his share of the slings and arrows from climate deniers in the media . . .

He concludes:

The complex world of climate science rarely enjoys such clear and simple validation. When such opportunity presents itself, we owe it to ourselves to make some noise about it.

With appreciation to Jim Hansen, how the actual science has borne him out over the past 30 years, and with respect for the predictions he makes, we should as soon as we can begin to address ourselves to this problem.

Jim is not alone. An array of scientific organizations wrote us all a letter back in October of 2009 whose conclusion is pretty clear and stark in scientific language:

Observations throughout the world make it clear that climate change is occurring and rigorous scientific research demonstrates that the greenhouse gasses emitted by human activities are the primary driver. These conclusions are based on multiple independent lines of evidence and contrary assertions are inconsistent with an objective assessment of the vast body of peer reviewed science.

We act as if it is something new, but, in fact, it is not. The determination that carbon dioxide would warm the planet as it increased its concentration in the atmosphere was figured out around the time of the American Civil War by an Irish scientist who worked in England named John Tyndall. What Tyndall discovered we have proven to be true, as since then we have dumped gigaton after gigaton of carbon into our atmosphere, loading it up to the point now, as I said before, that we are well outside the bounds that have protected our species for 800,000 years on this planet.

The scale of what 8,000 centuries means is perhaps best measured against the time that scientists now believe man first began to engage in agriculture, first started scratching the earth and putting seeds into the ground. Before then, we were primarily hunter-gatherers, leading a very primitive life. So we have gone from beginning to scratch the earth and plant things to be, 10,000 years later, the species we are. We lived within this bandwidth of 170 to 300 parts per million for 8,000 centuries. To veer outside of it is significant and hazardous.

I am delighted that Mr. Hansen, despite all the abuse that has been heaped on him, continues his work. I hope the time comes when we start to listen to the voice of what our planet is telling us, the voice of what our scientists are telling us, the voice of what our children are telling us, and not just the voice of what the lobbyists for the polluting industries—particularly the oil and gas industries—are telling us.

Frankly, the lobbyists for the polluting oil and gas industries are not

telling us the truth. They are not telling us the truth. The truth is becoming increasingly apparent, and the problem is that as time goes by you can reach tipping points that are irrecoverable. It would be really tragic for us to look back and think, if we had been able to act on time, if we had listened on time to the signals of our Earth, our planet, the signals that are plainly in our face, we could have made a world that was better and safer for our children. But, instead, in our folly, in our greed, in our willingness to listen to the falsehoods of these polluters, we shot past that point, and there is no way to recover it now.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MARY LEAHY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise on the Senate floor today to pay tribute to Mary Leahy, director at the Central Vermont Adult Basic Education—sister, friend, and lifetime educator—who is retiring this month.

For 40 years, Central Vermont Adult Basic Education has provided free literacy services for adults and out-of-school youth. Thirty-seven of those years, Mary Leahy has been at the helm. In her role as codirector at Central Vermont Adult Basic Education, Mary dedicated herself to preparing lower skilled workers to meet the demands of the shifting economy.

Whether it was attending townhalls, community centers and libraries, or knocking on doors directly, Mary has spread the word. She has recruited members for this program all over the State.

I have seen the joy in the face of a grandfather able to read a children's story to a grandchild—something the grandfather was not able to do for that child's parent because he could not read when they were a child.

In a recent article honoring Mary in the Times Argus, Vermont Poet Laureate Sydney Lea said these kind words about Mary:

> This has been way beyond a job for Mary; it's really a vision of humanity that she's been dedicated to. I have an admiration for her that is pretty close to boundless.

I agree with my friend Sydney. Mary's lifelong passion for learning has enabled countless Vermonters to gain the critical skills needed to participate in today's workforce. In our country today, 88 million adults face at least one educational barrier, such as no high school diploma or no college, and only 3 to 4 percent of the workers with the most limited literacy proficiencies receive the basic skills training from their employers. Under Mary's guiding hand, Central Vermont Adult Basic Education has allowed Vermonters, young and old, to reach their full potential and to be successful both in the classroom and in the workforce—I might add parenthetically, also just in their everyday lives.

As her older brother, I have known Mary all her life. She is a loving, intelligent, and hard-working person. She has the soul and talent of an artist and the generosity of a saint in sharing her talent and commitment.

I am so proud of Mary, and I ask unanimous consent that the Times Argus article ''Closing a Chapter'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Times Argus, April 30, 2012]

CLOSING A CHAPTER: MARY LEAHY ENDS CAREER AT ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

(By David Delcour)

Pages turn, chapters end, books close, and Mary Leahy—a woman who has dedicated her life to literacy in central Vermont—knows that better than most.

On Tuesday, Leahy plans to put the proverbial ''period'' at the end of her 37-year career with Central Vermont Adult Basic Education. The Marshfield woman's name has become synonymous with the organization where she's worked for nearly four decades.

And Leahy will tell you she's treasured every minute of it.

''I'm surprised I'm leaving,'' Leahy said during a Friday afternoon interview at CVABE's office on Washington Street in Barre. ''This is what I am because the work is every bit at the center of my heart.''

For those unfamiliar with CVABE, ''the work'' involves providing ''free, individualized and confidential academic services'' to folks who range in age from 16 to 90-something.

Many are high school dropouts, some are immigrants struggling to learn English, and still others are challenged by a growing ''digital divide'' that didn't exist back in 1975 when a much younger Leahy ditched her job as a high school art teacher to try something completely different.

Seated in an armchair located in the shadow of a paper mache version of Barre's ''Stonecutter'' memorial—this one holding a book in an outstretched hand, instead of a hammer at his side—Leahy said she has never regretted enlisting as a foot soldier in one of the earliest fronts in the ''War on Poverty.''

''When this job opened up, I went for it and it's grabbed every single bit of imagination that I have,'' she said. ''It has been endlessly interesting and incredibly rewarding.''

It was also real work, according to Leahy.

''Back then all of us were working out of our cars and going here and there and everywhere,'' she recalled. ''I've tutored in barns, I've tutored in churches, I've tutored in restaurants . . . wherever people were and (wherever they) felt comfortable.''

Leahy's initial assignment was to expand the then-loose-knit, Barre-based program into five communities in Washington, Orange and Lamoille counties.

''That meant literally going through the hills and knocking on doors and saying: This is a program, it's free, and do you know anybody . . . who would find it helpful?'' she recalled.

Those trips, Leahy said, were as much a search for ''students'' as they were an attempt to recruit volunteers, whom, she is quick to note, have long been the backbone of CVABE.

That outreach paid off, according to Carol Shults-Perkins, who joined CVABE two years before Leahy and is the other half of the organization's long-standing ''executive team.''

''We've been delivering, and committed to delivering community-based services here in central Vermont for more than 40 years now, but it really was Mary (Leahy) who began—community by community, town hall by town hall, library by library engaging individual community members . . . and ensuring that community partnership and community participation has been part and parcel of the community-based services we provide.''

According to Shults-Perkins, who will soon assume the role as CVABE's first executive director, the thought of running the organization without Leahy sharing the helm is going to take some getting used to.

''We have worked as a team for 35 years,'' she said. ''You can't replace Mary (Leahy).''

Shults-Perkins won't get any argument from Newberry resident and Vermont Poet Laureate Sydney Lea. Lea, an 18-year member of CVABE's board of directors and its current president, thinks highly of the woman who recruited him during a chance encounter in a hospital parking lot.

''This has been way beyond a job for Mary (Leahy); it's really a vision of humanity that she's been dedicated to,'' Lea said.

''I have an admiration for her that is pretty close to boundless,'' he added, noting when he had to pick someone to install him as poet laureate last year, he turned to Leahy.

''She (Leahy) was the first person who came to mind,'' he said. ''No fellow poets, no academics, just Mary.''

A soft-spoken, silver-haired woman, with kind eyes and a tendency to deftly shift the focus of a conversation away from herself, Leahy speaks passionately about the importance of adult education, the courage of those who avail themselves to the services CVABE provides, and the commitment of an ever-changing cadre of volunteers who ''find the time in their busy schedules to make a difference.''

It's a recipe that works, according to Leahy, who spent one of her last days on the job pitching the merits of a program that has been her life's work.

''We're really the earliest of early ed(ucation) programs,'' Leahy said. ''If parents are really important to their children's academic success, then for the parents who missed out on their own education, it stands to reason their child is not going to be on an equal playing field with other kids . . . That's where we come in.

''If we can place ourselves in the public imagination as part of the warp and weave of the entire fabric of education, then we're there for people whose time is right,'' she said. ''When they're ready to learn (and) they want to learn, we're here to help.''

Leahy said she is in the process of sifting through an office filled with notes, letters, and student work that underscore the life-changing nature of a basic education.

''It's like a memory tunnel,'' she said. ''I'm unearthing all these wonderful things.''

One was a note from a then-newly computer literate woman who thanked her CVABE teacher for helping her master modern technology.

''She was 90,'' Leahy said of the woman.

Although Leahy believes it is time for her to retire from CVABE, she said she won't be going far and will likely add her name to the organization's roster of volunteers.

''I'll be around,'' she said.

Leahy will also be missed, according to Lea, who penned a poem—''Her Eyes''—that he read at her recent retirement party.

Here is what Lea wrote:

HER EYES

—for Mary Leahy, on her retirement
I asked your friends about your eyes—what color
They were, in a few short words. The answers ranged
From what I'd expect, like sparkling, penetrating,
To ones that were anything but: the earliest green
Of spring, said one, another brook trout green.
And yet the words they used around the colors
They'd chosen made a chorus: compassion, kindness,
Acceptance, faithfulness, honor. What can I add?
Only that in my knowing and loving you
These years, I've beheld within those eyes a shine
That none of us will ever quite describe:
A certain mystery flicker born of watching
Pain for years yourself, and from its kindling
In them what we, in our own crude ways, name hope.

ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a bill I introduced yesterday, the Army Arsenal Strategic Workload Enhancement Act of 2012.

I am grateful to be working with seven of my colleagues on this issue: Senator KIRK, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator HARKIN, Senator PRYOR, Senator BOOZMAN, Senator SCHUMER and Senator GILLIBRAND. Each of us understands the strategic contributions that arsenals make to our national defense. I am pleased that we have a bipartisan bill to put those capabilities on a firm footing for the future.

I know that the men and women at Rock Island Arsenal in my home State of Illinois deserve that firm footing. I was there just last month, seeing again for myself their good work to equip our troops.

The Joint Manufacturing and Technology Center, JMTC, employs some 1,700 highly skilled workers, at least half of whom are veterans. The JMTC is the heart of Rock Island's 8,600-person workforce, every one of them dedicated to providing our troops with what they need.

For more than 10 years now, they have made critical weapons, parts and materiel for our men and women on the front lines of Iraq and Afghanistan. Very often, they have produced items in a crisis, when no one else including the private sector could do it. And they have made it by the deadline and kept it affordable.

The arsenal has made things like up-armored HMMWV kits to protect against improvised explosive devices, IEDs, at a time in the war when, frankly, we were caught flat-footed by the threat. They have produced portable tool sheds so that vehicle maintenance can take place in theater instead of having to pull those vehicles off the front lines. When the Army depleted its stock of a small but critical component for artillery repair, Rock Island stepped up to provide it on short notice.

These are the little-known, lifesaving contributions made by this arsenal.

So my colleagues and I have come together on a bipartisan basis to make sure this strategic asset has a strong future. Our bill would require the Army to create a strategic plan to ensure each arsenal receives the workload it needs to keep its workers' skills sharp. The Army does this type of systematic planning for some of its subdivisions, but not for arsenals. This bill addresses that.

Our bill also would ensure that these arsenals can compete for any military contract, defense-wide. Too often, arsenals are passed over in the contract process. But this bill will ensure these connections happen.

Rock Island's highly skilled workforce has a proven track record. It is in everyone's interest to strengthen this competition.

These two core provisions will help to ensure the long-term health of Rock Island Arsenal. They build upon a bipartisan effort last year by the Illinois and Iowa delegations to expand the arsenal's ability to enter into public-private partnerships. We have seen how these partnerships can drive innovation in new areas like titanium and metal alloys. And they cost the government nothing, all the while assisting in keeping the factory warm and these critical skills available when our country needs them when our troops need them.

I appreciated Senator LEVIN and Senator MCCAIN working with us through the National Defense Authorization Act last year to ensure these provisions were included. I look forward to working with them this year as well.

Rock Island Arsenal is a little-known gem in our military with great importance for our country. I hope we may continue to support their critical role by advancing the ideas I have discussed today.

RECOGNIZING THE BUSH VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the dedication and devotion shown by a group of men and women to their local community. The longstanding services of the Bush Volunteer Fire Department in Laurel County, KY, has been on the cutting edge of rural and volunteer fire departments in the State of Kentucky since the department's beginnings in 1975.

What is so inspiring about the individuals in the Bush VFD is that despite the obstacles placed before them, they have always persevered and prevailed. While the men and women of the department have experienced many successes and accomplishments, I think it is safe to say that these individuals feel that their biggest achievement is the opportunity to serve and protect their fellow citizens in the face of danger.

The Bush Volunteer Fire Department was conceived of by a group of 13 local men who saw a flaw within their community. At the time, the Laurel County Fire Department presided over the Bush community, but the LCFD was over half-an-hour away. The 13 men in Bush decided that the LCFD was just too far away, and for the safety of their citizens, it was time to assemble a firefighting unit closer to home. The LCFD donated a 1947 K-model International fire truck, and just like that, the Bush Volunteer Fire Department was born.

Since the beginning of the department, the men and women at BVFD have sought to become the best that they could possibly be, by implementing new and innovative practices at each and every turn in the road. In less than a year since their start in 1975, the department had secured funds to develop a fire station to house its truck and equipment. Bush VFD was also the third rural volunteer department in the Commonwealth of Kentucky to receive a Class 7 rating from ISO.

In 2011, the department began a junior firefighter program to enlist the help of eager youth in the community in a safe and beneficial way. In 2011, BVFD also enlisted its first female member, Whitney Minton, who joined in alongside her father Rick. These changes, and others, have assisted the Bush Volunteer Fire Department in attaining much of the success it knows today.

I am encouraged by the passion for service of the men and women firefighters and EMTs of the Bush Volunteer Fire Department. Former Bush Chief Ernest Rudder has had the pleasure of following in his father's footsteps, Birchell L. Rudder, in working in the fire house. Ernest's son Marc joined the ranks once he had reached the proper age, and now his son Noah is anxious to be the fourth generation of Rudders to enter firefighting. The Bush Fire Department is truly a family affair for families like the Rudders.

I wonder if those 13 men who took it upon themselves in 1975 to enact change in their community ever thought their dream of a volunteer fire department would become such a huge success. Although this story is common in our country, let us not go without recognizing those who set themselves apart in pursuit of a better future, like those in the Bush community.

Mr. President, at this time I would like to ask my colleagues in the United States Senate to join me in paying tribute to the outstanding service of the many volunteers over the course of the lifetime of the Bush Volunteer Fire Department.

There was recently an article published in the Sentinel-Echo: Silver Edition, an eastern Kentucky local periodical magazine, highlighting the many years of service given by the Bush Volunteer Fire Department. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that said article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Sentinel-Echo: Silver Edition]

THEY ANSWER THE CALL

(By Sue Minton)

Imagine waking in the middle of the night with your home engulfed in a sea of black smoke, or out for an afternoon drive when you spot a cloud of smoke billowing from a distant hillside. The first call you make is to the county dispatch. Pagers buzz in pockets and on tables of volunteer firefighters, summoning them to their stations. And they always come.

Members of the Bush Volunteer Fire Department have been answering these calls for almost 37 years.

In April 1975, 13 men from the Bush community met at Providence Baptist Church for the purpose of organizing a fire department to protect the lives and property within their community.

The reason for starting the department, according to Dennis Minton, charter and current board of trustees member, was—''The Laurel County Fire Department was responding to calls in the county. It could be as long as 30 minutes from the time they received the call until they arrived at the scene (in the old Bush community). By this time, in most cases, the structure was on the ground or fully involved. The residents needed and deserved better protection within their community.''

A fire department was organized and they received their first truck before they found a home.

''The Laurel County Fire Department donated the department a used 1947 K-model International,'' said Ernest Rudder, charter member and captain. ''Because we didn't have a building, the truck was parked at different firemen's homes.''

With fundraising and donations, in less than a year a two-story building was constructed off east Ky. 80 on Ky. 1803 adjacent to the ''old'' Bush School. To repay a proposed loan, in May of 1976 the fire department proposed a tax rate of .08 cents per $100 on real-estate property. Today, that tax rate has been lowered to .0570 cents. The primary purpose of the loan was to pay for fire hydrants and dry hydrants, which were installed throughout the district.

This move paved the way for the district to receive a Class 7 rating from ISO. ''We were the third rural volunteer department in the Commonwealth of Kentucky to be granted this rating,'' Rudder said. ''This move also substantially lowered insurance rates for some homeowners.''

Under the leadership of its first chief, Kenneth Smith (1975 to 1984), the department grew in manpower and equipment. But, at 3:43 a.m. on June 20, 1984, members of the fire department responded to a blaze at the last place they would have expected their own station.

Daybreak found the firefighters still on the scene, and the realization was sinking in they had lost their building and all their equipment.

The loss of the building was a major blow for the firemen and the community, but the Bush residents were never without fire protection. Other departments in and outside the county volunteered their service and equipment.

''One of the trucks brought to the fire by Laurel County Fire Department stayed until we got a new truck,'' Rudder said. ''Bell County Fire Department also sent a tanker for us to use.''

In January 1985, the community and county were invited to a dedication and open house for the newly rebuilt fire station.

The new station grew both in size and membership from 13 charter members without a fire truck or station into a roster of 42 active volunteers, seven of whom are EMTs; three Class A pumpers; and two tankers.

Bush Fire Department proudly protects more than 10,000 people living in an area of 35 square miles and operates out of two stations—Fire Station No.2, opened in 1993, is located on east Ky. 80 in the Lick Fork community. ''Congressman Hal Rogers gave the dedication address,'' Rudder said.

Six chiefs were elected to command the department over the years; the current is Phillip Williams, and the longest serving chief was Don Minton (1999 to 2010).

The fire chiefs, along with their men, have one thing in mind: ''to serve and protect the Bush community.'' And this they are doing by continuing their training and recruiting new members.

In 2011, the department initiated a junior firefighter program.

Also in 2011, Whitney Minton became the first female member of the department, joining her father, Rick, a sergeant.

In volunteer fire departments, and for many in close-knit rural communities, it is natural that one generation would follow the next on the department roll.

And it was a given that Marc Rudder would follow in the footsteps of his father, Ernest Rudder.

Marc Rudder knew that he would grow up to become a firefighter. ''Being able to watch the firefighters help the people of the community in their time of need played a major role in the factor of me wanting to be a fireman,'' Marc Rudder said.

''I feel that the fire department is something that I have always known,'' he added. ''I always played 'fireman' as a child. I did not know childhood without the fire department. I got to play with small toy fire trucks and big real fire trucks.''

''Yes, he has been interested in all things fire or EMS since he was just a small child,'' Ernest Rudder added. ''Like he said, his first toys were fire trucks, ambulances and police cars. It is just natural that he would want to be a firefighter.''

''Marc was with me at the fire department meetings from the time he was a small boy.'' he added. ''He was around the volunteers and he learned as we did.''

At that time, the fire department didn't have a junior firefighter program, so Marc could not join the department. But by the time he was 16 years old, he was taking classes with the other firemen. ''When he could 'officially' be on the roster, he was ready to be certified with his required 150 hours of training,'' his father said.

''One of my first jobs was as an EMT with Ambulance Inc. of Laurel County,'' Marc Rudder said. ''And I feel this was due to the influence the fire department had on me.''

His exposure to the volunteers at Bush Fire Department has, in a round-about way, given him that experience that is now his life's career.

Rudder, who is the State Fire Rescue Training Area 13 Coordinator with the Kentucky Fire Commission, said the knowledge he learned at the Bush Fire Department has helped him each day in his job.

''I feel that coming from a volunteer department serving a rural community has a great benefit over many other people that I work with across the country.''

He coordinates an office that provides training and assistance to 67 fire departments in eight counties in southeastern Kentucky. His office is also an assisting agency to the fire departments in the area for any information that they might need to better serve their communities. Rudder has studied at the National Fire Academy in Maryland and also serves on committees across the region, state, nation, and world.

The fourth generation of the Rudder family, Noah, can't wait to follow in the footsteps of his great-grandfather, grandfather and father.

His great-grandfather, Birchell L. Rudder, was an original member of the board of trustees, being elected in 1975, elected chairman of the board of trustees in 1979, and served as chairman until 1996, but remained on the board until his death in 2002.

Noah Rudder, a seventh-grader at North Laurel Middle School, has been coming to the Monday night meetings like his father, Marc, for a long time. He is just waiting until he is old enough to become a junior firefighter.

''I like to go to the fire department because I know all the people and they are like family to me. And I enjoy learning about firefighting and seeing the equipment,'' he said.

''Incidentally, Noah is an authority on all things having to do with 9/11,'' his grandfather added.

Also, Noah's aunt, Dawn, and her husband, Frank Kilby, are members of the Laurel County Volunteer Fire Department.

''The department is comprised of members from all walks of life and everyone brings something to the table,'' Ernest Rudder said. ''During an emergency, we are all business. We are a department of friends and neighbors. But we are always willing to welcome another member.''

''We like what we do. We volunteer our time to help people when they need it. It's giving back to the community. And the department has an excellent relationship with the community. They visit schools to present fire-safety programs, allow children to climb onto their fire trucks, and participate in local parades and other civic functions.''

From its earliest beginnings, the Bush Volunteer Fire Department has realized the importance of training for this most hazardous job. Proper training ensures that the best interests of the citizens are being served and they are able to return to the station without the life of a firefighter being harmed or lost.

Requirements for being a certified firefighter in Kentucky are the same, but Bush requires each member to obtain at least 20 additional hours of training a year.

''Many of the members are certified or currently obtaining emergency medical technician training, which requires more training every two years,'' Marc Rudder said.

''This training will enable the EMTs to provide medical care to the community and assist the EMS agency.''

Because of the extensive training Bush Fire Department members receive, they hold the honor of being five-time Kentucky Firefighter Olympic Champions, having won the title in 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, and 1993. The team retired undefeated.

''Firefighters have become more aware of the dangers of being firefighters, EMS workers and police officers since 9/11,'' he continued. ''Many new training requirements have come about since Sept. 11, 2011, and I believe the people who want to be firefighters realize the dangers and the great responsibility that being a firefighter entails. I imagine all the

fire departments have gotten better and train harder because of 9/11.''

Every firefighter is by law a ''peace officer'' and duty-bound to report anything unseemly they come across.

In the post-9/11 world we live in today, firefighters are expected to do even more to safeguard the lives of residents in their districts. They must be able to address all hazards, not just fires.

As ''first responders,'' firefighters can provide information to emergency-response agencies that have not yet arrived on the scene. They can determine the situation and decide what resources are required, whether it be an ambulance, law enforcement, hazmat team, or an arson investigator.

House fires kill and injure thousands yearly, and cost many more their valued possessions and memories.

''The activity report for 2011 has Bush Volunteer Fire Department responding to 102 calls,'' Ernest Rudder said. ''Thankfully, only nine were structure fires. We had several grass fires and about five or six vehicle fires. The vast majority of our calls these days are to assist Ambulance Inc. of Laurel County with automobile accidents or to answer and investigate residential smoke or fire alarms.''

Rudder said it would be hard to designate the most dangerous fire the department had responded to over the years. ''But the Blackwater Church fire was really big with a roof collapse. The big fires in the city of London that we've assisted with and the fires at Chaney Lumber were big and dangerous. We've never had anyone seriously hurt, but recently, on a mutual-aid fire with Laurel County, two of our men were knocked down when the garage doors and ceiling fell on them. Luckily, there were several other firemen there who pulled them to safety.''

TRIBUTE TO KENTUCKY WORLD WAR II VETERANS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of a group of men from the Commonwealth of Kentucky who all acted bravely and valiantly during their time of service in the United States Armed Forces in World War II. Glenn Combs, Toleman Combs, Mansell Stone, Benjamin Garrison, Walter Garrison, Rufus Miller, Earl Hobbs, and Elvy Roberts, who are all from different towns and hollers in Clay County, KY, each has a fascinating story of his experiences while in the military. And it is my hope to share a few of those with you today.

When the United States of America decided to enter the Second World War, we did so with an insurmountable level of patriotism, dedication, and determination to defeat the Axis Powers. Men were going to extreme lengths to enlist and answer the call to serve their country, and protect freedom and democracy in the foreign countries around the world in which it was being tested.

Earl Hobbs, one of the men in this group of eight, had learned that he was just 2 pounds shy of the minimum weight required by the U.S. Army at the time of his enlistment. Upon hearing this news, he hurriedly ran to the nearest convenience store and purchased 3 square pounds of bananas. He gobbled them down right there outside the grocery, every last one of them. Later that day he passed the physical, including the weight requirement, and was an official member of the U.S. Armed Forces. It was instances like Earl's that truly inspire me; instances of men and women going to such great lengths to secure their freedom and the freedom of the ones that they love.

Earl's action that day so long ago was just one of many from what we call the ''Greatest Generation.'' Men and women alike across the Nation assumed new and unfamiliar assignments and positions that they may not have been comfortable with, all for the cause of defending liberty and securing freedom. We must look to the veterans of not only the Second World War, but the veterans of all the Nation's conflicts and struggles, with the utmost respect. We must not take for granted the inalienable rights we have so passionately fought to gain and maintain, and we must never forget those who have made the greatest sacrifice made by many on behalf of those rights.

I truly cherish the opportunity to stand on the floor of the U.S. Senate today to speak on behalf of these eight men and relate a true story of a local Kentucky ''Band of Brothers'' who decided to honor God and country and selflessly serve all those who inhabit this great Nation.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating the great contributions of Glenn Combs, Toleman Combs, Mansell Stone, Benjamin Garrison, Walter Garrison, Rufus Miller, Earl Hobbs, and Elvy Roberts to the cause of freedom.

In July of 2011 there was an article published in the Manchester Enterprise, Clay County's local newspaper, which featured the truly unique journey these eight World War II veterans have experienced in their lifetimes. I ask unanimous consent the said article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to appear in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Manchester Enterprise, July 28, 2011]

A CHAPTER IN WWII HISTORY

Note: This week's feature story covers eight individuals who aided their country to take part in World War II. This story was graciously sent in by Ted Garrison.

After a thorough debate on the world situation, expressing their personal opinions and obligations for a month, they made a decision. They would honor God and country, and defend the Republic of the United States in WWII.

Glenn and Toleman Combs, Mansell ''Dude'' Stone, and Benjamin and Walter Garrison enlisted in the U.S. Army. Another of the Garrison brothers, Theo, wanted to join, but he was informed that it would be more important to the war effort for him to remain at home and continue to mine coal.

When I first began my research on this small group, I thought Rufus ''Jamup'' Miller and Earl Hobbs were with them. I found that they entered the military at a different date, but these men (as did so many others) endured enormous hardships during their service, so I decided it necessary to include them in this brief history of patriotism and uncommon valor.

The small group of recruits departed Manchester on October 16, 1940, to be inducted into the military at Ft. Thomas, KY. Walt Garrison was 18 years old at that time. Walt and a friend from Kentucky earned the top scores for expert riflemen in their company. Later, Uncle Walt laughed and blamed snow for causing him to lose to his friend by one point the day they were at the rifle range.

Toleman Combs, Ben Garrison, and Walt Garrison were assigned to Anti-Tank Company of the 10th Infantry Regiment attached to Lt. General George S. Patton's 1st Armored Division of the 3rd Army. Glenn Combs was assigned to Headquarters training and was a Glider Wing of the 82nd Airborne Division.

I believe we should mention that Capt. Elvy Roberts, born on Beech Creek in Clay County, commanded a Glider Wing in the 101st Airborne at Normandy. He also participated in two parachute jumps there. Elvy Roberts made a career of the U.S. military and led the 6th Army as a Lt. General in Vietnam.

The 10th Infantry, with other Army units, including segments of the 101st and 82nd Airborne, were stationed in Iceland. The troops weren't informed that this location was actually a staging area in preparation for the Normandy invasion. Normandy was one of the most important events of WWII. They shipped out of Iceland bound for an unknown destination. After arriving offshore, the 10th Infantry Regiment stayed aboard ships during the first three days of the battle. Their orders were to wait until inclement weather cleared enough to move the tanks and anti-tank guns onto the beaches.

The day before the landing, in the pre-attack briefing, they learned the location was Normandy, and details of the mission were revealed. At that time, they were unaware that their friend, ''Dude'' Stone, was in the initial attack on the German-held beaches. Soldiers of the 82nd and 101st Airborne had already fought a fierce battle, starting June 3, 1944. ''Dude'' had gone in with a glider wing. There were 200 men in his wing, and only nine survived.

10th Infantry Regiment and other units prepared to attack. The Anti-Tank company departed the USS Republican by landing crafts and stormed the beach on June 6 at 6:30 AM. Uncle Walt said, ''The scene was terrible, but we had a job to do. We could see fortifications blown apart, tank wreckage, and the bodies of American airborne troops lying on the beach.''

I asked him if he was afraid when they hit the beach, and he answered, ''No, but I was very angry when I saw how the Germans had treated our soldiers.'' American troops had sustained approximately 6,036 casualties during the first hour of the invasion and over 2,400 at Omaha Beach alone, but they had gained a toehold.

American troops were able to fight their way over the beaches and hundred-foot high cliffs to move ahead a few miles and dig in for approximately 24 hours, thus securing the area. This was a process they repeated, moving the line forward. During these advances, Uncle Walt and a soldier of German ancestry performed sniper and reconnaissance duty for their company. On one occasion near the Modelle River in France, A-T Company came under mortar and rifle fire from a small town. Walt and Wolfgang split up and worked their way toward each end of the village, firing on the enemy positions as they moved in. When they were close, Wolfgang yelled to the enemy troops using the German language, telling them they were surrounded and ordered them to surrender.

Approximately 150 German soldiers surrendered. There was at least one SS Trooper with them. Walt and Wolfgang referred to that episode as their Sgt. York Trick!

Earl Hobbs was discovered to be two pounds under the required body weight at the induction center. He ran to a nearby grocery store, bought three bounds of bananas, hurriedly ate the fruit and passed the physical. Was this an example of youthful patriotism or what?

After basic training, Earl was schooled in armor at Ft. Knox, KY. He was assigned to a tank crew in the 1st Armored Division. During a battle near Algeria, Africa, his tank was disabled and the crew was forced to evacuate. They were captured by German soldiers and taken to a POW camp, Stalag 3B in Berlin, Germany, where he was a prisoner for 27 months.

While he was in this camp, fellow Clay Countian Squire Baker was incarcerated there for three or four months, then moved out to a different location. Squire and surviving members of their bomber crew had been shot down and captured. Stalag 3B was liberated by Russian allies. Earl said, ''The Russians were much more cruel than our former German captors.''

Rufus ''Jamup'' Miller, Jr. was inducted into the military at Cincinnati, Ohio, August 13, 1943. After basic training at Camp Blanding, Florida, he was assigned to K Company of the 339th Infantry, Third Battalion. They were heavily involved in the assault on the Gustav line.

This location was in Italy. K Company's losses were very heavy, nearly 55 percent. Most of the casualties in K Company were from the minefields. However, they also encountered mortar, rifle, and machine-gun fire. ''Jamup'' was among the wounded. The 339th Infantry was one of the three regiments of the 85th Infantry Division. In WWI, they were nicknamed the ''Polar Bears.''

The 85th had a proud and famous history. The second time ''Jamup'' was wounded was in the North Apennines Campaign in bitter fighting east of Mount Verruca. He was also involved in the PO Valley campaign as well as the Rome-Arno Campaign. After being wounded twice, Miller was transferred to the military police. June 5th, 1944, the 339th did their victory march through Rome.

Glenn Combs was at the induction center when doctors decided his feet were a little flat for the infantry. He went through basic training and into Headquarters Company of the 1st Armored Division. In December of 1942, they traveled to North Africa by ships. Glenn was involved in battles at Anzio, Kasserine Pass, Tunisia, and Algeria. After avoiding a near disaster at Kasserine Pass, the commanding general was relieved and Col. Robinett was placed in charge of operations. Because of his excellent strategy and leadership in attaining victory in a very negative situation, Col. Paul ''Little Man'' Robinette was promoted to Brig. General. Kasserine Pass was considered to be the first major battle won by American forces in North Africa. Glenn Combs was promoted from staff sergeant to junior warrant officer, and in a few months to chief warrant officer. Glenn said, ''One of the reasons I was promoted through the enlisted ranks to officer was due to so many men getting killed in my company.''

These men served approximately five years. Walt Garrison was one of the fortunate. He didn't receive a scratch. Uncle Ben wasn't so lucky. He was wounded in the shoulder by shrapnel from an exploding artillery shell on a hill near the Moselle River in France.

Walt Garrison was one of those veterans who could talk about his war experience. Ben, ''Dude,'' ''Jamup,'' and many others were too scarred emotionally, mentally, and physically to recall their combat duty.

I apologize that I'm unable to provide more complete information concerning the sacrifices these men made for our country. They and many more of those veterans are heroes and should never be forgotten. The American people who lived during the WWII era earned a reputation as ''The Greatest Generation.'' I truly believe they deserve that compliment. Not only in military service, but also in different walks of life, many of them had exemplary attitudes and accomplishments.

At this time, Glen Combs is the only one of these men still living. He is 92 and in poor health.

Toleman Combs passed away November 29, 1995, and is buried at Nancy, KY. Rufus ''Jamup'' Miller died February 3, 1997, and is buried in Manchester. Benjamin Franklin Garrison died at Wilmore Veteran's Hospital December 27, 1997, and is buried at Memorial Gardens in Manchester. Walter Garrison passed away on May 22, 2002.

Years ago, Uncle Walt decided to be buried with some of the soldiers he served with at Normandy. He was laid to rest in Butler County Memorial Park ''Field of Honor'' near Hamilton, Ohio.

Earl Hobbs died November 25, 2003, and is buried at Memorial Gardens in Manchester. Mansell ''Dude'' Stone passed on July 2, 2004, and is buried in Harts Branch Cemetery outside Manchester.

TRIBUTE TO BURT BACHARACH

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I salute the life and accomplishments of Burt Bacharach, who received The Library of Congress Gershwin Prize for Popular Song on Tuesday night. This award is given to musicians whose lifetime contributions to the field of popular song demonstrate the standard of excellence associated with George and Ira Gershwin. Mr. Bacharach received this award jointly with cowriter Hal David, which is the first time in the history of this award that it has gone to a songwriting team. This prestigious honor not only celebrates their work, but it places them among the ranks of Paul Simon, Paul McCartney, and Stevie Wonder, all previous recipients.

Born in Missouri and raised in New York, Burt built a name for himself over his six-decade career as one of the country's most respected and honored songwriters. His partnership with Hal David created such beloved songs as ''Raindrops Keep Fallin' on My Head,'' ''What the World Needs Now is Love,'' ''Walk on By,'' and ''Alfie.'' The duo first began collaborating in the 1950s at the Famous Paramount Music Company, and among their first big hits were ''The Story of My Life,'' made famous by Marty Robbins, and ''Magic Moments,'' performed by Perry Como.

Following on their first successes, between 1962 and 1972 their songs were almost continuously on Billboard Magazine's singles chart. During this time they worked with an array of singers, including Dionne Warwick, B.J. Thomas, Dusty Springfield, The Carpenters, Tom Jones, Jackie DeShannon, Gene Pitney, and Herb Alpert. Together, Burt and Hal have written numerous hits that have helped launch the careers of some of America's most celebrated musicians.

Mr. Bacharach, one of the most honored and successful composers of our time, has earned three Academy Awards and eight Grammy Awards. These include the 1997 Grammy Trustees Award, which he shares with David, and the 2008 Lifetime Achievement Award. Even after being inducted into the Songwriters Hall of Fame, he is still touring and performing all over the world.

I ask my Senate colleagues join me in honoring and congratulating Mr. Burt Bacharach on this well-deserved honor.

TRIBUTE TO PATROLMAN BEN CAMPBELL

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Patrolman Ben Campbell of Copley, OH, for being honored as a 2012 National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO) TOP COPS award recipient for the brave and heroic actions he has displayed in the line of duty.

On August 7, 2011, Officer Ben Campbell responded to a report of shots fired in a Copley Township neighborhood and he found a very grisly scene. An armed suspect had shot eight people, killing seven, and was still at large in the neighborhood. Without waiting for backup, Officer Campbell took off on foot after the suspect. As he scoured the area, he heard more gunshots and ran in their direction. Suddenly he found himself in an open area, with no protection, but surrounded by trees and houses, any one of which could be concealing the shooter. Moments later, the suspect stepped out from behind a house and pointed an automatic pistol directly at Officer Campbell. Officer Campbell commanded the shooter to drop his weapon, and when the man refused, the Officer had no choice but to shoot, killing the suspect.

It was a horrible tragedy, but without Officer Campbell's unhesitating courage, it would have been far worse. A subsequent investigation confirmed this when more than 200 rounds of ammunition were discovered in the suspect's car.

For his commitment to the Copley community, as well as his tremendous acts of bravery on August 7, 2011, I would like to recognize and thank Mr. Campbell for his service and congratulate him on receiving the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO) TOP COPS award.

2011 U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION HONOREES

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, every year the U.S. Small Business Administration, SBA, honors our country's local entrepreneurs, hardworking Americans who have built businesses from ideas and created jobs for their communities. I would like to congratulate the eight outstanding entrepreneurs from Connecticut who were recognized in 2011, most especially, A. Gregory Bachmann of Torrington, Connecticut's DYMAX Corporation, who

was named 2011 Connecticut Small Business Person of the Year.

The SBA has advocated for small businesses in Connecticut since 1953, providing assistance through the Federal Small Business Innovation Research, SBIR, Program, facilitated at Connecticut Innovations. This support has included more than $500 million of financing, education and training, and procurement aid for individuals with big ideas and businesses wanting to expand by taking technological risks.

The winner of the Small Business Person of the Year award must meet eight sets of criteria, including staying power, growth in number of employees, increase in sales and/or unit volume, current and past financial performance, innovativeness of product or service offered, response to adversity, contributions to community-oriented projects, and the products exported and markets served.

In 1979, Mr. Bachmann inherited the business his parents had started in their basement. Now, DYMAX makes its home in a 100,000 square foot building and operates facilities globally, including in Germany, China, Hong Kong, and Korea. It offers innovative technology, such as adhesives, coatings, epoxies, masking resins, and light-curing systems, to manufacturers who rely on innovative solutions for reliable, cost-effective, and quick automated assembly. Most recently, DYMAX has successfully experimented with UV and LED technology as a cutting-edge way for companies to grow. In addition to the tremendous progress Mr. Bachmann has made since his parents' vision, I commend him for ensuring that his company remains environmentally conscious while making remarkable strides in research and development. DYMAX also gives back to Connecticut's less fortunate, and has received an award from United Way of Northwest Connecticut for ''conducting the most unique employee incentive program'' for contributions to their annual food drive.

In addition to the title of Small Business Person of the Year, the SBA recognizes seven other businesses or individuals in Connecticut every year as Minority Small Business Champion, Veterans Advocate Champion, Explorer of the Year, the Jeffrey Butland Family Owned Business of the Year, Region One Subcontractor of the Year, Women in Business Champion, and Financial Services Champion.

Clayton Williams and Dennis Brown are two of the 2011 awardees who are driven by their passion for the potential of small businesses and the ways they can transform lives. I have seen firsthand the tremendous roots local businesses have set in New Haven and the central part they play in the city's community, so it is no surprise that Mr. Williams, the city of New Haven's small business development officer, received the 2011 Minority Small Business Champion award. He has worked tirelessly on behalf of minority entrepreneurs as part of the Office of Economic Development to help fund and sustain the best, most promising ideas in the New Haven area. Veterans Advocate Champion Dennis Brown was awarded for his service as vice president of Business Counseling for Connecticut Community Investment Corporation, a nonprofit that works with small business owners to secure loans and develop strategy. A veteran and recipient of an SBA veteran's loan in 1982, Mr. Brown demonstrates that dreams can be realized with persistence. I applaud the SBA for recognizing the importance of providing for our Nation's heroes who wish to run their own businesses once returning home.

In addition, every year the SBA names an Explorer of the Year in Connecticut, acknowledging that risk confronts business owners every day. 2011 winner, On Site Gas Systems of Newington and its president, Frank X. Hursey, are committed to the most cutting-edge solutions and designs for reliable sources of gas used by a comprehensive set of industries, including emergency response, food preservation, automobile, and by our military.

Often, it is family owned businesses, hoping to continue the legacy of previous generations that become reliable sources of products or services central to their communities. The SBA named Jim Nilsson, owner and managing partner of Geissler's Supermarkets of South Windsor, as the 2011 Jeffrey Butland Family Owned Business of the Year. In 1923, Geissler's was a small storefront, and now it offers online shopping and delivery. Often family businesses in Connecticut also win other categories, and in 2011, the SBA honored Region 1 Subcontractor of the Year Thomas Dolan, Jr., for his work as president of Hi-Rel Products in Essex. Hi-Rel Products was started in the early 1970s by Mr. Dolan's father, who worked out of his Old Saybrook home to experiment with reliable precision components for microelectronics. Now, this technology has applications across a wide range of industries. Currently, Hi-Rel employs approximately 100 people in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom.

Lastly, I would like to recognize Margaret Sheahan, 2011 Women in Business Champion, and Patrick Lorent, 2011 Financial Services Champion, for their work in Connecticut in the legal and financial lending industries, respectively. Ms. Sheahan is founding partner of Mitchell & Sheahan of Redding and provides important legal counsel in employment and union disputes. Mr. Lorent was honored by the SBA for his role as vice president and manager of People's United Bank Government Lending Department where he connects United Bank with national, statewide, and local lending programs. This important work provides vital lifelines to the small businesses of Connecticut that can continue to focus on research and development without worrying about their protection and sustenance.

The SBA continues to raise awareness and support for Connecticut's local entrepreneurs with their annual awards. The SBA and its 2011 honorees are inspirational, showing our Nation's budding business owners and leaders how to grow an idea to global proportions—driven by the most advanced research and technology and steadfast confidence in the American legacy of starting from the beginning to achieve greatness.

PHARMACY COMPETITION AND CONSUMER CHOICE ACT

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Pharmacy Competition and Consumer Choice Act, S. 1058. In light of the Federal Trade Commission's recent decision to allow the merger of two Pharmacy Benefit Managers, creating the largest PBM in our nation, I call on my colleagues to join me in supporting this vital piece of legislation. The Pharmacy Competition and Consumer Choice Act, if enacted, would help protect patients and providers from soaring health-care costs and potentially anticompetitive conduct by PBMs, who are the middlemen in the prescription drug industry.

Over the past several years, I have spoken with many of Mississippi's pharmacists who feel powerless against PBMs and their overreaching influence in their industry. In Mississippi, where over 1 million individuals live in rural, medically underserved areas, community pharmacists play a pivotal role in providing health care to patients. These pharmacists, often the only health-care providers in an area, develop trusting relationships with their customers and communities. This legislation will help level the playing field between community pharmacies and PBMs, while ensuring Americans have access to the providers of their choice.

While a few States, such as my State of Mississippi, regulate the activities of PBMs, these powerful players in health care remain largely unregulated by the Federal Government. PBMs compete across state lines in our country, and this legislation would provide national anti-fraud oversight in each of our 50 States.

The need for this legislation is clearer now than ever. With the upcoming merger, one company will control 40 percent of the market. As one FTC Commissioner appropriately stated, it will be a ''game changer.''

I am an unyielding supporter of free markets, and I strongly believe this legislation would facilitate a more transparent, competitive, and fair marketplace for PBMs, pharmacies, providers, and patients. On behalf of the millions of Americans and businesses affected by the market practices of Pharmacy Benefit Managers, I urge my colleagues to pass the Pharmacy Competition and Consumer Choice Act.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRED CAPTAIN THOMAS JEROME HUDNER, JR.

Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I rise today in tribute to retired United States Navy Captain Thomas Jerome Hudner, Jr. of Concord, MA, a true American hero. For his uncommon valor and dedication to the highest principals of our military, the Navy announced this week it will name the Arleigh Burke class guided-missile destroyer DDG–116 the USS *Thomas Hudner*.

It is a distinct honor, for an individual to have a Navy vessel commissioned in their name; it is an extremely rare honor indeed for a warship to be named after a living person. Yet there are few, if any, people more deserving of this honor than Tom Hudner.

A native of Fall River, MA, Hudner was a student at Philips Exeter Academy when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. Already a leader on his school's athletic fields and in its student government, he responded to the call of duty and was admitted to the U.S. Naval Academy. Though World War II ended before his commissioning at Annapolis, Hudner began a storied Navy career that would ultimately earn him our nation's highest military honor.

During his first few years in the Navy, Hudner served as a communications officer aboard various warships before being accepted to the Navy's flight school in Corpus Christi, TX. After earning his ''wings of gold,'' Hudner became one of the ''Fighting Swordsmen'' of Strike Fighter Squadron 32 (VF–32) aboard the aircraft carrier USS *Leyte*. Just a few years after the racial integration of the US military, Hudner began flying with a young ensign named Jesse LeRoy Brown, the Navy's first black pilot. Brown was born and raised in the segregated deep south town of Hattiesburg, MS, a world away from Hudner's upper middle class home in Fall River and the fields of Hudner's alma mater Philips Exeter Academy.

The relative calm of post-war life as a Naval Aviator aboard the Mediterranean-based USS *Leyte* would not last long. In the summer of 1950, less than a year after Hudner's flight certification, North Korean Communist forces invaded the Republic of Korea. Within months, President Truman would order the *Leyte* into action off the coast of Korea where Hudner and his wingman, Jesse Brown, immediately began flying reconnaissance and attack sorties against Communist positions. Not long after VF–32 joined the fight, China invaded and threatened to overrun US positions.

There are no routine missions in wartime, especially when flying close air support over enemy positions. Such was the case on the afternoon of December 4, 1950 when Hudner and Brown were on a mission to destroy enemy targets near the Chosin Reservoir. About an hour into the mission, Brown's Corsair was hit by enemy fire, began to lose fuel and he was forced to crash land his aircraft into a snowy mountainside.

The events that transpired over the next few hours became enshrined in the history of American Naval Aviation.

Despite exposure to hostile ground fire, Hudner continued to make low passes over Brown, who was trapped in the wreckage of his destroyed aircraft. And, when Hudner saw that his wingman's plane was burning, he deliberately crash-landed his own aircraft and though injured in the violent landing, ran to Brown's rescue. You see for Hudner, never leaving one's wingman was more than a guideline, it was a covenant. Hudner, later a rescue helicopter pilot, tried in vain to free Brown from the wreckage. With night falling and Ensign Brown lapsing in and out of consciousness, Hudner was finally forced to evacuate the bitter cold crash site. Brown's final words to Hudner were to tell his wife, Daisy, that he loved her. He would have the chance to do just that in person. On April 13, 1951, Daisy Pearl Brown was in the audience when President Harry S. Truman presented Thomas J. Hudner, Jr. with the Medal of Honor for his heroic attempt to save Ensign Brown.

Over the next two decades, Hudner would continue to serve with distinction in the United States Navy. In addition to flying many of the Navy's newest jet fighters, Hudner's career would take him from various ships and air bases where he served in positions of increasing responsibility, including as executive officer of the USS *Kitty Hawk* during the Vietnam War.

Hudner and Daisy Pearl Thorne, she had since remarried, remained friends, their lives intertwined by the events decades earlier on a snowy mountainside on the other side of the globe. In fact, the two friends would be together at another ceremony some 22 years later when the US Navy commissioned the first American warship in honor of an African American, the USS *Jesse L. Brown*.

Hudner retired from the US Navy at the rank of captain in 1973, and while his day-to-day service in the Navy would end, this American hero would continue to serve his fellow veterans through the USO and a variety of veterans' organizations. For most of the 1990s, Hudner served with distinction as Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Veterans Affairs.

In closing, I will quote Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus:

> Thomas Hudner exemplifies the core values of honor, courage and commitment the Navy holds dear. Naming the Navy's next DDG for him will ensure his legacy will be known, honored and emulated by future generations of sailors and Marines who serve and all who come in contact with this ship.

I thank Captain Hudner for his lifetime of exceptional service to our nation and his dedication to his fellow veterans and wish him and his wife Georgia all the very best in the years ahead.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

2012 ACADEMIC DECATHLON CHAMPIONS

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the hard work and remarkable accomplishments of Granada Hills Charter High School's Academic Decathlon team for winning the 2012 Academic Decathlon—its second consecutive national championship. I want to congratulate all the members of the team: Christian Koguchi, Stella Lee, Priscilla Liu, Kimberly Ly, Hamidah Mahmud, Lev Tauz, Julia Wall, Sean Wejebe, and Jimmy Wu, as well as its coaches Matthew Arnold, Nick Weber, and Spencer Wolf.

Each year, hundreds of high schools throughout our Nation compete for the honor of becoming Academic Decathlon National Champions. This year, Granada Hills Charter High School not only became one of three schools to ever win consecutive national championships, but also set the highest score ever achieved at the Academic Decathlon National Championships.

Competing in an Academic Decathlon is a daunting task. The Academic Decathlon's intense 2-day national final competitions include multiple-choice testing in seven different events, speeches, essay writing, and interviewing exercises. Students spend many hours studying, practicing, and competing, often away from their family and friends. I invite all of my colleagues to join me and the State of California in congratulating California's Granada Hills Charter High School Academic Decathlon team on becoming 2012 National Academic Decathlon Champions.•

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT COLONEL ROBERT B. SHAIN

• Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life of LTC Robert B. Shain, who passed away on Sunday, April 29, 2012. I would like to express my condolences to Lieutenant Colonel Shain's family, in particular his wife of 52 years, Sherry, his two daughters, Cynthia and Stephanie, his son, Michael, and his three grandkids, Bella, Jason, and Mia. He is also survived by his sister-in-law, Nancy, and many nieces and nephews.

Robert Shain had an honorable and extensive career which began upon his graduation from the Military Academy at West Point in 1959. He served in the US Army for 20 years as an infantry officer as well as a fixed-wing and helicopter pilot. He completed two tours of duty in Vietnam and was awarded the Legion of Merit, two Distinguished Flying Crosses, two Bronze Stars, 27 Air Medals with V for valor, Meritorious Service Medal, Vietnamese Medal of Honor, and Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry. He served as commander of the Executive Flight Detachment and pilot of the presidential helicopter,

Army One, for presidents Nixon and Ford from 1973 to 1976.

Following his retirement, he enjoyed a long professional career in the aeronautics industry. He was an active supporter of the National Rifle Association and a member of the Military Officers Association. However, I understand that his greatest joy in life was spending time with his loving family.

Bob Shain lived every aspect of his life whether service to his country, to his family, or to his business with unrivaled pride and dignity. The career of Lieutenant Colonel Shain serves as a reminder of the sacrifice and commitment that has carried our great nation through the toughest of times. His service to the people of the United States and the State of Iowa is worthy of much admiration and respect. I am grateful for his service and pay tribute to his patriotism.●

TRIBUTE TO PROFESSOR JAMES OLESEN

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate Professor James Olesen from the Department of Music at Brandeis University, the winner of the 2012 Festival of the Creative Arts Award for Distinguished Contribution to the Arts.

The Festival, which began in 1952, celebrates the idea that ''art activates dreams, revolution, and the future,'' and Professor Olesen's career is certainly deserving of this special recognition amid the creativity and community of the Festival that blooms on the Brandeis campus every spring.

Professor Olesen has spent his career striving for excellence and fostering musical greatness in his students as the Choral Director at Brandeis since 1972. He has served as Music Department Chair and collaborated with faculty members and other departments on various music programs. He was instrumental in the creation of the Office of the Arts and School of Creative Arts.

Throughout his long and illustrious career, Professor Olesen has sung as a professional chorister with numerous conductors, including Charles Munch, Gustav Meier, Leopold Stowkowski and the founder of the Festival, the legendary Leonard Bernstein.

Professor Olesen also has performed with premier musical organizations including the American Symphony Orchestra, the New York Philharmonic Orchestra, the Robert Shaw Chorale and the American Ballet Theater at venues including Carnegie Hall, the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Metropolitan Opera.

Professor Olesen has also recorded for Columbia, RCA and Decca Records. He is former Director of the Back Bay Chorale and founded and directed the Orpheus Singers. In 2008, the University Chorus, under his direction, made the first international tour by any Brandeis student music ensemble.

His career reflects Mr. Bernstein's belief that ''the art of an era is a reflection of the society in which it is produced, and through creative endeavors the thoughts and expression which characterize each generation are revealed and transformed.''

I congratulate Professor Olesen on this wonderful achievement, thank him for his service to our young people, and salute all that he's accomplished.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:31 a.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 bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4133. An act to express the sense of Congress regarding the United States-Israel strategic relationship, to direct the President to submit to Congress reports on United States actions to enhance this relationship and to assist in the defense of Israel, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4967. An act to prevent the termination of the temporary office of bankruptcy judges in certain judicial districts.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 3:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2668. An act to designate the station of the United States Border Patrol located at 2136 South Naco Highway in Bisbee, Arizona, as the ''Brian A. Terry Border Patrol Station''.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4133. An act to express the sense of Congress regarding the United States-Israel strategic relationship, to direct the President to submit to Congress reports on United States actions to enhance this relationship and to assist in the defense of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 10, 2012, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1302. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in Tracy, California, to the City of Tracy.

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–6029. A communication from the Chief of Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Unlicensed Operation in the TV Broadcast Bands, Third Memorandum Opinion and Order'' (ET Docket No. 04–186; FCC 12–36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6030. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Naval Explosive Ordnance Disposal School Training Operations at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida'' (RIN0648–AY64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6031. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Electric Motors and Small Electric Motors'' (RIN1904–AC05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6032. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; California; Western Mojave Desert Ozone Nonattainment Area; Reclassification to Severe'' (FRL No. 9669–7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6033. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Ohio; Determination of Clean Data for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Standard for the Steubenville-Weirton Area'' (FRL No. 9669–5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6034. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Kentucky; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan; Correction'' (FRL No. 9669–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6035. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Nonattainment New Source Review

Rules'' (FRL No. 9669–3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6036. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Quality Designations for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9668–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6037. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Priorities List, Final Rule No. 54'' (FRL No. 9668–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6038. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Rule to Implement the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard: Classification of Areas That Were Initially Classified Under Subpart 1; Revision of the Anti-Backsliding Provisions to Address 1-Hour Contingency Measure Requirements; Deletion of Obsolete 1-Hour Ozone Standard Provision'' (FRL No. 9668–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6039. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Model Safety Evaluation for Plant-Specific Adoption of Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler TSTF–432, Revision 1, 'Change in Technical Specifications End States (WCAP–16294)' Using the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process'' (NUREG–1431) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6040. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management and Volume Reduction'' (NRC–2011–0183) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6041. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Administration, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Access Authorization Fees'' (RIN3150–AJ00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6042. 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 ''Section 42 Qualified Contract Provisions'' (RIN1545–BD20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2012; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6043. 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 ''Request for Comments on Reporting of Health Insurance Coverage'' (Notice 2012–32) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2012; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6044. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Finalizing Medicare Regulations under Section 902 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (MMA) for Calendar Year 2011''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6045. 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 ''Request for Comments on Reporting by Applicable Large Employers on Health Insurance Coverage under Employer-Sponsored Plans'' (Notice 2012–33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2012; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6046. 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 ''Minimum Value of an Employer-Sponsored Health Plan'' (Notice 2012–31) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2012; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6047. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medicare Program; Extension of Certain Wage Index Reclassifications and Special Exceptions for the Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems (PPS) for Acute Care Hospitals and the Hospital Outpatient PPS'' (CMS–1442–N) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2012; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6048. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medicare Program; Community First Choice Option'' (CMS–2337–F) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2012; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6049. A communication from the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to continuing disability reviews (CDR) completed in fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6050. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, a report relative to action taken to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding Between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Hellenic Republic Concerning the Imposition of Import Restrictions on Categories of Archaeological and Byzantine Ecclesiastical Ethnological Material through the 15th Century A.D. of the Hellenic Republic; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6051. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on the Administration, Cost, and Impact of the Quality Improvement Organization (QIO) Program for Medicare Beneficiaries for Fiscal Year (FY) 2009''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6052. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Defense Trade Cooperation Treaty with the United Kingdom'' ((RIN0750–AH70) (DFARS Case 2012–D034)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6053. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Contingency Contract Closeout'' ((RIN0750–AH71) (DFARS Case 2012–D014)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6054. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: New Free Trade Agreement with Colombia'' ((RIN0750–AH72) (DFARS Case 2012–D032)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6055. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Utilization of Domestic Photovoltaic Devices'' ((RIN0750–AH43) (DFARS Case 2011–D046)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6056. A communication from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Authority to Require Supervision and Regulation of Certain Nonbank Financial Companies'' (RIN4030–AA00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6057. A communication from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of the Freedom of Information Act'' (RIN4030–AA02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6058. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determinations'' ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA–2012–0003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6059. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determinations'' ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA–2012–0003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6060. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the Department in the position of Deputy Secretary, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6061. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Version 4 Critical Infrastructure Protection Reliability Standards'' (Docket No. RM11–11–000) received in the Office of the President of the

Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6062. A communication from the Executive Director, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Annual Update of Filing Fees'' (Docket No. RM12–5–000) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6063. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to proposed amendments to parts 120, 123, 124, 126, 127, and 129 of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6064. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2012–0042—2012–0045); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6065. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the implementation of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 for fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6066. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on the Head Start Fiscal Monitoring Assessment''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6067. A communication from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chief Executive Officer at the Corporation for National and Community Service received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6068. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''New Animal Drugs; Ceftiofur Crystalline Free Acid; Gamithromycin; Tylosin'' (Docket No. FDA–2012–N–0002) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6069. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Disqualification of a Clinical Investigator'' ((RIN0910–AG49) (Docket No. FDA–2011–N–0079)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6070. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005–59, Introduction'' (FAC 2005–59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2012; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6071. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Employees Health Benefits Program: New Premium Rating Method for Most Community Rated Plans'' (RIN3206–AM39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2012; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6072. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the Austin, TX and Waco, TX, Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas'' (RIN3206–AM50) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2012; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6073. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''Review of the Permanent Supportive Housing Program—Department of Human Services''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6074. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–346, ''DISB Fingerprint-Based Background Check Authorization Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6075. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–347, ''Fresh Healthy Mobile Cart Vending Pilot in Underserved Areas Temporary Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6076. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–348, ''Advisory Neighborhood Commissions Boundaries Temporary Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6077. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–349, ''Medical Marijuana Cultivation Center Temporary Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6078. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–350, ''Wrongful Death Temporary Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6079. A communication from the Chief of the Liaison and Policy Section, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Controlled Substances and List I Chemical Registration and Reregistration Fees'' (RIN1117–AB32) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2012; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–6080. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Copayments for Medications in 2012'' (RIN2900–AO28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2012; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–6081. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Technical Revisions to Update Reference to the Required Assessment Tool for State Nursing Homes Receiving Per Diem Payments from VA'' (RIN2900–AO02) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2012; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–6082. A communication from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the receipts and expenditures of the Senate for the period from October 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2012; ordered to lie on the table.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. COBURN:

S. 3076. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to require the public disclosure by trusts established under section 524(g) of such title, of quarterly reports that contain detailed information regarding the receipt and disposition of claims for injuries based on exposure to asbestos, and the filing of such reports with the Executive Office for United States Trustees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 3077. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the Pro Football Hall of Fame; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 3078. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the United States on June 6, 1944, the morning of D-Day; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 3079. A bill to make participation in the American Community Survey voluntary, except with respect to certain basic questions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 3080. A bill to eliminate certain subsidies for fossil-fuel production; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3081. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax rate parity among all tobacco products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. JOHANNS):

S. 3082. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the National Veterans Support Network to carry out activities to support and supplement the mission of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 3083. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require certain nonresident aliens to provide valid immigration documents to claim the refundable portion of the child tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BURR:

S. 3084. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to reorganize the Veterans

Integrated Service Networks of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. REED, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 3085. A bill to provide for the expansion of affordable refinancing of mortgages held by the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3086. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on acrylic staple fibers containing 85 percent or more by weight of acrylonitrile units and 2 percent or more but not over 3 percent of water, raw white (undyed), crimped, with an average decitex of 1.2 (plus or minus 10 percent) and fiber length of 38 mm (plus or minus 10 percent); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3087. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on acrylic filament tow containing 85 percent or more by weight of acrylonitrile units and 2 percent or more but not over 3 percent of water, colored, crimped, with an average decitex of 3.3 (plus or minus 10 percent) and an aggregate filament measure in the tow bundle between 660,000 and 1,2000,000 decitex, with a length greater than 2 meters; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3088. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on filament tow of rayon; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3089. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on staple fibers of viscose rayon, not carded, combed, or otherwise processed for spinning, measuring 1.67 to 16.67 decitex and having a fiber length each measuring 20 mm or more but not over 150 mm; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3090. A bill to renew the temporary reduction of duty on staple fibers of viscose rayon, not carded, combed, or otherwise processed for spinning; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3091. A bill to extend the temporary reduction of duty on viscose rayon staple fibers having a decitex of less than 5.0; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3092. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on staple fibers of rayon, carded, combed, or otherwise processed for spinning, presented in the form of top; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3093. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on acrylic staple fiber, not dyed, not carded, combed, or otherwise processed for spinning, with a cut fiber length of 100 mm to 135 mm and a target length of 120 mm; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3094. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on acrylic staple fiber, dyed, not carded, combed, or otherwise processed for spinning, with a cut fiber length of 89 to 140 mm and a target length of 115 mm; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3095. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on acrylic staple fibers, dyed but not carded, combed, or otherwise processed for spinning, with a cut fiber length of 100 mm to 135 mm and a target length of 120 mm; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3096. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on acrylic staple fibers, not dyed and not carded, combed, or otherwise processed for spinning, with a cut fiber length of 89 mm to 140 mm and a target length of 115 mm; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3097. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on acrylic or modacrylic staple fibers, carded, combed, or otherwise processed for spinning; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3098. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on mucochloric acid; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3099. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 4-Chloro-3,5-dinitro- a,a,a-trifluorotoluene; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3100. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on [2,2'-bi-1H-indole]-3,3'-diol, potassium sodium salt; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3101. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixtures of 9,10-anthracenedione, 1,8-dihydroxy-4-nitro-5- (phenylamino)- and 3- Pyridinecarbonitrile, 5-[2-(2- cyano-4-nitrophenyl) diazenyl]-2-[[2-(2-hydroxyethoxy)ethyl]amino]- 4-methyl-6-(phenylamino)- and 3-Pyridinecarbonitrile, 5-[(2-cyano-4-nitrophenyl) diazenyl]-6-[[2-(2-hydroxyethoxy)ethyl]amino]- 4-methyl-2-(phenylamino)- and Acetic acid, cyano-[3-[(6-methoxy-2-benzothiazoyl)amino]-1H-isoindol-1- ylidene]-, pentyl ester; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3102. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixtures of 2,7-naphthalenedisulfonic acid, 4-amino-5-hydroxy-6-[2-[2-methoxy-5-[[2-(sulfooxy)ethyl]sulfonyl]]phenyl]di azenyl]-, sodium salt (1:4) and 2,7-Naphtalenedisulfonic acid, 4-amino-5-hydroxy-3,6-bix[2-[4-[[2-(sulfooxy)ethyl] sulfonyl]]phenyl]diazenyl]-, sodium salt (1:4); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3103. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixures of chromate(2-), [3-(hydroxy-kO)-4-[2-[2-(hydroxy-kO)-1-naphthalenyl]diazenyl-kN2]-1-naphtaenesulfonato(3-)[1-[2-[2-(hydroxy-kO)-5-[2-(4-methyoxyphenyl)diazenyl]phenyl]diazenyl-kN2]-2-naphtalenolato(2-)-kO]-sodium (1:2) and coaltate(1-), bis[2-[2-[5-(aminosulfonyl)-2-(hydroxy-kO)phenyl]diazenyl-kN1]-3-(oxo-kO)-N-phenylbutanamidato(2-)], sodium (1:1) and chromate(1-), bis[3-[4-[5-chloro-2-(hydroxy-lO)phenyl]diazenyl-kN1]-4,5-dihydro-3-methyl-5-(oxo-kO)-1H-pyrazol-1-yl]benzenefulfonamidato(2-)]-, sodium (1:1); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3104. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on acid blue 324; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3105. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixtures-of cobaltate(3-), bis[2-[[[4-(hydroxy-kO)-3-[2-[2-(oxo-kO)-1-[(pheylamino) carbonyl] propyl] diazenyl-kN1] phenyl] sulfonyl] amino] benzoato(3-)]-, ammonium sodium and coaltate(2-), [2-[[[4-(hydroxy-kO)-3- [2-[2-(oxo-kO)-1-[(phenylamino) carbonyl] propyl] diazenyl-kN1] phenyl] sulfonyl] amino] benzoato (3-)][2-[2-[2-(hydroxy-kO)-5-[(phenylamino) sulfony] phenyl] diazenyl-kN1]-3- (oxokO)-N-phenylbutanamidato (2-)]-, ammonium sodium; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3106. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Reactive Black 5; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3107. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain other made up articles; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3108. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on ethanol, 2,2'-[[4-[2-(3,5-dinitro-2-thienyl)diazenyl]phenyl]imino]bis-, 1,1'-diacetate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3109. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2,7-naphthalenedisulfonic acid, 3,3'-[carbonylbis(imino-4,1-phenylene-2,1-diazenydiyl)]bis[4-amino-5-hydroxy-6-(2-phenyldiazenyl)-, sodium salt (1:4); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3110. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on disperse blue 77; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3111. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on cobaltate(1-), bis[4-(hydroxy-k O)-3-[2-[2-(hydroxy-k O)-1-naphthalenyl]diazenyl-k N1]benzenesulfonamidato(2-)]-, sodium (1:1); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3112. A bill to renew the temporary suspension of duty on cuprate (4-), [2-[[3-[[substituted]-1,3,5-triazin-2-yl]amino]-2-hydroxy-5-sulfophenyl](substituted)azo], sodium salt; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3113. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-anthracenesulfonic acid, 1-amino-9,10-dioxo-4-[[3-[[2-(sulfooxy)ethyl]sulfonyl]phenyl]amino]-, sodium salth (1:2); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3114. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on cobaltate(2-), [6-(amino-kN)-5-[2-[2-(hydroxy-kO)-4-nitrophenyl]diazenyl-kN1]-N-methyl-2-naphthalenesulfonamidato(2-)][6-(amino-kN)-5-[2-[2-(hydroxy-kO)-4-nitrophenyl]diazenyl-kN1]-2-naphthalenesulfonato(3-)]-, sodium (1:2); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3115. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on acetic acid, cyano-(3-[(6-methyoxy-2-benzothiazoyl)amino]-1H-isoindol-1-ylidene}-, pentyl ester; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3116. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-naphthalenesulfonic acid, 5,5'[carobnylbis(imino-4,1-phenylene-2,1-dia zenediyl)]bis[8-[2-(4-sulfophenyl)diazenyl]-, sodium salt (1:4); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3117. A bill to renew the temporary suspension of duty on vat blue 66; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3118. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on disperse yellow 64; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3119. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on disperse red 60; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3120. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on staple fibers of viscose rayon, not carded, combed, or otherwise processed for spinning, measuring over 1.3 decitex but not over 1.66 decitex and having a fiber length each measuring 20 mm or more but not over 150 mm; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3121. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on modacrylic staple fibers containing 35 percent or more but not over 85 percent by weight of acrylonitrile units and 2 percent or more but not over 3 percent of water, not pigmented (ecru), crimped, with an average decitex of 2.2 (plus or minus 10

percent) and fiber length of 51 mm (plus or minus 10 percent); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3122. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on modacrylic staple fibers containing 35 percent or more but not over 85 percent by weight of acrylonitrile units and 2 percent or more but not over 3 percent of water, not pigmented (ecru), crimped, with an average decitex of 1.9 (plus or minus 10 percent) and fiber length of 51 mm (plus or minus 10 percent); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3123. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on acrylic staple fibers containing at least 85 percent by weight of acrylonitrile units and 2 percent or more but not more than 3 percent of water, not dyed or pigmented (ecru), crimped, with an average decitex of 1.9 (plus or minus 10 percent) and fiber length of 51 mm (plus or minus 10 percent); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3124. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on acrylic staple fibers containing at least 85 percent by weight of acrylonitrile units and 2 percent or more but not more than 3 percent of water, raw white (undyed), crimped, with an average decitex of 2.2 (plus or minus 10 percent) and fiber length of 38 mm (plus or minus 10 percent); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3125. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on acrylic staple fibers containing at least 85 percent by weight of acrylonitrile units and 2 percent or more but not over 3 percent of water, raw white (undyed), crimped, with an average decitex of 1.3 (plus or minus 10 percent) and fiber length of 38 mm (plus or minus 10 percent); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3126. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on acrylic staple fibers (polyacrylonitrile staple) containing 85 percent or more by weight of acrylonitrile units and 2 percent or more but not over 3 percent of water, not pigmented (ecru), crimped, with an average decitex of 1.3 (plus or minus 10 percent) and fiber length of 40 mm (plus or minus 10 percent); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3127. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on acrylic filament tow containing 85 percent or more by weight of acrylonitrile units and 2 percent or more but not over 3 percent of water, raw white (undyed), crimped, with an average decitex of 4.1 (plus or minus 10 percent) and an aggregate filament measure in the tow bundle from 660,000 to 1,200,000 decitex, with a length greater than 2 meters; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3128. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on acrylic filament tow containing 85 percent or more by weight of acrylonitrile units and 2 percent or more but not over 3 percent of water, raw white (undyed), crimped, with an average decitex of 2.2 (plus or minus 10 percent) and an aggregate filament measure in the tow bundle from 660,000 to 1,200,000 decitex, with a length greater than two meters; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3129. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on acrylic fiber tow containing 85 percent or more by weight of acrylonitrile units and 2 percent or more but not over 3 percent of water, raw white (undyed), crimped, with an average decitex of 3.3 (plus or minus 10 percent) and an aggregate filament measure in the tow bundle from 660,000 to 1,200,000 decitex, with a length greater than 2 meters; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3130. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Fluopyram; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3131. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on imdaziflam; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3132. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on flubendiamide; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3133. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on fenhexamid; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3134. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on fluopicolide; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3135. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Fenamidone; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3136. A bill to extend the temporary reduction of duty on Imidacloprid; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3137. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2,4-dichloroaniline; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3138. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on trinexapac-ethyl; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3139. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Cypermethrin; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3140. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on staple fibers of viscose rayon, not carded, combed, or otherwise processed for spinning, measuring over 1 decitex but not over 1.3 decitex and having a fiber length each measuring 20 mm or more but not over 150 mm; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3141. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Hostavin 3058; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3142. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Hostapur SAS; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3143. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on confectionery (including gum) containing synthetic sweetening agents (e.g., saccharin) instead of sugar; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3144. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on preparations intended to assist smokers to stop smoking; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3145. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Oxyfluorfen; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3146. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Acifluorfen; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3147. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain eyelash curlers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3148. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on manicure and pedicure sets; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3149. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on nail clippers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3150. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain plaiting material products suitable for use in window shades; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3151. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain plaiting material products suitable for use in window shades; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3152. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on lithium chloride; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3153. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on lithium carbonate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3154. A bill to extend and modify the temporary reduction of duty on acrylic filament tow imported in the form of 8 sub-bundles crimped together, each containing 24,000 filaments (plus or minus 10 percent); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3155. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on acrylic filament tow imported in the form of bundles of crimped product, each containing 198,000 filaments (plus or minus 10 percent) with an average decitex of 4.0 to 5.6 (plus or minus 10 percent) and length greater than 2 meters; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3156. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on acrylic filament tow imported in the form of bundles of crimped product each containing 214,000 filaments (plus or minus 10 percent); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3157. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on acrylic filament tow imported in the form of bundles of crimped product of 250,000 to 350,000 filaments (plus or minus 10 percent) with an average decitex of 2.4 to 3.7 (plus or minus 10 percent) and length greater than 2 meters; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3158. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on acrylic staple fibers, not carded, combed, or otherwise processed for spinning, with a decitex of 2.4 to 3.7 (plus or minus 10 percent), a fiber shrinkage of from 0 to 22 percent (plus or minus 10 percent), and a cut fiber length of 89 to 140 mm, with a target length of 115 mm; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3159. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on acrylic filament tow imported in the form of bundles of crimped product, each containing 250,000 filaments (plus or minus 10 percent) with an average decitex of 3.3 to 5.6 (plus or minus 10 percent) and length greater than 2 meters; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3160. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Spiromesifen; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3161. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Indaziflam; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3162. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Flubendiamide; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3163. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Sodium monochloroacetate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3164. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Reactive Black 31; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3165. A bill to renew the temporary suspension of duty on Pigment Yellow 154; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3166. A bill to renew the temporary suspension of duty on Pigment Yellow 175; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3167. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pigment Yellow 151; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3168. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Hostanox P-EPQ; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3169. A bill to extend and modify the temporary suspension of duty on preparations based on ethanediamide, N-(2-ethoxyphenyl)- N′-(4-isodecylphenyl)-; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3170. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Hostavin 3055; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3171. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Nylostab seed; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 3172. A bill to renew the temporary suspension of duty on Ethanoyl chloride; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. Res. 453. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that supporting seniors and individuals with disabilities is an important responsibility of the United States, and that a comprehensive approach to expanding and supporting a strong home care workforce and making long-term services and supports affordable and accessible in communities is necessary to uphold the right of seniors and individuals with disabilities in the United States to a dignified quality of life; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. RISCH):

S. Res. 454. A resolution commending the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Department of Energy hosting the Third International Conference on Nuclear Power Plant Life Management; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. TESTER, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

S. Res. 455. A resolution designating June 27, 2012, as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KOHL, Mr. TESTER, Mr. KERRY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BAUCUS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. Res. 456. A resolution commemorating and acknowledging the dedication and sacrifice made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. Res. 457. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Republic of Argentina's membership in the G20 should be conditioned on its adherence to international norms of economic relations and commitment to the rule of law; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JOHANNS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. Res. 458. A resolution commemorating May 15, 2012, as the sesquicentennial of the founding of the Department of Agriculture; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 503

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 503, a bill to declare English as the official language of the United States, to establish a uniform English language rule for naturalization, and to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States, pursuant to Congress' powers to provide for the general welfare of the United States and to establish a uniform rule of naturalization under article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

S. 506

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) were added as cosponsors of S. 506, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 598

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 598, a bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage.

S. 740

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 740, a bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act.

S. 881

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 881, a bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to assure meaningful disclosures of the terms of rental-purchase agreements, including disclosures of all costs to consumers under such agreements, to provide substantive rights to consumers under such agreements, and for other purposes.

S. 1058

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1058, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure transparency and proper operation of pharmacy benefit managers.

S. 1086

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1086, a bill to reauthorize the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004, to provide assistance to Best Buddies to support the expansion and development of mentoring programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1111

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1111, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the tax on beer to its pre-1991 level, and for other purposes.

S. 1299

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1299, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the establishment of Lions Clubs International.

S. 1301

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1301, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2012 through 2015 for the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, to enhance measures to combat trafficking in persons, and for other purposes.

S. 1309

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1309, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care.

S. 1512

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1512, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1591

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1591, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Raoul Wallenberg, in recognition of his achievements and heroic actions during the Holocaust.

S. 1616

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1616, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes.

S. 1718

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S.

1718, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the application of Medicare secondary payer rules for certain claims.

S. 1796

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1796, a bill to make permanent the Internal Revenue Service Free File program.

S. 2003

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2003, a bill to clarify that an authorization to use military force, a declaration of war, or any similar authority shall not authorize the detention without charge or trial of a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States and for other purposes.

S. 2017

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2017, a bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration.

S. 2103

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2103, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 2118

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2118, a bill to remove unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats from seniors' personal health decisions by repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

S. 2165

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 2165, a bill to enhance strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2205

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2205, a bill to prohibit funding to negotiate a United Nations Arms Trade Treaty that restricts the Second Amendment rights of United States citizens.

S. 2245

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 2245, a bill to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States.

S. 2325

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2325, a bill to authorize further assistance to Israel for the Iron Dome anti-missile defense system.

S. 2347

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2347, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services.

S. 2371

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2371, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to permit employers to pay higher wages to their employees.

S. 2388

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2388, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 3053

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3053, a bill to require Regional Administrators of the Environmental Protection Agency to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

S.J. RES. 38

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 38, a joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to the certification of nonimmigrant workers in temporary or seasonal nonagricultural employment.

S. RES. 402

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 402, a resolution condemning Joseph Kony and the Lord's Resistance Army for committing crimes against humanity and mass atrocities, and supporting ongoing efforts by the United States Government and governments in central Africa to remove Joseph Kony and Lord's Resistance Army commanders from the battlefield.

S. RES. 450

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 450, a resolution designating May 15, 2012, as ''National MPS Awareness Day''.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3081. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax rate parity among all tobacco products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. 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. 3081

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 ''Tobacco Tax Equity Act of 2012''.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHING EXCISE TAX EQUITY AMONG ALL TOBACCO PRODUCT TAX RATES.

(a) TAX PARITY FOR PIPE TOBACCO AND ROLL-YOUR-OWN TOBACCO.—Section 5701(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''$2.8311 cents'' and inserting ''$24.78''.

(b) TAX PARITY FOR SMOKELESS TOBACCO.—

(1) Section 5701(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''$1.51'' and inserting ''$13.42'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''50.33 cents'' and inserting ''$5.37''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) SMOKELESS TOBACCO SOLD IN DISCRETE SINGLE-USE UNITS.—On discrete single-use units, $50.33 per thousand.''.

(2) Section 5702(m) of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or chewing tobacco'' and inserting ''chewing tobacco, or discrete single-use unit'';

(B) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by inserting ''that is not a discrete single-use unit'' before the period in each such paragraph;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) DISCRETE SINGLE-USE UNIT.—The term 'discrete single-use unit' means any product containing tobacco that—

''(A) is not intended to be smoked; and

''(B) is in the form of a lozenge, tablet, pill, pouch, dissolvable strip, or other discrete single-use or single-dose unit.''.

(c) TAX PARITY FOR LARGE CIGARS.—Paragraph (2) of section 5701(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by this Act, is amended by striking ''but not more than 40.26 cents per cigar'' and inserting ''but not less than 5.033 cents per cigar and not more than 100.66 cents per cigar''.

(d) TAX PARITY FOR ROLL-YOUR-OWN TOBACCO AND CERTAIN PROCESSED TOBACCO.—Subsection (o) of section 5702 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting '', or processed tobacco removed or transferred to a person other than a person with a permit provided under section 5713'' after ''wrappers thereof''.

(e) CLARIFYING TOBACCO PRODUCT DEFINITION AND TAX RATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 5702 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(c) TOBACCO PRODUCTS.—The term 'tobacco products' means—

''(1) cigars, cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, pipe tobacco, and roll-your-own tobacco, and

''(2) any other product containing tobacco that is intended or expected to be consumed.''.

(2) TAX RATE.—Section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) OTHER TOBACCO PRODUCTS.—Any product described in section 5702(c)(2) or not otherwise described under this section, including any product that has been determined to be a tobacco product by the Food and Drug Administration through its authorities under the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act, shall be taxed at a level of tax equivalent to the tax rate for cigarettes on an estimated per use basis as determined by the Secretary.''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to articles removed (as defined in section 5702(j) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) after the last day of the month which includes the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) DISCRETE SINGLE-USE UNITS AND PROCESSED TOBACCO.—The amendments made by subsections (b)(1)(C), (b)(2), and (d) shall apply to articles removed (as defined in section 5702(j) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) after the date that is 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 453—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT SUPPORTING SENIORS AND INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES IS AN IMPORTANT RESPONSIBILITY OF THE UNITED STATES, AND THAT A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO EXPANDING AND SUPPORTING A STRONG HOME CARE WORKFORCE AND MAKING LONG-TERM SERVICES AND SUPPORTS AFFORDABLE AND ACCESSIBLE IN COMMUNITIES IS NECESSARY TO UPHOLD THE RIGHT OF SENIORS AND INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES TO A DIGNIFIED QUALITY OF LIFE

Mr. HARKIN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 453

Whereas the aging of the baby boom generation will cause the number of individuals in the United States who are 65 years of age or older to increase from 40,000,000 to 70,000,000 during the next 2 decades;

Whereas 12,000,000 adults, nearly half of whom are under 65 years of age, need long-term services and supports due to functional limitations;

Whereas the decision of the Supreme Court in Olmstead v. L.C., 527 U.S. 581 (1999), mandates the end of unnecessary segregation of individuals with disabilities in institutions, and requires that individuals with disabilities receive services in the most integrated setting appropriate to their needs;

Whereas the vast majority of individuals in the United States prefer to receive long-term services and supports in their homes so that they may continue to live independently and with dignity;

Whereas the costs of long-term services and supports for seniors and individuals with disabilities are high;

Whereas the great expense of long-term services and supports can affect all individuals, regardless of income;

Whereas 70 percent of individuals who are 65 years of age or older will need some form of long-term services and supports;

Whereas the number of individuals who need long-term services and supports is projected to grow from 12,000,000 to 27,000,000 by 2050;

Whereas there are approximately 3,000,000 workers in the direct care workforce, leaving a huge gap between the services needed and the size of the current workforce;

Whereas the United States is experiencing a jobs crisis, as 25,000,000 individuals are unemployed or underemployed;

Whereas home care is one of the fastest growing industries in the United States economy, providing critical daily care, services, and supports to millions of individuals and families across the country;

Whereas an estimated 1,800,000 additional home care workers will be needed during the next decade to serve the growing population of seniors and individuals with disabilities;

Whereas the quality of home care jobs is poor, with low wages, few benefits, high turnover, and a high level of job stress and hazards;

Whereas home care and personal assistance workers earn a median hourly wage of $9.40, and nearly half of such workers live in households that also rely on public assistance;

Whereas approximately 58 percent of home care workers work part-time, and approximately 40 percent of those part-time workers would prefer to work more hours;

Whereas nearly 23 percent of the individuals who provide home care services were born outside the United States;

Whereas a stabilized home care workforce would lead to improved continuity and quality of long-term services and supports;

Whereas the issue of long-term services and supports is a critical issue for women, as 70 percent of individuals who need such care are women 65 years of age or older, 90 percent of paid caregivers are women, and 85 percent of family members and friends who informally provide care are women who often have to leave the paid workforce to provide such care, and thus are at a financial disadvantage during their working years and face a reduction in Social Security benefits when they retire; and

Whereas a comprehensive approach that focuses on job creation and job quality, workforce training, pathways to citizenship and career advancement, and support for individuals and families is necessary to build a strong home care workforce and make quality long-term services and supports affordable and accessible for all individuals in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that a comprehensive approach to expanding and supporting a strong home care workforce and making long-term services and supports affordable and accessible in communities is necessary to uphold the right of seniors and individuals with disabilities in the United States to a dignified quality of life.

SENATE RESOLUTION 454—COMMENDING THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY HOSTING THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT LIFE MANAGEMENT

Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. RISCH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 454

Whereas the Third International Conference on Nuclear Power Plant Life Management has been organized by the International Atomic Energy Agency and will be hosted in the United States for the first time from May 13–17, 2012, in Salt Lake City, Utah;

Whereas the Senate recognizes the important contribution of the United States, through the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Department of Energy, and National Laboratories, to nuclear power plant life management;

Whereas conference attendees will discuss ways to safely and cost-effectively renew the operating lifetimes of many of the nuclear power plants in the world, especially the 104 operating commercial nuclear power reactors in the United States; and

Whereas the Senate recognizes the continuing importance of the 436 commercial nuclear power reactors that operate in 31 countries and currently provide 14 percent of the electricity in the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Department of Energy for hosting the Third International Conference on Nuclear Power Plant Life Management in the United States;

(2) applauds the efforts of conference attendees to discuss and explore the increased role of nuclear power plant life management in support of license renewal and the safe, long-term operation of commercial nuclear reactors throughout the world;

(3) thanks the International Atomic Energy Agency for organizing the Third International Conference on Nuclear Power Plant Life Management in the United States for the first time; and

(4) encourages Member States of the International Atomic Energy Agency to take advantage of the latest available technology to further develop licensing programs, promote safety, and secure the long-term success of commercial nuclear power generation.

SENATE RESOLUTION 455—DESIGNATING JUNE 27, 2012, AS ''NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AWARENESS DAY''

Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. TESTER, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 455

Whereas the brave men and women of the United States Armed Forces, who proudly serve the United States, risk their lives to protect the freedom of the United States and deserve the investment of every possible resource to ensure their lasting physical, mental, and emotional well-being;

Whereas more than 2,000,000 service members have deployed overseas as part of overseas contingency operations since the events of September 11, 2001;

Whereas the military has sustained an operational tempo for a period of time unprecedented in the history of the United States, with many service members deploying multiple times, placing them at high risk of PTSD;

Whereas according to the Armed Forces Health Surveillance Center, approximately

90,000 service members who have returned from overseas contingency operations have been clinically diagnosed with PTSD;

Whereas the Department of Veterans Affairs reports that—

(1) since 2002, more than 217,000 of the more than 750,000 veterans of overseas contingency operations who have sought care at a Department of Veterans Affairs medical center have been diagnosed with PTSD; and

(2) in fiscal year 2011, more than 475,000 of the nearly 6,000,000 veterans from all wars who sought care at a Department of Veterans Affairs medical center received treatment for PTSD;

Whereas many cases of PTSD remain unreported, undiagnosed, and untreated due to a lack of awareness about PTSD and the persistent stigma associated with mental health issues;

Whereas PTSD significantly increases the risk of depression, suicide, and drug- and alcohol-related disorders and deaths, especially if left untreated;

Whereas perceived or actual symptoms of PTSD or other mental health issues create unique challenges for veterans seeking employment;

Whereas the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs have made significant advances in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of PTSD and the symptoms of PTSD, but many challenges remain; and

Whereas the establishment of a National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day will raise public awareness about issues related to PTSD, reduce the stigma associated with PTSD, and help ensure that those suffering from the invisible wounds of war receive proper treatment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 27, 2012, as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day'';

(2) supports the efforts of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to educate service members, veterans, the families of service members and veterans, and the public about the causes, symptoms, and treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder (referred to in this resolution as ''PTSD''); and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, today I am submitting—for the third year in a row—resolution to designate June 27 as National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day. That date was inspired by the birthday of North Dakota National Guard Staff Sergeant Joe Biel. Staff Sergeant Biel served two tours of duty in Iraq as a Trailblazer, part of a unit responsible for route clearance operations. Each day, Joe's mission was to go out with his unit to find and remove Improvised Explosive Devices and other dangers from heavily traveled roads to make it safe for coalition forces and Iraqi civilians to travel. Joe lost his post-deployment struggle and, suffering from PTSD, tragically took his own life 6 months after returning home. There is no doubt that Joe Biel is a hero who gave his life for our country.

I learned of Joe's story because friends from his platoon, the 4th Platoon, A Company, of the North Dakota National Guard's 164th Combat Engineer Battalion, have organized an annual motorcycle ride across the State of North Dakota in his memory. The Joe Biel Memorial Ride serves as a reunion for the 164th, a memorial for a lost friend, and a beacon to those suffering from PTSD and other mental health issues across the region. The key point made to me by the event's organizer, Staff Sergeant Matt Leaf, is that we have to raise awareness of this issue so that the lives of service members, veterans, and other PTSD sufferers and their families can be saved.

For many, the war does not end when the warrior comes home. All too many service members and veterans face PTSD symptoms like anxiety, anger, and depression as they try to adjust to life after war. We cannot sweep these problems under the rug. PTSD is real. We know PTSD is caused by a traumatic event. We also know that we are sending our troops into combat situations where they are going to experience traumatic events. We know that the percentage of PTSD diagnoses increases with each deployment into combat. We know, as a nation, that we must take responsibility to help our sons and daughters cope with what they have experienced. We owe them that much.

When our troops came home from Vietnam, we ignored their health concerns for far too long. When our troops came home from the first Gulf War we tried to make sure the government was doing all it could to resolve their health concerns. PTSD is this conflict's Gulf War Illness. The Department of Defense has created a Defense Center of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury and teams with the National Institute for Mental Health and universities to address PTSD. The Department of Veterans Affairs has likewise established the National Center for the study of PTSD. These departments have made significant advances in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of PTSD and its symptoms to help us live up to our responsibility.

But more can and must be done. We need to ensure that these efforts are coordinated. In 1995, a President's Advisory Commission was created to conduct an independent, open, and comprehensive review of government activities relating to Gulf War illness. Today, I am calling on President Obama to establish a new Presidential Advisory Commission to conduct a similar review of the Government's efforts to address PTSD in order to maximize the time and treasure we are spending on solving this problem. We owe it to those who have served.

I am proud that Staff Sergeant Leaf and his fellow Trailblazers continue the annual Joe Biel Memorial Bike Ride, to be held on Memorial Day this year. am proud that I was able to help boost their efforts to bring attention to this issue by creating a National PTSD Awareness Day. I am proud to introduce this Resolution once again. Actions like these garner attention and help to eliminate the stigma surrounding mental health issues. They are about letting our troops and veterans know it is okay to come forward and say they need help—that it is a sign of strength, not weakness, to seek assistance. And they help show that we can, and we must, do more.

SENATE RESOLUTION 456—COMMEMORATING AND ACKNOWLEDGING THE DEDICATION AND SACRIFICE MADE BY THE FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS WHO HAVE BEEN KILLED OR INJURED IN THE LINE OF DUTY

Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KOHL, Mr. TESTER, Mr. KERRY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BAUCUS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. SESSIONS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 456

Whereas the well-being of all citizens of the United States is preserved and enhanced as a direct result of the vigilance and dedication of law enforcement personnel;

Whereas more than 900,000 men and women, at great risk to their personal safety, presently serve their fellow citizens as guardians of the peace;

Whereas peace officers are on the front lines in protecting the schools and schoolchildren of the United States;

Whereas in 2011, 163 peace officers across the United States were killed in the line of duty;

Whereas Congress should strongly support initiatives to reduce violent crime and to increase the factors that contribute to the safety of law enforcement officers;

Whereas there are more than 19,000 Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who lost their lives in the line of duty while protecting their fellow citizens, and whose names are engraved upon the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, District of Columbia;

Whereas in 1962, President John F. Kennedy designated May 15 as National Peace Officers Memorial Day; and

Whereas on May 15, 2012, more than 20,000 peace officers are expected to gather in Washington, District of Columbia, to join with the families of their recently fallen comrades to honor those comrades and all others who went before them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates and acknowledges the dedication and sacrifices made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty;

(2) recognizes May 15, 2012, as ''National Peace Officers Memorial Day''; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate ceremony, solemnity, appreciation, and respect.

SENATE RESOLUTION 457—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE REPUBLIC OF ARGENTINA'S MEMBERSHIP IN THE G20 SHOULD BE CONDITIONED ON ITS ADHERENCE TO INTERNATIONAL NORMS OF ECONOMIC RELATIONS AND COMMITMENT TO THE RULE OF LAW

Mr. LUGAR submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 457

Whereas Argentina has enjoyed the privilege of membership in the Group of Twenty Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors (G20);

Whereas, at the Summit of the Group of Twenty in 2008, G20 leaders declared that ''our work will be guided by a shared belief that market principles, open trade and investment regimes, and effectively regulated financial markets foster the dynamism, innovation, entrepreneurship that are essential for economic growth, employment and poverty reduction'';

Whereas, at the Pittsburgh Summit of 2009, G20 nations ''designated the G20 to be the premier forum for our international economic cooperation'';

Whereas, at the Cannes Summit of 2011, G20 leaders reaffirmed their ''commitment to work together'' and stressed among other principles the need to conduct International Monetary Fund surveillance of national economies, avoid protectionism and the need to reinforce the multilateral trading system, strengthen anti-money laundering measures, and combat financing of terrorism;

Whereas the Republic of Argentina has consistently violated the spirit and letter of these and other G20 declarations through its policy of expropriating the property of foreign investors, evading the judgments of United States courts, ignoring decisions of international arbitral forums, refusing to comply with International Monetary Fund membership requirements, and failing to implement anti-money laundering and terrorist financing measures;

Whereas the President Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner has flouted international norms and agreements by proposing legislation to nationalize Argentina's largest oil and gas producer, YPF SA, effectively expropriating the assets of foreign investors;

Whereas President Fernandez won congressional backing to seize YPF SA (YPFD) from Spain's Repsol YPF SA (YPF), with the Argentina Senate approving the legislation on April 26, 2012, and the lower house of the Argentina Congress voting 207 to 32 on May 3, 2012, to back her bill empowering the Government of Argentina to take 51 percent of YPF;

Whereas Argentina has persistently ignored claims brought by United States and other countries before the International Center for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID), administered by the World Bank, despite receiving billions of dollars in loans from the World Bank;

Whereas Argentina remains one of only four countries, and the only G20 member, that refuse to submit to an International Monetary Fund review in violation of Article IV of the IMF Charter; and

Whereas the Financial Action Task Force has warned of Argentina's failure to comply with fully 47 out of 49 recommendations to address the vulnerability of institutions to terrorist financing and money laundering, giving Argentina the worst evaluation of any G20 nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) finds that the Republic of Argentina has failed to meet the responsibilities inherent to membership in the G20;

(2) calls upon the President and the Secretary of the Treasury to work with the governments of the G20 to suspend the participation of the Republic of Argentina in the G20 until the Government of Argentina has fully demonstrated its intent to adhere to international norms of economic relations and to commit to the rule of law; and

(3) calls upon the President and the Secretary of the Treasury to work with the governments of the G20 members to condition any reinstatement of Argentina's membership in the G20 on its demonstrated compliance with its international commitments and obligations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 458—COMMEMORATING MAY 15, 2012, AS THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. JOHANNS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 458

Whereas, on May 15, 1862, President Abraham Lincoln signed into law an Act that established a Department of Agriculture (12 Stat. 387, chapter 72);

Whereas President Lincoln gave the Department of Agriculture general authority to acquire and spread useful information on agricultural subjects and to assist in the development and use of new and valuable seeds and plants;

Whereas, in 1862, President Lincoln also signed into law the Act entitled ''An Act to secure homesteads to actual settlers on the public domain'' (commonly known as the ''Homestead Act of 1862''; 12 Stat. 392, chapter 75) and the Act of July 2, 1862 (commonly known as the ''First Morrill Act''; 12 Stat. 503, chapter 130), which, along with the creation of the Department of Agriculture, lay the foundation for Federal agricultural policy;

Whereas, in the 1850s, there was 1 farmer for every 2 people in the United States, while today the average farmer in the United States feeds more than 150 people;

Whereas the United States is now the second largest producer and the largest exporter of agricultural products in the world;

Whereas the role of the Department of Agriculture has expanded to include functions impacting nearly every aspect of the rural United States and beyond;

Whereas the Department of Agriculture helps to ensure the safety of the food supply of the United States, provides conservation assistance, collects market data, provides nutrition assistance, protects the health of plants and animals, supports rural communities, conducts agricultural research, maintains risk management tools for producers, and promotes agricultural exports; and

Whereas the professionalism, dedication, and work ethic of the public servants at the Department of Agriculture provide a shining example of why President Lincoln called the Department of Agriculture the ''People's Department'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the men and women of the Department of Agriculture on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the Department;

(2) celebrates the growth and success of agriculture in the United States; and

(3) honors the farmers and ranchers of the United States, whose ingenuity, adaptability, and skill have created the safest and most abundant food supply in the history of mankind.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2099. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2072, to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2100. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. DEMINT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2072, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2101. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2072, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2102. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2072, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2103. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2072, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2104. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. DEMINT, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2072, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2099. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2072, to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 8 and insert the following:

SEC. 8. NONSUBORDINATION REQUIREMENT.

Section 2 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635), as amended by section 7 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) NONSUBORDINATION REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Bank may not make or guarantee a loan that is subordinate to any other loan.''.

SEC. 8A. FINANCING OF DOMESTIC FOSSIL FUEL PROJECTS; RESTRICTION ON FINANCING OF FOSSIL FUEL PROJECTS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF DOMESTIC FOSSIL FUEL PROJECTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall identify projects involving the production, refining, or transportation of fossil fuels in the United States that could benefit from the provision of financing by the Bank.

(b) FINANCING OF FOSSIL FUEL PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the Export-Import Bank of the United States identifies projects involving the production, refining, or transportation of fossil fuels in the United States that could benefit from the provision of financing by the Bank under subsection (a)—

(1) the Bank may provide financing (including guarantees, insurance, or extensions of credit, or participation in the extension of credit) with respect to those projects; and

(2) the Bank shall not provide financing with respect to any project that involves the production, refining, or transportation of fossil fuels in a foreign country until the Bank certifies to Congress that—

(A) all projects identified under subsection (a) have been reviewed; and

(B) with respect to each such project, the Bank—

(i) has provided financing;

(ii) has determined that the persons conducting the project have no interest in receiving financing from the Bank; or

(iii) has determined that providing financing with respect to the project would present a risk of loss that is unacceptable under the standards of the Bank.

(c) ATTORNEY AND CONSULTING FEES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Export-Import Bank of the United States may, in providing financing with respect to a project identified under subsection (a), increase the amount of the financing to take into account the costs of any attorney or consulting fees incurred in—

(1) meeting the requirements necessary to obtain a permit from any Federal agency with respect to the project; or

(2) responding to any civil action relating to the environmental impact of the project filed in any Federal or State court by a nongovernmental organization.

(d) DEFINITION OF FOSSIL FUEL.—In this section, the term ''fossil fuel'' means natural gas, petroleum, coal, or any form of solid, liquid, or gaseous fuel derived from natural gas, petroleum, or coal.

SEC. 8B. PROHIBITION ON, AND REPEAL OF MINIMUM INVESTMENT GOALS FOR, FINANCING OF RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS.

(a) PROHIBITION ON FINANCING OF CERTAIN RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Export-Import Bank of the United States may not provide any guarantee, insurance, or extension of credit (or participate in the extension of credit) with respect to any project that involves the manufacture of renewable energy products in a foreign country.

(b) REPEAL OF MINIMUM INVESTMENT GOAL FOR FINANCING OF RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS.—Section 534(d) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1990 (12 U.S.C. 635g note) is repealed.

SA 2100. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. DEMINT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2072, to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. TERMINATION OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other provision of law, the authority of the Export-Import Bank of the United States under section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f) terminates on May 31, 2013.

(b) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other provision of law, on and after June 1, 2013—

(1) the Export-Import Bank of the United States may not enter into any new agreement for the provision of a loan, a loan guarantee, or insurance, the extension of credit, or any other form of financing;

(2) the Bank shall continue to operate only to the extent necessary to fulfill the obligations of the Bank pursuant to agreements described in paragraph (1) entered into before June 1, 2013; and

(3) the President of the Bank shall take such measures as are necessary to wind up the affairs of the Bank, including by reducing the operations of the Bank and the number of employees of the Bank as the number of remaining agreements described in paragraph (1) decreases.

(c) REPEAL OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other provision of law, effective on the date on which the Export-Import Bank of the United States has fulfilled all outstanding obligations of the Bank pursuant to agreements described in subsection (b)(1) entered into before June 1, 2013, the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. ____. NEGOTIATIONS TO END EXPORT CREDIT FINANCING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall initiate and pursue negotiations with other major exporting countries, including members of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and countries that are not members of that Organisation, to end subsidized export financing programs and other forms of export subsidies.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the progress of the negotiations described in subsection (a) until the President certifies in writing to those committees that all countries that support subsidized export financing programs have agreed to end the support.

SA 2101. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2072, to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. PROHIBITION ON FINANCING BY THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR PERSONS OR PROJECTS IN COUNTRIES THAT HOLD DEBT INSTRUMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635 et seq.), the Export-Import Bank of the United States may not provide any guarantee, insurance, or extension of credit (or participate in the extension of credit) to a person or with respect to a project in a country the government or central bank of which holds debt instruments of the United States.

(b) DEBT INSTRUMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''debt instruments of the United States'' means bills, notes, and bonds issued or guaranteed by the United States or by an entity of the United States Government.

SA 2102. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2072, to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 25 and insert the following:

SEC. 25. LIMITATION ON FINANCING BY THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES TO TRANSACTIONS SUBSIDIZED BY OTHER COUNTRIES OR FOR WHICH PRIVATE SECTOR FINANCING IS UNAVAILABLE OR PROHIBITIVELY EXPENSIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635 et seq.) or any other provision of law, the Export-Import Bank of the United States may not provide any financing (including any guarantee, insurance, or extension of credit, or participation in any extension of credit) for the exportation of any article unless the Bank certifies to Congress in writing that—

(1) an export credit agency of a foreign country is providing financing for the exportation of a substantially similar article from that country; or

(2) private sector financing for the exportation of the article is not available or is prohibitively expensive.

(b) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED.—If the Export-Import Bank of the United States certifies under subsection (a)(2) that private sector financing for the exportation of an article is not available or is prohibitively expensive, the Bank shall also include in the certification the following:

(1) An explanation of why private sector financing is not available or is prohibitively expensive.

(2) An explanation of how financing by the Bank for the exportation of the article does not put the United States at a substantial risk of loss.

(3) If private sector financing is available but prohibitively expensive, an assessment of the difference between the cost of private sector financing and the cost of financing provided by the Bank.

(c) REPORT ON REGULATORY BARRIERS.—For any transaction relating to the exportation of an article financed by the Export-Import Bank of the United States after certifying under subsection (a)(2) that private sector financing is unavailable, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) assesses the extent to which private sector financing is unavailable as a result of excessive regulation of domestic financial institutions by the Federal Government or the obligations of the United States under international agreements relating to risk management by financial institutions; and

(2) makes recommendations for eliminating the barriers to private sector financing identified under paragraph (1).

SEC. 26. CAPITAL RATIO REQUIREMENT FOR THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall maintain a capital ratio of not less than 10 percent.

(b) CAPITAL RATIO DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''capital ratio'' means the ratio of the capital of the Export-Import Bank of the United States to the total outstanding principal balance of all loans made or guaranteed by the Bank.

SEC. 27. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as provided in section 9(b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the earlier of June 1, 2012, or the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2103. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2072, to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 8 and insert the following:

SEC. 8. NONSUBORDINATION REQUIREMENT.

Section 2 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635), as amended by section 7 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) NONSUBORDINATION REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Bank shall not make or guarantee a loan that is subordinate to any other loan.''.

SEC. 8A. PROHIBITION ON FINANCING OF FOSSIL FUEL PROJECTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES THAT ARE SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR TO CERTAIN FOSSIL FUEL PROJECTS IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF CERTAIN DOMESTIC FOSSIL FUEL PROJECTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall identify projects involving the production, refining, or transportation of fossil fuels in the United States that could benefit from the provision of a loan, loan guarantee, or other form of financing by a Federal agency.

(b) PROHIBITION ON FINANCING OF CERTAIN FOSSIL FUEL PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on and after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Bank shall not provide any guarantee, insurance, or extension of credit (or participate in the extension of credit) with respect to any project in a foreign country that the Bank determines is substantially similar to a project identified under subsection (a).

(2) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—If, on and after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Export-Import Bank of the United States provides financing with respect to a project involving the production, refining, or transportation of fossil fuels in a foreign country, the Bank shall certify to Congress that to the knowledge of the Bank there are no projects in the United States that are substantially similar to the project in the foreign country that could benefit from the provision of a loan, loan guarantee, or other form of financing by a Federal agency.

(c) DEFINITION OF FOSSIL FUEL.—In this section, the term ''fossil fuel'' means natural gas, petroleum, coal, or any form of solid, liquid, or gaseous fuel derived from natural gas, petroleum, or coal.

SEC. 8B. PROHIBITION ON, AND REPEAL OF MINIMUM INVESTMENT GOALS FOR, FINANCING OF RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS.

(a) PROHIBITION ON FINANCING OF CERTAIN RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall not provide any guarantee, insurance, or extension of credit (or participate in the extension of credit) with respect to any project that involves the manufacture of renewable energy products in a foreign country.

(b) REPEAL OF MINIMUM INVESTMENT GOAL FOR FINANCING OF RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS.—Section 534(d) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1990 (12 U.S.C. 635g note) is repealed.

SA 2104. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. DEMINT, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2072, to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 3 and insert the following:

SEC. 3. LIMITATIONS ON OUTSTANDING LOANS, GUARANTEES, AND INSURANCE.

Section 6(a)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635e(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''and'';

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking the comma at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(F) during fiscal year 2012 and each succeeding fiscal year, $100,000,000,000, except that—

''(i) the applicable amount for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 shall be $120,000,000,000 if—

''(I) the Bank has submitted a report as required by section 4(a) of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012;

''(II) the rate calculated under section 8(g)(1) of this Act is less than 2 percent for the quarter ending with the beginning of the fiscal year, or for any quarter in the fiscal year; and

''(III) the Secretary of the Treasury has certified in writing to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives that the Secretary has initiated the negotiations required by section 11(a) of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012; and

''(ii) notwithstanding clause (i), the applicable amount for fiscal year 2014 shall be $140,000,000,000 if—

''(I) the rate calculated under section 8(g)(1) of this Act is less than 2 percent for the quarter ending with the beginning of the fiscal year, or for any quarter in the fiscal year;

''(II) the Bank has submitted a report as required by subsection (b) of section 5 of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012, except that the preceding provisions of this subclause shall not apply if the Comptroller General has not submitted the report required by subsection (a) of such section 5 on or before July 1, 2013; and

''(III) the Secretary of the Treasury has submitted to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives the text of a multilateral agreement to eliminate subsidized export financing programs (including aircraft export credit financing) agreed to by—

''(aa) each country that is a member of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; and

''(bb) each country that is not a member of that Organisation that, during fiscal year 2012 or any fiscal year thereafter, provided export financing in excess of $50,000,000,000.''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 10, 2012, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 10, 2012, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 10, 2012, at 10 a.m. in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a roundtable entitled ''Medicare Physician Payments: Understanding the Past so We can Envision the Future.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 10, 2012, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled, ''NATO: Chicago and Beyond.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Beyond Mother's Day: Helping the Middle Class Balance Work and Family'' on May 10, 2012, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on May 10, 2012, at 10 a.m. in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 10, 2012, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION AND FORESTRY FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Mike Johanns:									
Ghana	Cedi		504.11						504.11
South Africa	Rand		642.03						642.03
Tanzania	Shilling		193.53						193.53
Germany	Euro		265.29						265.29
Total			1,604.96						1,604.96

SENATOR DEBBIE STABENOW,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, Mar. 20, 1012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MARCH 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison:									
New Zealand	Dollar		266.00		448.70				714.70
Australia	Dollar		1,664.00						1,664.00
Senator Lamar Alexander:									
New Zealand	Dollar		266.00						266.00
Australia	Dollar		1,632.00						1,632.00
Matthew Sonnesyn:									
New Zealand	Dollar		266.00						266.00
Australia	Dollar		1,632.00						1,632.00
Paul Grove:									
Ghana	Cedi		178.00						178.00
South Africa	Rand		170.00						170.00
Tanzania	Shilling		54.00						54.00
Germany	Euro		28.17						28.17
Senator Daniel K. Inouye:									
Tunisia	Dinar		509.38						509.38
Israel	Shekel		1,398.00						1,398.00
Jordan	Dinar		716.16						716.16
Italy	Euro		1,412.68						1,412.68
Betsy Schmid:									
Tunisia	Dinar		497.55						497.55
Israel	Shekel		1,398.00						1,398.00
Jordan	Dinar		716.16						716.16
Italy	Euro		427.98						427.98
Kate Kaufer:									
Tunisia	Dinar		498.00						498.00
Israel	Shekel		823.50						823.50
Jordan	Dinar		716.16						716.16
Italy	Euro		708.50						708.50
Kay Webber:									
Tunisia	Dinar		497.55						497.55
Israel	Shekel		1,298.00						1,298.00
Jordan	Dinar		716.16						716.16
Italy	Euro		1,283.94						1,283.94
Stewart Holmes:									
Tunisia	Dinar		497.55						497.55
Israel	Shekel		1,169.00						1,169.00
Jordan	Dinar		716.16						716.16
Italy	Euro		1,054.94						1,054.94
Senator Thad Cochran:									
Tunisia	Dinar		497.55						497.55
Israel	Shekel		1,398.00						1,398.00
Jordan	Dinar		716.16						716.16
Italy	Euro		1,283.94						1,283.94
Senator Barbara Mikulski:									
Tunisia	Dinar		471.00						471.00
Israel	Shekel		438.00						438.00
Jordan	Dinar		381.00						381.00
Italy	Euro		386.72						386.72
Teri Spoutz:									
Japan	Yen		476.00						476.00
Korea	Won		240.00						240.00
M. Colleen Gaydos:									
Japan	Yen		520.00						520.00
Korea	Won		240.00						240.00
United States	Dollar				16,174.90				16,174.90
Alycia Farrell:									
United States	Dollar				17,324.90				17,324.90
Japan	Yen		520.00						520.00
Korea	Won		214.00						214.00
Alexander Keenan:									
Brazil	Real		2,723.82						2,723.82
United States	Dollar				4,528.60				4,528.60
Heideh Shadmoradi-Holley									
Brazil	Real		2,733.82						2,733.82
United States	Dollar				4,528.60				4,528.60
Carl Barrick:									
Brazil	Real		2,948.82						2,948.82
United States	Dollar				4,528.60				4,528.60
Dennis Balkham:									
Poland	Zloty		970.48						970.48
United States	Dollar				8,509.33				8,509.33
Igor Khrestin:									
Poland	Zloty		975.46						975.46
United States	Dollar				8,106.43				8,106.43
Senator Mark Kirk:									
Poland	Zloty		1,045.48						1,045.48
United States	Dollar				8,283.33				8,283.33
Rebecca Davies:									
Guatemala	Quetzales		314.54						314.54
Panama	Dollar		506.00						506.00
Colombia	Peso		860.00						860.00
United States	Dollar				1,373.90				1,373.90

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MARCH 31, 2012—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Carol Cribbs:									
Guatemala	Quetzales		314.54						314.54
Panama	Dollar		506.00						506.00
Colombia	Peso		1,721.00						1,721.00
United States	Dollar				1,373.90				1,373.90
Howard Walgen:									
Panama	Dollar		506.00						506.00
Colombia	Peso		1,356.50						1,356.50
United States	Dollar				1,846.90				1,846.90
Charles Kieffer:									
Panama	Dollar		506.00						506.00
United States	Dollar				1,122.40				1,122.40
Senator John Hoeven:									
Afghanistan	Afghani		38.00						38.00
Egypt	Pound		84.00						84.00
Israel	Shekel		46.00						46.00
Tunisia	Dinar		51.00						51.00
Tim Rieser:									
Colombia	Peso		365.00						365.00
Cuba	Dollar		344.00						344.00
Delegation Expenses:[1]									
Italy	Euro						8,541.27		8,541.27
Jordan	Dinar						2,395.16		2,395.16
Tunisia	Dinar						6,652.54		6,652.54
Israel	Shekel						28,588.79		28,588.79
Total			49,910.21		78,150.49		46,177.76		174,238.46

[1] Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 2977.

SENATOR DANIEL INOUYE,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Apr. 22, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator James M. Inhofe:									
Afghanistan	Dollar		14.00						14.00
United States	Dollar				14,068.00				14,068.00
Anthony Lazarski:									
Afghanistan	Dollar		14.00						14.00
United States	Dollar				14,068.00				14,068.00
Senator Joseph I. Lieberman:									
United States	Dollar				8,844.95				8,844.95
Israel	Dollar		1,338.47						1,338.47
Tunisia	Dollar		157.00				333.00		490.00
Libya	Dollar						333.00		333.00
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
Ghana	Dollar		112.33						112.33
South Africa	Dollar		161.77						161.77
Tanzania	Dollar		46.75						46.75
Germany	Dollar		64.60						64.60
Richard Perry:									
Ghana	Dollar		112.33						112.33
South Africa	Dollar		161.71						161.71
Tanzania	Dollar		46.75						46.75
Germany	Dollar		64.38						64.38
Andrew King:									
Ghana	Dollar		112.33						112.33
South Africa	Dollar		161.71						161.71
Tanzania	Dollar		46.75						46.75
Germany	Dollar		64.38						64.38
Senator Mark Begich:									
United States	Dollar				11,932.70				11,932.70
Afghanistan	Dollar						29.81		29.81
Lindsay Kavanaugh:									
United States	Dollar				11,932.70				11,932.70
Afghanistan	Dollar						24.01		24.01
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				14,645.90				14,645.90
Philippines	Dollar		40.78						40.78
Vietnam	Dollar		71.04						71.04
Thailand	Dollar		383.47						383.47
Burma	Dollar		68.71						68.71
Robie I. Samanta Roy:									
United States	Dollar				8,795.00				8,795.00
Bahrain	Dinar		1,069.50						1,069.50
Jason W. Maroney:									
United States	Dollar				9,854.20				9,854.20
Kuwait	Dollar		425.95						425.95
Bahrain	Dollar		792.84						792.84
Senator Kay Hagan:									
Ghana	Dollar		112.33						112.33
South Africa	Dollar		107.93						107.93
Tanzania	Dollar		46.75						46.75
Germany	Dollar		84.65						84.65
Senator John McCain:									
Germany	Dollar		189.77						189.77
Senator Susan M. Collins:									
Germany	Euro		370.00						370.00
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
Germany	Dollar		142.69						142.69
Michael J. Sistak:									
United States	Dollar				8,795.20				8,795.20
Bahrain	Dollar		1,012.48						1,012.48
Senator Jeff Sessions:									
New Zealand	Dollar		317.62		4.04		20.76		342.42

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Australia	Dollar		5,446.33		6.02		53.82		5,506.17
Senator Lenwood A. Landrum:									
New Zealand	Dollar		451.01		25.00				476.01
Australia	Dollar		4,375.13				11.00		4,386.13
Senator Mark Udall:									
Germany	Euro		370.00						370.00
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
United States	Dollar		5.72						5.72
Afghanistan	Dollar		20.42						20.42
Israel	Dollar		118.43						118.43
Egypt	Dollar		142.96						142.96
Tunisia	Dollar		13.47						13.47
Senator John McCain:									
Afghanistan	Dollar		20.42						20.42
Egypt	Dollar		108.57						108.57
Israel	Dollar		73.10						73.10
Tunisia	Dollar		19.91						19.91
Senator Joseph I. Lieberman:									
Germany	Dollar		259.66		814.00				1,073.66
Senator Jeff Sessions:									
Afghanistan	Dollar		20.42						20.42
Egypt	Dollar		422.79						422.79
Israel	Dollar		393.10						393.10
Tunisia	Dollar		111.64						111.64
Vance Serchuk:									
United States	Dollar				14,645.90				14,645.90
Philippines	Dollar		270.00						270.00
Vietnam	Dollar		148.00						148.00
Thailand	Dollar		244.00				142.86		386.86
Burma	Dollar		138.00						138.00
Margaret Goodlander:									
United States	Dollar		128.00		14,645.90				14,773.90
Philippines	Dollar		92.50						92.50
Vietnam	Dollar		138.00						138.00
Thailand	Dollar		326.58				142.86		469.44
Burma	Dollar		92.00						92.00
Vance Serchuk:									
United States	Dollar				10,200.95				10,200.95
Israel	Dollar		1,338.47						1,338.47
Tunisia	Dollar		157.00				333.33		490.33
Libya	Dollar						333.33		333.33
Margaret Goodlander:									
United States	Dollar				9,579.95				9,579.95
Israel	Dollar		1,213.92						1,213.92
Tunisia	Dollar		157.00				333.33		490.33
Libya	Dollar						333.33		333.33
Germany	Dollar		352.00		814.00				1,166.00
Adam J. Barker:									
United States	Dollar				837.90				837.90
Colombia	Dollar		1,525.00						1,525.00
Brian Burton:									
Germany	Dollar		215.77		814.00				1,029.77
Lucian L. Niemeyer:									
United States	Dollar				9,834.20				9,834.20
Kuwait	Dollar		72.00						72.00
Bahrain	Dollar		267.00						267.00
Senator Joseph I. Lieberman:									
United States	Dollar		77.69		14,645.90				14,723.59
Philippines	Dollar		32.88						32.88
Vietnam	Dollar		82.85						82.85
Thailand	Dollar		326.58				142.86		469.44
Burma	Dollar		15.00						15.00
Senator Kelly Ayotte:									
Germany	Dollar		133.21						133.21
Philippines	Dollar		99.15						99.15
Vietnam	Dollar		187.33						187.33
Thailand	Dollar		613.65						613.65
Burma	Dollar		68.40						68.40
Michael J. Noblet:									
United States	Dollar				784.00				784.00
Colombia	Dollar		449.00						449.00
Matt Rimkunas:									
Afghanistan	Dollar		13.47						13.47
Egypt	Dollar		169.87						169.87
Israel	Dollar		73.10						73.10
Tunisia	Dollar		13.47						13.47
United States	Dollar		13.12						13.12
Senator Richard Blumenthal:									
United States	Dollar		12.66						12.66
Afghanistan	Dollar		13.47						13.47
Egypt	Dollar		422.79						422.79
Israel	Dollar		397.96						397.96
Tunisia	Dollar		105.06						105.06
Christian D. Brose:									
United States	Dollar						50.00		50.00
Afghanistan	Dollar		28.00						28.00
Egypt	Dollar		179.00						179.00
Israel	Dollar		113.00						113.00
Tunisia	Dollar		76.00						76.00
United States	Dollar				14,645.90				14,645.90
Philippines	Dollar		206.00						206.00
Vietnam	Dollar		113.00						113.00
Thailand	Dollar		244.00						244.00
Burma	Dollar		77.00						77.00
Clarine Nardi Riddle:									
Germany	Dollar		138.99		814.00				952.99
Christian D. Brose:									
Germany	Dollar		147.00						147.00
Total			31,806.79		196,048.31		2,617.30		230,472.40

SENATOR CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Apr. 2, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1, TO MAR. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Richard C. Shelby:									
New Zealand	Dollar		416.00						416.00
Australia	Dollar		2,414.00						2,414.00
William D. Duhnke III:									
New Zealand	Dollar		416.00						416.00
Australia	Dollar		2,414.00						2,414.00
Anne Coleman Caldwell:									
New Zealand	Dollar		416.00						416.00
Australia	Dollar		2,414.00						2,414.00
Senator Michael Bennet:									
Turkey	Lira		237.25						237.25
India	Rupee		1,075.86						1,075.86
United States	Dollar				4,864.50				4,864.50
Andrew Leahy:									
Turkey	Lira		142.34						142.34
India	Rupee		612.09						612.09
Slovakia	Koruna		21.84						21.84
Senator Richard C. Shelby									
Cuba	Peso		264.00						264.00
Colombia	Peso		471.00						471.00
Anne Coleman Caldwell									
Cuba	Peso		264.00						264.00
Colombia	Peso		471.00						471.00
Total			12,049.38		4,864.50				16,913.88

SENATOR TIM JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on: Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,
Apr. 2, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Kent Conrad:									
Cuba	Peso		544.00						544.00
Colombia	Peso		2,165.00						2,165.00
Sara Garland:									
Cuba	Peso		444.00						444.00
Colombia	Peso		1,505.00						1,505.00
Delegation Expenses [1]									
Cuba	Peso						143.64		143.64
Colombia	Peso				1,475.80		2,846.90		4,322.70
Senator Mark Warner:									
Turkey	Lira		432.97						432.97
India	Rupee		1,800.00						1,800.00
Slovakia	Euro		360.95						360.95
Mark Brunner:									
Turkey	Lira		277.96						277.96
India	Rupee		2,400.58						2,400.58
Slovakia	Euro		360.95						360.00
Delegation Expenses [1]									
Turkey	Lira						506.67		506.67
India	Rupee						8,434.35		8,434.35
Slovakia	Euro						2,875.58		2,875.58
Total			10,291.41		1,475.80		14,807.14		26,574.35

[1] Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR KENT CONRAD,
Chairman, Committee on: Budget, Apr. 26, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Thune:									
Ghana	Cedi		499.33						499.33
South Africa	Rand		608.36						608.36
Tanzania	Shillin		200.72						200.72
Germany	Euro		265.58						265.58
Delegation Expenses:									
Ghana	Cedi						957.00		957.00
South Africa	Shilling						906.80		906.80
Senator Max Baucus:									
Russia	Ruble		476.39						476.39
United States	Dollar				9,144.04				9,144.04
Amber Cottle:									
Russia	Ruble		661.00						661.00
United States	Dollar				9,144.04				9,144.04
Chelsea Thomas:									
Russia	Ruble		611.51						611.51
United States	Dollar				9,728.04				9,728.04
Hun Quach:									
Russia	Ruble		464.23						464.23
United States	Dollar				9,144.04				9,144.04
Bruce Hirsh:									
Russia	Ruble		623.93						623.93
United States	Dollar				9,144.04				9,144.04

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Scott Mulhauser:									
Russia	Ruble		442.33						442.33
United States	Dollar				9,144.04				9,144.04
Jon Selib:									
Russia	Ruble		479.11						479.11
United States	Dollar				9,728.04				9,728.04
Paul Wilkins:									
Russia	Ruble		495.11						495.11
United States	Dollar				9,728.04		4,086.01		13,814.05
Delegation Expenses:									
Russia	Ruble						9,106.47		9,106.47
Bruce Hirsh:									
China	Renminbi		2,584.82						2,584.82
United States	Dollar				12,908.19				12,908.19
Heather O'Louglin:									
New Zealand	Dollar		2,115.29						2,115.29
United States	Dollar				14,399.93				14,399.93
Gregory Kalbaugh:									
New Zealand	Dollar		1,969.03						1,969.03
United States	Dollar				14,399.93				14,399.93
Total			12,496.74		116,612.37		15,056.28		144,165.39

[1] Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 5012(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, May 1, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Barrasso:									
Ghana	Cedi		512.33						512.33
South Africa	Rand		650.25						650.25
Tanzania	Shilling		201.75						201.75
Germany	Euro		281.73						281.73
Senator Bob Corker:									
Switzerland	Franc		1,324.65						1,324.65
France	Euro		977.58						977.58
Senator John Kerry:									
Oman	Rial		73.00						73.00
Israel	Shekel		788.00						788.00
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		329.00						329.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		1,660.00						1,660.00
Jordan	Dinar		394.00						394.00
France	Euro		815.58						815.58
United States	Dollar				11,196.00				11,196.00
Germany	Euro		1,306.42						1,306.42
United States	Dollar				4,634.00				4,634.00
Qatar	Riyal		340.65						340.65
United States	Dollar				10,534.00				10,534.00
Senator Marco Rubio:									
United States	Dollar				1,106.50				1,106.50
Senator Jeanne Shaheen:									
Belgium	Euro		970.86						970.86
Senator Tom Udall:									
Turkey	Lira		436.59						436.59
India	Rupee		2,496.59						2,496.59
Slovakia	Euro		360.95						360.95
Michael Bright:									
Switzerland	Franc		1,082.10						1,082.10
France	Euro		1,157.10						1,157.10
Jason Bruder:									
Romania	Leu		777.59						777.59
Poland	Zioty		302.23						302.23
Belgium	Euro		1,131.45						1,131.45
United States	Dollar				4,827.30				4,827.30
Perry Cammack:									
Israel	Shekel		945.00						945.00
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		433.00						433.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		1,430.00						1,430.00
Jordan	Dinar		685.00						685.00
United States	Dollar				9,658.10				9,658.10
Kuwait	Dinar		435.00						435.00
Qatar	Riyal		362.00						362.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		367.00						367.00
United States	Dollar				16,149.90				16,149.90
Victor Cervino:									
Haiti	Dollar		250.00						250.00
United States	Dollar				1,106.50				1,106.50
Heidi Crebo-Rediker:									
Switzerland	Franc		2,170.00						2,170.00
United States	Dollar				812.30				812.30
William Danvers:									
Israel	Shekel		743.00						743.00
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		350.00						350.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		1,630.00						1,630.00
Jordan	Dinar		500.00						500.00
France	Euro		626.00						626.00
United States	Dollar				11,269.00				11,269.00
Germany	Euro		1,269.97						1,269.97
Qatar	Riyal		340.65						340.65
United States	Dollar				10,527.00				10,527.00
Gary Hart:									
Russia	Ruble		2,033.35						2,033.35
United States	Dollar				8,744.00				8,744.00
Chris Homan:									
Cuba	Dollar		224.00						224.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Haiti	Dollar		589.00						589.00
United States	Dollar				1,933.70				1,933.70
Frank Jannuzi:									
Germany	Euro		1,205.00						1,205.00
United States	Dollar				2,270.20				2,270.20
Greg Kausner:									
Kuwait	Dinar		454.71						454.71
Qatar	Riyal		361.75						361.75
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		402.00						402.00
United States	Dollar				16,149.90				16,149.90
Tamara Klajn:									
Nigeria	Naira		105.75		173.00				278.75
United States	Dollar				4,339.30				4,339.30
Chad Kreikemeier:									
Belgium	Euro		1,007.70						1,007.70
Emily Mendrala:									
Haiti	Dollar		399.00						399.00
United States	Dollar				1,155.50				1,155.50
Matthew Padilla:									
Turkey	Lira		271.57						271.57
India	Rupee		2,395.27						2,395.27
Slovakia	Euro		360.95						360.95
Shannon Smith:									
Sudan	Dollar		1,109.45		217.85				1,327.30
South Sudan	Dollar		425.00						425.00
United States	Dollar				4,449.82				4,449.82
Christopher Socha:									
Belgium	Euro		1,019.35						1,019.35
United States	Dollar				1,923.40				1,923.40
Mark String:									
Russia	Ruble		1,973.00				1,211.73		3,184.73
United States	Dollar				9,949.40				9,949.40
Anthony Wier:									
Romania	Leu		778.03						778.03
Poland	Zloty		303.34						303.34
Belgium	Euro		1,031.45						1,031.45
United States	Dollar				2,907.30				2,907.30
Total			47,356.69		136,033.97		1,211.73		184,602.39

SENATOR JOHN KERRY,
Chairman, Committee on: Foreign Relations, Apr. 27, 2011.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS, AMENDED, FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Susan M. Collins:									
United States	Dollar				14,615.40				14,615.40
Jordan	Dinar		595.95						595.95
Turkey	Lira		262.00						262.00
Ryan Kaldahl:									
United States	Dollar				14,892.40				14,892.40
Jordan	Dinar		677.00						677.00
Turkey	Lira		262.00						262.00
Vance Serchuk:									
Canada	Dollar		626.73						626.73
Margaret Goodlander:									
Canada	Dollar		796.73						796.73
Delegation Expenses:[1]									
Jordan	Dinar						544.75		544.75
Total			3,220.41		29,507.80		1,497.45		34,225.66

[1] Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs,
May 1, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Vance Serchuk:									
United States	Dollar				4,028.80				4,028.80
Egypt	Pound		485.00						485.00
Jordan	Dinar		562.70						562.70
Qatar	Qatari Riyal		667.56						667.56
Margaret Goodlander:									
Egypt	Pound		421.00						421.00
Jordan	Dinar		303.30						303.30
Vance Serchuk:									
United States	Dollar				2,169.80				2,169.80
Germany	Euro		1,003.25						1,003.25
United States	Dollar				2,745.30				2,745.30
Egypt	Pound		534.00						534.00
Israel	Shekel		466.00						466.00
Tunisia	Dinar		180.85						180.85
Delegation Expenses:[1]									
Jordan	Dinar						228.25		

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Total			4,623.66		8,943.90		228.25		13,795.81

[1] Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs,
May 1, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse:									
United States	Dollar				14,645.90				14,645.90
Philippines	Piso		338.69						338.69
Vietnam	Dong		379.17						379.17
Thailand	Baht		593.81						593.81
Burma	Kyat		228.18						228.18
Delegation Expenses:[1]									
Philipines	Pisa						8.88		8.88
Vietnam	Dong						237.25		237.25
Thailand	Baht						441.19		441.19
Burma	Kyat						541.56		541.56
Senator Jon Kyl:									
New Zealand	Dollar		357.16						357.16
Australia	Dollar		4,099.97						4,099.97
Carolyn Leddy:									
New Zealand	Dollar		508.13						508.13
Australia	Dollar		4,280.00						4,280.00
Delegation Expenses:									
New Zealand	Dollar						945.84		945.84
Australia	Dollar				474.00		9,446.72		9,920.72
Senator Patrick Leahy:									
Cuba	CUC		544.00						544.00
Colombia	Peso		2,165.00						2,165.00
Senator Christopher Coons:									
Cuba	CUC		544.00						544.00
Colombia	Peso		2,165.00						2,165.00
John P. Dowd:									
Cuba	CUC		444.00						444.00
Colombia	Peso		1,505.00						1,505.00
Kevin McDonald:									
Cuba	CUC		444.00						444.00
Colombia	Peso		1,505.00						1,505.00
Lisa Hummon:									
Cuba	CUC		444.00						444.00
Colombia	Peso		1,505.00						1,505.00
Delegation Expenses:[1]									
Cuba	CUC						359.10		359.10
Colombia	Peso				3,689.55		7,117.00		10,806.55
Total			22,050.11		18,809.45		19,097.54		59,957.10

[1] Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary, Apr. 27, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Michael B. Enzi:									
New Zealand	Dollar		30.00						30.00
Australia	Dollar		840.00		174.00				1,014.00
Melissa Pfaff:									
Zambia	Kwacha		1,545.00		248.00				1,793.00
United States	Dollar				3,144.10				3,144.10
Anna Abram:									
Zambia	Kwacha		1,669.00		248.00				1,917.00
United States	Dollar				3,144.10				3,144.10
Ashley Cottingham:									
Zambia	Kwacha		1,639.00		248.00				1,887.00
United States	Dollar				9,905.10				9,905.10
Total			5,723.00		17,111.30				22,834.30

SENATOR TOM HARKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions,
Apr. 25, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Daniel Coats:			2,179.09						2,179.09
Brian Miller:			1,082.00						1,082.00
Senator Ron Wyden:			49.00						49.00
	Dollar				11,897.70				11,897.70
Isaiah Akin:			49.00						49.00
	Dollar				11,897.70				11,897.70
Randall Bookout:			773.00						773.00
	Dollar				12,668.20				12,668.20
Lorenzo Goco:			680.00						680.00
	Dollar				12,668.20				12,668.20
Paul Matulic:			880.00						880.00
	Dollar				12,668.20				12,668.20
Hayden Milberg:			2,074.00						2,074.00
	Dollar				15,960.70				15,960.70
Jamal Ware:			1,602.00						1,602.00
	Dollar				10,945.55				10,945.55
Brian Walsh:			1,566.00						1,566.00
	Dollar				10,541.55				10,541.55
Senator Marco Rubio:			125.84						125.84
Senator Saxby Chambliss:			144.00						144.00
Andrew Grotto:			1,473.00						1,473.00
	Dollar				8,310.00				8,310.00
Jeffrey Howard:			1,192.00						1,192.00
	Dollar				8,309.50				8,309.50
Ryan Tully:			430.00						430.00
	Dollar				6,947.30				6,947.30
Senator Saxby Chambliss:			930.00						930.00
Tressa Guenov:			420.00						420.00
Christian Cook:			3,328.00						3,328.00
	Dollar				17,676.70				17,676.70
James Smythers:			3,493.00						3,493.00
	Dollar				17,676.70				17,676.70
Neal Higgins:			2,001.00						2,001.00
	Dollar				15,058.80				15,058.80
Tyler Stephens:			3,328.00						3,328.00
	Dollar				17,676.70				17,676.70
Andrew Kerr:			2,074.00						2,074.00
	Dollar				15,960.70				15,960.70
Richard Girven:			1,914.00						1,914.00
	Dollar				15,960.70				15,960.70
Ryan Tully:			2,024.00						2,024.00
	Dollar				15,960.70				15,960.70
Senator Richard Burr:			760.00						760.00
Total			34,570.93		238,785.60				273,356.53

SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, Mar. 28, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Fred Turner:									
Austria	Euro		662.83						662.83
United Kingdom	Pound		1,497.00						1,497.00
United States	Dollar				1,668.40				1,668.40
Total			2,159.83		1,668.40				3,828.23

SENATOR BENJAMIN CARDIN,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe,
Apr. 16, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), REPUBLICAN LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Mitch McConnell:									
United States	Dollar				12,582.90				12,582.90
Japan	Yen		75.25						75.25
Burma	Kyat		395.71						395.71
Thailand	Baht		152.98						152.98
RADM (Dr.) Brian Monahan:									
United States	Dollar				12,583.80				12,583.80
Japan	Yen		95.25						95.25
Burma	Kyat		326.30						326.30
Thailand	Baht		202.97						202.97
Roy Brownell:									
United States	Dollar				12,583.80				12,583.80
Japan	Yen		70.25						70.25
Burma	Kyat		322.91						322.91
Thailand	Baht		152.98						152.98
Thomas Hawkins:									
United States	Dollar				14,958.00				14,958.00
Japan	Yen		1,079.80				546.11		1,625.91
Burma	Kyat		366.00						366.00
Thailand	Baht		152.98						152.98
Delegation Expenses: [1]									
Japan	Yen						565.00		565.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), REPUBLICAN LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Burma	Kyat						6,085.57		6,085.57
Thailand	Baht						312.12		312.12
Thomas Hawkins:									
Germany	Euro		1,120.18						1,120.18
Total			4,513.56		52,708.50		7,508.80		64,730.86

[1] Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under the Authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR MITCH McCONNELL,
Republican Leader, Apr. 24, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2010

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael Bassett:									
Switzerland	Franc		1,378.73		143.28				1,522.01
United States	Dollar				1,698.00				1,698.00
Francine Hennie:									
Switzerland	Franc		1,378.73		143.28				1,522.01
United States	Dollar				1,698.00				1,698.00
Anne Oswalt:									
Switzerland	Franc		1,378.73		143.28				1,522.01
United States	Dollar				1,698.00				1,698.00
Martin Schuh:									
Switzerland	Franc		1,378.73		143.28				1,522.01
United States	Dollar				1,698.00				1,698.00
Total			5,514.92		7,365.12				12,880.04

SENATOR HERB KOHL,
Chairman, Committee on Special Committee on Aging, Apr. 17, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Anne Oswalt:									
Zambia	Kwacha		2,064.00						2,064.00
United States	Dollar				15,805.50				15,805.50
Total			2,064.00		15,805.50				17,869.50

SENATOR HERB KOHL,
Chairman, Committee on Special Committee on Aging, Apr. 16, 2012.

PREVENTING THE TERMINATION OF TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4967, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4967) to prevent the termination of the temporary office of bankruptcy judges in certain judicial districts.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I congratulate Senator COONS for a second time on the passage of legislation that will reauthorize 30 temporary bankruptcy judgeships in districts around the country. I was pleased to support Senator COONS' very strong and persistent efforts on this important legislation. The Judiciary Committee reported this legislation favorably on December 15, 2011.

The Senate passed the first version of this legislation on April 19. Despite the good intentions of everyone involved, a technical error was discovered after transmittal to the House of Representatives. Senator COONS worked quickly with the House Judiciary Committee to resolve that technical issue and, on May 9, the House took up and passed a perfected bill.

As I noted the first time the Senate acted on this legislation, the bill we pass today, when enacted, will reauthorize 30 temporary judgeships in 14 States and Puerto Rico. All of these positions have already expired, and without this legislation, upon retirement or departure of the judges in these positions, they could not be filled again. Needlessly reducing the resources of our bankruptcy courts does nothing but put more pressure on Americans who are already navigating a difficult economic environment. This legislation should help avoid that and provide some small degree of relief to overburdened bankruptcy courts around the country. Quite frankly, I think we should be doing more and hope we will continue to make sure the Federal Judiciary has the resources it needs to serve all Americans.

As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I will note once again my concern with a portion of the legislation the Senate passes today. In order to secure passage of this legislation, Senator COBURN insisted upon adding a section to the bill that purports to tell future Senate and House Judiciary Committees how to conduct their business. Unfortunately, the perfected bill we pass today retains this provision. Senator COBURN's amendment would dictate that before any of these 30 judgeships could be reauthorized again, the Senate and House Judiciary Committee's would be required to take certain steps and require a report from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, AO. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, Senator COBURN knows that this is precisely what committees do in the ordinary course of

the consideration of legislation and what was done during the development of this legislation. Senator COONS worked with the AO, which made recommendations, and with bankruptcy judges in a variety of districts to determine where need was greatest. To codify an unenforceable mandate nominally imposed on future Congresses is unnecessary and unwise.

Once again I take the opportunity to thank and congratulate Senator COONS for his hard work and attention to this issue. This would not be passing again without his diligence, focus, and legislative skill. He has now done twice what has seemed impossible to do once.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4967) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HONORING FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 456, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 456) commemorating and acknowledging the dedication and sacrifice made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I commend the Senate for agreeing to this resolution to honor the men and women who serve in law enforcement and to officially recognize May 15 as National Peace Officers Memorial Day.

Despite the progress that has been made in improving officer safety, there is much work to be done. The year 2011 was an especially tragic one for the law enforcement community. Last year, 163 State and Federal law enforcement officers lost their lives in the line of duty. This is an increase from 2010 and a grim reminder of the sacrifices far too many individuals make serving their communities and fellow citizens. The Senate should continue to do all it can to support officer safety.

To recognize these sacrifices, as they do every year, law enforcement officers and their families from across the United States will come to Washington to pay tribute and honor the men and women who have lost their lives. And as I do each year, I will stand with them.

In 1962, President Kennedy designated May 15 as National Peace Officers Memorial Day. Once again I am proud to have introduced a resolution officially recognizing that designation and honoring these men and women, and all of those that came before them. I am glad we passed this official recognition today.

The safety of law enforcement officers across the United States should be something on which we can all agree. I hope the quick passage of this resolution will foreshadow future bipartisan work on behalf of the men and women who work day after day to protect all of us.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I will take a moment to recognize the significance of that measure. I know the Presiding Officer, in his many years as attorney general of the State of Connecticut, became keenly aware of the sacrifices our law enforcement officers are too often called upon to make to protect our communities. In the State of Rhode Island, we recently lost a Providence police officer who was killed in the line of duty. So it is a somber and important act that we take.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 456) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 456

(Commemorating and acknowledging the dedication and sacrifice made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty)

Whereas the well-being of all citizens of the United States is preserved and enhanced as a direct result of the vigilance and dedication of law enforcement personnel;

Whereas more than 900,000 men and women, at great risk to their personal safety, presently serve their fellow citizens as guardians of the peace;

Whereas peace officers are on the front lines in protecting the schools and schoolchildren of the United States;

Whereas in 2011, 163 peace officers across the United States were killed in the line of duty;

Whereas Congress should strongly support initiatives to reduce violent crime and to increase the factors that contribute to the safety of law enforcement officers;

Whereas there are more than 19,000 Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who lost their lives in the line of duty while protecting their fellow citizens, and whose names are engraved upon the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, District of Columbia;

Whereas in 1962, President John F. Kennedy designated May 15 as National Peace Officers Memorial Day; and

Whereas on May 15, 2012, more than 20,000 peace officers are expected to gather in Washington, District of Columbia, to join with the families of their recently fallen comrades to honor those comrades and all others who went before them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates and acknowledges the dedication and sacrifices made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty;

(2) recognizes May 15, 2012, as ''National Peace Officers Memorial Day''; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate ceremony, solemnity, appreciation, and respect.

COMMEMORATING THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 458, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 458) commemorating May 15, 2012, as the sesquicentennial of the founding of the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the resolution.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 458) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 458

Whereas, on May 15, 1862, President Abraham Lincoln signed into law an Act that established a Department of Agriculture (12 Stat. 387, chapter 72);

Whereas President Lincoln gave the Department of Agriculture general authority to acquire and spread useful information on agricultural subjects and to assist in the development and use of new and valuable seeds and plants;

Whereas, in 1862, President Lincoln also signed into law the Act entitled ''An Act to secure homesteads to actual settlers on the public domain'' (commonly known as the ''Homestead Act of 1862''; 12 Stat. 392, chapter 75) and the Act of July 2, 1862 (commonly known as the ''First Morrill Act''; 12 Stat. 503, chapter 130), which, along with the creation of the Department of Agriculture, lay the foundation for Federal agricultural policy;

Whereas, in the 1850s, there was 1 farmer for every 2 people in the United States, while today the average farmer in the United States feeds more than 150 people;

Whereas the United States is now the second largest producer and the largest exporter of agricultural products in the world;

Whereas the role of the Department of Agriculture has expanded to include functions impacting nearly every aspect of the rural United States and beyond;

Whereas the Department of Agriculture helps to ensure the safety of the food supply of the United States, provides conservation assistance, collects market data, provides

nutrition assistance, protects the health of plants and animals, supports rural communities, conducts agricultural research, maintains risk management tools for producers, and promotes agricultural exports; and

Whereas the professionalism, dedication, and work ethic of the public servants at the Department of Agriculture provide a shining example of why President Lincoln called the Department of Agriculture the ''People's Department'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the men and women of the Department of Agriculture on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the Department;

(2) celebrates the growth and success of agriculture in the United States and

(3) honors the farmers and ranchers of the United States, whose ingenuity, adaptability, and skill have created the safest and most abundant food supply in the history of mankind.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, May 14, 2012, at 4:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 570 and 571; that there be 60 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote, without intervening action or debate, on the nominations in the order listed; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 14, 2012

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m., on Monday, May 14; 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 until later in the day; and that the majority leader be recognized; further, that when the Senate resumes legislative session following the votes on the Russell and Tharp nominations, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2072.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am informed that it is the majority leader's intention to resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 2072, the Export-Import Bank reauthorization bill on Monday.

At 4:30 p.m., there will be an hour of debate on the Russell and Tharp nominations.

At 5:30 p.m., there will be up to three roll call votes on confirmation of the Russell nomination, confirmation of the Tharp nomination, and the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2072, the Export-Import Bank bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 14, 2012, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:11 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 14, 2012, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 8033 AND 601:

To be general

GEN. MARK A. WELSH III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. PHILIP M. BREEDLOVE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE VICE CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 8034 AND 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. LARRY O. SPENCER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. NOEL T. JONES

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. WAYNE A. ZIMMET

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROBERT M. AGUE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

LESLIE A. WOOD

To be major

DAVID B. FRANKLIN
ANTHONY R. IANNUCCILLO
JOSHUA M. MCCONKEY
MATTHEW L. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

NATHAN BARRY ALHOLINNA
CARL R. ALVAREZ
SHAWN MICHAEL ANDERSON
MATTHEW P. ANDREWS
TIMOTHY W. AZBILL
SANDRA L. BEST
EDWARD E. BLACK
JAMES M. BRUHL
PHILLIP C. BUNTON
JOHNIE A. BURTON, JR.
JEFFREY L. BUTLER
DARREN DENNIS WADE CHESTER
DAVID ANTHONY CLARK
LARRY K. CLARK
DAVID V. COCHRAN
CHRIS S. COLLINS
MARSHALL C. COLLINS
STEVEN EDWARD CONEY
MITCHELL D. CULP
SUSAN M. DICKENS
DAVID A. DIXON
BRADFORD RUSSELL EVERMAN
CHRISTOPHER E. FINERTY
MATTHEW GAGE
MARK ANDREW GREEN
PATRICK MARTIN GUINEE
TERRY E. HALL
ANTHONY W. HAMEL
ROBERT E. HARGENS
JODIE A. HARVEY
THOMAS J. HESS
JEREMY C. HORN
QUINCY N. HUNEYCUTT III
BRIAN KURT JOHNSON
NATHAN H. JORGENSEN
SEAN R. KELLEY
DAVID J. KEMPSON
LAWRENCE JAMES KLEIN
JENNIFER R. KONDAL
JOHN S. LADNER
JOHN A. LEBLANC
MATTHEW WALTER LECLAIR
MICHAEL KEVIN LOVE
TIMOTHY JOSEPH MADDEN
DAVID V. MCNULTY
TAMARA DAWN MIELKE
TODD A. MITTON
MICHAEL H. MORGAN
KELLY JAMES PARKINSON
JOHN EVAN PATTERSON
SHAUN J. PERKOWSKI
KATHRYN C. PFEIFER
JOHN J. PTAK, JR.
THOMAS WILLIAM RYAN
GREGORY M. SCRIVNER
THOMAS R. SERRANO
KEITH B. SNYDER
MICHAEL S. SPENCER
JOHN G. TUGWELL
EDWARD L. VAUGHAN IV
RALPH C. WALSH, JR.
DAVID A. WEISHAAR
TIMOTHY LEE WILKINSON
DOUGLAS ALLAN WILLIAMS
JOHN P. YORK
CRAIG M. ZIEMBA

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

RHANDA J. BROCKINGTON
VICKIE M. SCHNACKEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

RICHARD A. DANIELS
DANIEL J. HOLDWICK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S. C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

ANDREW C. GALLO
CHRISTA M. LEWIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

JOHN C. MOFFITT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MIMMS J. MABEE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531, AND 3064:

To be major

JONELLE J. KNAPP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. , SECTIONS 531, AND 3064:

To be major

ROBERT E. BESSEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624, AND 3064:

To be major

LAUREL A. THURSTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531, AND 3064:

To be major

TINA M. MORGAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

KARL W. HUBBARD

To be major

BENJAMIN N. HOFFMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOANN B. COUCH
GILBERT R. GHEARING
SANDRA M. WANEK

To be major

EDWARD E. BRIDGES
FRANK T. BRYANT
LEWIS RUBINSON
RICHARD J. YOON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

MATTHEW F. PHELPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JENNIFFER D. GUNDAYAO
DAVID S. KEMP
SUSANNE M. MCNINCH
HUI K. PAK
GEORGE K. WERENSKJOLD
DONALD R. WILKINSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

DAVID A. ADAMS
HENRY C. ADAMS III
JEFFREY T. ANDERSON
ANDREW ARNOLD
TODD A. BAHLAU
STEPHEN E. BANTA
STEPHEN D. BARNETT
DOUGLAS J. BEAVER
PAUL W. BIERAUGEL
CRAIG T. BOWDEN
THOMAS A. BRADEN
MICHAEL D. BRATTON
RICHARD D. BRAWLEY
RICHARD T. BROPHY, JR.
DAVID J. BRYSON
SCOTT A. BUNNAY
JOHN F. BUSHEY
GEORGE J. BYFORD
KEVIN M. BYRNE
DOUGLAS W. CARPENTER
ANTHONY C. CARULLO
ROBERT B. CHADWICK II
STANFIELD L. CHIEN
MARK J. COLOMBO
TIMOTHY A. CRONE
JOHN J. CUMMINGS
BRIAN L. DAVIES
STERLING W. DAWLEY
CHRISTOPHER P. DEGREGORY
ARTHUR M. DELACRUZ
JOSEPH A. J. DIGUARDO
JEFFREY S. DODGE
WILLIAM C. DOSTER
MICHAEL G. DOWLING
KRISTY D. DOYLE
ROBERT C. DUNN
JOHN L. ENFIELD
HUGH P. EVERLY
CHRISTOPHER P. FAILLA
JOHN W. FANCHER
MARY J. FEINBERG
EDUARDO R. FERNANDEZ
JOSEPH F. FINN
MICHAEL A. FISHER
MICHAEL D. FISHER
SEAN M. FITZPATRICK
JOHN D. FREEMAN
RAYMOND A. J. GABRIEL
ROBERT M. GAUCHER
EDWARD S. GETTINS
LAWRENCE G. GETZ III
PAUL G. GIBERSON
DEREK B. GRANGER
MARKUS J. GUDMUNDSSON
DAVID K. GULUZIAN
JASON R. HAEN
LYLE D. HALL
STEVEN K. HALL
JEFFREY L. HAMMER
PATRICK J. HANNIFIN
RICHARD F. HAYES
EDWARD L. HEFLIN
KEITH M. HENRY
BENJAMIN L. HEWLETT
PAUL H. HOGUE, JR.
HEATH M. HOWELL
JEFFREY F. HYINK
CHRIS D. JANKE
DOUGLAS A. JORDAN
JASON T. JORGENSEN
JEFFREY A. JOSEPH
JOSEPH M. KEENAN
JOHN L. KELSEY
MARK D. KESSELRING
JEFFREY J. KIM
WILLIAM K. KIMMEL II
ROBERT T. KING
DAVID E. KOSS
DEREK M. LAVAN
MATTHEW L. LEAHEY
CRAIG E. LEE
LAWRENCE F. LEGREE
GARY LEIGH
ANTHONY J. LESPERANCE
OLIVER T. LEWIS
SEAN R. LIEDMAN
DAVID P. LITTLE
MICHAEL R. LOCKWOOD
DAVID A. LOTT
CORD H. LUBY
STEPHEN G. MACK
ALEXANDER R. MACKENZIE
JOHN J. MANN IV
DANIEL P. MARTIN
JOHN M. MAXWELL
CLYDE F. MAYS, JR.
WILLIAM A. MCCONVEY
BRIAN J. MCCORMICK
MAX G. MCCOY, JR.
STEPHEN D. MCKONE
SEAN G. MCLAREN
RICHARD J. MEADOWS
CHRISTOPHER A. MERWIN
CARL W. MEUSER
CLAYTON W. MICHAELS
DAVID E. MILLER
CHRISTOPHER M. MILLS
JAMES D. MINYARD
KEVIN S. MOONEY
ANGELA MORALES
SEAN D. MORDHORST
PAUL G. MOVIZZO
STEPHEN F. MURPHY
MARK T. MURRAY
THOMAS M. NEILL
JACK P. OLIVE
DANIEL F. OLSON
JOSEPH R. OLSON
JUAN J. OROZCO
MICHAEL B. PARKER
GARY J. PATENAUDE
RANDALL W. PECK
MIGUEL L. PEKO
GEORGE PEREZ, JR.
DAVID T. PETERSON
ERIC V. PETERSON
WILLIAM D. PFEIFLE
ERIC N. PFISTER
MANUEL A. PICON
GARY W. PINKERTON
WILLIAM E. POWERS
BRIAN J. QUIN
SCOTT E. RAUPP
COREY W. RAY
SCOTT F. ROBERTSON
GARY A. ROGENESS
ROBERT A. RONCSKA
MATTHEW D. ROSENBLOOM
MARK B. RUDESILL
MICHAEL S. RUTH
NICK A. SARAP, JR.
MICHAEL K. SAVAGEAUX
MICHAEL B. SAWIN
DAVID G. SCHAPPERT
MARK W. SCHMALL
MICHAEL S. SCIRETTA
LANCE G. SCOTT
DANIEL J. SENESKY
JEFFREY W. SINCLAIR
JOHN A. SIPES
WALTER M. SLAUGHTER
ANDREW F. SMITH
SCOTT M. SMITH
PHILIP E. SOBECK
GERHARD A. SOMLAI
BRIAN K. SORENSON
TIMOTHY F. SPARKS
JOHN D. SPENCER
SCOTT B. STARKEY
RANDY C. STEARNS
MATTHEW P. STEVENS
ANDREW B. STJOHN
CHRISTOPHER J. SWEENEY
JOSEPH M. TURK
ERIC H. VERHAGE
WILLIAM S. WALSH
EDWARD C. WHITE III
PAUL A. WHITESCARVER
JEROMY B. WILLIAMS
NILS E. WIRSTROM
ERIC P. WOELPER
RICHARD S. YOUNG
JOHN J. ZERR II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MARK D. LARABEE
EMIL T. PETRUNCIO
RICHARD J. WATKINS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

GREGORY D. BURTON
BRIAN R. DURANT
CHRISTOPHER E. HAND
JOEL P. HARBOUR
JEFFREY T. HEYDON
HUGH J. HUCK III
JASON M. LLOYD
JOHN A. LOBUONO
STEPHEN A. MARINO
JOHN C. MARKOWICZ
MARK M. MATTHEWS
KURT J. ROTHENHAUS
JOHN M. STUBBLEFIELD
JOSEPH M. TUITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MICHAEL N. ABREU
JOHN W. BAILEY
ROBERT H. CASSOL
JEFFREY C. DALATRI
PAUL J. FILARDI
CRAIG D. GRUBB
MICHAEL M. HOCKER
MATTHEW S. MCLAURIN
JOHN H. ROUSSEAU
CHRISTOPHER M. SCHIMENTI
SCOTT D. TINGLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

TRENT R. DEMOSS
ROBERT B. FARMER
CHARLES K. NIXON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

ROGER L. ACEBO
PEYTON M. ALLEN
DAVID L. ANSELMI
ALAN D. ARMSTRONG
JEFFREY A. BAUMGARTEN
CLINTON D. BECK
TODD H. BISANG
JOSEPH R. BLAYLOCK
TERRANCE A. BRAND
RONALD G. BUDDE
GEORGE J. BYRD III
PATRICK C. CAREY
SHAWN C. CASEY
DOUGLAS A. COCHRAN
DAVID A. CROUNSE
KENNETH C. CROWE
MICHAEL W. DICKINSON
JOEY B. DODGEN
WILLIAM P. DONNELLY, JR.
DANIEL H. DRUCKENMILLER
DALE R. EADS
KEVIN B. EDWARDS
NELS S. ENBERG
DARIN A. ENGELHART
ANTHONY A. FREY
MICHAEL F. GILLETT
PARKER B. GLASIER III
MICHAEL W. GOCHIS
JEFFRY T. GUMAER
JAMES L. HAJJ
KELLY L. HANSEN
RUSSELL A. HARGROVE
CHARLES T. HEBERLE IV
BRIAN M. HOFFMANN
WILLIAM R. IRWIN
ELISABETH A. KIRKPATRICK
BRADLEY S. KNOWLTON
WILLIAM P. KRONEN
NANCY S. LACORE
CRAIG P. LAWS
CHADWICK M. LICHT
MARK H. LOKAY
JAMES LONGO
ALAN P. MACQUOID, JR.
BRADLEY J. MAY
MOIRA E. MCCARTHY

KENNETH C. MCDONNELL
JOHN J. MCGINN
KEVIN J. MCKEAG
VAN S. MCKENNY IV
MICHAEL J. MCMANUS
FERMIN S. MENDEZ
MELINDA K. MICHAEL
STEPHEN A. MILONE
BRIAN P. MOYERS
RUTHVEN P. NELSON, JR.
STEPHANIE L. NORDHOFF
CHRISTOPHER B. OLAES
JACK M. OMOHUNDRO
BRIAN E. PARK
ERIC A. PAYNE
MICHAEL G. PERKOW
WILLIAM B. PETERS
JOHN M. PETIT
SAMUEL F. PHILLIPS
STEVEN J. POLLPETER
WILLIAM E. RANDALL
JAMES T. REID
DOUGLAS W. RHODES
CHARLES M. RICHARDSON
THOMAS L. ROBERTSON
ERICH R. ROEDER
ROMEO A. ROSARIO
KURTIS R. SANBORN
DUANE A. SAND
ANDREW A. SCHNEIDER
CLARK A. SCHROEDER
GREGORY J. SCHUSTER
EDWARD B. SEGO
SCOTT F. SINGER
SAMUEL E. SORGEN
DAVID L. SPERRY
STEVEN P. STACY
THEODORE V. SUMMERS
SCOTT H. SWORDS
ROBERT W. TAMARO
TONY TROUP
JAY R. VANNICE
BERTRAM W. WAGNER
WILLIAM M. WALES
LARRY D. WATKINS
WILLIAM S. WHITE
SALLY L. WILBUR
JEFFREY D. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

THOMAS F. BOLICH, JR.
JERRY M. EDWARDS
HELEN H. FURBUSH
ANTHONY G. GIGLIO
KENNETH W. LARUE
JOHNNY M. MARSHALL, JR.
EUGENE H. MATTHEWS
THOMAS R. ORR
ALDEN D. PIERCE
STEVEN A. SWIFT
MICHAEL B. TRACY
ROBERT D. VANDERLUGT
MICHELE R. WATSON
DONALD R. XIQUES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

RAYMOND I. BRUTTOMESSO
JAMES D. COX
DAVID D. FERRIS, JR.
ROBERT A. GREEN
JEFFREY A. ISAACSON
DENNIS W. PRATHER
MICHAEL J. RIGO
MARK R. SANDS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

WILLIAM A. BAAS
MARK M. BAENZIGER
JAMES E. PUCKETT II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

THOMAS J. AMIS
JOHN E. M. BROWN
SUEANN K. SCHORR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

JEFFERSON W. ADAMS
ROBERT B. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

ROBERT W. MULAC
WILLIAM K. SALVIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

COLETTE E. KOKRON
CURTIS L. MICHEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

TAWNYA J. RACOOSIN
TODD D. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

ELISABETH S. STEPHENS
SHERYL L. TANNAHILL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

DONALD W. BOSCH
ANN H. DUFF
THERESA M. STICE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

DARREN E. ANDING
DANIEL S. BLACKBURN
MARK D. BRAZELTON
BRIAN A. CARPENTER
SCOTT W. EDWARDS
HEBERT F. FREDERICK
SCOTT K. FULLER
ANTHONY L. GILBERT
SCOTT R. GOOTEE
STEVEN P. KNIGHT
BRETT J. KORADE
EDWARD A. LIZAK
THOMAS A. LONG
DALE W. MAXEY
BRENT R. MCMURRY
SCOTT V. NEEDLE
CHRISTIAN PERRY
ROBERT T. RASCOLL
JOSEPH G. REHAK
STEVEN K. RENLY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JEFF A. DAVIS
BRENDA K. MALONE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MARK R. ASUNCION
DONALD A. CRIBBS
SARAH A. DACHOS
HIRAM S. JOHNSON
TIMOTHY N. KETTER
ROBERT H. PALM, JR.
RICHARD M. STACPOOLE
ERIK J. STOHLMANN
GREGORY P. STPIERRE
ELIZABETH A. THOMAS
PAULO B. VICENTE
BERNARD P. WANG
CLAY G. WILLIAMS
PHILIP W. YU

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MARC C. ECKARDT
MICHAEL J. ROTH
FRANK M. SCHENK, JR.
PETER J. SMITH
ROBERT W. WITZLEB

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

WILLIAM A. DODGE, JR.
NICHOLAS M. HOMAN
BRIAN L. LUKE
TIMOTHY M. MAY
ALBERT M. MUSSELWHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ALLEN L. EDMISTON
JAMES B. GINDER
MARK A. GUZZO
JACQUELINE V. MCELHANNON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JASON L. ANSLEY
MAUREEN FOX
HARUNA R. ISA
MARK C. KESTER
MICHAEL N. OLUVIC
CHARLES A. PRATT
DALE C. RIELAGE
JOSEPH R. ROBSON, JR.
MATTHEW A. ROSS
LOUIS T. UNREIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

GEORGE A. ALLMON
WILLIAM E. BINDEL
CHRISTOPHER J. CARTER
ALAN D. DEAN
BRIAN M. LEPINE
WILLIAM E. NOEL
JEFFREY L. SHEETS
TIMOTHY G. SPARKS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ERIC J. SKALSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

TED J. STEELMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

DAVID A. MOORE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

JOHN P. AYRES
AARON G. BRESNAHAN
JOHN M. CARROLL
CARLOS B. DELEON
BRUCE E. FUCHS
DAVID S. HUBER
KEVIN W. KRICK
ROBERT D. LYNCH
MICHAEL S. MATIS
MARK A. MURPHY
JAMES A. PERDUTO
ANDREW S. TROY
CLAY L. WILD

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DEBORAH RUTH MALAC, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

FERNANDO TORRES-GIL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2014. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

THOMAS SKERIK SOWERS II, OF MISSOURI, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (PUBLIC AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS), VICE LADDA TAMMY DUCKWORTH.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOSTON CARMEN'S UNION, LOCAL 589

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Boston Carmen's Union, Local 589, who for the past 100 years has been a strong voice for transportation professionals in Boston and the surrounding areas.

As it celebrates its centennial, the Boston Carmen's Union represents 6,000 union members and is a part of the Amalgamated Transit Union, the largest labor union in America with over 190,000 members. The union was born in the same way as the labor movement itself: with a great deal of cooperation, dedication and perseverance. In 1912, after a number of failed attempts to meet with management to assert their rights and address their grievances, the first organized Boston Elevated Carmen's Union voted to strike—1,389 votes to eight. During the strike, the newly-formed union faced uncooperative tactics and strike breakers hired by the transit company. Despite these challenges, the union members fought for their rights, enjoying strong support from the labor community, and soon after, from District Attorney Joseph Pelletier, Governor Eugene Foss and legendary Boston Mayor John ''Honey Fitz'' Fitzgerald. Finally, after more than six weeks of striking, the union was able to come to a settlement and gained recognition from Boston Elevated Company.

In the years to come, the Carmen's Union continued to grow and collaborate with other local unions, evolving with the changing transit industry to best serve its members. As it marks this centennial milestone, the Boston Carmen's Union has both served and represented the many transportation professionals whose important work forms the backbone of our city and the surrounding area's infrastructure. It is with their help that the employees of the MBTA have been able to stand up for better working conditions, hours and wages.

The Boston Carmen's Union has a stellar record of activism and community service. This year, the union participated in the National Day of Action for Transportation on April 4th. The event gathered the Carmen's membership and supporters to demand fair treatment for transit workers and to demonstrate that available, affordable and well-maintained public transit is an issue of civil rights. The union also works hard to build awareness about the crucial role transportation professionals play in the daily life of every Bostonian. From subway drivers to mechanics to baggage handlers, and so many more, members of the Local 589 provide integral services to their communities every single day.

Along with its efforts to improve working conditions for its membership and empower them to assert their rights as an employee, the Boston Carmen's Union values its ability to play a positive role in the community. When firefighters, policemen or other public servants are killed in the line of duty, members of Local 589 routinely volunteer their time and services to provide transport to and from the memorial service. I applaud the Boston Carmen's Union both for its dedication to its mission of empowering transportation and allied professionals and for its commitment to serving the Boston community and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Boston Carmen's Union, Local 589, its President John Lee and the entire community on the celebration of 100 years of service to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

HONORING THE BUFFALO AND ERIE COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY'S SESQUICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY AND PARTNERSHIP WITH THE NEWLY RESTORED HOTEL LAFAYETTE IN DOWNTOWN BUFFALO NEW YORK

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to recognize the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society (BECHS) on the occasion of their 150th Anniversary celebration. It is with great enthusiasm that I learned of their recent partnership with the newly restored Hotel Lafayette in Downtown Buffalo and I am inspired by their creative collaboration with significant restoration projects throughout our great city and region.

As the premier historical organization in Western New York, the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society serves to collect, research, interpret and share the rich history of the Niagara Frontier. Founded in 1862, the organization holds more than 100,000 artifacts, 200,000 photographs, and 20,000 books.

On Thursday May 10, 2012, the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society will celebrate their 150th Anniversary Gala and will partner with the Hotel Lafayette at a premier event held at the hotel to announce their collaboration and concept of leveraging Western New York history as a brand. Their shared vision will be showcased at the hotel in the form of inspired images, artifacts and ephemera from the museums vast collection.

Other creative collaborative efforts include: the use of BECHS designed Pan-American dinnerware for use as dessert plates in the newly named Pan-American Grill and Brewery in the Hotel, curating reproduced images for the hotel suites and corridors, and wall coverings to name a few.

As Buffalo's Congressional Representative, and a former teacher of History and Economics at Buffalo State College, it gives me great pride to see such innovative collaborations come to life. This presents a remarkable opportunity to tell the great story of Buffalo, its rise as one of America's fastest growing cities with a bustling and diversified economy, home of the Pan-American Exposition in 1901, and home of many of the great works of architectural and landscape greats of America. This partnership also allows us to tell the story of a city that is making a great comeback, in large part due to the creativity and contributions of its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the long-standing work and commitment of the staff, board of directors, docents and volunteers at the Buffalo and Erie County's Historical Society on the occasion of their 150th Anniversary Gala at the grand, Hotel Lafayette.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE PRESIDIO ROCKETRY NATIONAL FINALISTS

HON. FRANCISCO "QUICO" CANSECO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. CANSECO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to congratulate students from Presidio High School and Lucy Rede Franco Middle School for qualifying for this year's Team America Rocketry Challenge national finals. This prestigious competition, which includes approximately 7,000 students from across the country, is the largest model rocket contest in the world.

Through their extraordinary talent and hard work these 3 teams earned a spot within the top 100 finalists, earning them a trip to Washington, DC for the national finals on May 12th. I am proud to congratulate Ana Karen Nieto, Itza Hanai Rodriguez, Antonio Bujanda, Marla Baltazar, Dylan Rivera, Rene Cardona, Gwynelle Condino, Jillianne Franco, Andres Villa, Hector Montemayor, and John Valeriano for this outstanding achievement and wish them the best of luck in the competition.

IN RECOGNITION OF JASON BRANCH

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Specialist Jason Branch, the winner of the Massachusetts Army National Guard's 2012 Best Warrior Competition.

To be eligible for the grueling contest, Spc. Branch was first selected by his unit, the 189th Engineer Detachment, as the most qualified candidate. The Massachusetts Best Warrior Competition is known to test participants with rigorous physical and mental challenges. Now in its fourth year, the competition continues to evolve to meet the caliber of the contestants. This year's event included tests

of physical fitness and marksmanship, a written exam and a challenging mock urban combat situation. The demanding weekend culminated in an interview with a board of Command Sergeants Major testing each participant's knowledge on a variety of subjects.

Throughout the competition, Spc. Branch demonstrated the dedication, ingenuity and perseverance that make an excellent soldier, and in the end, emerged victorious amongst the commissioned officers competing. When not in uniform, he continues to serve his community as a Unit Manager at Plymouth's Radius HealthCare and Pediatric Center, playing a vital role in the rehabilitation of the center's patients. Spc. Branch truly represents the very best of our community and our country.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Spc. Jason Branch as he is honored for his excellence as a soldier, and we wish him the best of luck as he moves on to the regional stage of the competition.

CONGRATULATING PRESIDENT MA YING-JEOU ON HIS RE-ELECTION

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to recognize and congratulate Ma Ying-jeou, President of Taiwan, as he continues to honorably serve the people of the Republic of China. On January 14, 2012, through a free and fair election, the people of Taiwan reelected Ma Ying-jeou to serve a second term as president, continuing the country's commitment to a strong and stable democratic government.

Over the past century Taiwan has increasingly become an influential free-market democracy in the Asia-Pacific region. Now a model government to surrounding countries, Taiwan continues to play a vital role in maintaining peace and stability in the region and has experienced sustained economic growth and sociopolitical development in recent years.

As a result, U.S-Taiwan relations have become especially close. Our shared economic, cultural, political, and strategic values coupled with our mutual interest in forging strong ties have encouraged innovation and growth between our nations. U.S. arms sales to Taiwan have more than doubled over the past several years and on December 22, 2011, the U.S. State Department announced Taiwan's nomination for inclusion into the Visa Waiver Program. Officials estimate acceptance into this program will increase the more than 400,000 Taiwanese citizens who visit the United States each year by 20 to 30 percent.

As a member of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus, I commend President Ma for his exemplary leadership and his efforts to advance and ensure regional stability and peace. President Ma and his administration have worked tirelessly to develop a strong strategy of rapprochement which upholds our shared values of freedom, democracy, and the rule of law. I look forward to the future as we continue to work together to seek mutual best interests for both the United States and Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating President Ma Ying-jeou and wish him continued success as he begins his second term as president of the Republic of China.

CONGRATULATING CUMBERLAND SCHOOL OF LAW

HON. SPENCER BACHUS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to join my colleagues Robert Aderholdt, Martha Roby, and Dennis Ross in congratulating Cumberland School of Law on the celebration of their fiftieth anniversary as an entity on the campus of Samford University in Birmingham, Alabama. The school's legacy and impress extends across the globe and indeed into this very chamber, my three colleagues having walked its historic halls as law students.

What began as a humble and at times struggling law school in the hills of Lebanon, Tennessee, through tenacity and divine providence blossomed into a first rate and nationally-recognized center of legal education. Today, Cumberland boasts the fourth ranked trial advocacy program in the nation and has served as the educational backdrop for countless state and federal judges, legislators, and other elected officials. Judge John Carroll, whose service as the Dean and chief advocate for the law school, deserves our utmost commendation for thrusting Cumberland onto the national stage. His dedication and leadership have ensured the continued growth and prosperity of this respected law school.

Mr. Speaker, as a body that daily ponders the law and the effects of law, it is only fitting and proper that we honor an institution dedicated to excellent legal education and commend Cumberland and Judge John Carroll on a job very well done. The city of Birmingham, our great state of Alabama, indeed the entire nation owes a debt of gratitude to Cumberland School of Law for its educational prowess, its historic legacy, and its integral part in preparing the next generation of our nation's leaders.

HONORING DR. WILLIAM FOEGE, RECIPIENT OF THE PRESIDENTIAL MEDAL OF FREEDOM

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great epidemiologist and immunization champion Dr. William Foege and to celebrate his receipt of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the nation's highest civilian honor. Dr. Foege's commitment to public health throughout his career—particularly in the area of promoting child survival and immunization worldwide—is nothing less than extraordinary.

In 1966, Dr. Foege served as a medical missionary in a remote part of Nigeria where he encountered the devastating disease of smallpox. He campaigned tirelessly for a more aggressive response to this terrible disease. In the absence of sufficient vaccine supply, Dr. Foege developed a strategy called "surveillance and containment" to combat the spread of smallpox. An innovative strategy, his focus on "hot zones" was remarkably successful and led to the global eradication of smallpox in 1979.

Dr. Foege's work led him to become the Chief of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Smallpox Eradication Program and in 1977 he was elevated to Director of the CDC where he remained an aggressive champion for childhood immunization and continued his leadership in the fight for the eradication of smallpox.

Dr. Foege's accomplishments and awards are many and span his long career. After leaving the CDC, he formed the Task Force for Global Health (1984), which continues today as a critical nexus for the establishment of international collaborations to promote child wellness and survival. The impact that Dr. Foege and the Task Force has had on the world through childhood immunizations to prevent polio, measles, river blindness, and many other diseases has been nothing short of astonishing.

In 1986, Dr. Foege joined the Carter Center in Georgia serving as their Executive Director until 1992. He is a professor emeritus at the Rollins School of Public Health at Emory University in Atlanta and an affiliate professor of epidemiology in my District at the University of Washington (UW), School of Public Health. In 1999, he became senior medical advisor to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation where he remains an emeritus fellow. With this record of accomplishment and service, it is clear why UW chose to name their Bioengineering-Genome Sciences building after Dr. Foege.

To this day, Dr. Foege continues to educate the world on domestic and international health policies through his writing and speaking engagements. His is a career defined by service and rooted in science. Dr. Foege's enthusiasm and talent for global health continues to generate and influence future generations of public health professionals. I am delighted that he has been awarded this honor.

WELCOMING THE SEVENTH HONOR FLIGHT SOUTH ALABAMA TO WASHINGTON, DC

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize Honor Flight South Alabama and the World War II veterans this very special organization is bringing on its seventh flight to Washington, D.C. on May 9, 2012. It is also my honor to insert this tribute into the RECORD during the week of the 67th anniversary of the Victory in Europe (V–E Day).

Founded by the South Alabama Veterans Council, Honor Flight South Alabama is an organization whose mission is to fly heroes from southwest Alabama to see their national memorial.

Nearly seven decades have passed since the end of World War II and, regrettably, it took nearly this long to complete work on the memorial that honors the spirit and sacrifice of the 16 million who served in the U.S. Armed Forces and the more than 400,000 who died. Sadly, many veterans did not live long enough to hear their country say "thank you," yet for

those veterans still living, Honor Flight provides for many their first—and perhaps only—opportunity to see the National World War II Memorial, which honors their service and sacrifice.

This Honor Flight begins at dawn when the veterans will gather at historic Fort Whiting in Mobile and travel to Mobile Regional Airport to board a chartered flight to Washington. During their time in their nation's capital, the veterans will visit the World War II Memorial, Arlington National Cemetery, and other memorials.

The veterans will return to Mobile Regional Airport that evening, where some 1,000 people are expected to greet them.

Mr. Speaker, the May 9, 2012, journey of heroes from South Alabama is an appropriate time for us to pause and thank them—and all of the soldiers who fought in World War II. They collectively—and literally—saved the world. They personify the very best America has to offer, and I urge my colleagues to take a moment to pay tribute to their selfless devotion to our country and the freedoms we enjoy.

I salute each of the veterans who made the trip to Washington. May we never forget their valiant deeds and tremendous sacrifices:

Bradford Amazeen; Frank Boykin, Jr.; Henry Brady; Wesley Davis; Charles Jackson; Manley Kulman; Archie Lewis; Raymond Lovell; Travis Mitchell; Niland Mortimer; Wilson Oglesby; James O'Rear; John Osterday, Sr.; Almon Ready; Kermit Reedstrom; Dr. James Rencher; Harold Richard; Jesse Robinson; Raymond Roser; Lawrence Roubion, Jr.; John Ruffin; James Santa Cruz, Jr.; Harold Schumann; Richard Stairhime; Lloyd Stewart; William Sumrall; Harlan Taylor; Tom Ware; Robert Wheeler; Wendell Williamson; Hugh Blount; William Boone; Cecil Bosarge; John Bosco; Howard Bowman; Vercial Bray; William Brennan; Claude Broun; Johnnie Burgess; Paul Carroll, Jr.; Cordelia Catlin; Dan Coleman; Leo Crain; Miles Crutchfield; Carl Daughdrill; Dr. Conan Davis; Nathan Denmark; Kirby Evans; Almus Goins; Johnnie Grovenstein; Michael Guarino; Angelo Harris, Jr.; John Hickman, Sr.; Joseph C. Holliday; Philip Kile; Richard Lentz; Alfred Phillips; Rudolph Rolison, Sr; John Tyson, Sr.; Thomas Brown; Frank Daniels; Lyman Daugherty; Elisha Davis, Jr.; John Folson; Edward Haeflinger; Oliver Henderson, Jr.; Frank Holyfield; Hal Johnson; Mitford Keel; Thomas Kelly, Jr.; James Lambeth; Father George Lassett; Josephine Lassett; Donald LeDuc; Seymour Lichtenfeld; Arnold Loucks; John Magnon; Ulderico Marcucci; Moss McCarty; Raymond McCrary; Earl McDonald; Pervis McMillan; Nicolas McShea, Jr.; Robert Nodar; Edward O'Neal; Charles Parker; Kenneth Patrick; Edwin Phillips; Arthur Raines; and James Werner.

IN MEMORY OF GARY SAIN

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the passing of a friend and an ardent advocate for Central Florida. Gary Sain passed away May 6, 2012, just hours after delivering opening remarks at the Boys and Girls Club of Central Florida's "Celebrate the Future" fundraiser, an event for which Gary served as chairman, and which typified Gary's dedication to the people and community of Central Florida.

I would like to extend my deepest sympathy to Pam Sain and the Sain family. Gary was a talented and enthusiastic proponent of Central Florida's future and development. Gary was personable, humble and energetic. He was refreshing to be around and optimistic for the future. He envisioned great things for Central Florida, and he worked hard to make them happen.

As CEO of Visit Orlando, Gary was instrumental in making Orlando America's number one tourist destination. With his work, Orlando became the first travel destination to host more than 50 million visitors in a calendar year, with 51.5 million people visiting Orlando in 2010.

Gary's vision for Orlando, and the legacy he leaves, will serve the Central Florida area well for years to come. His work will be carried on, but he will be sorely missed. May his example of dedication, hard work and altruistic enthusiasm lead many to follow in his steps.

CONGRESSIONAL CAUCUS ON CPA AND ACCOUNTANTS

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Congressional Caucus on CPA and Accountants, I rise today to congratulate the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), on reaching the historic milestone of 125 years of service to its members and the public. Founded in 1887, the AICPA has grown into an organization with over 377,000 members in 128 countries.

As the ten CPAs and accountants in Congress, we each have deep personal connections to the accounting profession and profound respect for the work the AICPA does to strengthen it. As a professional organization, the AICPA supports and educates its members, but it also promotes financial literacy and education for the general public as well.

The accounting profession is about trust: trust between a CPA and a client, and trust between an auditor and the public. It is these relationships, carefully tended, that are the foundation of our economy. For 125 years, the AICPA has been hard at work building this trust by promoting the highest standards of independence, objectivity, competence, and ethics for the profession.

The AICPA's members practice in specialties across the accounting spectrum—from private practice to business and industry to education to government to consulting—but all are supported by the resources, information, and leadership provided by the Institute. The AICPA serves its members in many activities including standards, certification, peer review, education, thought leadership, and promoting the public image and professionalism of CPAs.

For over a century, the AICPA has stood as a custodian of the accounting community, protecting the integrity of the profession and promoting the competence of its members. Today, Americans are served by a cadre of well trained, objective CPAs whose analysis and advice serves as the foundation for millions of financial and business decisions each day. These professionals are the living legacy of the AICPA's 125 years of service.

Today, as a member of AICPA, I join with my fellow CPAs and accountants to congratulate the staff, leadership, and members of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants on their 125th Anniversary. Our nation is a better, stronger nation because of your work.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, I rise in reluctant opposition to H.R. 5326, the Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations bill for FY2013.

This spending bill provides funding for essential agencies, including the National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, Census Bureau, Economic Development Administration, FBI, Drug Enforcement agency, U.S. Attorneys and Marshalls, NASA, and the National Science Foundation.

I recognize that Chairman WOLF had a difficult task because of the sharply reduced allocations included in the Ryan Budget, which I opposed. The bipartisan agreement represented by the Budget Control Act of 2011 already made sharp cuts to spending levels. The decision by this Republican-led Congress to break that agreement to make even deeper cuts on the programs Americans rely on will make it very difficult to come up with a final spending agreement with the Senate. The Obama Administration has issued a Statement of Administration Policy expressing strong opposition to H.R. 5326.

This bill underfunds programs that are critical to Hawaii, including programs that support fisheries and ocean stewardship programs. It includes a $20 million cut to the Legal Services Corporation, denying legal aid to tens of thousands in underserved communities, as well as many military families. Funding for the Community Oriented Policing Services, COPS, program in the bill is well below the administration's request. Fortunately, we were successful in passing an amendment to increase funding for COPS by $126 million (equivalent to the FY 2012 level), but many other amendments to this bill have made it even worse. For instance, amendments were adopted that would: Prevent use of Department of Justice funds in the legal defense of the Affordable Care Act; Prohibit funding to implement the National Ocean Policy; Eliminate funding for science-based climate change education efforts that will help prepare students for careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics; Prohibit funding of Census Bureau collection of detailed housing, economic, and demographic statistics.

I expect this bill will pass today. I only hope that it can be improved in conference with the Senate so I can vote for the final spending agreement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote Nos. 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, and 223. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall vote Nos. 202, 205 and 214. I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall vote No. 199, 200, 201, 203, 204, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, and 223.

HONORING DR. AILEEN RIOTTO SIREY FOR HER SERVICE TO THE NATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF ITALIAN AMERICAN WOMEN AND OUR COMMUNITY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with my heartfelt thanks and appreciation that I rise today to join the many family, friends, and colleagues who have gathered to pay tribute to the invaluable contributions of my good friend, Dr. Aileen Riotto Sirey. After founding and leading the National Organization of Italian American Women for more than 30 years, Aileen has decided to step down from the helm. She has led NOIAW with pride, integrity, honor and, most importantly, passion—molding it into the outstanding organization it is today.

Aileen has one of the most unique personal stories I have ever come across. After receiving both her undergraduate and graduate degrees from Brooklyn College, she began teaching in Brooklyn. With the birth of her daughter, JoAnne, she left the workforce and spent the next five years as a full time mother. When she decided to go back to work, she joined Beth Israel Hospital as a community organizer and she was soon recruited by the Maternal Infant Care Project, a program within the New York City Health Department, to develop the first In-Hospital Family Planning Program. Under this program, community women were recruited, screened, and trained in peer counseling in birth control and were placed in 25 New York City Hospitals. Women talking to women about family planning—which at the time was still not commonplace—was an extraordinary effort. Aileen went on to for two consulting firms in health services and later earned her doctorate in psychology and started her own practice. For most this would seem like a lifetime's of work already completed—but not for Aileen.

One of Aileen's greatest professional interests has been the effects of culture on values, attitudes, and behaviors. It was because of this interest that, more than 30 years ago, Aileen gathered a small group of Italian American women in her Upper West Side apartment. That meeting and their desire to assist other Italian American women and develop a nationwide network of women sharing a common ancestry sparked the formation of the National Organization of Italian American Women. Through their commitment to this effort, NOIAW members have developed a very successful scholarship and mentoring program and also offer a variety of educational and social programs. Today, NOIAW has a strong membership and is well-known as a resource for other Italian American women pursuing their own educational and professional aspirations. Throughout our nation's history, Italian Americans have played a pivotal role in the success and progress of America. The myriad of invaluable contributions that those of Italian ancestry have made to this nation are immeasurable. NOAIW celebrates these contributions and our rich ethnic history—it is Aileen's lasting legacy to our country and to all Italian-American families.

I have had the distinct pleasure to work with Aileen on a variety of projects over the years. She is an extraordinary resource and her positive energy and enthusiasm is contagious. She instills an inspiration in others that does not quickly fade. I consider myself fortunate to call her my friend and would be remiss if I did not extend a special note of thanks to her for her many years of special friendship and support.

More than anything else, Aileen greatest pride is in her family. I am proud to join her husband, Charles, her daughter and son-in-law, JoAnne and Sol, and her granddaughters, Emma and Maia, as well as all of those who have gathered this evening in extending my very best wishes to Aileen Riotto Sirey as she celebrates her retirement. She has set an extraordinary example of service and dedication—it is a bar to which we should all strive.

WOMEN WHO MAKE A DIFFERENCE

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize this year's ''Women Who Make a Difference'' being honored by the YWCA in my home of Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

Since 1954, the YWCA of Bucks County has worked to empower women and provide a wide range of educational programs to the disadvantaged and vulnerable populations in our community.

After accepting nominations from the community, the YWCA has chosen the following women to receive this year's honors: Anne Clark, Yolando D'Arcangelo, Jeryl DeGideo, Susan Eckert, Mynetta Edwards, Kim Everett, Kathy Feldcamp, L.J. Herman, Jo Klienmann-Wood, Jacqueline Garnett Neal, Sally Pollock, and Kathleen Rosso-Gana.

All of these women have made a big difference in my Congressional District. Their overall empathy for others has helped our neighbors fight life threatening diseases and overcome physical challenges. Their enthusiasm for learning has inspired our youth, and their sense of duty has compelled them to assist total strangers in crisis, sometimes putting their own lives at risk.

The hard work and dedication that these women have shown has made Bucks County a better place for all of us. Thanks again to the YWCA and all of this year's honorees.

MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

HON. LYNN JENKINS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, as a Nation, we pride ourselves on the support we give our men and women in uniform.

So much so, that over the last ten years, ''Support the Troops'' has become a rallying cry that cuts through all social and political difference.

This month is Military Appreciation Month, and today I rise to thank the men and women serving in our military in Kansas and around the world.

This week, as the House attempts to block the gutting of our defense department, I think it is important to remember that the first priority of the Federal Government is to protect us and there are brave men and women across the globe who deserve our support.

So from Fort Riley, Fort Leavenworth, Forbes Field, and other military installation across Kansas's Second District and indeed the world, I want to express my sincere gratitude to the men and women of our armed services. Your service makes my service possible.

ACLU RECOGNIZES SHARON KISSEL

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I enter this statement on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union, ACLU. The ACLU is a non-partisan organization with more than 500,000 members, 53 state and local affiliations, and countless additional activists and supporters, dedicated to the principles of equality and justice as set forth in the U.S. Constitution and in our laws protecting individual rights. The ACLU asked me to enter the following statement into the RECORD recognizing Sharon Kissel, a DC resident who serves as Legislative Librarian for the organization.

On the 15th anniversary of Sharon Kissel's tenure with the American Civil Liberties Union Washington Legislative Office, her colleagues and many friends would like to honor her tremendous work over the past two decades on many of our nation's most pressing civil rights and civil liberties issues. In her role as the Legislative Librarian, Sharon is one of the unsung heroines in the ACLU's efforts to achieve equal justice, freedom, and fairness for all. Over the past 15 years, Sharon's work has been critical to a wide range of issues, including the ACLU's advancement of the Fair Sentencing Act, the Violence Against Women Act, and the ACLU's national security advocacy.

Sharon has been a key participant in some of the most important civil liberties and civil and human rights campaigns over the past 15

years. One area of concern particularly in which she has been involved is the restoration of the rule of law in interrogations and detention practices in violation of human rights and the U.S. Constitution. She has participated in one of the leading coalitions against torture and indefinite detention, as a researcher, writer, and source of wise counsel for her colleagues.

Further, her work has been an integral part of the ACLU's efforts to protect our democracy from Constitutional amendments that would diminish the basic rights afforded to all Americans. Her research and advice were important to helping prevent an array of constitutional amendments, including the flag desecration amendment, the school prayer amendment, the federal marriage amendment, and the so-named victims' rights amendment. Without the work of Sharon and her coalition partners, the Bill of Rights would have been riddled with exceptions.

No matter what the issue, Sharon always approaches research with a joy and a curiosity that is contagious, which is part of the reason she is beloved by her current and former colleagues. Sharon is also described by her colleagues as a ''genius'' for her ability to find arcane tidbits of legislative history. Her daily in-depth review of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other legislative research provides incredibly timely information. By feeding her colleagues these buried nuggets of information, Sharon helps the rest of the legislative staff shine as advocates for their issues. Sharon is the ACLU's secret weapon—pouring over 800-page bills and the barrage of amendments attached to omnibus bills. Her keen attention to Congress and broader public policy debates has enabled the ACLU to address many potential challenges to civil liberties, even before they reach the House or Senate floor. Moreover, Sharon has ushered the entire ACLU team's legal research capacity into the 21st century. She works continually to maximize resources and expand access to online research tools for her colleagues nationally. Throughout her career, Sharon's colleagues have also celebrated and admired her perennial role as a patient teacher and a devoted mentor to many who have worked with her over the years.

In addition to her invaluable work at the ACLU, Sharon's impressive career as a librarian spans over 40 years, and includes her work at the White House, the World Bank, the Federal Reserve, the U.S. Department of the Interior, the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, and Shea & Gardner. Sharon also organized and managed the information resource center for President Bill Clinton's transition team after his election in 1992. Furthermore, Sharon's accomplishments in the field of library science extend to her professional affiliations—she has previously served as the President of the Law Librarians' Society of Washington, DC, and as a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Equal Justice Institute Library. Sharon has also worked as a faculty member for the American Association of Law Libraries Summer Institute.

Sharon came of age during the civil rights movement, and her passion for civil rights and social justice extends to her personal life. She has been actively engaged in DC politics for decades and is the go-to resource on local civic and political issues, with a particular interest in safety and zoning issues. Many in the office, who have been working in national politics for decades, go to Sharon for information on local DC matters. Sharon's strong personal belief in the Bill of Rights and her devotion to her local community occasionally have sparked her to take action, such as the time she organized a demonstration of roughly 30 librarians in front of Kramer books when it appeared that the bookstore was going to comply with Kenneth Starr's subpoena of private book purchases in 1998. The owner of the store ultimately decided to challenge the subpoena on constitutional grounds.

Sharon and her beloved husband of over 40 years, Peter, also are active alumni of their alma mater, Syracuse University, and they established an endowed fund at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs to support activities that contribute to public understanding of civil rights and liberties. Sharon actually decided to pursue a career in librarianship after a work-study job in the Maxwell School Library, and Sharon and Peter have long maintained close ties to the school. She also received an M.L.S. from the University of Maryland, where she was a member of the Phi Kappa Phi Honorary Society.

Beyond her many professional accomplishments and contributions, Sharon is a dear friend to many at the ACLU. She has a generous and compassionate spirit. Sharon is always willing to share her deep love of Ireland and Irish politics, which has been a shared passion of her and her husband throughout their lives, and she will often bring back food or treats from her trips to Ireland with Peter to share with her colleagues. She is devoted to her family and enjoys her dogs, traveling, gardening, art, and music—especially Irish music! The personal and professional lives of her ACLU colleagues are richer because of Sharon's contributions, and we honor her 15 years of service to the ACLU and hope for many more.

WILLIAM F. EZZELL

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to William F. (Bill) Ezzell, one of America's leading Certified Public Accountants on his retirement from Deloitte, LLP.

As a member and former Chairman of the Board of Directors of the America Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), Bill has been an industry leader and pace setter for the accounting profession. His numerous accomplishments include the establishment of a major project within the AICPA foundation to increase the number of PhDs teaching auditing and tax in university accounting programs. He also played an integral role in the implementation of key legislation including Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 as well as the associated regulations.

Bill has been a frequent speaker and panelist at corporate governance forums and accounting conferences and has an expertise in emerging issues of interest to audit committees, corporate management, and auditors.

Bill graduated from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill with a B.S. degree in Business Administration and Accounting and had been with Deloitte 38 years. He has been a Commissioner on the Pathways Commission on the Future of Accounting Education, a recipient of the AICPA Gold Medal for Distinguished Service, and is a former Chairman of the AICPA Legislative Task Force.

Mr. Speaker, the Accounting Profession will miss Bill Ezzell's leadership and the Congress will miss the expertise he has provided through the years. I know my colleagues join me in thanking my good friend Bill for his years of service to the accounting profession and the guidance he has given us over the years. We wish him well on a well-earned retirement and hope he will be successful in his future endeavors.

HONORING CHERYL E. THOMPSON UPON HER RETIREMENT

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Cheryl E. Thompson on the occasion of her retirement from Mantua Elementary School on June 30, 2012. She began in the Fairfax County Public School System in 1973 as a Physical Education teacher and she became the Lead Physical Education teacher at Mantua 21 years ago. After serving in that capacity for 11 years, Ms. Thompson was promoted to Assistant Principal, a role which she embraced for the last decade.

Ms. Thompson has served the children of Fairfax County for the past four decades, spending the last 21 years at Mantua, where she personified the concept of community-building. She was the voice of the Mantua Elementary Intramural Basketball Finals; she organized and served as the DJ for the yearly Ice Cream Social, Sixth Grade End-of-Year Party, Spirit Parade, and the Mantua Citizens Association Pool Party. Ms. Thompson coached girls' basketball at Woodson High School, my daughter's alma mater, for 14 years, winning a number of division titles and the Virginia State Title in 1982. She earned Woodson Coach of the Year honors three times. The athletic instruction and support that Ms. Thompson gave to her students was exemplary; however, her dedication to her students' education is even more admirable. She earned Teacher of the Year and Support Employee of the Year honors with Mantua Elementary as well.

While Ms. Thompson's absence will be felt throughout the Fairfax County Public School System, and especially at Mantua Elementary School, her dedication to her community will continue to resonate. I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating her on her retirement and recognizing her many accomplishments.

COMMENDING FORMER IOWA CHIEF JUSTICE MARSHA TERNUS AND JUSTICES DAVID BAKER AND MICHAEL STREIT

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, courage is a virtue that is too often in short supply. That's why I congratulate former Iowa Chief Justice Marsha Ternus and Justices David Baker and Michael Streit. These courageous public servants received the prestigious John F. Kennedy Profile in Courage Award for doing their jobs on the Iowa Supreme Court. Together, they stood up for equal protections under the law for all Iowans. These courageous Justices were part of a unanimous decision that recognized marriage equality for all Iowans.

Although these Justices faced intimidation and threats after deciding the landmark case Varnum v. Brien, they did what they were supposed to do: uphold the Constitution. Justice Baker's words are a great example of why they deserve such a prestigious honor, ''I am comfortable with my vote in that case and even if I had known what would have occurred, I would have not changed my vote. We fulfilled our role as judges.''

Efforts to intimidate judges and try and turn the bench into a political soap box will do nothing to advance justice. Iowa judges are chosen based on merit, not politics. After they are appointed, their positions are subject to retention elections. In 2010, these judges were on the ballot for a retention vote and were ousted from their positions on the Supreme Court after large sums of out-of-state money funded a ''Vote No'' campaign.

They were voted off the bench because they fulfilled their sworn oath to uphold the Constitution of Iowa, which guarantees equal protection under the law to all citizens of Iowa, without regard to their sexual orientation. They are great role models for my children and all Iowans. By their actions, they became symbols that doing what's right isn't always easy; and doing what's easy isn't always right.

HONORING THE 60TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF CONCETTA (CONNIE) AND CARMEN CACCIOTTOLO

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two long time residents of the 3rd Congressional District of Illinois, Concetta, Connie to her friends, and Carmen Cacciottolo who will be celebrating their 60th wedding anniversary on May 3rd, 2012.

Their story starts back in 1937 when Connie and Carmen met in their kindergarten class at St. Mary of Mount Carmel School in Chicago. At the age of five, Connie and Carmen became very good friends; and now, 75 years later, they are celebrating 60 years of marriage. They attended classes together throughout grade school and split for their four years of high school with Connie attending Lourdes and Carmen attending Tilden Tech. On May 3, 1952, Connie and Carmen were married at St. Richard Church on Kostner Avenue in Chicago.

Carmen served our country proudly in the United States Army during the Korean War for two years. Upon returning home, Carmen worked as a full-time printer and lithographer for Raynor/Carquivelle Company while running the family-owned Italian store on Kolin Avenue in the Archer Heights community with Connie.

Connie went on to become a real-estate agent, insurance sales representative, and finally retired from her job at Talman/LaSalle Bank after 23 years. Carmen retired after 38 years with Raynor/Carquivelle. Connie and Carmen have raised three beautiful children: James, born in 1957, Albert in 1963, and their daughter Mary Ann who was born in 1964. All three of them still live close to their parents in the Chicago area preserving their strong family bonds.

Since their retirements, Connie and Carmen have enjoyed spending time with their five grandchildren: Kristin, Anthony Connor, Jenna and their angel Megan. Connie and Carmen have selflessly given their time for their community. They have been active residents in the Chicago Archer Heights neighborhood, at their schools, church, and community, including the local American Legion and V.F.W. After moving to Palos Park in 1995 they once again became active in their new church, Sacred Heart, with the local senior club, along with their neighbors and the Palos Park Women's Club.

Today as Connie and Carmen Cacciottolo celebrate their 60th wedding anniversary with their children, grandchildren, neighbors, friends, and bridal party, I would like to extend my best wishes to the happy couple. This is truly an amazing event in their lives, and as they celebrate together their 60 wonderful years of love and marriage, I wish them great happiness and joy for many more years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for several of the rollcall votes on amendments to H.R. 5326 held that day. Had I been present I would have voted:

''no'' on rollcall 202, the Peters Amendment to increase funding for the International Trade Administration and US Trade Representative by decreasing funding for NASA's Cross Agency Support account. While I support fully funding the Interagency Trade Enforcement Center in FY 13, I believe it is unwise to do that by taking funding away from NASA.

''no'' on rollcall 203, the Broun Amendment (#1), which unwisely seeks to make dramatic cuts to numerous accounts in the bill.

''no'' on rollcall 204, the McClintock Amendment, which would make an excessive 59 percent cut to the International Trade Administration at a time when we are trying to grow US exports.

''no'' on rollcall 205, the Michaud Amendment to increase funds for Economic Development Assistance Programs by taking funds from the Bureau of Census, Periodic Censuses and Programs. While I support increasing EDA funding, if there is any lesson to be learned from the last decadal census it is that short-changing the program in the early years of a census cycle leads to much greater costs in later years.

''no'' on rollcall 206, the Scalise Amendment, which seeks to cut Economic Development Administration funding at a time when we need to invest in growing our economy.

''no'' on rollcall 207, the Pompeo Amendment, which would go even further than the Scalise and completely eliminate Economic Development Assistance programs and grants.

''no'' on rollcall 208, the Quayle Amendment, which unwisely seeks to cut funding for the Advanced Manufacturing Technology Consortia, which will help us regain our edge so that we ''Make it in America'' again.

''no'' on rollcall 209, the Harris Amendment, which continues Republican efforts to keep their heads in the sand on climate change by cutting funding for a NOAA climate website.

''no'' on rollcall 210, the Grimm Amendment, which sought to increase funding for Regional Information Sharing Activities at DOJ by cutting funding for NOAA. While I support RISS, I do not believe this is an appropriate offset for that funding.

''no'' on rollcall 211, the Broun Amendment (#2), a wrong-headed attempt to cut funding to recover Pacific salmon.

''no'' on rollcall 212, the Runyan Amendment. While I support increasing funding for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program, which is a worthy program, the offset used is ill advised, particularly because it would impact the Civil Rights Enforcement Office of the DOJ.

''no'' on rollcall 213, the Davis (IL) Amendment. While I support the Second Chance Act grants that this amendment sought to increase funding for, I am greatly concerned that the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program is already woefully underfunded and cannot support further reducing SCAAP funding for an offset.

''no'' on rollcall 214, the Grimm Amendment. While I support the COPS program that this amendment sought to increase funding for, I cannot support the use of NASA as an offset.

''no'' on rollcall 215, the Huizenga Amendment, which seeks to allow the outsourcing of federal correctional worker jobs.

''no'' on rollcall 216, the Johnson (GA) Amendment. While I support the EEOC and the purpose that this amendment sought to increase funding for, I cannot support the use of NASA as an offset.

''no'' on rollcall 217, the Flake Amendment, which sought to make drastic cuts to the National Science Foundation.

''no'' on rollcall 218, the Westmoreland Amendment, which sought to dramatically reduce funding for the Legal Services Corporation at a time when more and more Americans facing hard times rely upon the services it provides.

''no'' on rollcall 219, the Austin Scott (GA) Amendment, which went even further than the Westmoreland Amendment and sought to eliminate LSC.

''no'' on rollcall 220, the Black Amendment, which blocks the federal government's ability to defend its authority to write and enforce immigration law.

"no" on rollcall 221, the Blackburn Amendment, which sought to make indiscriminate, across the board cuts of 1 percent throughout the bill.

"no" on rollcall 222, the Broun (GA) Amendment, which sought to make draconian cuts to most of the agencies within the bill.

"no" on rollcall 223, the Southerland Amendment, which unwisely prohibits the use of funds to develop, approve, or implement fishing catch shares programs in certain areas. Catch shares have been shown to be a successful tool for managing fisheries, one we should not rule out.

RECOGNIZING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE UNITED STATES

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again reaffirm my interest in maintaining a strong working relationship with Israel. Unrest in the Middle East has once again brought national security concerns to their doorstep.

Our two unwavering democracies in the United States and Israel have held firm together against outside threats for more than 60 years. As a close ally and trading partner, it is imperative that we provide training and materials for their military for years to come.

The nations surrounding Israel continue to seek nuclear weapons, an action that directly compromises the United States' security and interests. We must work together to ensure that Israel is able to defend themselves if such an event occurs. With the passing of H.R. 4133, I am pleased to see our nation again confirm its support for Israel's right to self-defense. This security cooperation will provide Israel with necessary aircraft and weaponry against the ever-present threat of attack.

The continued violence against the Israeli people must be condemned. However, as there is no immediate end in sight, the United States must stand up and continue to support Israel as they look to enhance their national security.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF DR. CHRISTOPHER T. JONES

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to honor Christopher T. Jones as he retires from the Center for Domestic Preparedness (CDP) in Anniston, Alabama.

Dr. Jones joined the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as Superintendent for the CDP on August 3, 2008.

He began his public service career with the Department of the Army Medical Command, following successful completion of active duty as a U.S. Naval Medical Service Corps officer. Dr. Jones then served as Deputy Under-Secretary of Defense (Environmental Security) liaison to the U.S. Public Health Service's Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, where he worked collaboratively with Federal and State agencies addressing high-risk public health issues arising from releases of military compounds, to include weapons of mass destruction components and military munitions.

Dr. Jones earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Health Sciences from Fairmont State College and a Master of Science degree in Occupational Health from West Virginia University. Additionally, he holds an MBA from Florida Institute of Technology, with an emphasis in federal procurement and earned a Doctorate of Education from George Washington University's Executive Leadership Program. He graduated in 2010 from the Executive Leadership Program, Center for Homeland Defense and Security at the Naval Postgraduate School. He's a member of the Academy of Management and a recipient of The Surgeon General of the Army Commander's Award for Civilian Service.

As Superintendent for the CDP, Dr. Jones brought leadership to workforce, operational and contracting challenges. Dr. Jones greatly helped in achieving the mission of the National Training Program and institutionalizing the CDP as the Nation's premier first responder training center in the United States. A native West Virginian, Dr. Jones is married with three children.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations to Dr. Jones and thank him for his outstanding service to our community and our Nation.

HONORING THE 100 YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE SAINTS PETER AND PAUL BASEBALL CLUB

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Saints Peter and Paul Baseball Club for one hundred years of service to Chicago's McKinley Park community. This year, the club will celebrate a century of quality athletics and social outreach by hosting the Centennial Celebration and Annual Dinner Dance. The Saints Peter and Paul Baseball Club has been a valuable asset to the community for many years, and I thank all those involved in the club and the current president, Mr. William Gonerka, for their dedication to our community.

The club was founded in 1912 by a group of parishioners from Saints Peter and Paul Church who realized the need for a community organization that could provide both athletic and social outlets for youth in the area. Growing with the community, the club soon expanded its sponsorship to other sports such as basketball, softball, and touch football and broadened its fundraising efforts for parishes and local schools. For the last twenty years, the club has continued its stewardship to the neighborhood by hosting communion breakfasts, trips to White Sox and Bears games, and other parish social events. Although Saints Peter and Paul Church has since joined with St. Maurice and Our Lady of Good Counsel to form the Blessed Sacrament Parish, members of the club have continued to hold events under their original name.

For the last one hundred years, the Saints Peter and Paul Baseball Club has worked to form healthy relationships and camaraderie among the people of McKinley Park. In supporting numerous athletic programs and acting as a social organization, the club has created a safe and productive outlet for many members of the local community. The work of this organization has helped members of the community develop vital leadership skills, appreciate the value of teamwork, and cultivate self discipline. I am grateful for the Saints Peter and Paul Baseball Club's outstanding one hundred years of service and am proud of the members who keep the club active.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF FLORENCE LARIVIERE

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an extraordinary woman, an environmentalist before the term was invented, one who has taught generations the value of wetlands and forests, mountains and oceans, and who learned and taught so many how to protect and preserve these immeasurably valuable resources. A gentle giant of a woman; a quiet roar of a voice; a tiny footstep with a huge footprint . . . Florence LaRiviere has righted many wrongs and prevented many environmental tragedies by the sheer force of her knowledge, determination, advocacy, participation, and persuasive talents.

Florence LaRiviere recognized the devastation that development was creating in San Francisco Bay long before others did. She saw the need for a National Wildlife Refuge and working closely with many others, she persuaded Congressman Don Edwards, despite opposition from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, to introduce legislation creating the Refuge. President Nixon signed the legislation creating it in 1972.

One of my proudest moments as a Member of Congress was the 1998 inclusion of the 1600 acres of Bair Island in the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. Florence worked closely with me on this project, tirelessly promoting it, working with the Citizens committee, challenging the owners of the property and using many creative means to move public opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very proud to have my Bay Area colleagues—Rep. ZOE LOFGREN; Rep. MIKE THOMPSON; Rep. MIKE HONDA; Rep. JERRY MCNERNEY, and Rep. JACKIE SPEIER join me in honoring this great and good woman, our dear friend of many years, as she is honored with the 2012 National Wetlands Award. This is an honor she has earned and richly deserves. We ask the entire House of Representatives to join us in thanking Florence LaRiviere for her decades of invaluable service. She is a national treasure and it is a high privilege to represent her.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following eleven rollcall votes. Had I been present I would have voted:

1. Aye—Peters (D–MI)—Page 3, Line 10-Adds $9 million for International Trade Administration offset by cuts to Cross Agency Support—NASA.

2. Nay—Broun (R–GA)—Page 3, Line 10—3% cut to Salaries and Expenses/Administrative Accounts, $847 million, and puts the savings into the Spending Reduction Account.

3. Nay—McClintock (R–CA)—Page 3, Line 10—Cuts $277.8 million from the International Trade Administration and puts the savings into the Spending Reduction Account.

4. Aye—Michaud (D–ME)—Page 5, Line 17—Adds $38 million Economic Development Administration, offset: Census Account.

5. Nay—Pompeo (R–KS)—Amendment No. 3—Cuts funding for the Economic Development Administration, $219.5 million, and puts the savings in the Spending Reduction Account.

6. Nay—Scalise (R–LA)—Page 6, Line 7—Reduces spending and overhead of Economic Development Administration and the Department of Commerce to FY08 levels and reduces the Deficit by $18.2 million.

7. Nay—Quayle (R–AZ)—Page 11, Line 18—Eliminates funding for Advanced Manufacturing Technology Consortia, $21 million, and puts the savings into the Spending Reduction Account.

8. Nay—Harris (R–MD)—Amendment No. 10—Strikes $542,000 increase from National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Climate Website and puts the savings into the Spending Reduction Account.

9. Aye—Grimm (R–NY)—Page 13, Line 2-Adds $18 million for Regional Information Sharing Systems, offset: National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration Climate Services.

10. Nay—Broun (R–GA)—Page 15, Line 13—Cuts $15 million from the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery account and puts the savings into the Spending Reduction Account.

11. Aye—Runyan (R–NJ)—Page 21, Line 23—Transfers $22.4 million from Department of Justice General Administrative Expenses to the Byrne Memorial Justice Program.

TO COMMEND THE HURLEY ELEMENTARY SCIENCE BOWL TEAM FOR REACHING THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOWL

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alfredo Guzman, Ulises Trejo, Vanessa Campos and Alondra Arciga of Hurley Elementary School, and their coaches Ms. Jazmine Smith-Falicetti, Ms. Roxana Del Real, and Ms. Shellie Affolter for earning the opportunity to compete in the 2012 National Science Bowl.

Two weeks ago, I had the opportunity to meet with these outstanding students and congratulate them and their teachers on their success. They clearly represent our country's bright future. Their confidence, intellect, and respectfulness will take them far, and I encouraged them to pursue studies in science, engineering, and math.

The National Science Bowl is a nationwide academic competition that tests students' knowledge of mathematics and science. This competition was launched by the Department of Energy as a new way to encourage students' interest in math and science career opportunities. During the bowl, competitors participate in a fast paced question-and-answer quiz, as well as attend science seminars and workshops. Middle school teams also compete in the Lithium-Ion Battery-Powered Model Car Challenge. This challenge stimulates creativity and fosters engineering skills as students compete to design, build, and race model cars.

Since the beginning of January, regional tournaments have been held across the country narrowing the competition to the best and the brightest in the nation. Hurley Elementary was the only school from the Midway Network of the Chicago Public School system that qualified to compete in the Chicago Regional Science Bowl. Likewise, the national competition was extremely tough this year as only 44 middle school teams earned the opportunity to compete in the final rounds in Washington, D.C.

As a team of sixth graders competing against students up to two years older, it has been an amazing accomplishment for Hurley to make it to the national competition. Although they did not bring home any awards this year, I am proud that they advanced as far as they did. Their hard work coupled with natural talent will take them far in life. I commend Ms. Smith-Falicetti, Ms. Del Real, and Ms. Affolter, for motivating these excellent young minds as well. Their leadership and guidance has been an invaluable asset to this team. I am proud of these bright students and I look forward to seeing what they accomplish in the future.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2012

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2072, the "Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011." This legislation reauthorizes for three years the charter and lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of the United States. In addition, the legislation contains several financial reforms that will help ensure the "Ex-Im Bank" remains fiscally sound so it may continue its outstanding record supporting American business increase export sales, which is perhaps the best way to preserve and increase high value manufacturing and service jobs.

As the representative of the congressional district that adjoins the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, the largest port complex in the nation, I know first-hand the important role the Ex-Im Bank plays for U.S. exporters, and the thousands of jobs created by increased international trade.

The Ex-Im Bank is the official export credit agency of the United States and provides financial assistance for the export of American goods and services to international markets. In Fiscal Year 2011 alone the Bank supported 290,000 export-related American jobs by providing more than $32 billion in financing to facilitate more than $40 billion in export sales by more than 3,600 American businesses.

Since 1934, the Ex-Im Bank has served as the principal government agency responsible for aiding the export of American goods and services, thereby creating and sustaining U.S. jobs. With its 75 year track-record, the Ex-Im Bank is projected to inject $900 million into the U.S. Treasury by facilitating the sale abroad of hundreds of billions of dollars of American made goods, which in turn will create or preserve hundreds of thousands of American jobs. In 2011 alone, the Ex-Im Bank facilitated sales supported 290,000 American jobs.

The United States must stay competitive in the emerging and competitive global market. The Ex-Im Bank assists U.S. manufacturers, small and large, in selling their products abroad. The Bank facilitates financing for foreign buyers who wish to purchase American manufactured goods, thus increasing sales, which translates into more good-paying American jobs.

Reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank's charter will have a positive impact on job preservation and creation in the United States, and in the 37th Congressional District in California which I represent. My district is home to more than a dozen companies that export millions of dollars of products annually.

Mr. Speaker, exporters in my congressional district include a diverse group of small and large businesses as well as businesses that are minority or women owned. In the aggregate they generate about $100 million dollars in export sales annually. I ask unanimous consent to include in the record a list of local businesses in California's 37th Congressional District that have directly benefited from financing by the Ex-Im Bank.

The Ex-Im Bank is self-sustaining and does not cost taxpayers a dime. Rather, the money it generates is returned to the U.S. Treasury, nearly $2 billion over the past five years, and helps reduce the deficit. Moreover, since its inception, less than 2 percent of the Bank's loans have ever defaulted, and even in those cases, loss is minimized because the borrower's manufactured goods are pledged as part of the collateral for the loan.

Mr. Speaker, exports are increasingly critical to the economic growth and job creation, economy and job recovery. The Ex-Im Bank is an indispensable tool in the national effort to increase export sales. That is why I am a proud and enthusiastic supporter of H.R. 2072, which enjoys broad support from business and labor and the Obama Administration.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to pass this important legislation.

TRIBUTE TO SUSAN BLACK ELWELL

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Susan Black Elwell, a constituent and a woman of strength, courage,

and vision. I am sad to say that Susan just lost her life to cancer, but, until her very last weeks, she used her life to make a difference in the lives of others. From her work as a founder and director of an innovative neighborhood nursery school and her visionary leadership of the largest and oldest women's political club in Maryland, to her service as a Peace Corps volunteer, Susan sought to enlighten and engage others through education and activism.

Born in North Bay, Ontario and raised in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Susan graduated from Chatham College for Women in 1962. She came to Washington as a young college graduate, working for the Washington Urban League and then the Peace Corps, where she met her husband Richard. They served in the Peace Corps together in Niger. After returning to the Washington, D.C. area and starting a family, Susan became a founder and the first director of the Chevy Chase Baptist Church Children's Center for children aged 6 months to 5 years. An innovative school, CCBC Children's Center became a much sought-after nursery school.

Susan was an active member of the Chevy Chase Historical Society Board. In 2007, she launched a new Historical Society program called ''History Go-Round,'' a series of programs for residents who love to learn about our community's history. The series offered neighbors with similar interests guided visits to historical sites, roundtables led by distinguished speakers, and exploration of historical sites both in the neighborhood and throughout the larger community.

Susan brought the same creativity and enthusiasm to her leadership of the Woman's Suburban Democratic Club, Maryland's oldest and largest political group, which celebrates its 55th anniversary this year. As a board member and president, she led the group to unprecedented growth and activity, encouraging a broader membership and mentoring younger members.

In addition to these achievements, Susan was a Master Gardener, the founder of the Chatham College for Women's Washington Area Alumnae Club, a Democratic precinct chair, and a lifelong activist. In 2005, she was awarded the William Trimble Beatty Award, which is presented to a Chatham College volunteer who embodies the spirit and hard work of that college's founder, Reverend William Trimble Beatty. Even as she has fought her own battle with cancer, she spoke out against the shortage of some cancer drugs and the terrible impact these shortages have on those who so desperately need them.

Mr. Speaker, I was honored to know Susan and to represent her in Congress. As an elected official, I benefitted from her idealism, wisdom, and hard work. More importantly, her strong sense of community and her dedication to building a better, more educated and thoughtful community made the world a better place, and she will be deeply missed.

I send my deepest condolences to her husband Richard and son Martin, stepsons David, Joe, and Peter, and daughter-in-law, Josie, and ask that my colleagues join me in paying tribute to this remarkable woman.

CONGRATULATING GOLD EAGLE CO. OF CHICAGO FOR RECEIVING THE PRESIDENT'S ''E'' AWARD

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the owners and employees of the Gold Eagle Company of Chicago, Illinois. On May 17, 2012, they will receive the prestigious President's ''E'' Award from the Department of Commerce. The ''E'' Award is presented to select American companies that demonstrate excellence in their ability to export American goods abroad. I appreciate the work of the employees and management at this company who have demonstrated leadership and resilience over the past several years.

Creative and successful in its business growth model, Gold Eagle utilizes innovative international marketing strategies that have led to four years of dynamic export expansion. Moreover, Gold Eagle has demonstrated its ability to overcome export barriers, selling its products in more than 75 countries and five continents. To reward rising global sales and its commitment to entering international markets, the Department of Commerce will recognize Gold Eagle at its 50th Annual President's ''E'' Award Ceremony. The Secretary of Commerce, John Bryson, will present the award. For strengthening America's trade portfolio and creating high-paying jobs, I commend everyone at Gold Eagle for their hard work in pioneering product development and market expansion.

Located on Chicago's Southwest side, Gold Eagle has been an unwavering stalwart of the local economy. The company, founded in 1932, is an industry leader in the manufacturing of automotive and marine engine additives, fluids, and cleaners. This is not the first time Gold Eagle's excellence has been recognized: the company was named by the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity as 2008's Manufacturer of the Year, and Chairman Bob Hirsh and Vice President Rich Hirsh were named Ernst & Young's Illinois Entrepreneurs of the Year in 2002. In its mission to create innovative chemical products that help ''protect, preserve, and perform,'' Gold Eagle has been committed to community development, sustainability, and employee satisfaction for over eighty years.

For their efforts in creating manufacturing jobs and providing quality products around the world, I am proud to have Gold Eagle in my district. I wish them my sincerest congratulations as they receive this prestigious award, and thank them for their efforts in driving export growth in this challenging global trade environment.

HONORING MR. GORDON HIRABAYASHI, RECIPIENT OF THE PRESIDENTIAL MEDAL OF FREEDOM

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the late Mr. Gordon Kiyoshi Hirabayashi and to celebrate his Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian honor. As a student at the University of Washington during the bombing of Pearl Harbor, Mr. Hirabayashi resisted the internment of Japanese Americans by refusing to board a bus to an internment camp and by questioning the constitutionality of an imposed curfew.

Mr. Hirabayashi challenged Executive Order 9066, which authorized the Japanese American internment during World War II. Along with Mr. Hirabayashi, Fred Korematsu and Minoru Yasui brought lawsuits before the Supreme Court. Though Mr. Hirabayashi lost his first case in 1943, he would go on to win in 1987 as the evidence proved there was no military reason for the exclusion order.

As Mr. Hirabayashi noted ''there was a time when I felt that the Constitution failed me, but with the reversal in the courts and in public statements from the government, I feel that our country has proven that the Constitution is worth upholding. The U.S. government admitted it made a mistake. A country that can do that is a strong country. I have more faith and allegiance to the Constitution than I ever had before.''

As the representative of Seattle, I am proud this high honor will be presented, albeit posthumously, to Mr. Hirabayashi. He had the bravery and strength to stand up for civil rights during a time when racism was widespread against Japanese and people of Japanese descent. I join many in honoring Mr. Hirabayashi for his courage.

MAJOR GENERAL ROBERT SCOTT FRIX

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Major General Robert Scott Frix, and recognize his 34 years of service in the United States Army. General Frix will be interred May 11, 2012 at Arlington National Cemetery.

Major General Frix served in the United States Army for 34 years as a combat infantryman, Ranger instructor, master parachutist, and master aviator. He served tours in the Vietnam War, Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, and was deployed to Pakistan, Afghanistan, Kenya, and Somalia. Among Major General Frix's decorations are the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Distinguished Flying Cross, Bronze Star Medal, Air Medals for valor, Meritorious Service Medal, and the Army Commendation Medal.

Major General Frix passed away Thursday, December 15, 2011, at his home in Sequim, Washington. He is survived by his loving wife, Maureen; his sister, Joanna; his brother-in-law, Andrew; his son, Alexander; his daughter-in-law, Kathryn; and his daughter, Michele.

Major General Frix lived his life in dedication to his Country, and he has passed that down to his family. Major General Frix's life serves as an inspiration to all of us on living a life dedicated to service to our country and to our fellow man.

HONORING ROSE PADILLA JOHNSON AND THE FAMILY RESOURCE CENTER

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rose Padilla Johnson, and the Family Resource Center located in San Leandro, California. The Davis Street Family Resource Center provides services to over 20,000 people annually. Rose Johnson has provided outstanding leadership as Executive Director of the Center for the past twenty years.

Rose has transformed Davis Street into one of the most vibrant and comprehensive nonprofit providers of human services in Central Alameda County and the Greater San Leandro area.

She began her career working with low income, immigrant families in Alameda County. Her focus on working poor families throughout her career has led her to develop a keen understanding of the problems facing them. Rose's vision, leadership, business and community relationships, and sheer determination have grown Davis Street from the $380,000 organization of 1994 to the current $11,000 million dollar agency today.

Davis Street provides childcare services to over 1,000 children monthly and over 4,000 individuals receive food and clothing from the Center. Hundreds of individuals, who are uninsured and underinsured, are seen in the Center's medical and dental clinic and hundreds of others consult with housing and employment specialists, tax specialists, therapists, and counselors who specialize in drug and alcohol prevention.

In October 2002, Rose achieved her personal goal of creating a ''one stop shop'' in the form of the Davis Street Family Resource Center. All of the agency's programs are in one location, thereby eliminating transportation obstacles for those needing assistance.

Under Rose's advocacy and leadership, Davis Street launched a $3.5 million Capital Campaign to secure the purchase of Davis Street's 22,000 square foot building. On June 30, 2010, the organization became proud owners of the building.

In addition to her work at Davis Street, Rose is active in the community contributing her time and expertise to the San Leandro Chamber of Commerce, Alameda County Childcare Local Planning Council, the San Leandro Rotary Club and is co-administrator of the RotaCare Free Clinic. She is the recipient of many significant awards and honors.

I join the community in congratulating Rose Padilla Johnson for her 20 years of exemplary commitment and leadership, which have lead to the phenomenal success of the Davis Street Family Resource Center.

TRIBUTE TO PETE REIXACH

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize A.J. ''Pete'' Reixach, Jr. as he retires from his longtime position as the executive port director for Port Freeport, Texas. Port Freeport is one of the largest ports in my district, and it has been a pleasure to work alongside Mr. Reixach on a number of maritime issues. Pete is very well known in South Texas and the port community not only for his strong commitment to Port Freeport, but also for his efforts to expand international trade throughout the Gulf. He also is very well known for his tremendous contributions to the Brazoria County business community.

I'm happy to announce that Pete will not be retiring from the port business altogether, however. On the contrary, congratulations are in order for his recent promotion to chairman of the American Association of Port Authorities board. With his years of experience, talent, and expertise on a wide variety of issues I am certain Pete will enjoy a very successful tenure as chairman of the AAPA board. I'm also happy to see the Gulf coast represented at the highest level of the AAPA.

Pete has been an integral part of Gulf Coast port operations since his career began in 1970. He started as the assistant manager of the Greece-based Hellenic Lines Ltd. in New Orleans. He later arrived in Houston to become the general manager for Netherlands-based F.A. Voight Inc., before becoming the Texas Gulf Coast port assistant manager in 1985 and then general manager in 1986. In 1988 he finally made his way down to Port Freeport where he has been the executive port director now for over 20 years.

Port Freeport is ranked 16th among U.S. ports in international cargo transport. The landscape extends over 7,500 acres creating promise for future infrastructure and development. Port Freeport serves my district through technological advancement and is one of the leading job creators on the Texas Gulf Coast. Pete understands the importance of economy-enhanced sustainability efforts especially during these tumultuous times.

Not only has Pete been a treasured asset in Port Freeport, but he has also taken an active role on the national level as chairman of the Gulf Ports Association of the Americas and was vice chairman of AAPA Legislative Policy Council. Locally, he has also been involved with the Texas Ports Association and served on the Brazosport Area Chamber of Commerce.

The AAPA board has certainly gained a knowledgeable leader to spearhead their international trade efforts. In September, Pete will assume a one year chairmanship during the AAPA's 99th annual convention in Halifax, Nova Scotia. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to commemorate this great accomplishment and to wish Pete Reixach all the best as he moves into the next part of his career.

JANELLE JAMISON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Janelle Jamison for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Janelle Jamison is a 12th grader at Ralston Valley High and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Janelle Jamison is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Janelle Jamison for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

SIX ISSAQUAH POLICE OFFICERS HONORED IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, September 24 of last year during a beautiful fall afternoon, six police officers in Issaquah, Washington stopped a gunman intent on murdering innocent people. Because of their quick actions and bravery, the officers will be honored Saturday evening at the 19th annual TOP COPS Awards ceremony in Washington, D.C.

On that fateful day last fall, the gunman walked through yards and on sidewalks indiscriminately firing a rifle at homes, businesses, and passersby. Not far away, more than 100 people were watching a youth football game at a local school. Before the players and spectators could find refuge, the six officers put an end to his rampage utilizing the information being relayed via 9–1–1 operators. On that day, as on every day, law enforcement officers saved lives calmly, swiftly and selflessly.

Each year, Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Police Organizations recognizes law enforcement officers from federal, state, country and local agencies for acts of bravery, courage and outstanding service to their communities over the preceding year. I am proud that six of our nation's finest officers—and who serve in the district that I represent—8th of Washington—will be acknowledged with the rest of our heroes during police week.

Mr. Speaker, to Officers Brian Horn, Jesse Petersen, Laura Asbell, Tom Griffith, Corporal Christian Munoz, and Sergeant Chris Wilson, I say ''thank you.'' I will continue to support you and all of our law enforcement professionals around the country.

HONORING STEVE DENSLEY

HON. JASON CHAFFETZ

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the service and dedication of Steve Densley, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Utah Valley Chamber of Commerce. He served and guided Utah Valley for over three decades, becoming the second longest sitting Chamber President in Utah history. Steve Densley leaves a tradition of excellence in business and leadership throughout Utah Valley. He has been recognized numerous times

throughout his career including the Provo City Mayor's Medal of Honor and the Silver Beaver award from the Utah National Parks Council of the Boy Scouts of America. Mr. Densley was also chosen to be a representative of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to serve on the Western Region Board of Regents. Mr. Densley has served on over 70 boards, committees and councils during his 30-year career.

Steve Densley is a 35-year resident of the city of Provo and the proud husband of Colleen Densley. They have a beautiful family, with six children and 17 grandchildren. Mr. Densley was an All-American football and basketball player at Jordan High School and is an alumnus of Brigham Young University. He was honored with the Distinguished Alumni Award from the same university.

I invite my colleagues to join me in celebrating the accomplishments of this community leader who has served the Utah Valley Chamber of Commerce for the past 30 years. In essence Steve Densley built the Utah Valley Chamber of Commerce into what it is today and will leave a lasting legacy.

ERIKA SOLIS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Erika Solis for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Erika Solis is a 12th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Erika Solis is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Erika Solis for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

HONORING HOBSON PATRICK WOOD

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to honor one of the most prominent leaders in my District.

Hobson Patrick Wood, or Pat as he was known by everyone, passed away recently at the age of 83. He was well-known and beloved in Knoxville for his endless optimism and service.

Pat was a longtime friend of mine, and my District is a better place because of him and his tireless effort to make Knoxville a better place, both through his business ventures and through community service.

He is probably best known for his real estate and insurance firm, the Wood Agency, which he created in the 1950's. He later went on to form the Lawler-Wood group, which is responsible for developing large portions of downtown Knoxville, including the old Whittle building now housing the U.S. District Court and my Knoxville District office. Much of the downtown skyline of Knoxville is a product of Pat's community development work.

His business partner, Rodney Lawler, remembered Pat as one of the most generous people he has ever known. He told the Knoxville News Sentinel the only disagreement the two men ever shared was when Pat tried to give him too big a share of a deal they were working on. "We had a disagreement, a sizeable disagreement, over him being too generous to me," Lawler said.

Pat loved Knoxville and spent his entire career there, never losing touch with East Tennessee despite great personal success.

He also served the community as a political leader, being elected to the Knox County Court and serving on the board of the 1982 World's Fair, which he was instrumental in bringing to Knoxville.

I offer my condolences to his three children, five grandchildren, and devoted wife of 25 years, Brenda, who said she will remember Pat as "a loving husband and father and friend."

I too will remember Pat as a good family man who touched the lives of hundreds of people in many positive ways.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Colleagues and other readers of the RECORD to join me in remembering Pat Wood and the immeasurable impact he made on my District.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote Nos. 196, 197, and 198. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote Nos. 196, 197 and 198.

JACOB CISNEROS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jacob Cisneros for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Jacob Cisneros is an 11th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jacob Cisneros is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jacob Cisneros for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all his future accomplishments.

HONORING COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER, INC. AS THEY CELEBRATE THEIR 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to join all of those gathered in congratulating the Community Health Center, Inc. on their 40th anniversary. This is a remarkable milestone for this outstanding organization and I am proud to recognize their invaluable contributions to our community.

Health care is a right, not a privilege. It is a simple motto and the fundamental basis of the establishment of Community Health Center, Inc. Forty years ago, a group of students from Wesleyan University joined with community activists in Middletown—drawn together through a shared vision for affordable, accessible and responsive health care—to create a free clinic to meet the needs of the community. Fueled by idealism and a deep belief that patients should be the cornerstone of whatever was created, the Community Health Center, Inc. was born.

Since its inception, CHC has a fixture in Middletown's downtown community. What began as a free clinic has grown to provide care for 130,000 Connecticut residents—ninety percent of whom live at or near poverty level. Though its main offices remain in Middletown, CHC has expanded to include more than two hundred locations throughout Connecticut. In addition to the provision of primary care, CHC has also become known for its work in two other areas: research innovation through their Weitzman Center as well as training the next generation of health professionals through their residency programs. Recognized as a national model of care, most recently CHC was named by both the Joint Commission and the National Committee for Quality Assurance as a Primary Care Medical Home—the first and only health care organization in Connecticut, and one of the first in the Nation, to receive such a designation.

President and CEO Mark Masselli has been there from the beginning. As a founding member of CHC, Mark has devoted a lifetime of hard work and energies to turning the vision of CHC into a reality. His leadership has been integral to the success of CHC and I would be remiss if I did not extend a special note of congratulations and thanks to Mark for his extraordinary work.

I have had the privilege of working closely with Mark and the team at CHC and have often found myself in awe of the quality and quantity of service that they provide every day. The staff and administration dedicate themselves to providing those most in need with a wide-range of patient-centered medical, dental and behavioral health services. In fact, as they celebrate their 40th Anniversary, they also mark the opening of the newest addition—the Dodd Primary Care Center, a revolutionary

new space housing a 21st Century delivery system of primary health care. This innovative, and beautiful, new facility will ensure that CHC can continue to provide outstanding care to the thousands of residents they see every year.

I could not be more proud to join the Middletown community in celebrating this very special anniversary with the Community Health Center. Their outstanding dedication and commitment to ensuring that everyone—regardless of circumstance—has access to affordable, quality health care serves as an example to us all. I am honored to extend my heartfelt congratulations and very best wishes to Mark Masselli and the entire CHC family on this very special occasion.

RECOGNIZING CONVOY OF HOPE

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Convoy of Hope's generous outreach following last year's tornado which devastated the community of Joplin, Missouri, on May 22, 2011.

Convoy of Hope provides food, clothing, medical aid and other resources to disaster areas or to those in need. They are a shining example of the generous American spirit and the immense power of private faith-based charities to be a force for good in our local communities. Since its founding in 1994, Convoy of Hope has served over 51 million people throughout the world. Hours after the tornado struck Joplin, Convoy of Hope was on the scene offering a helping hand to those in need.

Convoy of Hope's initial response was coordinated with the cooperation of Ignite Church in Joplin where a mobile distribution site was established. Twelve local churches in Joplin and surrounding states organized volunteers to assist Convoy of Hope in the disaster response effort, which has provided more than 3 million pounds of food, water and supplies to help the community get back on its feet.

Through a partnership with Pyramid Foods, Convoy of Hope operated a ''compassion store'' where tornado victims received free relief products like rakes, shovels, trash bags and gloves to assist them with debris removal. The compassion store remained opened until November 2011.

In January 2012, Convoy of Hope announced their commitment to provide $1 million to help tornado victims on the series finale of ABC's Extreme Makeover: Home Edition, which featured the building of seven homes in seven days in Joplin. In February, Convoy of Hope, in partnership with the Global Green Building, Project Safe Home and T.F. Concrete Forming systems, embarked on a mission to help build storm-resilient homes for at least a dozen deserving families.

Convoy of Hope is constructing homes that emphasize protections against strong winds and promote energy efficiencies. Convoy of Hope and its partners are coordinating these and future efforts with the Department of Homeland Security and the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide guidance on other future ''resilient'' constructions. These new high-tech, low-energy buildings are specially designed with reinforced concrete walls and other innovations to be sturdier than traditional houses.

Convoy of Hope and their 3,852 volunteers served 12,161 families, helped clear and clean 42 houses at no cost to the homeowners, and completed four major critical needs projects for homeowners who did not have adequate resources to address the safety concerns on their property.

Convoy of Hope's generous spirit of outreach helped thousands of Joplin residents during a dark chapter in their lives. I know that many families impacted by this tornado are grateful for the helping hand and support they received from Convoy of Hope.

FRANK CURIEL

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Frank Curiel for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Frank Curiel is a 11th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Frank Curiel is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Frank Curiel for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all his future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING DANIELLE GREEN-BYRD

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the pleasure to recognize a hometown hero, Ms. Danielle Green-Byrd as she has been selected as the inaugural recipient of the Red Cross, Tiffany Circle Distinguished Woman Warrior Award for her outstanding service to our country.

Ms. Green-Byrd is a 1999 graduate of the University of Notre Dame with a BA in Psychology as a full scholarship athlete, excelling in varsity basketball. Once a standout left-handed shooter, she scored 1,106 points, averaging 9.5 points and 4.5 rebounds per game for the women's basketball team.

Upon graduating from college, Danielle chose to serve her country by enlisting in the Army and subsequently sent to Iraq, serving with the 571st Military Police Company from Fort Lewis, Washington during Operation Iraqi Freedom. She explained that she wanted to gain life lessons as an enlisted soldier before one day receiving a commission.

One of the first women injured during the beginning of the conflict in Iraq, Danielle had been at her post for only a few minutes when two rocket propelled grenades hit a barrier on the ground and exploded. A third hit her arm and damaged her thigh and face. She lost her left hand and arm and was awarded the Purple Heart.

Presently, Danielle is the assistant sports coordinator in the Chicago Board of Education's Department of Sports Administration and Facility Management and spends time with military veterans in the Chicagoland area. She enjoys time playing golf, a sport that she has said has taught her patience and brought enjoyment.

I am so proud to acknowledge a ''she-ro'' who is still living among us and I encourage her to continue to live her dreams, give back to the community and continue to make the greater Chicagoland community a better place.

Congratulations and may God continue to bless you in every field of human endeavor.

JAZMIN MEDINA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jazmin Medina for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Jazmin Medina is a 12th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jazmin Medina is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jazmin Medina for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL R. MANTHE

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Daniel R. Manthe, an extraordinary leader in education policy and a dear friend who recently passed away.

In my nearly half-century in education policy and politics, I have been blessed to work with and meet the widest range of committed and caring teachers and leaders. Daniel R. Manthe was both. Dan had education in his heart and mind and was one of the most knowledgeable people I ever met in the field. His efforts to make education more effective made a difference in the quality of education in whatever he touched. Education is better because of him.

As a young teacher, Dan toiled and suffered innumerable indignities securing the signatures that formed the roots and early support

base for the Michigan Education Association. As an Assistant Superintendent for the first Wayne County Intermediate School District, and then the modernized and retooled Wayne Regional Education Service Agency, Dan not only crafted the Michigan student aid formula section for education service agencies, but became the go-to person whenever any legislative bill or regulation even hinted at changing state education policy or practice for the county school district delivery system. His embedded in-depth knowledge base was beyond compare and unquestionably accurate.

Dan also had an innate ability to be able to know and foretell the inter-agency effects of legislation outside the education realm. He was the recognized expert on the complicated process of school consolidation and was Dan universally liked and admired in the corridors of the State Capitol of Michigan. He was courteous, knowing, and ever ready with a joke and generous in assisting young people new to the Capitol. Dan secured handwritten amendments, bill drafts and multiple documents and was often the first to recognize emerging, important legislative information.

Dan Manthe proudly represented the children of Wayne County, Michigan—all 34 districts, from Detroit to Ecorse, Hamtramck and Belleville. He was sought out by administrators and union members alike for his sage advice and deep expertise on how to accomplish various legislative feats. He tutored and fine-tuned the skills of a lineup of Michigan Department of Education state directors of legislation and school law who have gone on to become chiefs of staff for a Michigan governor and Speaker of the state House, a multi-district legislative consultant, and several Congressional and state legislative assistants.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in paying tribute to Daniel R. Manthe, a great Michigan education leader as we offer our heartfelt condolences to Dan's family on his passing.

EVERETT MILLER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Everett Miller for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Everett Miller is an 11th grader at Standley Lake High and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Everett Miller is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Everett Miller for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all his future accomplishments.

MOTHERS' DAY

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Mothers' Day and to thank our nation's mothers, grandmothers, and aunts, as well as all the women who mentor and nurture future generations. On this holiday, I thank these incredible women by recommitting myself to the effort to preserve Medicare and to protect their health and wellbeing.

My mother was a true inspiration to me, and she taught me the importance of a solid work ethic and compassion for others in the community. She took on the challenge of raising two children by herself, which meant work during the day and school at night. Life certainly was not easy for her, but she always provided for my family and is one of the strongest women I have ever known.

Today, many families in my district and across the country are also coping with limited resources while demonstrating the same determination and compassion that my mother instilled in me. Many are seniors who cannot afford the exorbitant cost of treatments for chronic medical conditions and preventative care. Medicare program is a vital lifeline for so many and should be protected at all costs.

The proposed Republican plan to end Medicare as we know it would distribute vouchers for beneficiaries to purchase health insurance. Under the plan, the voucher would not grow as fast as health care costs, shifting the burden of the costs onto seniors. It would repeal the free preventive services benefit in Medicare, increasing seniors' out-of-pocket costs for preventive care by over $110 million in 2012 alone.

The Republican plan would have a particularly damaging effect on women, who, on average, live longer than men, have lower incomes than men, and have more chronic health conditions than men—making Medicare even more vital to their wellbeing. 57 percent of women on Medicare live below 200 percent of the federal poverty line, compared to 45 percent of men. Additionally, 49 percent of women on Medicare have three or more chronic health conditions, compared to 38 percent of men.

As a representative of the 37th Congressional District of California, this issue is of particular importance to me. In California alone, there are nearly 2.7 million female Medicare beneficiaries, more than any other state in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in solidarity with these women—America's mothers and grandmothers—as I reaffirm my support of the Medicare program. I will not support legislation that balances our budget on the backs of our nation's most vulnerable citizens, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in this critical fight.

Mr. Speaker, I wish a happy Mothers' Day to all the mothers of the 37th district and across the country.

JESSE LUCERO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jesse Lucero for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Jesse Lucero is an 11th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jesse Lucero is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jesse Lucero for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all his future accomplishments.

ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize May as Asian Pacific American Heritage month and to a service organization from my district, the Pacific Asian Consortium in Employment (PACE) that provides crucial services to our community. This month gives us an opportunity to reflect and honor the Asian American and Pacific Islanders (AAPIs) who have enriched our nation with their countless contributions to American history.

While generations of AAPIs have had profound impact on our nation and have achieved the American Dream, the AAPIs community is extremely diverse and some AAPIs have challenges and require assistance from federal programs to overcome obstacles in the journey to achieve the American Dream. Around the country, there are number AAPI community based organizations that provide assistance to the diverse AAPI community and doing great work to support AAPIs families. I applaud them for the work that they do everyday to help AAPIs to overcome these obstacles and to support to better their lives for themselves and their families.

An example of an outstanding AAPI organization is the Pacific Asian Consortium in Employment (PACE) that is lead by a committed and dedicated individual—Kerry Doi, the President and CEO. The mission of the PACE is to create economic solutions to meet the challenges of employment, education, housing, business development and the environment in the Pacific Asian and other diverse communities. PACE is a non-profit community development organization founded in 1976 to address the employment and job training needs of the Pacific Asian Islander communities. PACE has since expanded into a variety of service areas, all tailored to meet the growing

and changing needs of the multi-ethnic communities in Los Angeles County. Now, in addition to job training and employment services, significant PACE programs encompass: business development; early childhood education; financial education and asset building; housing and rehabilitation services; weatherization and energy-conservation programs; and affordable housing development. PACE's guiding principle in all their programs is the idea of expanding opportunity. A small sample of their business lines include:

An extensive workforce development center which offers a variety of job training opportunities.

190 affordable housing units and a home repair service to enable elderly and disabled persons to stay in their homes.

An extensive energy and environmental program that promotes energy conservation.

A business development center that provides entrepreneurial training, business counseling and access to capital.

28 school sites offering early childhood education programming for more than 1,900 low income children and their families.

A financial literacy and asset building program that provides financial skills training.

This year, PACE established a new initiative called the Diversity and Democracy: America's Strength program that celebrates the important contributions that our nation's many diverse ethnicities, nationalities and races have made to our way of life—and the important role that government has played in their success. With the donation of 40 tickets from Southwest Airlines, PACE embarked on a journey to bring a diverse group of Federal program participants to Washington, DC to meet and hold a briefing with their elected representatives in Congress and representatives of federal agencies and the White House to tell their stories of how these programs have helped them on their journey to achieve the American Dream. The clients who are of various ethnic backgrounds will tell their own unique story describing how various programs empowered them to be able to become productive, economically self-sufficient Americans. They hope by conveying their real stories from PACE program participants will illustrate the key role that the various Federal programs have played in the lives of low income, ethnic minority, refugees, immigrants and asylees. Numbers tell one story; faces tell an even more important story.

As we in Congress debate the funding levels of the Federal programs that have helped numerous PACE participants, it is important that we listen to the voices of the PACE participants who have been helped by these programs that helped them—to start a business, to get the job training they need to secure good paying jobs, to provide early childhood education and to help refugees gain the skills they need to begin a new life in America. I encourage all my colleagues to read the compelling stories of these individuals who have become productive, economically self-sufficient Americans because of the existence of these Federal programs.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

I am Arax Nazarian.

My story is about hope—how I almost lost it and then found it again.

In April 2009, my family and I arrived in the U.S. as refugees from Iran. We fled our country seeking opportunities for a better life and to raise our son in a safe place without harsh discrimination. We came here without any money. But we had lots of hope.

The U.S. was going through one of its worst economic downturn in 2009. I worried about how I could get a job to support my family, repay my debt and help my parents back home. I spoke very little English. I didn't have any work experience in the U.S. I also needed some time to adjust to a new society, new culture, and new rules.

I applied for different full time jobs but I was denied repeatedly for different reasons. I was studying days and nights to improve my English and at the same time working in any odd jobs that I could find. But I was barely making ends meet. I felt helpless, desperate, frustrated and sad. I was losing hope.

My worry and sadness must have shown on my face.

Because my 11-year old son came to me one day and said, ''Don't worry, Mom. I don't need a new bow for my violin and I am not interested in going on the school's field trip. I just need your smile.'' I choked back the lump in my throat with a sense of guilt that I could not provide for my child's needs. I also felt a tinge of pain and pride in my heart that my child would sacrifice his own needs for his mother. I must not give up hope.

A ray of hope came to me when I heard about the Transitional Subsidized Employment program. I started my first Work Experience job at PACE's Home Energy Assistance Program Department where needy families get helped by paying their gas and light bills. Through this on-the-job training opportunity I became more skilled and confident. I learned about my new society, work environment, rules and regulations. Little by little I adjusted myself to a new life here in the United States.

Then I was offered a permanent job and I am now working at PACE Weatherization Department as a Program Support Clerk. I have earned recognition and respect from my coworkers.

And the best of all, I am able to support my family. I am happy that I am no longer dependent on public aid. My husband has a peace of mind to focus on his education in pursuing his carrier as an Electrician. My son has been growing up with good manners. He is one of the best students in his school, and receiving many awards.

I hope the program will continue to give other people the same opportunities I received. These programs give people hope, create jobs and change people's lives. They gave me my hope and changed my life.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

My name is Benjamin Alcaraz.

My story is about a Legacy through Education.

Like many other families in my neighborhood my mother and father emigrated from Mexico to America for a better life. One thing my mother always preached to her children was to get an education and bring her a High School Diploma. This for any immigrant family was considered a great accomplishment. After my father abandoned our family, my mother's determination to give her children an advantage through education became more acute.

That was when Head Start became a focal point in our lives. My mother enrolled me in a neighborhood Head Start school. I have vivid memories of her cleaning and helping to prepare food for the classroom as a parent volunteer. But what it did more than anything was what education meant to her and what it should mean to me. Once I was in the K–12 system, I flourished. I joined the honors program, and was the 1st in my family to go to a four year university straight after high school.

Now at the age of 33 I have two sons of my own, Mario and Alexander. And I do all of the things my mother did with me like reading books, counting, and learning. And I told them to bring me their College Degrees, one step up from the goal my mother set for me. Once Mario was old enough, I began to look for a preschool for him. I still live in the same neighborhood and I still have vivid memories of my Head Start days. Behold, the same school is still there! Mario loved it once he was enrolled in the same school.

Every day was a new adventure and a new learning experience, for both Mario and me. Just like my mother some 29 years ago, I was now the one helping out with the school, joining the policy councils and looking for ways to grow as a parent.

Head Start did not just give Mario a leg up in learning, but it also helped me to become a better parent. Mario has moved on to the K–12 system, but the experience, the social interaction, and the growth he gained from Head Start was immediately noticeable by his Kindergarten teachers. They expressed that they appreciate those parents who send their kids through Head Start program because they noted those children are more prepared for the K–12 system. Now Mario still sees me involved in his Elementary school and knows how much we as a family emphasize the importance of education.

And I know he understands this expectation because he declared that he will be attending UCLA after high school. Head Start instilled a love of education with Mario and I know it will do the same with my second son, Alexander. And I know they will carry on my mother's legacy of an emphasis on education, especially early on, with their young ones when the time comes. And I know they will also be looking for ways to be as involved as I am as parents.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

My name is Estella Navarrette.

My story is about Mariana and her Head Start experience.

Mariana is my 6th child out of 7. Being a single mom for so many years putting all my children through schools was a well-adjusted routine for me by the time Mariana reached the pre-school age. Playing both mommy and daddy for my seven children were all about finances, feeding and clothing them. Educating my children was not on my radar screen.

As Mariana grew older, she started to be curious and interested about school because of her older siblings coming home talking about their days at school. Right around this time I became a stay-at-home mom because of the learning disability of my youngest child.

Realizing Mariana's interest in school became more persistent, I began looking for information about a Head Start program. And that was when I came across PACE Early Childhood Education and enrolled her in the program.

Mariana was a very quiet and timid child. She was afraid to do anything. With the Head Start program I saw the change in her. Mariana went from always being quiet to being very outspoken. She expresses her feelings whether they are good or bad, and accepts them.

Before Head Start, Mariana reminded me of the same traits I had when I was her age. But unlike me, Mariana will not grow up with a sense of insecurity. I did not have the same opportunity as she does. Mariana will have the opportunity to grow with confidence. She will feel secure and develop a sense of independence because of the learning that the Head Start education has instilled in her. What Mariana has learned at school, she brings home to share with her

other siblings. She is so proud and animated in explaining how her day at Head Start went to her siblings. She even dished out project assignments to them. While explaining the projects to them she gets everyone to sit around like she did at school. I was watching Mariana playing this lead with her sibling and can't help but feel proud and appreciative of how important education is at this early age. Through the process that Mariana has been going through, Head Start has not only brought an interest in education to her, but it has also brought our family together.

Our schedules were always crazy and there was never any family time. Everyone was so busy with school and I was occupied for being a single mom caring for a child with disabilities. Now, after dinner Mariana brings everyone together for family time and to appreciate education.

I appreciate PACE Early Childhood Education because of the love, compassion, and interest that their staff has for our children. I want to thank the PACE organization for showing how warm hearted and caring they are about early childhood education.

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

My name is Francisco Talamantes.

I work for PACE's Home Energy Assistance Program or HEAP. The HEAP program helps families pay their utility bills. I help hundreds of families each week to pay for their electricity, water or gas bills.

For example, a lady in her late 20s walks into the office one day with a notice from the utility company that her electricity was about to be disconnected. She had that worry and weary look on her face. Her husband lost his job recently and they have 3 young children to support. Her situation was dire. Should they not feed their children or live in darkness without electricity?

Her electric bill was over $1000. I calmed her down and told her to not worry and this program is here to help her. Right away you can see the relief on her face. She filled out her application and we got the proper documents copied, and I was able to call the utility company and help her with $1000, which was enough to prevent disconnection. So perhaps for a little while, they can feed their children with hot food that can be cooked on their electric stove. And perhaps for a little while, her children can read and do their homework not in the dark.

These stories are very common. My coworkers sometimes asked me why I could be so patient and empathetic for so many clients that line up all way down the hall way each day. Do you know why? Because I was one of those children like this lady when I was young. This lady reminded me of when I was growing up when my family also often faced the choice between having food on the table or paying the utility bills.

I feel very honored and proud to be here today. You see, I come from an immigrant family. My parents were born and raised in Mexico and when my father lost his job there he decided to come to this country for a better life. With little education and not being able to speak English, it was hard for my father to find a job. He did his best and was able to find a job to support his family, but still struggled because he did not make much.

What my father brought home was barely enough to pay for rent and food for my eight brothers and sisters. It was great that we had food and a roof over our head but we still worried about our lights being disconnected. So my dad had to work extra shifts to pay the electric bill since we did not know about HEAP program like this.

With the HEAP program families can find relief and hope that they will have a good chance to overcome their financial struggles. I know what it feels like for not having electricity, water or gas. I feel for the struggle our clients are going through when they come to my window for assistance. My job makes it easier for families to succeed and I feel honored to help them.

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

My name is Guojian Cui.

My story is about my transformation as an F.O.B.

I am a trained artist specializing in Chinese calligraphy and traditional Chinese framing. But since I came to America in 1993 with one suitcase and a big dream, I had worked in various other odd jobs for 17 years. But I had always yearned to follow my true passion.

You can tell that I am getting old, thin on top and losing my teeth. For 17 years, I felt like an F.O.B.—''Free on Board''. It is a shipping term. For 17 years, I felt like a shipping good in between departure and destination. I was going somewhere but have not yet arrived. With one push, I could fall into the ocean; or with a push in a different direction I could land in my dream.

In 2009, a push helped me land in my dream. I decided to set up an art gallery business providing framing and Chinese calligraphy services. But my plan ran into a lot challenges. I faced the challenges of having limited start-up capital. I faced the challenges that my traditional way of using water, paste, brush and simple tools can't compete with modern framing technology. I faced the challenge of declining demand for valuable art because of the near economic crash in 2009. The sharp increase of price of oil did not help either because it made all materials and supplies more expensive. I needed to buy equipment and machines to make my framing more precise. I needed a computer and gave up my abacus. I needed some technical assistance. I felt like an F.O.B. again because I could give up and get dumped into the ocean like a piece of damaged good. Or I could get a different push and land where I wanted to land.

I met PACE's Business Counselor Dandan Shan right around this time. He is a smart young man. He encouraged me to step forward and not give up. He told me that PACE has programs to help small business to start up. So, I was encouraged. I was transformed to become a different F.O.B.—Focus on Business. I was given a little push to step forward on boarding the battle field of business. PACE offered me some technical assistance and some financial support through its Individual Development Account or IDA program designed especially for business start-ups. With the help of PACE, I started my gallery in September, 2010. And I became another FOB—Fighting on Board of the business battle field. I was having fun because I was also a different F.O.B.—Fun on Board.

Now, I have more and more customers and they become my friends. They are satisfied with my services and getting good prices in the deal. For this Year of Dragon, my Chinese calligraphy of ''Dragon'' was prominently displayed on all the lamppost banners in Los Angeles Chinatown. My conclusion? Micro businesses do need that assistance and that critical push to move forward because it really can help people to go forward with their own business.

This is my F.O.B. Story.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

My name is Hasmik Sargsyan.

My story is about reaching for the American Dream.

My family and I immigrated to the US in 2007. As an immigrant family, we had to start our life from zero. We had no job, no car, not knowing English, and no one to support morally or help with any advice. In my home country I was a Certified Public Accountant. In the new land my husband and I took any job that came along, and attended school to learn English as a fourth language. Besides taking English classes, I pushed myself to take classes in accounting with a dream that someday I will return to my profession. I got very little sleep in those days for always being busy going to classes, working, washing, cooking, and taking care of my three children.

As I was improving my English skills and beginning to acclimate with my new environment, I did not realize that my own struggle paled in comparison to what my children were going through.

My eldest son always wanted to be an artist and in those days he could only afford to draw pictures with regular pencils. Understanding our financial situation, at his young age, he never asked for anything. I don't know enough about his potential as an artist or if I was just an adoring portant, but I liked his drawing very much. But I could not afford to buy him any art supplies or pay for any art classes. It was extremely painful for me for not being able to help my child to reach his dream as I was struggling to reach mine.

At that time, I was attending Glendale College. I heard about programs that help people with employment. I called many workforce programs in Los Angeles but only PACE responded to me. PAC's Transitional Subsidized Employment program helped me to land a temporary job that helped me to gain work experience, knowledge, skills and confidence. Then PACE offered me a permanent position in the Department of Energy and Environmental Services in Weatherization Program as a Program Specialist. It was unbelievable to me when I was being interviewed and they said to me ''you are hired''. I started to cry because they gave me hope that I had lost.

I am so thankful for this program. Now I am self sufficient and I feel happy awakening every day with the sense of joy knowing that I have a job. I have gained recognition from my co-workers. I am grateful that I no longer live at the expense of the government. I cannot find words to express my gratitude for what PACE and the federal government program has done for my family, especially for my son. Now I can afford to pay for his art lessons and buy him art supplies for his drawing. Because of this, he is taking part in many Art exhibitions. I believe that one day he will become a famous artist and he will write about the history of his family and the struggles of immigrant lives.

My story is neither a special nor an extraordinary one, but it is similar to the lives of many other people who have been struggling. We are truly grateful with the support we received to reach for our American Dream. I wish the opportunities afforded me will continued to be made for other families like mine.

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

My name is Judy Thang.

My story is about how a passionate entrepreneur got started!

Starting a business as a young woman is tough in any industry. Being a graphic designer working with small business owners is even harder. As a recent graduate from a California State University, I've always had two passions—starting my own business and helping other small business owners build their brand image. I guess my parents passed their entrepreneur bug to me.

My parents owned a restaurant where I worked as a little cashier at age 12 and graduated to potato peeling when I got older.

They promoted my little sister from janitor to cashier. We grew up with lots of work ethic, eating lots of delicious hot wings. When my parents moved to Australia, my sister and I kept the restaurant operating for a while. So naturally, out of school, I couldn't wait to open my own business. I took a low-paying job in marketing to gain some experience, then quit a few years later to start my business, girlwithflair design.

I had no money, no formal design experience, and no connection in the industry since I majored in business. There were a lot of obstacles. Age was my biggest difficulty. Here I was, trying to convince a client to let me build his brand image and generate sales, but I looked like I was fresh out high school! I charged peanuts for what I did three years ago.

Fortunately, I found Swann, my savior and mentor at PACE Woman Business Center. Here are a few important things she and PACE have done for me: 1) Great Advice—When I had problems with my pricing, she gave me invaluable advice on how to stick to my guns; 2) Networking—I've gotten to know other small business owners, which makes me not feel so lonely; 3) I've gotten a lot of referrals to other small business owners.

It has only been a year, but I am far from where I started. I now have an office space in Chinatown, a much steadier clientele and lots of happy customers that help me constantly with new referrals. Without Swann's guidance in the past year, I would probably be eating instant noodles everyday for dinner. That, or go find a 'real' job, as my parents would say. I'd rather eat instant noodles.

I have come forward to share my story because I believe in the value of social programs that empower people to start their own businesses. Programs such as PACE Woman Business Center provide hope and opportunity for underrepresented segments of society. These are the people working at restaurants for minimum wages, making tamales, bookkeeping or assembling furniture in between work who dream of becoming an entrepreneur one day. The fact that they are great at their hobby and passionate enough to invest their energy, time and money to pursue it merits the support that programs such as PACE Women Business Center provides.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

My Name is Kimberly Hua. I am a Head Start Parent.

My story is about "The Window of Opportunity".

When my family and I emigrated here from Vietnam, my parents could barely provide food and shelter for me and my two siblings, much less taking us on buses to go places. My parents did not speak English and did not know where to look for help. They did not know that they could have put my siblings and me through free pre-schools that would prepare us for kindergarten. Their concern was working two jobs to make ends meet. So from the beginning, school was hard for me and I struggled every day. I ended up hating school and did not appreciate the value of a quality education.

The "window of opportunity" opened for my children when I enrolled my two sons in the PACE Head Start Program. I wanted to make sure that my sons would have the opportunity that I did not have when I was a child. Although I appreciated the benefits and resources that PACE Head Start education offered to my children, I was working a lot and did not spend enough time with my children.

I did not know at the time that this "opportunity" was for me too. What changed was when I became a PACE parent policy committee member.

My active volunteerism inspired and empowered my children to develop their own sense of independence and self-confidence and love of learning. In my children's eyes, I was no longer just their mother; I was also a teacher and a mentor. Because of all that, I believe that my children will establish a solid educational foundation and acquire the early learning skills to carry them throughout their higher education.

Watching my children blossoming at the Head Start Program, I was inspired to grow with them. I decided to follow my life-long dream of pursuing an advanced degree. I completed my master's degree with a 3.80 GPA in April this year. I will always be grateful to the parenting and empowerment programs that Head Start program had to offer to parents like me. My story of "The Window of Opportunity' is why I am here today to show my support for the Head Start program. I believe early education can play a critical role for young children and increase their odds of success in later life.

The Head Start program also played a critical role for parents like me. It helped me to become a better parent to my children. Along the way, I became a better person and an advocate for my community.

BUSINESS LOANS

My name is Linda Wong.

My story is about sacrifice and courage.

My parents immigrated to the US from Taiwan when I was 6 years old so their children could have a better education in America. My sister and I were the only two Chinese children in a new school that taught in a language that I knew nothing of, except my new name, Linda—I was no longer Chih-Ling. I quickly learned that adapting to a new culture would be just as challenging as the language barrier.

There were many days when I came home crying because I was made fun of for being different. My parents did their best to console me, while hiding their own struggles of assimilating to this country. When I was 16 my father decided to leave my mother, my sister and I to return to Taiwan.

Since my mother did not speak any English, I was left with all the responsibilities of my father: I made sure all the bills were paid on time, did all the grocery shopping and signed my own letters of excuse when I was sick from school. Some might think a child with that kind of "freedom" would take advantage of the situation; however, this had the opposite effect on me. I knew I had to really work hard in school to get into a good college since my parents had sacrificed for us to have a better life.

After receiving my Bachelors of Arts from Otis College of Art & Design, I was hired by a multi-million dollar jewelry company to help launch their first clothing collection. I took the skills I learned there and formed my own clothing company, The Battalion. In 2011 my business generated $350,000 in sales, but lacked the capital to pay our fabric vendors and contractors. If we could not pay to produce the goods that we had already sold we would lose both the orders and trust of our customers. We turned to PACE to help us find solution to our problem. In March 2011, with the guidance of PACE's Mr. Howard Sun, The Battalion received a loan of $30,000 from PACE SBA Micro-Loan Program. Two months later we promptly delivered our products to our customers' satisfaction.

Running a business never gets any easier; there are always new challenges and roadblocks that loom ahead. It is easier to summon the courage to face these obstacles when you have a program like PACE in your corner. I believe this is an essential program because it makes it possible to succeed for people who have sacrificed and have courage to charge forward.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

My name is Patrick Martinez. I am a Head Start parent.

My story is about keeping a promise, a promise I made to my son before he was even born. I vowed that I'd be there for him no matter what obstacles we faced.

My story began with a typical boy meets girl story. Boy and girl fall in love. They give birth to a precious little baby boy after spending eight years together.

The arrangement was for me to be a stay-home dad to take care of my child and our home. I was very proud of my little family. Then it became the girl leaves boy story.

My baby boy and I were kicked out of our house. We suddenly found ourselves displaced.

We found ourselves having to live at my parents' house. In a living room that grew cramped with our play pens and diapers. Why did this happen to us? What was I to do? I was in a lot of pain and felt depressed. I was left with two choices. I either walk the road of self-destruction, or keep that promise I made to my son. One night, to distract my heart and mind, I watched one of my favorite movies, Star Wars. I sat on the couch watching that movie, while my son slept in his playpen in front of me. I tearfully looked into that playpen as he slept and I thought, "You're my Luke! You're A New Hope." We weren't going to succumb to the Dark Side. That promise would be kept.

Early the next morning my Padawan and I went to seek help at a local agency. That agency led us to services such as food stamps, fatherhood support groups and parenting classes. I took everything and anything I felt that could help my son and me. We were then led to PACE Head Start program. Through PACE and Head Start I watched my son grow socially and mentally. I grew along side of my son through its parenting and Male Involvement programs. I became a more engaged father. I became encouraged to volunteer at my son's site, which I've done nearly every single day. I became involved on the parent policy committees at both the delegate and grantee levels. Through this involvement, I was helping other families as well and by being a positive male role model to my son and to other families.

PACE and Head Start have made me a man, a better parent, a leader, an advocate, and a representative for my community. It has enriched my son's education, as well as thousands of other children they serve. If Head Start and the services were to be cut, it could surely crumble the future of hundreds of thousands of families like mine. That is how effective and powerful this program is to our children, our families, our community, and our country. Early childhood education is where our future leaders are created and where our families are strengthened. Without this program we may lose all hope.

My story of that promise is why I am here today to tell how Head Start and early childhood education helps parents keep promises to our children.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes:

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Department of Justice's (DOJ) final rule detailing requirements for accessible entry and exit for pools and spas under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and in opposition to a provision included in the Commerce, Justice, and Science FY13 Appropriations Bill to inhibit DOJ's enforcement of this important rule.

Over twenty years after the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the accessibility of swimming pools and other recreational facilities remains important to people with disabilities around the country. The 54 million Americans living with disabilities deserve to finally be able to enjoy these facilities to the same extent as others in our society.

The Department's process to develop accessibility guidelines for swimming pools began over 7 years ago on September 30, 2004, and the DOJ published the final rule on September 2010 after receiving feedback from all stakeholders and the public. DOJ delayed compliance until May 21, 2012 and issued guidance at the beginning of this year, clarifying the intent of the final rule.

The final rule ensures that small, family-owned business are not overburdened, by only requiring installation of fixed pool lifts for existing pools and spas if it is ''readily achievable,'' meaning that it is not overly costly or burdensome. It strikes an appropriate balance between the needs of Americans living with disabilities and our businesses.

The need for pools and spas to be accessible for people with disabilities is not a new idea, but one that has been in federal law for more than 2 decades. The requirement to remove barriers to accessibility to swimming pools for people with disabilities has been part of the statutory requirement under the Americans with Disabilities Act since it was passed in 1990, almost 22 years ago. The regulatory process is functioning just as it was intended to.

People with disabilities should be able to enjoy the same recreational amenities and opportunities as every other American. Delaying the effective date of the regulations any further will mean another season where people with disabilities will be denied the opportunity to use pools when they travel on vacations with their families or on business.

JADA HERRERA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jada Herrera for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Jada Herrera is a 7th grader at Wheat Ridge 5–8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jada Herrera is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jada Herrera for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

IN MEMORY OF DR. ZEB F. POINDEXTER, JR.

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the memory of a trailblazer, Dr. Zeb Ferdinand Poindexter, Jr. With exceptional distinction, Dr. Poindexter served his community and acted as a role model for young people from diverse backgrounds.

Dr. Poindexter was born in Forth Worth, TX on April 5, 1929. He excelled in school, graduating from Wiley College with a B.S. in 1949 and then Texas Southern University with an M.S. in Endocrinology in 1952. Dr. Poindexter, upon completion of his Master of Science, served our great nation as a Second Lieutenant and later Captain in the United States Air Force. Later, he and the University of Texas (UT) took a bold and historically meaningful step forward when he was accepted into University of Texas School of Dentistry in Houston. He became the first African American to receive a doctoral degree from the school in 1956.

Dr. Poindexter's graduation from and association with the University of Texas (UT) literally changed the image of UT. His indelible example can continue to impact future generations of UT graduates, should UT take another bold and historically meaningful step forward by naming the School of Dentistry in his honor. It would symbolize his commitment to UT, and memorialize UT's commitment to inclusivity and diversity.

After receiving his degree from UT, Dr. Poindexter opened the first dental clinic in south Houston. The clinic still stands as a landmark to his achievement in the Sunnyside neighborhood. After establishing his practice, he went on to form the Zeb F. Poindexter, Jr. Chapter of the Student National Dental Association, and become the first black member of both the University of Texas Dental School faculty and the Houston District Dental Society.

Dr. Poindexter's leadership and community service have been consistently recognized by his colleagues. Amongst other honors, Dr. Poindexter became the president of the Gulf State Dental Association, life member of the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Incorporated, board member of the Urban League, and received the University of Texas Outstanding Alumnus Award in 1990.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Poindexter will be dearly missed by his wife of 58 years, Ruby Poindexter, son, Dr. Zeb F. Poindexter, III, and daughters, Merlene Russell and Eleanor Patricia Dixon. He is also survived by his sisters, Revodia Johnson, Vandetta King, his brother, James Poindexter, and numerous nieces, nephews, grandchildren, great-grandchildren and great-great grandchildren. He will be remembered in the city of Houston as a dedicated public servant and principled leader.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL TEACHER DAY

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 645 to urge my colleagues and our nation to observe Teacher Appreciation Week and the monumental contributions of America's teachers.

As a cosponsor of H. Res. 645, I commend our nation's teachers for their tireless work on behalf of millions of students and families; their knowledge and expertise; and their selfless dedication to their profession.

Throughout the year, our nation's teachers spend countless hours preparing lesson plans, evaluating student progress, counseling students and families, and instilling the vital importance of civic responsibility and national service.

In South Texas, we are fortunate to have exceptional educators who work day in and day out to educate and prepare children, youth, and adult learners to lead prosperous and healthy lives.

I especially want to thank Dr. Daniel King, Superintendent of the Pharr-San Juan-Alamo (PSJA) Independent School District, for honoring 44 of PSJA's teachers of the year this month.

Today, it's truly an honor for me to recognize and congratulate two of PSJA's outstanding teachers of year: my daughter, Iliana Hinojosa, a pre-kindergarten teacher at Dr. William Long Elementary who was selected as the PSJA Elementary District Teacher of the Year; and Agnes Ocampo, a science teacher at PSJA Memorial High School who was selected as the PSJA Secondary District Teacher of the Year.

Due to their hard work and extraordinary commitment to students and academic excellence, Iliana and Agnes have advanced to the regional competition. This is quite an accomplishment!

Iliana Hinojosa and Agnes Ocampo are shining examples of what can be achieved in our nation's classrooms. By instilling a love of learning in our children and ensuring that they

succeed, Iliana and Agnes are transforming lives and helping students to reach their full potential.

As our nation observes Teacher Appreciation Week, I urge my colleagues and all Americans to support critical investments in education that help to provide all students with a high quality education and to make teaching one of the most valued professions in America.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF DEBORAH SZEKELY

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a treasured member of the San Diego community. Deborah Szekely is an extraordinary woman of tenacity and dedication, and on May 3rd she celebrated her 90th birthday.

Deborah is a renowned health and wellness advocate, philanthropist, community leader, and champion for childhood nutrition. At 90 years old, she represents the beauty and energy that comes from a life committed to health and wellness, and she outpaces younger fitness advocates. She truly lives what she teaches. Along with her husband, Edmond Szekely, she founded Rancho la Puerta, a destination spa and wellness center in Baja California, and the Golden Door Spa in Escondido, California. She is committed to helping others prioritize healthy living.

Deborah has worked with my office on initiatives related to educating children about health and nutrition. She is committed to changing the culture of eating and making sure young children understand the importance of healthy food, and the role it plays in wellness. Ever the energetic advocate, on May 3, 2012, her 90th birthday, Deborah launched wellnesspring.org, a grassroots effort to encourage the creation of a culture of wellness throughout the United States. I appreciate her laser focus when it comes to reaching people and educating them about the importance of living a healthy lifestyle and eating well.

In addition to her healthy living work, Deborah has served as the president of the Inter-American Foundation, worked with the Organization of American States, and served as principal delegate to the Inter-American Commission on Women. She currently works as the Chairman and Founder of the New Americans Museum in San Diego and serves on the Board of Directors for the Center for Science in the Public Interest and the Old Globe Theatre in San Diego.

Deborah ran for Congress in 1982, and while she did not win that election, through that process she conceived the idea of Setting Course, a publication of the Congressional Management Foundation which provides guidance on the fundamentals of managing a congressional office. The first edition of Setting Course was published in 1984, and the 12th edition of Setting Course just recently came out. This manual has been an invaluable resource to congressional offices, including my own. Deborah is still a member of the Board of Directors for the Congressional Management Foundation and continues her critical role in the publication of Setting Course.

I truly admire Deborah's ongoing commitment to helping people of all ages understand the importance of good nutrition, healthy living, and being a force for positive change in their communities.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of our greatest American success stories. Today let us all pause to recognize the United States Department of Agriculture's 150th Birthday.

President Abraham Lincoln established the USDA 150 years ago, on May 15, 1862. That act helped ground our nation's agriculture industry in science, and helped give our nation the ability to lead the world in feeding the globe. One of the first responsibilities delegated to the USDA was the Homestead Act. The Homestead Act gave pre-approved U.S. citizens undeveloped federal land at no cost if they agreed to develop that land. This act led to the settling of the Great Plains; today those lands are the world's largest producers of wheat and corn.

Our nation's agriculture industry has, throughout our history, been a significant force in our economy. One out of every twelve Americans is employed in an agriculture-related industry. So it is important to recognize that agriculture is not just a nostalgic notion of the past but remains a foundation of the American economy. The influence of American farmers and ranchers not only reaches every state and household within the United States, but it can be felt all around the world. The Port of Long Beach, in my district, exports millions of metric tons of agricultural cargo to our vital Asian trade partners every year.

American consumers spend on average less than ten percent of their disposable income on food. That ten percent represents the lowest percentage in the history of the world. By comparison, most European consumers spend more than double that and in developing countries the percentage is often higher than 50 percent. Our nation's advanced system of production agriculture is evidence of how successful the USDA has been in ensuring a safe, affordable and abundant food supply.

Today, the United States is the world leader in the development and use of agricultural biotechnology, contributing to our positive balance of agricultural trade. We must continue supporting policies that promote the smart use of research, science and biotechnology that has enabled production agriculture to thrive. We must embrace the importance of agricultural innovation in the same way we endorse innovation in fields such as health care or communications.

Mr. Speaker, our producers remain a critical source of jobs and innovation. Maintaining a strong agriculture industry is vital to the present and future U.S. economy and is critical to the economic and political stability. It is with great pride and respect that I honor our nation's farmers and ranchers and extend birthday wishes to the USDA.

TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the teachers of Broward and Miami-Dade Counties during National Teacher Appreciation Week, taking place this year from May 7 through May 11, 2012.

This week affords students, parents, and communities across the nation a chance to come together and honor the extraordinary work our teachers are doing in the classroom to transform the lives of young people and educate the next American generation.

It is a time to remember that education is the cornerstone of a vibrant and prosperous America, and to recognize the teachers that make America's successful future a reality.

As a member of Congress and the proud mother of three children in Broward County Public Schools, I see the talent and hard work of our teachers every day—not just in my role as a policy maker, but in a very personal way.

Educating the next generation is an essential and great act of public service—it's a calling that our teachers have answered because they care, they believe in our children, and they choose to make a difference in the lives of future generations.

For our students, nothing is more important than an excellent teacher at the front of the room and in their lives, and now more than ever, we must make an investment in our future by investing in our teachers.

We must provide them with the resources they need to successfully do their jobs, and we must afford them the respect and support that their profession deserves.

Thank you to Florida's teachers for investing your skills and talents into the lives of future generations, and thank you for the sacrifices made each day to ensure that our kids have the tools they need to learn. We are all grateful for your work.

HONORING FALLEN STAFF SGT. THOMAS KENT FOGARTY

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise, along with my colleague Rep. BARBARA LEE of California, to honor the service and sacrifice of Staff Sgt. Thomas Kent Fogarty, age 30, of Alameda, California. He was killed in action on May 6th, 2012 in Pakita Province, Afghanistan. The married father of two sons, ages 2 and 5, was felled by an improvised explosive device that detonated near the vehicle he was commanding.

My heart goes out to SSG Fogarty's wife Vanessa, their young sons, his parents and his friends for the loss of this noble man and soldier. SSG Fogarty made the ultimate sacrifice in service to his country. His fellow countrymen and women, and I, will be forever grateful.

A graduate of Alameda High School, SSG Fogarty entered the military in 2003 and his first deployment was in January of 2005. His tragic and untimely death occurred after eight years and three months of service to his country, and only a month after his arrival in Afghanistan. He had served two previous tours in Iraq. Before being deployed, SSG Fogarty was a military recruiter. He was assigned to the 3rd Battalion (Airborne), 509th Infantry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team (Airborne), 25th Infantry Division at Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson in Alaska.

SSG Fogarty was an accomplished soldier. His military awards include: 3 Army Commendation Medals, 2 Army Good Conduct Medals, National Defense Service Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal w/Bronze Service Star, Iraq Campaign Medal w/Bronze Service Star, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, 2 Noncommissioned Officers Professional Development Ribbons, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, Combat Infantryman Badge, Combat and Special Skill Badge, Basic Marksmanship Qual Badge—Bar, Weapon: Rifle (Inscription: Rifle), Expert, Parachutist Badge, Basic, U.S. Army Recruiter Identification Badge, Gold, and Overseas Service Bar.

It is because of the commitment of truly brave individuals like SSG Fogarty that our Nation can enjoy the freedoms that we are all afforded. It takes an exceptional man to give his life for the betterment of his country, and SSG Fogarty was a truly exceptional man.

HUNTER FRITZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Hunter Fritz for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Hunter Fritz is a 7th grader at Oberon Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Hunter Fritz is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Hunter Fritz for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all his future accomplishments.

CONGRATULATING PRESIDENT MA YING-JEOU OF TAIWAN

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate President Ma Ying-jeou on his inauguration to his second term as the leader of The Republic of China (Taiwan).

Back in January of this year, the people of Taiwan reelected President Ma Ying-jeou and on May 20th he will have his second inauguration. President Ma has worked hard to maintain a peaceful relationship with China and his efforts must be recognized. The United States deeply appreciates his efforts to keep the peace, promoting stability in an important region.

Over his first term, President Ma worked with the United States to continue Taiwan's longstanding security partnership with the United States, requesting to purchase and U.S. defense systems. I and my colleagues in Congress remain strong supporters of The Taiwan Relations Act, which spells out the relationship between the United States and Taiwan, and is critical to the peace and prosperity of the region.

President Ma achieved acceptance from the World Health Organization for Taiwan to observe at the World Health Assembly, a significant step forward for Taiwan's international standing, and for the health of the people of the East-Asian and Pacific region. We should work to encourage Taiwan's participation in participate in other international organizations such as the United Nations' International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO).

I would also like to note that this also marks the 10th anniversary of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus, of which I have been a proud member for years.

President Ma has diligently maintained peace and stability and we look forward to his future term as it provides an opportunity to achieve even greater accomplishments for the people of Taiwan and further strengthen the U.S.-Taiwan relationship.

HONORING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNION BAPTIST CHURCH IN ALTON, ILLINOIS

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the 175th Anniversary of the Union Baptist Church in Alton, Illinois.

In the first half of the 19th Century, Alton, Illinois had developed as a major stop on the Underground Railroad as slaves came north in search of their freedom. It was a small group of these former slaves, some having arrived via the Underground Railroad and some having previously been freed, that gathered to form a Baptist Church in Alton.

The group organized as the African Mission Freedmen. In 1837, the same year that the City of Alton was incorporated and also the same year that the famed abolitionist journalist, Elijah Lovejoy, was killed, the Union Baptist Church was founded. The first pastor was Rev. John Livingston and one of the founding members, John Anderson, had worked as a pressman for Elijah Lovejoy at The Alton Observer.

As the church congregation grew, a two-story building was constructed in 1854, with Union Baptist Church meeting on the second floor and the first African-American school in Alton using the first floor.

The church was forced to sell the building in the later years of the 19th Century and went back to meeting in congregation homes. In the early 1900's a new church was built.

The 175 year history of Union Baptist Church has seen its membership go through periods of decline, followed by resurgence. Throughout those years, however, the spirit of its founders, who came searching for freedom and a better life, has sustained the church and kept it thriving as a place of worship up to today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the 175th Anniversary of the Union Baptist Church and to wish the congregation the best for many years to come.

A TRIBUTE TO KAYLA DE WEERD

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Kayla De Weerd, a 14-year-old 4–H'er of Hull, Iowa, who has been named the state's top high school youth volunteer for 2012 by the Prudential Spirit of Community Awards.

The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program is our country's largest youth recognition program based entirely on volunteer community service. Since 1995, 345,000 American youths have participated in this program, with only 102 state honorees chosen each year. Kayla's path to this prestigious award began with her efforts through Reach Out Iowa, a federally funded grant that supports young people who benefit their local communities through service.

To accomplish this goal, Kayla started a nutrition and physical activity program at her junior high school. Kayla gave presentations to her fellow classmates warning of the dangers of obesity and how to live a responsible, healthy lifestyle to avoid the long-term consequences of inactivity. In addition to arming her peers in the fight against obesity, Kayla also educated others to effectively implement similar programs in more schools across her community. Kayla and her mother, Deb, traveled to Washington D.C. earlier this week to accept this great honor.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Miss De Weerd for her sincere dedication to positively impact the lives of others in her community and beyond. Kayla's commitment to a cause greater than herself is a testament to the high-quality character and unwavering work ethic instilled in Iowans both young and old. I know I speak for all of my colleagues in the United States Congress in congratulating Kayla, thanking her supportive family, and thanking all of those involved in this wonderful project for their life-changing efforts. Thank you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM L. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I unintentionally voted ''aye'' on rollcall No. 215 when I intended to vote ''no'' on the Huizenga amendment to H.R. 5326. I reiterate my strong support for public sector employees.

HONORING THE WEST ESSEX FIRST AID SQUAD'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the West Essex First Aid Squad, located in the Township of West Caldwell, Essex County, New Jersey as they celebrate their 75th anniversary.

The West Essex First Aid Squad formed in November of 1937, when a group of local citizens joined together to solve the problem of obtaining a prompt and efficient ''First Aid and Ambulance'' service to meet the needs of the sick and injured. Two months later, the group had completed training, and on January 7, 1938 the West Essex First Aid Squad answered its first call for help.

During its early years, from 1937 to 1941, the Squad answered 543 calls for assistance and contributed 2,402 man-hours answering those calls, additional hours were logged for training and practicing. During its second 5 years from 1942 to 1947, the number of calls more than tripled to 1,759.

The West Essex First Aid Squad now includes 85 volunteer members who serve Caldwell, West Caldwell, North Caldwell, Essex Fells, and Fairfield. The Squad's four ambulances and one rescue truck provide 24-hour emergency medical service to the community, as well as rescue with the Jaws of Life, all at no cost to the public they serve. In 2007 and 2008, the Squad received more than 2,500 calls each year.

Men and women of the West Essex First Aid Squad have demonstrated a marked commitment to the public by dedicating their time and resources to providing lifesaving services to the community. The Squad is always available to provide aid to local fire departments. The Squad also provides support during hazardous material incidents, structure fires, and natural disasters.

The West Essex First Aid Squad has exhibited dedication to serving the community by answering a full spectrum of calls for help, ranging from complaints of chest pain or difficulty breathing, to motor vehicle collisions. The volunteers further serve the community by standing by at community events such as football games, parades, concerts, and 4th of July fireworks. Members have not only volunteered their time to the Squad and to public events, but have also sponsored blood drives and donated their time and talents in offering first aid and CPR instruction to members of the community.

The West Essex First Aid Squad is truly a selfless group of individuals, devoted to providing basic life support services, emergency medical services, and heavy rescue to the public. Through their steadfast dedication to addressing the needs of area families and businesses, the West Essex First Aid Squad has proved itself to be a pillar of our community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the West Essex First Aid Squad as they celebrate their Seventy-fifth Anniversary.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $15,674,047,733,490.96. We've added $5,047,170,684,577.88 to our debt in just over 3 years. This is debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL CANCER RESEARCH MONTH

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize May as National Cancer Research Month. This month we recognize the critical importance of cancer research and the contributions of researchers, clinicians, and patients across the country.

Before I was a Congresswoman, I was a survivor of ovarian cancer. I was lucky—my cancer was found by chance in its earliest stage, and I have now been cancer-free for 25 years now. So I arrived in this body knowing firsthand the crucial importance of medical research.

I am glad to say that our progress in fighting cancer since the National Cancer Act of 1971 has been nothing short of amazing. Nearly 12 million Americans are cancer survivors. There is a vaccine to help prevent cervical cancer. The overall five-year survival rate has increased from 52 percent in 1975 to 80 percent today.

And biomedical research is growing our economy. The National Institutes of Health support over 300,000 researchers at more than 3,000 universities, institutions, and businesses across the country. Every single dollar of National Institutes of Health funding is estimated to result in an additional two dollars of business activity and economic impact. Keeping it simple, this means that research supports jobs, and has a nearly two-fold return on our federal investment.

But, there is more to be done. Some cancers, including ovarian cancer, still have an extraordinarily high mortality rate and are typically caught far too late in the disease. This year, more than 1.6 million Americans are expected to be diagnosed with cancer. More than 570,000 Americans will pass away this year because of cancer; meaning more than 1,500 Americans each day, or one person a minute, will die because of this disease.

This is why our continued investments in cancer research are so important. Medical research creates investment opportunities for private industry. It strengthens our university medical system. It creates jobs, makes America more competitive, and drastically improves the quality of life for so many Americans. And it has the potential to save lives.

And it is why this month we join to thank scientists and clinicians for their work on cancer research. And we thank the patients who support that research by participating in clinical trials.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote numbers 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, and 243. Had I been present, I would have voted ''Aye'' on rollcall vote numbers 224, 225, 227, 237, 238, 239, and 240. I would have voted ''No'' on rollcall vote numbers 226, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 241, 242 and 243.

A TRIBUTE TO IOWA'S TOP COPS

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize six members of the Des Moines Police Department, Sergeant Michael McTaggart, Reserve Officer John Carter, and Senior Police Officers Colin Boone, Aaron Cawthorn, Jeremy Sprague, and Robin Swank, for being named Iowa's TOP COPS for 2012.

In the early morning of August 28th, 2011, these officers responded to a report of a car accident in Des Moines to find a vehicle on its side completely engulfed in flames. Inside the car, the cries for help of three teenage girls could be heard. Fighting jagged metal and fire hot enough to melt glass, Des Moines' finest didn't hesitate in risking their own lives to save the lives of the three trapped young girls. The quick action of these officers embodies the professionalism the Des Moines Police Department instills in its officers, but it's the selfless courage displayed immediately by these law enforcement professionals that truly makes this story inspiring. All six officers involved in the rescue were awarded the DMPD's highest honor, the Medal of Valor.

For their display of courage, the National Association of Police Organizations bestowed these officers with Iowa's 2012 TOP COP Honorable Mention award. This award is a tribute to outstanding law enforcement officers who display actions above and beyond the call of duty. Each year, TOP COPS are nominated nationwide by their fellow police officers, but only one case from each state is selected to

be honored with this award. Each state's TOP COPS are invited to an award ceremony in Washington D.C., which is attended by celebrities, politicians and members of the national law enforcement community alike to pay tribute to these local heroes.

Mr. Speaker, the extraordinary heroism displayed in the face of danger by these police officers is nothing short of awe-inspiring. These members of the Des Moines Police Department are a testament to the high quality of our state's law enforcement community. I know I speak for all of my colleagues in the United States Congress in congratulating Jeremy, Robin, Colin, Aaron, John and Michael, and thanking all of Iowa's police officers for their selfless efforts in protecting communities across our great state. Thank you.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE 40TH ANNUAL DEBUTANTE SCHOLARSHIP COTILLION OF THE THETA LAMBDA OMEGA CHAPTER OF THE ALPHA KAPPA ALPHA SORORITY

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the members and alumni of the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc.'s (AKA) Theta Lambda Omega Chapter on the 40th Anniversary of its Debutante Scholarship Cotillion.

Over a hundred years ago, in 1908, AKA was founded by a group of brave, determined and socially conscious African-American women at Howard University in Washington, D.C. As the first organization of its type, the pioneers of AKA banded together out of simple need to ensure that women of color not only attend college, but that their experiences while there helped them to fulfill their greatest potential. Over the decades following its creation, AKA has not only empowered its members, but has cultivated an attitude of commitment to service to the community.

Like its national organization, the Theta Lambda Omega Chapter of AKA shares in a rich history and commitment of service. Over the last four decades, the members of the Theta Lambda Omega chapter have engaged in countless community service projects and organized many charitable campaigns that have had a tremendous impact on communities in Southeast Michigan.

Among the Theta Lambda Omega chapter's many endeavors is a concerted effort to improve educational opportunities in the Pontiac community. As part of this effort, the Chapter's Emerging Youth Leaders Initiatives help youth develop their leadership skills, encourage parental involvement in the education process and promote civic activism. In addition to helping youth develop these important skills, the sorority provides scholarships to members and future members helping them achieve their educational goals.

For the past 40 years the Theta Lambda Omega Chapter has gathered to honor the young women of Pontiac and its surrounding communities at the annual Debutante Scholarship Cotillion. The scholarship cotillion is one of many community service contributions of the Pontiac chapter of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority and during the 40th year celebration, eleven extraordinary hard-working young women and high school seniors will receive scholarships to assist them in attending college. Each debutante is recognized for their outstanding scholastic achievements in addition to the many hours they have committed to community service and personal development.

Mr. Speaker, for almost half of a century, the Theta Lambda Omega Chapter of the Alpha Kappa Alpha sorority has been supporting the young women in Southeast Michigan and giving them the tools they need to build a bright future. Over its time, Theta Lambda Omega chapter and its members have been honored with many awards for their work, which has undoubtedly strengthened and ensured the continued vibrancy of the region. I wish the members and alumni of the Theta Lambda Omega Chapter of the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority many more years of success as they fulfill their mission in service to our community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUSS CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, due to being unavoidably delayed, I missed the vote on the Huelskamp Amendment, which prohibits the use of funds in contravention of the Defense of Marriage Act, to H.R. 5326 (roll No. 235), the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Appropriations Act for FY 2013. I would have voted against this amendment, had I been present to record my vote.

IN MEMORY OF DORIS B. McMILLAN

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the memory of an exceptional public servant and psychiatric nurse, Doris B. McMillan. A loving mother, godmother, grandmother and great-grandmother, Mrs. McMillan devoted her life to serving her family and community.

Mrs. McMillan was born in New York City on July 8, 1928. She was educated in New York City, graduating from the Psychiatric Institute of Nursing in Rockland County and then completed her graduate studies at Long Island University Psychiatric Institute at Columbia University and Glassboro State College.

After Mrs. McMillan completed her studies, she started her career as a school nurse in New Jersey with the Cape May County Special Services School. Mrs. McMillan excelled in her profession, she went on to work as a nurse at the Atlantic County Jail, and also became the supervisor and director of nursing at Harborfields Juvenile Correction Facility. Mrs. McMillan worked tirelessly for the underserved in society, frequently serving as an advocate for female inmates in county jails.

In addition to her lifelong service in her community, Mrs. McMillan volunteered her time with several organizations, including The Red Cross, The Advisory Commission on the Status of Women and the American Association of Retired People.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Doris B. McMillan leaves to cherish her legacy a host of friends and family members, including her beloved son, Minister Robert Muhammad of Houston.

CELEBRATING JEWISH AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2012

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, as the proud representative of one of the most ethnically diverse congressional districts in the nation, I am honored to join my friends in the Jewish American community in celebration of Jewish American Heritage Month, and to recognize the many contributions Jewish Americans have made to our country.

Jewish immigrants, like the immigrants from many other countries throughout our nation's history, came to our country for the promise of freedom, tolerance and socioeconomic mobility. For more than 350 years, Jewish Americans have enriched American society by placing a strong value on education, community and culture.

Through their entrepreneurial spirit and innovations in technology, the Jewish American community has contributed to the economic vitality of our nation and particularly of my district, leading the way in renewable energy development and high technology. Without question, Silicon Valley would not be the hub of innovation it is today without the many significant contributions of Jewish Americans.

The Jewish American community in my district serves as a shining example of what makes Silicon Valley a global leader. I am privileged to serve a district that celebrates its diversity, and proud to represent a community of Jewish Americans whose contributions in the fields of technology, business, education, and many others, have served as a testament to America's promise as a land of opportunity and of dreams.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

The House passed H.R. 5326, Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3051–S3106

Measures Introduced: Ninety-seven bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3076–3172, and S. Res. 453–458. **Pages S3084–87**

Measures Passed:

Civil Air Patrol Congressional Gold Medal: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 418, to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol, and the bill was then passed. **Pages S3071–73**

Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act: Senate passed H.R. 4967, to prevent the termination of the temporary office of bankruptcy judges in certain judicial districts. **Pages S3102–03**

Commemorating and Acknowledging Law Enforcement Officers: Senate agreed to S. Res. 456, commemorating and acknowledging the dedication and sacrifice made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty. **Page S3103**

Founding of Department of Agriculture Sesquicentennial: Senate agreed to S. Res. 458, commemorating May 15, 2012, as the sesquicentennial of the founding of the Department of Agriculture. **Pages S3103–04**

Measures Considered:

Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 2072, to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States. **Pages S3051–71**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, May 10, 2012, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nominations of George Levi Russell III, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, and John J. Tharp, Jr., of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois. **Page S3104**

Russell and Tharp Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 4:30 p.m., on Monday, May 14, 2012, Senate will begin consideration of the following nominations: George Levi Russell III, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, and John J. Tharp, Jr., of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois; that there be 60 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nominations in the order listed; and that no further motions be in order. **Page S3104**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Deborah Ruth Malac, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Liberia.

Fernando Torres-Gil, of California, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2014.

Thomas Skerik Sowers II, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Public and Intergovernmental Affairs).

5 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, and Navy. **Pages S3104–06**

Messages from the House: **Page S3082**

Measures Referred: **Page S3082**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S3082**

Executive Communications: **Pages S3082–84**

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S3087–88

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S3088–91

Additional Statements: Page S3081

Amendments Submitted: Pages S3091–93

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S3093

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:11 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, May 14, 2012. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3104.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: U.S. PACIFIC COMMAND

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense received a closed briefing on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2013 for Pacific Command Programs from Admiral Samuel J. Locklear III, USN, Commander, United States Pacific Command, Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support concluded a hearing to examine current readiness of U.S. forces in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2013 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from General Lloyd J. Austin III, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army, Admiral Mark Ferguson, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, General Joseph F. Dunford, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, and General Philip M. Breedlove, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, all of the Department of Defense.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Patricia K. Falcone, of California, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, Executive Office of the President, Marietta S. Robinson, of Michigan, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, who was introduced by Senator Levin, and William P. Doyle, of Pennsylvania, and Richard A. Lidinsky, Jr., of Maryland, both to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner, who were both introduced by Senator Mikulski, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

HELIUM STEWARDSHIP ACT

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 2374, to amend the Helium Act to ensure the expedient and responsible draw-down of the Federal Helium Reserve in a manner that protects the interests of private industry, the scientific, medical, and industrial communities, commercial users, and Federal agencies, after receiving testimony from Timothy R. Spisak, Deputy Assistant Director, Minerals and Realty Management, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Moses Chan, National Research Council of the National Academies Committee on Understanding the Impact of Selling the Helium Reserve, Park, Pennsylvania; Tom Rauch, GE Healthcare, Waukesha, Wisconsin; David Joyner, Air Liquide Helium America, Inc., Houston, Texas; and Walter L. Nelson, Air Products and Chemicals, Inc., Allentown, Pennsylvania.

MEDICARE PHYSICIAN PAYMENTS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Medicare physician payments, focusing on understanding the past so we can envision the future, after receiving testimony from Gail R. Wilensky, Project HOPE, Tom Scully, Alston and Bird LLP, and Mark McClellan, Brookings Institute, all of Washington, D.C.; and Bruce C. Vladeck, Nexera, Inc., New York, New York.

NATO

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, focusing on Chicago and beyond, after receiving testimony from Philip H. Gordon, Assistant Secretary of State; James Townsend, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense; and Charles A. Kupchan, Council on Foreign Relations, Ian J. Brzezinski, Atlantic Council, and Hans Binnendijk, National Defense University, all of Washington, D.C.

HELPING THE MIDDLE CLASS BALANCE WORK AND FAMILY

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine helping the middle class balance work and family, after receiving testimony from Ann O'Leary, Center for the Next Generation, San Francisco, California; Judith L. Lichtman, National Partnership for Women and Families, Washington, D.C.; Juanita Phillips, Intuitive Research and Technology Corporation, Huntsville, Alabama, on behalf of the Society for Human Resource Management; and Kimberly Ortiz, Bronx, New York.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 29 public bills, H.R. 5708-5736; and 9 resolutions, H.J. Res. 108; H. Con. Res. 123; and H. Res. 649-655, were introduced. **Pages H2644–46**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2647–48**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2621, to establish the Chimney Rock National Monument in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 112–473);

H.R. 2745, to amend the Mesquite Lands Act of 1986 to facilitate implementation of a multispecies habitat conservation plan for the Virgin River in Clark County, Nevada, with an amendment (H. Rept. 112–474); and

H.R. 3874, to provide for the conveyance of eight cemeteries that are located on National Forest System land in Black Hills National Forest, South Dakota, with amendments (H. Rept. 112–475). **Page H2644**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H2571, H2636**

Provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013: The House passed H.R. 5652, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013, by a recorded vote of 218 ayes to 199 noes with 1 answering "present", Roll No. 247. **Pages H2583–H2633**

Rejected the Loebsack motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 170 yeas to 232 nays with 11 answering "present", Roll No. 246. **Pages H2630–32**

Pursuant to the rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112–21 shall be considered as adopted. **Pages H2583**

H. Res. 648, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a recorded vote of 233 ayes to 183 noes, Roll No. 245, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 237 yeas to 177 nays, Roll No. 244. **Pages H2573–83**

Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013: The House passed H.R. 5326, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, by a yea-and-nay vote of 247 yeas to 163 nays, Roll No. 249. Consideration of the measure began on Tuesday, May 8th. **Pages H2633–36**

Rejected the Nadler motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 181 yeas to 233 nays, Roll No. 248. **Pages H2633–35**

H. Res. 643, the rule providing for consideration of the measure, was agreed to Tuesday, May 8th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow, May 11th and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Tuesday, May 15th for morning hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business. **Page H2638**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H2583.

Senate Referral: S. 2224 was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. **Page H2643**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2582, H2582–83, H2632, H2632–33, H2635, and H2635–36. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee completed markup of H.R. 4310, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes. The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION REFORM ACT OF 2012

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee completed markup of H.R. 5651, the "Food and Drug Administration Reform Act of 2012". The bill was ordered reported, without amendment.

THE COSTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF DODD–FRANK SECTION 1502: IMPACTS ON AMERICA AND THE CONGO

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade held a hearing entitled "The Costs and Consequences of Dodd-

Frank Section 1502: Impacts on America and the Congo''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Commercial and Administrative Law held a hearing on H.R. 4369, the ''Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency (FACT) Act of 2012''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ADDRESSING INSPECTOR GENERAL VACANCIES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Where Are All the Watchdogs? Addressing Inspector General Vacancies''. Testimony was heard from Daniel Werfel, Controller, Office of Federal Financial Management, Office of Management and Budget; Phyllis Fong, Inspector General, Department of Agriculture; and Brian Miller, Inspector General, General Services Administration.

SUPPORTING AMERICAN JOBS AND THE ECONOMY THROUGH EXPANDED ENERGY PRODUCTION

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy and Environment held a hearing entitled ''Supporting American Jobs and the Economy through Expanded Energy Production: Challenges and Opportunities of Unconventional Resources Technology''. Testimony was heard from Charles McConnell, Assistant Secretary of Fossil Energy, Department of Energy; Anu Mittal, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office; Samantha Mary Julian, Director, Office of Energy Development, State of Utah; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 11, 2012

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, May 14

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: The Majority Leader will be recognized. At 4:30 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of the nominations of George Levi Russell III, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, and John J. Tharp, Jr., of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, and vote on confirmation of the nominations at approximately 5:30 p.m. Following which, the Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 2072, Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11 a.m., Friday, May 11

House Chamber

Program for Friday: The House will meet in pro forma session at 11 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bachus, Spencer, Ala., E758
Bonner, Jo, Ala., E758
Braley, Bruce L., Iowa, E762
Canseco, Francisco ''Quico'', Tex., E757
Carnahan, Russ, Mo., E777
Chaffetz, Jason, Utah, E766
Chu, Judy, Calif., E769
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E776
Conaway, K. Michael, Tex., E759, E761
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E761
Costello, Jerry F., Ill., E775
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E768
Davis, Susan A., Calif., E774
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E760, E767, E776
Duncan, John J., Tenn., E767
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E763
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E760
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E776
Green, Al, Tex., E773, E777
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E757
Hinojosa, Rubén, Tex., E773
Hirono, Mazie K., Hawaii, E759
Honda, Michael M., Calif., E762, E777
Jenkins, Lynn, Kans., E760
Johnson, Sam, Tex., E758
Keating, William R., Mass., E757, E757
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E768
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E775, E776
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E762, E763, E764, E765
Long, Billy, Mo., E768
McDermott, Jim, Wash., E758, E765
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E760
Owens, William L., N.Y., E776
Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E764
Paul, Ron, Tex., E766
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E765, E766, E767, E767, E768, E768, E769, E769, E773, E775
Peters, Gary C., Mich., E777
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E763
Reichert, David G., Wash., E766
Richardson, Laura, Calif., E764, E769, E774
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E763
Rothman, Steven R., N.J., E773
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E760, E767, E776
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E766, E774
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E775
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E764
Wasserman Schultz, Debbie, Fla., E774
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E759

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.