United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 19, 2012 No. 93

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 19, 2012.

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

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 17, 2012, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

HONORING HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS WHO PROVIDE HOSPICE CARE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today on Capitol Hill there are hundreds of nurses, chaplains and social workers, the people who deliver hospice care at the bedside, here to promote an honest discussion and careful analysis of how to help individuals and their families grapple with the final chapter of life. It may be the hardest issue in health care, and the fear that it invokes can be a powerful weapon.

For most of us, the majority of health care we receive in our lifetime will be administered in those last few months. It's when we need the most doctors and nursing care, medical procedures and oftentimes in hospitals.

But we know from scientific studies that when patients are educated about their treatment options, they make decisions that are not only aligned with their personal preferences, but shared decision-making relieves stress and anxiety. Ironically, sometimes getting less intensive help, like in a hospice, not only improves the quality of life, these patients, many of them actually live longer.

From a public policy perspective, it's perverse that Medicare will pay for almost any medical procedure, yet not reimburse doctors to have a thoughtful conversation to prepare patients and their families for the delicate, complex, and emotionally demanding decisions surrounding the end of life.

That's why I sought to direct Medicare, in the Affordable Care Act, to cover a voluntary discussion with the doctor about living wills, power of attorney, and end-of-life preferences. Helping patients and their families clarify what they want and need should be an element of any rational, comprehensive health care system.

Despite our recent history, it's also a rare common denominator in health care politics because it's something that most people actually agree on. In fact, the majority of my Republican colleagues supported a similar provision for terminally ill elderly patients that was part of the 2003 prescription drug bill.

I had a friend of mine, a Republican cardiovascular surgeon here in the House, who told me he had many end-of-life conversations; but, unfortunately, they were often too late. He wished he could have spoken to patients and their families when they could have properly reflected, not just when the surgery was merely hours away.

During the early debates on the Affordable Care Act, I was confident that this was an area where we were making a contribution to improve the quality of health care, but it actually might be something that would bring us together because of the shared agreement. But, unfortunately, battle lines were drawn; and you know how the rest of that story went: death panels, rationing, forced consultation with government-appointed physicians.

In war, truth is the first casualty. The same goes for politics. As a country, we have a difficult time talking rationally and thoughtfully about end-of-life issues. That's why it's so important that we have these dedicated people on Capitol Hill today—the nurses, the hospice workers, the social workers—to have this thoughtful conversation from people who do it every day. Their work to help patients and families can help Congress understand that the work is not finished.

I urge my colleagues to take a look at the Personalize Your Health Care Act, H.R. 1589. Join me in making sure that the Federal Government is a better partner in helping families prepare for this difficult chapter.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SERGEANT TOM BAGOSY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, today, a number of us are rising to commemorate an individual out of the now more than 2,000 who have lost their lives during Operation Enduring Freedom. I would like to submit, for the RECORD, 11 names of brave servicemembers who were recently killed in Afghanistan.

Printed on recycled paper.

Today, I would like to recognize a man in particular who is not counted in the 2,000. Sergeant Tom Bagosy, a combat veteran of Iraq and Afghanistan, took his own life on May 10, 2010, at Camp Lejeune marine base in North Carolina. Tom's wounds were mental, but he is no less a casualty of the war in Afghanistan.

That Tom is not counted in this 2,000 number speaks to the fact that our country does not fully understand the effect that a generation of war has had on those who've fought it. We do not understand the future cost of caring for over 300,000 returning veterans with mental wounds.

Tom's death, like those of the 154 Active Duty servicemembers who took their lives at a rate of one per day this year, was preventable.

Tom left behind a wife, Katie, and two children. Today, Katie is working towards becoming a mental health counselor so she can support the thousands of veterans coming home today with mental wounds. We should be inspired by her efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with the House a letter that Katie wrote to her husband, Tom, who had died in May. And she wrote this letter August 23 of 2011. These are her words:

> I wonder what life would be like if you didn't die that day. I wonder what we would be doing right now in this very moment instead. I hate playing the ''what if'' game, but I'm playing it anyway right now.
>
> I could really use a hug and kiss from you. I love the way you kiss me. I wish your arms were around me right now. Guess wishing is all I can do.
>
> Love always, Katie.

Mr. Speaker, it's time now that our Congress stands up and says let's bring our troops home now; let's start the process. If we brought them home now, it would still take months, maybe even years. But 2014 is the date that the President says we'll start bringing them home.

Then, there's also going to be a security agreement with Afghanistan; 10 years, spending about $4 billion a month.

We need to be spending that money to take care of our wounded, both physically and mentally, veterans. We need to start spending that money here in America to build our streets and roads and bridges.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that the Congress does its job based on the Constitution. We have the authority based on the Constitution.

I don't know how many—this poster of Sergeant Bagosy and his wife, Katie, how many, how many are coming back from Afghanistan, and those who came back from Iraq, that are mentally wounded. It's time that this Congress starts thinking about the wounded and thinks about the families who lost loved ones in Afghanistan and Iraq. Let's not cheat them out of their benefits because we want to spend money in Afghanistan that we can't even account for by the Inspector General.

Mr. Speaker, I will, at this time, ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform.

I ask God, in His loving arms, to hold the families who've given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I ask God to bless the House and Senate, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people today.

I ask God to bless the President of the United States that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people today and tomorrow.

And three times I will ask God, please, God, please, God, please, God, continue to bless America.

RECENT U.S. SERVICE MEMBER DEATHS

Spc. Kedith L. Jacobs
Pfc. Leroy Deronde III
Staff Sgt. Alexander G. Povilaitis
Staff Sgt. Roberto Loeza
Petty Officer 2nd Class Sean E. Brazas
Cpl. Nicholas H. Olivas
Lance Cpl. Steven G. Sutton
Capt. John R. Brainard
Chief Warrant Officer Five John C. Pratt
Spc. Tofiga J. Tautolo
Spc. Vilmar Galarza Hernandez

□ 1010

STAFFORD STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, unless Congress acts in the next 11 days, the interest rates for the subsidized Stafford student loan program are going to increase from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. This is at a time when student loan debt now has topped the $1 trillion number, which is according to the Federal Reserve Bank.

This is a program which will provide relief for over 7 million college students who literally today are already trying to budget for next fall's semester at colleges and universities—at 2-year colleges, at 4-year colleges. Yet this Congress left for 10 days, up until yesterday, for another recess—the ninth recess this year. This number, 11 days until the rate-hike increase, should probably be 6 days because that's all the number of days that the Speaker has scheduled between now and July 1.

How did we get to this point?

In 2007, when the Democrats controlled the Congress, we voted for the College Class Reduction Act, with Republican support, which cut the rate for the subsidized Stafford student loan program from 6.8 percent to 3.4 percent. That has helped over 15 million college kids over the last 5 years. It was a sunset measure, like many other bills that pass in this Congress; and last July 25, on that podium, President Obama challenged this Congress to avoid allowing that rate to double on July 1.

For 3 solid months, we had absolutely no action in this Congress—no hearings, no markup, no bill. Luckily, external pressure was exercised on this Chamber. We had 130,000 college students drop off petition signatures to the Speaker, demanding action. Finally, the Speaker rushed a bill to the floor, without a hearing, without a markup—a totally hyper-partisan bill—that did delay the rate hike for 1 year, yet was paid for with a measure that was so unacceptable: cutting programs and funding for cervical cancer screening, diabetes screening, cardiac screening. It was a measure which was dead on arrival, but at least it was some response. It was at least a flicker of acknowledgment that there was a real problem out there for middle class families around the country.

Now, on January 5, when the President announced his challenge to the Congress, I introduced legislation before midnight that night which would have locked in the lower rate at 3.4 percent. We have 152 cosponsors in the House for that measure, and in the Senate there is a back-and-forth going on right now about a 1-year extension. So, again, there actually are some hopeful signs. Leader REID, HARRY REID, introduced a measure with a pay-for, which was not greeted with immediate criticism and denunciation, so there is actually a chance that between now and July 1 we can come together and do our jobs and actually be here to work on the people's business and to make sure that, again, 7 million college kids don't see their interest rates spike at a time when student loan debt has shattered all records.

The stakes could not be higher. U.S. graduation rates now have fallen to 12th in the world. We were No. 1 in the 1980s. There are a variety of reasons which explain that, but certainly the high cost of college is one of those reasons. We are seeing now an alarming trend of individuals who take on debt to go to college and then never get their degrees. Debt without a degree is almost a death sentence—a lifetime of struggling in terms of trying to get ahead. We as the Congress have the responsibility to make sure that that doesn't happen or at least that we don't add to the problem by allowing these rate hikes to go into effect on July 1.

Mr. Speaker, if you look historically at the Stafford student loan program, if you look historically at the Pell Grant program, if you look historically at the Land Grant College program instituted by President Abraham Lincoln, this is an issue on which we have always been able to put aside partisanship and move forward together in order to make sure that the real crown jewels of our country, which are our people—particularly our young people—are always protected. That test is now before us over the next 11 days.

Let's do the right thing; let's work together; let's compromise; let's come up with a plan to protect 7 million college kids, and for once send a signal to the people of this country that we are listening and that we are actually responding to the critical needs that face this Nation's future.

AN EMPEROR INSTEAD OF A PRESIDENT?

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's income tax system is a giant mess. It's complicated; it's not fair; it's outdated—and not everyone follows the law.

Hypothetically, suppose tomorrow, the President issued an edict from the White House directing the IRS not to enforce tax laws for certain special people, for example, people under the age of 30.

Why? Maybe the President just doesn't like the law, so he issues that new order. Well, Mr. Speaker, last Friday, much to the surprise of all of us who believe in the Constitution and in the separation of power, something very similar did happen.

In his latest Friday afternoon surprise, the President issued a decree unilaterally discarding the immigration law of the land—a law passed by Congress and signed by a previous President. The President disagrees with the law; and since he had to have his way, in spite of the Constitution, he improperly ordered his way to be the law of the land. The President's temporary amnesty plan applies to those who are under 30 years of age. They also can obtain a work permit.

It would be nice if the President were as concerned about the 23 million Americans who are looking for work in America as he is about the 12 million undocumented individuals the President claims are looking for work in America. News reports even show 50 percent of new American college graduates can't even find work.

Mr. Speaker, here is the chart we all probably saw in ninth grade civics classes: a bill is filed in the House. If the House of Representatives debates it and passes the bill, it goes down the hallway to the Senate, and they discuss it and vote on the bill. If they pass the bill, it becomes the law if the President signs it.

We call that ''the law of the land.''

But the President, it seems, has ignored most of this and has just issued new orders from the White House to not pay any attention to the Senate or to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, like most of us learned in ninth grade civics classes, it is Congress' job to write laws and the President's job to execute the laws. That means: enforce the law. It doesn't mean he is supposed to ignore laws and then issue his own policies like kings used to do with their policies. He is to follow the law whether he likes it or not. Once upon a time, the President even claimed to believe in the Constitution.

Here is what he said last year:

> With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that's just not the case, because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed.

But that was a year ago. That was then and this is now. If the President doesn't like a law, he believes he can ignore it and come up with his own set of rules.

Our Founders envisioned a country in which freedom was protected from government and was limited from the policies of kings. You see, old King George III of England constantly decreed new laws without the consent of the people. That was one of the reasons we rebelled against the merry ole King of England and his monarchy and his policies. Our ancestors structured the American Government in the Constitution. The last time I checked, it was Congress that makes laws and the job of the executive branch to enforce laws, not to ignore the ones it doesn't like.

The immigration system needs fixing. Congress should do its job and fix the problem. In the meantime, the President should do his job, not ours, and he should enforce the law. Otherwise, we have lawlessness in America.

The President says he can use prosecutorial discretion not to enforce immigration law. Mr. Speaker, the President is wrong again. I dealt with prosecutorial discretion as a former prosecutor and a judge. Prosecutorial discretion is when a prosecutor does not prosecute a specific case because the accused is innocent or there is insufficient evidence or witnesses have disappeared or the government has violated the rights of the accused, et cetera. Prosecutorial discretion cannot be used to ignore a specific law because the government just doesn't like the law.

It is true, through no fault of their own, that young undocumented individuals are here as a result of decades of a failed broken immigration system, but the President has no interest in fixing what is broken. He is more concerned with picking up a few votes to further his reelection. The law gets in the way, so his policies look like they come from an emperor instead of a President.

So what new orders will be issued next week from the President and the White House? Is he going to ignore the Tax Code for some in the name of prosecutorial discretion? I guess it depends on what political forces push the President to new orders and decrees.

We shall see.

Stay tuned for another day in the life of the Republic. It's time for the former constitutional professor to follow the Constitution, not to make up his own rules during his on-the-job training.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1020

HELPING OUR CHILDREN ACROSS THIS NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I've had the pleasure of chairing the Congressional Children's Caucus for a number of years, having founded it almost a decade ago.

I'm delighted to have, as part of our agenda, a number of issues dealing with mentoring, nutrition, obesity, issues dealing with now a phenomena that is raging across our Nation, bullying, and introduced legislation just 6 months ago and now revised legislation that deals with renewing the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant, as well as providing intervention on these issues.

I'm looking forward to bipartisan support because, as we've seen statistics across America, children as young as pre-K and kindergarten now can interpret actions as bullying. We need to give help and relief to school districts and parents and families, and most of all, a public statement that that action is intolerable and that we want our children to go to schools and playgrounds and places that they will find comfort and enjoyment as a child.

That brings me also to my commitment to science, technology, engineering, and math. I was very pleased to be involved in a program that provided opportunity for sixth and seventh grade boys at risk. It gave them math and science in the morning with what we called the SMART board, and then in the afternoon they played with college football players and learned the skills of football with various sports leagues. Of course, we had the corporate support.

So I raised the question to my good friend, the company Halliburton, and asked for their CEO, who was supportive of this program last summer, to recognize the value of science, technology, engineering, and math, and respond to the needs of these inner-city boys in Houston, the place where the company is located with so many employees. I'm reminded of going to give comfort to many of their employees when KBR was owned by Halliburton and they had tragically lost employees in Iraq. It was my chance to go and respond to that crisis and to give my sympathy. That's the way we are as neighbors, but they are not acting neighborly now. And there are a number of boys, the same kind of children that I see that come here to Washington all the time. Of course, these at-risk boys have probably never been out of the city of Houston, but they are in school districts across the city. Isn't it a shame that we can't get a response, with all the great employees that I know care about the city, to be able to support these children? I ask for the CEO to respond to these at-risk boys. I'll certainly be looking forward to engaging and making sure that that happens. It's very important.

I understand that there has been some question about an executive order that deals with helping children again across this Nation, children who have come to the United States not of their own accord, who were brought by their parents and have been here since the age of 16 and have attempted, like

many children that I see, to do the right thing, to get a high school diploma, to be in the United States service, to get a GED that happened to have come and they're unstatused.

This issue has been before the Congress for 11 years. In fact, there was an effort passed by the House that moved to the Senate, as was instructed, and the Senate refused to move forward on something called the DREAM Act. If you look at all of our cases and our caseload in our respective districts, particularly those of us in the Southwest, there are tons of cases that have come in that will bring tears to your eyes, children being deported away from their families or families being separated.

Let me disabuse you of the notion that this is not done under the law. There is a regulatory scheme under the Homeland Security Department that allows discretionary determination about deportation or whether or not someone should go into deportation. These are children. The President did the right thing by having an executive order that utilized the powers by the Secretary of Homeland Security under the Code of Federal Regulations to be able to use that discretion. It's the right thing to do.

Congress, it's not too late, my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to come forward and support the DREAM Act that has been introduced over and over again, that had bipartisan support. In fact, it's not too late to help the farmers, to help the high-tech industry, and pass comprehensive immigration reform. Who are we, other than Americans, who are humanitarians, who are empathetic, who love the values of this Nation and believe in opportunity?

I don't want people to be equating the loss of jobs with allowing a few children to be able to be saved from deportation, whether they come from South and Central America, they come from Ireland, they come from Italy, they come from the continent of Africa, the Caribbean. It is time to be the Nation that we know we are, which is lifting up people, giving opportunity. This is the greatest country in the world, and I look forward to corporations responding to at-risk boys, Mr. Speaker, and, as well, that we recognize the importance of helping children wherever they are.

THE WHITE HOUSE DECREE IS BAD FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, last week, the White House decreed partial amnesty for an estimated 3 million illegal aliens and mandated acceptance of illegal alien work permit applications. The White House decree is bad for America.

First, Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable for the White House to pit unemployed Americans against illegal aliens in a competition for scarce jobs. In 2009, the Pew Hispanic Center found that 7.8 million struggling American families have already lost job opportunities to illegal aliens. America suffers an 8.2 percent unemployment rate. Even worse, Hispanic Americans suffer an 11 percent unemployment rate. Even worse, African Americans suffer a 14 percent unemployment rate. Even worse, American teenagers suffer a 25 percent unemployment rate. All are hammered by a White House decree that grants as many as 3 million illegal aliens work permits.

I understand heartfelt compassion for illegal aliens, but where is the compassion for millions of Americans who are unemployed and suffering from jobs lost to illegal aliens? Where is the compassion for American taxpayers who must pay higher taxes to support millions of extra unemployed?

Second, the White House decree grants amnesty to illegal aliens. Webster's defines ''amnesty'' as ''the act of an authority, as a government, by which pardon is granted to a large group of individuals.'' Further, ''pardon'' is defined as ''a release from the legal penalties of an offense.''

A penalty for breaking America's immigration laws is not lawfully getting a job. The White House releases illegal aliens from this penalty; hence, the White House grants amnesty. While the amnesty is admittedly partial, it is amnesty nonetheless.

Third, Mr. Speaker, the 1980s amnesty taught foreigners that America won't enforce its immigration laws. The result is over 10 million illegal aliens in America and an immigration mess that is destructive to America. A 2011 Federation of Americans for Immigration Reform study found that illegal aliens cost American taxpayers a net loss of $99 billion a year. Illegal aliens overcrowd our schools and need costly English interpreters. In 2011, illegal aliens drove up America's K–12 education costs by $49 billion per year. Illegal aliens overcrowd our emergency rooms, delay treatment for Americans, and drive up health care costs. Illegal aliens commit crimes, sometimes heinous, against American citizens and burden taxpayers with higher jail costs. In my home county, more Madison Countians have been killed by illegal aliens than have lost their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan combined.

Mr. Speaker, amnesty did not solve America's illegal alien problem in the 1980s, nor will it today. Those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it. Mr. Speaker, America must never again give blanket amnesty to illegal aliens.

Fourth, Mr. Speaker, the White House decree is of questionable constitutionality. The Constitution states, and I quote article I, section 1, ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States,'' and ''the Congress shall have the power . . . to establish a uniform rule of naturalization.'' The Constitution does not empower a President to make law. Hence, the only change to immigration law is as our Constitution demands, through Congress, not by imperial decree.

Mr. Speaker, in 2011, when it was not an election year, President Obama agreed. On March 28, 2011, the President stated:

> With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that's just not the case because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed. The executive branch's job is to enforce and implement those laws. For me to simply, through executive order, ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President.

Last September the President again stated:

> I just have to continue to say this notion that somehow I can just change the laws unilaterally is just not true. The fact of the matter is there are laws on the books that I have to enforce. And I think there's been a great disservice done to the cause of the DREAM Act that somehow, by myself, I can go and do these things. It's just not true.

Mr. Speaker, the President's own words speak volumes about the constitutionality of a White House decree that undermines America and the rule of law.

□ 1030

EXTENSION OF RENEWABLE ENERGY TAX INCENTIVES

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this Congress' failure to extend renewable energy tax credits is already costing my home State, the Commonwealth of Virginia, jobs. As CBS News reported last month, Virginia is losing a wind turbine development to Spain because the United States doesn't have the right policies and tax incentives in place for renewable energy development. A spokesperson for the wind energy company Gamesa said that the uncertainty over the future of those tax credits for wind energy and the lack of Federal energy policy caused the company to invest in Spain instead of Virginia. The jobs to construct and maintain that turbine will be Spanish, not American.

The so-called Strategic Energy Production Act, coming to the House floor this week, actually perpetuates the problem by doubling down on oil and gas to the detriment of developing new and renewable energy sources in America. Even the Republican Governor of Virginia said that the lack of a national energy policy was one of the reasons we aren't moving forward with this project in America. President Obama has called on Congress to pass a ''clean energy standard'' that would guarantee a market for wind, solar, and other clean domestic energy sources. That legislation has not received any consideration in this House.

The House Republican leadership won't even bring legislation to the floor to extend critical renewable tax credits for wind and solar energy. Republicans consider it anathema to even suggest that they reconsider special oil and gas company tax breaks in the face of record industry profits. Yet while the extension of renewable energy tax credits would encourage the development of an innovative industry that would support America's energy independence, they allow it to wither. In fact, House Republicans actually attacked the renewable energy sector through a number of different amendments to the Energy and Water appropriations bill earlier this month.

As part of the Recovery Act, Congress and the President extended production and investment tax credits for the production of wind and solar energy. As a result of those investments, wind energy electricity generation has grown by 40,000 megawatts in the last 2 years. Between 2007 and 2010, wind energy represented 35 percent of all new electricity generation in America. Solar energy production in America more than doubled in that time period.

Approximately 173,000 Americans work now in the wind and solar industries, with 70 percent growth in the number of wind energy jobs since 2007. What other industry can we point to that has seen that kind of significant job growth? In fact, the growth in renewable energy jobs has helped offset job losses in the coal industry, which has been declining for many years. As the Nation continues to recover, and as monthly job growth moderates, it is essential to support innovative American industries, such as wind and solar, with extensive growth potential.

Wind and solar electricity generation creates American jobs throughout the supply chain. For example, Micron is a semiconductor manufacturer in my district whose components are used in solar installations. The value of solar installations completed in 2011 was $8.4 billion. Thanks to Buy American provisions and other domestic manufacturing programs in the Recovery Act, we're increasing the share of wind energy components manufactured in America. Over 470 factories in the United States now build components for wind turbines. But as tax incentives expire, where will that future growth go?

In the global hunt for scarce resources, the renewable energy industry will not just be a job creator, though it will create jobs. It will also help support national security. If America is not at the forefront of this burgeoning field, then we will be left behind as global competitors seize that initiative.

Unfortunately, all of this economic growth is at risk as the Republican House leadership ignores renewable energy tax credit extensions. Failure to extend the production and investment tax credits for renewable energy will mean losing projects across the country. As our loss of a wind facility in Virginia demonstrates, Mr. Speaker, the failure to extend these tax credits in a timely manner already is hurting what would otherwise continue to be a growth industry.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed listening to my Republican colleagues talk about the Constitution and how a bill becomes a law.

I taught freshman civics. And when a bill passes both Chambers, the bill then goes to the President. The President then signs a bill. It becomes a law. The job of the Chief Executive is to enforce the law, as signed and as passed.

Like the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act, it is the law of the land. The amendments passed in 1987 identified Yucca Mountain as the sole geological repository for nuclear waste in this country. The problem is, it's not being enforced by the President, who is complicit with the majority leader in the Senate, Senator REID, in stopping the project.

So over the past year, I have been coming down to the floor and identifying where we're at on the status of what do we do with high-level nuclear waste. And I have gone through the whole country. I have identified all the Senators and where they stand. We actually have a majority of Senators—55 of them—who support high-level nuclear waste being stored at Yucca Mountain. We have 23 that either have made statements of ''no'' or 22 that we don't know their position. Can you imagine being a U.S. Senator on a very important position, never having to state your position on what to do with high-level nuclear waste or defense waste, especially if it's in your own State, and never being forced to come to a position.

Over the past year, we've been going around the country identifying all these locations. And now the time for truth has come, to really start narrowing down on individual States and Senators who should at least state their position.

So I return to my next-door neighbor State, the State of Missouri. I live in the St. Louis metropolitan area. I represent parts of 30 counties in southern Illinois. But I am very close to the State of Missouri. In fact, I root for the Cardinals, the Rams, the Blues. And if the University of Missouri's not playing the Fighting Illini, I'll root for the Missouri Tigers.

Missouri has a nuclear power plant called Callaway. And what I did months ago, I came down on the floor—these are old posters—and compared Callaway to Yucca Mountain. Right now, Callaway has 615 metric tons of uranium spent fuel on site; Yucca has none. Waste would be stored 1,000 feet underground; waste is being stored in pools above ground. Waste would be 1,000 feet from the water table; at Callaway, it's 65 feet above the groundwater. At Yucca, the waste would be 100 miles from the Colorado River; at Callaway, it's only 5 miles from the Missouri River.

So the State of Missouri needs an answer by their elected Members of what should they do, how should we handle the nuclear waste at Callaway? Well, Senator BLUNT has already stated his position that he supports moving nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain. In fact, in a floor vote just 2 weeks ago, eight of the nine Members of Congress—a bipartisan majority—said nuclear waste should be in Yucca Mountain, or at least we should finish the scientific study to see if it's feasible versus keeping it in Missouri. The Members of the House who voted in support of the Shimkus amendment were Representative AKIN, Representative CLAY, Representative CLEAVER, Representative EMERSON, Representative GRAVES, Representative HARTZLER, Representative LONG, and Representative LUETKEMEYER. Of course we know Senator BLUNT supports it.

Now we focus on Senator MCCASKILL. This is no surprise to her—I've talked to her personally about this—that there would be a time when eventually she needs to state, does she support high-level nuclear waste being stored in Missouri? Does she support a long-term geological storage underneath a mountain in a desert in Nevada?

□ 1040

If she would make a statement, we could then move her from the undecided to either a nay or a yea. And if a yea, that would bring us to 56. We're actually trying to see if we can get 60 United States Senators to say, Yeah, we support moving forward. We've only spent $15 billion, going back to 1982, to prepare, locate the site.

Yucca Mountain is not just a mountain on its own but it's at the nuclear test site. It's bigger than the State of Rhode Island, the Federal grounds. It's Federal property. And so we come down on the floor—and we'll be doing this in the following weeks—highlighting individual Senators who are either undecided, no commitment, no position on what should be the disposition of high-level nuclear waste in their State, where it should go, and at least get them on the record as far as this issue.

Again, this law was passed in 1982. The amendment passed identifying Yucca Mountain as the long-term geological repository was then signed in 1987. We would just ask the administration to follow the law.

2,000 DEATHS IN OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, while the House was out of session last week, the Nation suffered its 2,000th fatality in the conflict known as Operation Enduring Freedom, the overwhelming number of those deaths coming in Afghanistan. For more than 10 years now, we've been losing young, courageous servicemembers on a mission that isn't bolstering our national security, isn't supported by the American people, but is costing us billions of dollars every month. What a disaster and what a tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, from this Chamber, I regularly hear Members of the majority invoking morality in support of efforts to cut effective programs that help the most vulnerable members of our society. So where is their moral outrage and where is their budget axe when it comes to the most expensive government program imaginable that has killed 2,000 of our troops?

Two of those 2,000 come from my part of the country, the Sixth Congressional District of California. Army Specialist Christopher Gathercole and Army Sergeant Ryan Connolly, both of Santa Rosa, California, were killed less than a month apart in the year 2008.

We had others who were killed during the nearly 9 years that our troops were in Iraq, but 2,000 deaths doesn't even begin to tell the story of the human cost of this war. More than 15,000 Americans have come home wounded, many in ways that will alter their lives forever. Even those who returned with their bodies intact often suffer from devastating posttraumatic stress that may never go away. Postdeployment suicide has reached epidemic levels.

Nearly 2.5 million men and women have served in Afghanistan and Iraq, and I actually can't say that I trust that the veterans health care system is prepared or will be prepared to deal with the huge demand that will be placed on the services in the coming years.

A recent report prepared by VA doctors outlines the unique and varied health care needs of returning Iraq and Afghanistan veterans. In addition to traumatic brain injuries, depression, and substance abuse, there's chronic muscle pain, sleep disturbances, hypertension, and complications from environmental exposures. Many of our returning heroes have difficulty readjusting to civilian life, integrating once again into their families, their workplaces, and their communities.

We had better be willing as a Nation to write that check for their care as we were for the war that damaged them in the first place.

And it's critical, Mr. Speaker, that we remember the human cost is not just here in the United States. Two thousand Americans have died in nearly 11 years of war. Well, 3,000 Afghan civilians, many of them children, were killed last year alone for the cause of their so-called liberation.

It's not enough to acknowledge the casualties of this war, to memorialize the dead and pay tribute to their service. What we need is an immediate change of policy. To extend the war through 2014 is to sentence hundreds more servicemembers to their deaths, all for a policy that isn't achieving its stated objectives while strengthening the very terrorists and extremists that we're trying to defeat.

There's only one solution, Mr. Speaker. There's only one choice that will finally keep the death toll from climbing. That choice is bring our troops home. Bring them home now.

WHEN WILL WE ATTACK SYRIA?

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

Mr. PAUL. Plans, rumors, and war propaganda for attacking Syria and deposing Assad have been around for many months. This past week, however, it was reported that the Pentagon indeed was finalizing plans to do just that.

In my opinion, all the evidence to justify this attack is bogus. It is no more credible than the pretext given for the 2003 invasion of Iraq or for the 2011 attack on Libya.

The total waste of those wars should cause us to pause before this all-out effort at occupation and regime change is initiated against Syria. There are no national security concerns that require such a foolish escalation of violence in the Middle East. There should be no doubt that our security interests are best served by completely staying out of the internal strife now raging in Syria. We are already too much involved in supporting the forces within Syria anxious to overthrow their current government. Without outside interference, the strife, now characterized as a civil war, would likely be nonexistent.

Whether or not we attack yet another country, occupying it and setting up another regime that we hope we can control, poses a serious constitutional question: From where does a President get such authority?

Since World War II, the proper authority to go to war has been ignored. It has been replaced by international entities like the United Nations and NATO, or the President, himself, while ignoring the Congress. And sadly, the people don't object.

Our recent Presidents explicitly maintain that the authority to go to war is not the U.S. Congress'. This has been the case since the 1950s, when we were first taken into war in Korea under a UN resolution and without congressional approval. Once again, we are about to engage in military action against Syria, and at the same time irresponsibly reactivating the Cold War with Russia. We're now engaged in a game of ''chicken'' with Russia, which presents a much greater threat to our security than does Syria.

Would we tolerate Russia in Mexico demanding a humanitarian solution to the violence on the U.S.-Mexican border? We would consider that a legitimate concern for us. But for us to be engaged in Syria, where the Russians have a legal naval base, is equivalent to the Russians being in our backyard in Mexico.

We are hypocritical when we condemn Russia for protecting its neighborhood interests, as we claim we are doing the same ourselves thousands of miles from our shore. There's no benefit for us to be picking sides, secretly providing assistance and encouraging civil strife in an effort to effect regime change in Syria. Falsely charging the Russians with supplying military helicopters to Assad is an unnecessary provocation. Falsely blaming the Assad government for a so-called massacre perpetrated by a violent warring rebel faction is nothing more than war propaganda.

Most knowledgeable people now recognize that to plan war against Syria is merely the next step to take on the Iranian Government, something the neoconservatives openly admit. Controlling Iranian oil, just as we have done in Saudi Arabia and are attempting to do in Iraq, is the real goal of the neoconservatives who have been in charge of our foreign policy for the past couple of decades.

War is inevitable without a significant change in our foreign policy—and soon. Disagreements between our two political parties are minor.

□ 1050

Both agree that sequestration of any war funds must be canceled. Neither side wants to abandon our aggressive and growing presence in the Middle East and South Asia.

This crisis building can easily get out of control and become a much bigger war than just another routine occupation and regime change that the American people have grown to accept or ignore.

It's time the United States tried a policy of diplomacy, seeking peace, trade, and friendship. We must abandon our military effort to promote and secure an American empire.

Besides, we're broke. We can't afford it. And worst of all, we're fulfilling the strategy laid out by Osama bin Laden, whose goal had always been to bog us down in the Middle East and bring on our bankruptcy here at home.

It's time to bring our troops home and establish a noninterventionist foreign policy, which is the only road to peace and prosperity.

This week I'm introducing legislation to prohibit the administration, absent a declaration of war by Congress, from supporting—directly or indirectly—any military or paramilitary operations in Syria. I hope my colleagues will join me in this effort.

MOURNING 2,000TH DEATH OF OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

California (Mr. GARAMENDI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the 2,000th U.S. military servicemember was killed in Operation Enduring Freedom. I send my deepest sympathies to the families and loved ones of each individual who has been killed since this war began more than a decade ago. Those losses are a cause for sadness beyond what I can adequately convey in my words. Having just celebrated Father's Day with my daughters and son, I reflect on the fact that each fallen soldier was the child of some parent. Many were husbands and wives, and many were parents themselves.

We are a Nation at war. Yet the burden of this war has been primarily borne by a very few, by our military servicemembers and their families. Less than 1 percent of the United States population is in the armed services. Many Americans were not aware of last week's tragic milestone, or perhaps they may have glanced at the fatality count in their local paper and then they went about their daily events. This is a war that, for many, goes on in the background while most Americans carry on their daily lives.

It's imperative that we stop and think deeply about the human cost of this war. We must read the names of those who have been killed, look at their pictures, and imagine the grief of those who have been left behind. We must also think about those who have been wounded. Every day outside this Chamber, we see yet one more military man or woman who has lost a limb, who has been harmed. They are in our military hospitals now, their futures uncertain. We must think about those servicemembers whose lives have been so shattered by the experience of war that they cannot continue living. More servicemembers took their lives in this year than were killed in combat in Afghanistan. Only when we feel those losses can we fully comprehend the cost of this war.

Recently, this House passed its version of the National Defense Authorization Act that I opposed but the majority pushed forward, a bill that has no meaningful timeline for ending combat operations and bringing our troops home, no concrete plans for transitioning full responsibility for Afghanistan security to Afghan forces. Most Republican supporters of the National Defense Authorization Act would slow down the withdrawal of our troops. They would have American troops continue to fight against a domestic insurgency in Afghanistan, and they would have American troops fighting for the corrupt Karzai government.

As Members of Congress, we're responsible for authorizing the funds that sustain this war. If we believe this war should continue, we should say that this war is absolutely essential to our Nation's security. This war is not.

Can we look into the eyes of the mother or father of a serviceman who has been killed and say your child died for a mission that's absolutely essential to our Nation's security? I can't do that, and I believe most of us cannot. I believe it is time for the war in Afghanistan to come to an end. Our troops and their families have given enough. We should welcome them home as heroes, and we should ensure that they receive the support and care that is due when they return.

We sent our brave servicemen and -women to Afghanistan to eliminate international terrorist organizations that threaten the United States. As President Obama said last month, our goal is to destroy al Qaeda. Our troops have successfully executed this mission with phenomenal dedication and capacity. We have virtually eliminated al Qaeda from Afghanistan. No expert says that there's more than 100 there, and they have no meaningful operation. They have demonstrated that we can take terrorists out wherever they are in this world. We have captured and killed most all of al Qaeda's top commanders. One year ago, we celebrated the historic moment when Osama bin Laden, the 9/11 mastermind, was killed. He met his just end.

The cost of this war in blood and treasure has been staggering. Even those who have not given their lives have given of their lives. It's time for this war to end. The loyalty and dedication of our servicemembers, our most sacred resource, must be conserved. We must not squander it. End this war now.

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the 2,000th U.S. military service member was killed in Operation Enduring Freedom. I send my deepest sympathies to the families and loved ones of each of the individuals who have been killed since we began this war in Afghanistan more than a decade ago. These losses are a cause for sadness beyond what I can adequately convey in words. Having just celebrating Father's day with my daughters and son, I reflect on the fact that each fallen soldier was the child of some parent. Many were husbands and wives, and many were parents themselves.

We are a nation at war. Yet the burden of this war has been primarily borne by the few—by our military servicemembers and their families. Less than 1% of the U.S. population serves in the armed forces. Many Americans were not aware of last week's tragic milestone, or perhaps glanced at the fatality count in their local paper and continued with their day. This is a war that, for many, goes on in the background while they carry on with their daily lives.

It is imperative that we stop and think deeply about the human costs of this war. We must read the names of those who have been killed, look at their pictures, and imagine the grief of those they left behind. We must think also about those who have been wounded, who are right now in our military hospitals with uncertain futures. Every day outside this Chamber, we see yet one more soldier who has lost a limb. And we must think about those servicemembers whose lives were so shattered by the experiences of war that they could not continue living. More servicemembers took their own lives this year than were killed in combat in Afghanistan. Only when we feel these losses can we fully comprehend the costs of this war.

Recently, this House passed its version of the National Defense Authorization Act, which contains a provision inserted by the majority that would continue this war indefinitely. I opposed this bill. This majority bill has no meaningful timeline for ending combat operations and bringing our troops home. It has not concrete plans for quickly transitioning full responsibility for Afghanistan's security to Afghan forces. The majority has pushed to slow down the withdrawal of U.S. forces. They would have American troops continue fighting against a domestic insurgency in Afghanistan and striving to defeat those armed factions that threaten the corrupt Karzai government.

As Members of Congress, we are responsible for authorizing the funds that would sustain this war. If we believe this war should continue, we affirm that this war is essential to our national security. It is not. We should be able to look into the eyes of a mother or father of a service member has been killed and say, "Your child died in a war that is absolutely necessary to keep our country safe." I cannot do that, and I believe most of us cannot. It is time for the war in Afghanistan to come to an end. Our troops and their families have given enough. We should welcome them back as heroes and ensure that they receive the support and care that is their due when they return.

We sent our brave service men and women to Afghanistan to eliminate those international terrorist organizations that threatened the United States. As President Obama stated very clearly last month, "Our goal is to destroy Al Qaeda." Our troops have successfully executed this mission with phenomenal dedication and capacity. They have virtually eliminated Al Qaeda from Afghanistan, as our intelligence experts report that fewer than 100 Al Qaeda operatives remain in the country. They have demolished terrorist training camps, and captured or killed most of Al Qaeda's top commanders. One year ago we all celebrated the historic moment when Osama Bin Laden, the 9/11 mastermind who bears responsibility for the death of thousands of innocent American civilians, met his just end.

The costs of this war, in blood and treasure, have been staggering. Even those who have not given their lives have given of their lives, missing time with loved ones at home while they serve our country abroad. The loyalty and dedication of our military servicemembers is America's most sacred resource, and we must not squander it. They have achieved the core national security objectives for which they were sent to Afghanistan. It is now time for our troops to come home to their families.

COMMEMORATING LEVITTOWN'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and commemorate the 60th anniversary of Levittown, Pennsylvania, which is the place that I have called home my entire life.

Located in historic Bucks County, Pennsylvania, construction of Levittown began in 1952 and was completed in 1958. One of the first planned communities built in the United States, it became a popular first home for thousands of returning veterans from World War II and Korea.

Over the course of its rich history, Levittown has developed into a model middle class community. Now it is home to over 50,000 residents with schools, churches, and businesses that help create a sense of community and foster a warm environment for families to live and to work, to raise their families and to retire to.

Levittown's residents have worked in our steel mills, built our communities, and served in our military, all while raising their children and their grandchildren. It was a pleasure growing up in such a close-knit, hard-working community. I'm proud to say that I'm from Levittown, raising my own family there.

The highest honor of all is being given the chance to serve Levittown in the United States Congress. I will continue to listen to and work with members of my community to ensure that all of their voices are heard. Congratulations to all who have called Levittown home over the last 60 years. With such a rich history, Levittown deserves our recognition and praise. I'm honored to live amongst these great families and wish them all the best on this momentous occasion.

HAPPY 100TH BIRTHDAY TO ROBERT GRAY SHIPLEY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish a well-deserved happy 100th birthday to a pillar of Watauga County, Mr. Robert Gray Shipley, Sr. Mr. Shipley was born in Valle Crucis, North Carolina, on June 23, 1912. Growing up on his parents' farm, Mr. Shipley's aptitude for agriculture and ranching was evident from a young age.

□ 1100

He put that skill to use, working his way through college, milking cows, judging livestock competitions, and maintaining records in Virginia Polytechnic Institute's dairy department.

Mr. Shipley began teaching upon his graduation from Virginia Tech in 1933, and aside from the time he spent in the United States Air Force as a gunnery instructor on B–24 bombers; teaching agriculture in an innovative and hands-on manner is what he did for most of his professional life. In fact, Mr. Shipley counts among his many students my husband, Tom.

Today, if you take a trip down to Watauga County, evidence of Mr. Shipley's involvement in the community is everywhere. He helped organize the Watauga County Hereford Association, he taught sheep sheering at 4–H clubs, and he ran the Cove Creek Horse Show for two decades. He's a member of the North Carolina State Fair Hall of Fame, the Western North Carolina Agricultural Hall of Fame, and the North Carolina Livestock Hall of Fame. He's a charter member of the Boone Rotary Club and is a mainstay in the Cove Creek Ruritan Club, working faithfully at every monthly fish fry.

Throughout his busy life, Mr. Shipley has had a wonderful partner, his wife of nearly 70 years, Agnes. Together, they are the proud parents of three children, grandparents to six, and great-grandparents to nine. This weekend, friends and former students of the Shipleys will be gathering at the historic Cove Creek High School in Sugar Grove to celebrate Mr. Shipley's 100th birthday and Mrs. Shipley's 95th birthday.

I speak for the community when I express gratitude for the lives of the Shipleys and for their being the wonderful role models that they are.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

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

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

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

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

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WELCH 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 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

NEW POLICY IS OUT OF TOUCH WITH AMERICAN FAMILIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the President revealed a new policy that promotes illegal aliens who are in our country from deportation. This shifts jobs from lawful Americans to illegal aliens. As a former immigration attorney myself, we welcome legal immigrants. In 2009 and 2010, Congress refused to pass legislation giving amnesty to the same individuals included under the President's new policy. Not only is this decision a Presidential abuse of power, it also shows this administration is out of touch with American families who are suffering from lack of jobs.

Instead of encouraging policies aimed to help our law-abiding citizens find jobs, the President believes that he should reward those who have broken laws by granting them work permits. At a time of record unemployment, I urge the President and the liberal-controlled Senate to take up the dozens of bipartisan bills that have passed the House to help American families find jobs.

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

DELPHI SALARIED RETIREES

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

Ms. HOCHUL. Imagine you got up every day of your adult life working for the same company, helping build the American auto industry. You worked hard, but you're proud because you're part of something bigger than just collecting a paycheck—you're part of rebuilding the economic engine that gave us the middle class. You counted on a pension, life insurance, and health insurance when you retired, because that's what you were promised. You

thought you lived the American Dream—until one day that dream turned into a nightmare.

That's what happened when GM spun off Delphi Corporation in 1999 and later filed for bankruptcy, and over 20,000 salaried employees were left out to dry. Family finances were ruined all across this country, including the cities of Lockport and Rochester in my district. This must be corrected. That's why I'm delighted to see the reemergence of GM as a global powerhouse.

But we cannot forget these individuals. I've called on this administration for their help. I've not received an adequate response from the Department of Labor and the Department of Treasury. And I call on the President to take up the cause of these retirees because they need our help. Their promises are broken, and it's our responsibility to help them at this time.

FARMERS DESERVE CERTAINTY

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, successful agriculture is vital for America and for my home State of Illinois to thrive in the future. The farmers in my district in northern Illinois are saying that they can do without direct payments as long as there is some protection from catastrophe. That's why I'm looking forward to supporting a broad plan for strong, reliable, and affordable crop insurance when we take up the farm bill next week.

A successful farm bill must have strong protection from uncontrollable risks for our Nation's agriculture sector. Farmers take large risks every year to acquire the seed, feed, and supplies they will need for the season. Crop insurance gives them the certainty to take these risks, knowing that they will be protected from conditions beyond their control.

We have an opportunity to empower farmers by giving them choices and the ability to tailor protection to their needs while also asking that they share the risk so the taxpayer isn't picking up the whole tab.

IT'S TIME TO EXTEND THE STUDENT LOAN RATE

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

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, in 11 days, the interest rates on the Stafford student loans will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. It's unthinkable that Congress would allow this to happen. But here we are, only 11 days from the deadline, and no closer to a solution than we were months ago. This is one of those only-in-Washington situations. Nearly everyone agrees that we can't let these rates double. Doing so will be a real blow to the middle class and those trying to climb their way into the middle class. It would be bad for the economy, and it makes no practical sense. The Federal Government is borrowing at 1.6 percent. Yet Congress has been unable to extend the lower rate, and it is now only 11 days away.

Take Jessie from Norwich, who will be affected. Despite significant financial support from scholarships and her family, she's graduating from nursing school with over $150,000 in student loan debt. At age 26, Jessie worries that she'll not be able to start a family or put a down payment on a home because of this staggering debt. She worries that if interest rates increase, a bad situation will be even worse.

Madam Speaker, we have 11 days. It's time to get this done.

CHINA'S ONE-CHILD POLICY

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, last week, I received an extremely disturbing report about China's one-child policy from China's central Shaanxi province. Feng Jianmei was 7 months pregnant and home alone when she was abducted by government family planning officials. She was taken to a hospital and bound while her child was administered a powerful poison. After she gave birth to her dead child, without the aid of painkillers, the baby was then left beside her on the hospital bed, as shown in this picture. Her husband is a common worker, who has no recourse for the crime that has been perpetrated on his wife and child. Family planning officials in Shaanxi took this gruesome step in order to meet their quotas under China's brutal one-child policy. This is further evidence that government officials routinely take extreme measures to enforce China's barbaric one-child policy.

It's a human rights issue. It's far past time that the Chinese government stop this terrible repression and end the destruction of lives. I call on Secretary Clinton to condemn this policy in the strongest terms.

LET'S PASS A TRANSPORTATION BILL

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. The American public deserves better. They deserve more from their Congress. The sacrifices that so many millions of Americans have given, whether it's in military service or service to this Nation, to allow us to stand here and self-govern ourselves needs to be repaid with maybe the words of Daniel Webster above us up there: Let's do something great in our time. The differences this Nation has is what makes us strong—differences of opinion. But compromise and common purpose is the glue that hold us together.

If there's anything that we can agree upon, it's that this Nation should have a world-class transportation system to move people and goods in an efficient, effective manner. And we're sitting here not passing a transportation bill. We have never had this problem in this Congress. The last five transportation bills have passed with an average of 375 bipartisan votes. We have a bill that passed the Senate 100 days ago that passed with a 74–22 vote. I'm not sure they can agree it's Tuesday in the Senate, and they compromised on a transportation bill.

I urge my colleagues here, either get the compromise done this week or bring the Senate bill forward and let us vote up or down to put America back to work and do something great in our time.

□ 1210

UTILITY MACT AND PJM AUCTION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, President Obama's regulatory war on coal is having an effect. In the 2015–2016 capacity auction by regional transmission organization PJM Interconnection, the market clearing price for the mid-Atlantic area was $167 per megawatt. And for northern Ohio, it was $357 per megawatt. The average over the last 8 years has been $89.

Andy Ott at PJM Interconnection said:

> Capacity prices were higher than last year's because of retirements of existing coal-fired generation resulting largely from environmental regulations which go into effect in 2015.

A study published in 2010 by the Edison Electric Institute identified seven different new regulations that will raise the cost of electrical generation by 2017. The costs are huge. The EPA's estimate of costs for its utility MACT regulation alone is $9.6 billion per year starting in 2015.

The House of Representatives has taken action to prevent the imposition of new regulatory burdens in the midst of this fragile economic recovery, but the Senate has yet to follow that lead. Madam Speaker, prices are climbing, and Americans will suffer.

2,000 AMERICAN FATALITIES IN OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, last Thursday, June 14, marked the 2,000th American fatality in Operation Enduring Freedom. Today, that number is now 2,004 OEF fatalities, of which 1,887 happened in Afghanistan. Suicide rates by our veterans are now

one every day. This is the human cost of war. It is heartbreaking. Forty-three hail from Massachusetts, including eight from my district. These are not just statistics. They were living, breathing men and women in uniform.

At this solemn moment, I would like to send my condolences to the families of:

Army Private Brian Moquin, Jr., 19 years old, Worcester; Army Master Sergeant Shawn Simmons, 39, Ashland; Army Major Brian Mescall, 33, Hopkinton; Marine Captain Kyle Van De Giesen, 29, North Attleboro; U.S. Air National Guard Sergeant Robert Barrett, 21, Fall River; Army Specialist Scott Andrews, 21, Fall River; U.S. Army National Guard Private 1st Class Ethan Goncalo, 21, Fall River; and Air Force Major David Brodeur, 34, Auburn.

You are not forgotten.

REBUILDING OUR NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, we all agree that rebuilding our Nation's infrastructure is the best way to create jobs today and ensure long-term economic growth tomorrow. Our failure to pass a long-term, fully funded transportation authorization has undermined our competitiveness as a Nation, overburdened our local and State governments, and hurt American businesses.

It prevents the State and local governments in every single one of our districts from funding repairs to their bridges, roads, and railways. It leaves our infrastructure crumbling. And it discourages businesses from creating construction and manufacturing jobs that American workers could be filling today.

Madam Speaker, I urge the transportation conference committee to finalize their work before the current authorization expires at the end of next week. We owe it to the American people to get this done.

LOOK TO THE GREEN ECONOMY

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, President Obama laid out in his State of the Union address a blueprint for an America to last. To do this, he said, we need to rebuild the American economy by reviving manufacturing, new and innovative energy sources, educating and creating a strong, more skilled workforce. And, more importantly, renewing our American values.

I want to talk about the new and innovative energy sources. Remember when the ARRA was passed, President Obama spoke about building the green economy, jobs in the energy field that look to the future. Hawaii shows that this can work. Our recent unemployment rate shows that it does work. Our UI rate is 6.3 percent, though we would like to see it lower. Note that our initial claims are down 16 percent. Total claims are down 10 percent from last year. And the area where we're seeing job creation is in the solar energy market. We have an 18 percent increase in the permits in the first 5 months of this year.

Our Department of Labor projects 2,900 jobs by the end of this year—green jobs, 25 percent over the past 2 years.

President Obama has got it right. Let's look to the green economy.

SUBSIDIZING ENERGY COMPANIES IS A FAILED POLICY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, each year, Americans write a check to Uncle Sam in hopes that their money is going to the right places. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has lost credibility as the steward of taxpayer money.

In the past 3 years, millions of taxpayer dollars have been squandered in risky ''clean and green'' energy projects, and many of those companies have failed. And the beneficiaries of these shady ventures just happen to be the President's men. Enter Solyndra. Half a billion tax dollars subsidized a company that was doomed to fail. Eighteen hundred people lost their jobs, and Americans will never see the refund on their money. But the cronyism continues. Last week, the Department of Energy awarded $2 million to Solar Mosaic. The President's former green jobs czar, Van Jones, is an adviser to that company. Imagine that.

It's time to quit gambling taxpayer money on risky projects for all the President's men.

And that's just the way it is.

MCCONNELL AND DISCLOSURE

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, in 2003, the current Senate minority leader told NPR:

> Money is essential in politics, and not something that we should feel squeamish about—provided the donations are limited and disclosed, everyone knows who's supporting everyone else.

I agree with that version of Senator MCCONNELL. But there's a new version who revealed last week that he doesn't think that we should know who's buying our democracy, and he compared this administration's opposition to unlimited anonymous campaign contributions to the Nixon administration. I understand why Nixon came to mind, but I think the Senator is projecting here. After all, he now believes anonymous donors using secret money should be able to influence elections, all out of public view. Nixon wrote that playbook.

Anonymity allows people in campaigns to distort the truth at best, or to lie outright, with no chance of being held accountable. If you oppose disclosure of campaign financiers, you're endorsing dishonest campaigns.

Madam Speaker, the voters have a right to judge the credibility of campaign ads, and that is simply impossible without disclosure of those who are influencing our elections.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 1380, the New Alternative Transportation to Give Americans Solutions Act of 2011.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2578, CONSERVATION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 688 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 688

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2578) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act related to a segment of the Lower Merced River in California, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this resolution and shall not exceed 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112–25. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment,

and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1220

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), with also a congratulations and a welcome back to the gentlelady from New York, who has been incapacitated for a while. It is nice to see her back on the floor with her health starting to recover.

Pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I also ask, Madam Speaker, that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which they may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. This particular resolution provides for a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 2578, the Conservation and Economic Growth Act, which contains 14 titles containing important legislation impacting our Nation's public lands and our national parks.

The rule provides for 90 minutes of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources and makes in order the vast majority of amendments which were filed at the Rules Committee. So this structured rule is extremely fair and will provide for a balanced and open debate on the merits of this particular bill.

It was only a couple of Congresses ago, Madam Speaker, in which the Senate sent over an omnibus bill. It had over 100 particular bills added to it. I should have been happy. Three of them were mine. And even though mine were really great bills, some of the rest of them were really bad. That was 1,200 pages. But what was most egregious about that bill that was sent from the Senate is that 75 of those 100 bills had not had any hearing whatsoever in the House. One in particular that dealt with my State, although not my district, not only had not had a hearing in the House, it hadn't even had a hearing in the Senate when it was put into this pile, and it was brought to the floor under a closed rule.

This bill, every single title has gone through regular order. The committee of jurisdiction has had a hearing on each of these elements. They have had a debate in full committee on each of these sections, and they have had a markup on every one of these bills. The committee has heard and has done the work. The amendments that were germane to the issue and were not assigned to other committees were made in order to be heard on the floor.

So once again, this is a bill that is unique in the spectrum of traditional omnibus bills, tying things together, because it did go through regular order, the committee did hear each of these provisions, and it is appropriate to now send it over to the Senate so they can try to consider something at some time in some form of regular order.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, first I want to say how happy I am to be back. I appreciate the welcome I've gotten from all my colleagues, and I've missed you terribly. I missed you, like we used to say in Kentucky, like a front tooth.

The bill before us today, Madam Speaker, is another wasted opportunity, I'm afraid. Today's legislation is composed of 14 separate bills, several of which are even bipartisan. But regrettably, these worthy proposals will not be signed into law because the majority has packaged them with other proposals that endanger our environment and public health.

Several of the controversial provisions before us are based on Democratic proposals. Unfortunately, the Democratic bills were taken and rewritten in such a way—extremely—that they can no longer receive bipartisan support. Two provisions in particular illustrate the extremely partisan approach.

First, title 3 would unnecessarily change a long-standing agreement and endanger the biologically sensitive Alaskan wilderness. This provision would open up our Nation's largest national forests to logging and allow rare old-growth forests to be clear-cut and sold for private gain.

Second, in the most extreme proposal before us, title 14 would impose a so-called ''operational control zone'' over almost 100 million square miles of American land.

On Federal land within this zone, the Department of Homeland Security would then be allowed to ignore 36 environmental laws, and Federal border agents would be able to operate with few limits on their power. My good friend from Utah has put forward an amendment to pare the 36 laws down to 16, but that is still 16 too many.

Title 14 proposes a solution to a problem that doesn't exist. Proponents claim that environmental protections prevent the U.S. Customs and Border Patrol from stopping illegal immigration. However, sworn testimony by both Border Patrol officials and the Federal land agency officials contradict this claim. In fact, the Department of Homeland Security opposes this legislation.

My entire district, all of it, would fall under the newly created operational control zone. As a result, U.S. Customs and Border Patrol could take control over all the historic landmarks, such as the Theodore Roosevelt National Historic Site, build anything on it that they needed. And I know my constituents pretty well after this number of years. They would not take to that at all.

Meanwhile, the sacred, historic, and sovereign lands of the Tuscarora Indian Nation would also be open to Federal agents. Such an extreme Federal overreach would violate the sovereignty of the Tuscarora Indian Nation. Many other tribes around the country whose land falls within this zone would face the same problem.

In a letter to the leaders of the House, the United South and Eastern Tribes wrote of the danger of this provision. They wrote:

> Many Indian tribes have lands and sacred places located near U.S. international borders, and we believe that the sovereignty and cultural integrity of our member tribes and others is unnecessarily put in jeopardy by the sweeping approach in this bill.

Federal cooperation, not Federal overreach, is a proven and prudent way to protect our borders. A recent GAO reported confirmed what we learned in sworn testimony: every time Federal cooperation between the Border Patrol officials and our land management officials was requested, it was given—every time. The only time conflicts remained between environmental laws and border enforcement was when Border Patrol officials didn't bother to ask the Department of the Interior nor the USDA for cooperation.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the majority violated the rules of the House when they combined 14 unrelated bills into the one bill before us today. However, the Rules Committee gave itself a waiver despite repeatedly denying such waivers for Democratic proposals throughout the year. Once again, when the majority wants to break the rules, they find a way. But when Democrats ask for a waiver for one of our proposals, all of a sudden the rules of the House have been written in stone.

I urge my colleagues to oppose today's extreme and partisan legislation and to stand up against the Federal overreach contained within this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Within this bill, there are, as I said, several proposals that are there, all of them dealing with Federal lands and all of them dealing with overreach that has taken place, unfortunately, by this administration. Let me just highlight a couple of them and why these bills are useful and very much important.

Title X of this particular section deals with Cape Hatteras in North Carolina. Cape Hatteras in North Carolina was established as a recreation area. In fact, the economy of that particular county, Dare County, was established as a recreation zone and a recreation area. Authorized in 1937, that's still 30,000 acres for recreation purposes.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service started in negotiations with the community of how they would actually try to manage that land, especially governing off-road vehicles. They established certain restrictions that would limit visitation.

□ 1230

And for local residents who were there, the residents agreed to those, even though they weren't really quite happy about it. And everything was going well until special interest groups started the litigation process.

You see, the Fish and Wildlife Service had issued a biological opinion finding that this interim management strategy that was established in the cooperative, collaborative process had indeed solved the problem and that there would never be any kind of jeopardy to any endangered species listed in that particular area. Everything was going well until, once again, there was a lawsuit.

A year after this agreement had been made, there was a lawsuit which this administration, unfortunately, decided to negotiate out of court. The lawsuit was never actually adjudicated. No judge made a decision. Basically, the administration caved to the special interest groups; and they rewrote the opinion that had been ruled by the Fish and Wildlife Service, their biological opinion that it did not jeopardize any endangered species.

So that went into effect. And, unfortunately, in March of this year, they even shrank the rule again to make it even more restrictive than the consent decree that had been settled out of court.

What this bill, this section of this particular bill, does in Cape Hatteras is do what's logical. It goes back to the original concern, the original land management plan that was done with the cooperation of the Fish and Wildlife Service and the local constituents that had been agreed upon, that had nothing to do with endangered species and did not jeopardize anything, simply going back to what had been done before the administration decided simply to cave in to special interest groups and settled out of court.

There's another section, I believe it's section 11, that deals with grazing rights. One of the things that businesses deal with, especially those that deal with grazing rights, is they need a constant to make sure that business is not uncertain. That is a most significant part.

One of the things we're finding out right now, though, is with grazing, especially in the West, excessive paperwork within the Department means we create missed deadlines that cause environmental litigation. And once again, stability is a constant that is necessary in business, and grazing is a business. It's one of those problems that to redo a permit to allow grazing will take 4 to 7 years for a permit that's only 10 years in the first place.

What this bill does is say those permits now go from 10 to 20 years, once again, to give some consistency to those who are engaged in grazing activities. It also codifies appropriation language that has had bipartisan support for over a decade and makes sure that NEPA review in crossing and trailing of livestock on public lands is not going to be subjected to another layer of red tape.

This industry puts $1.4 billion into our economy every year. And if, indeed, we do not treat our ranchers well, the 22,000 ranchers who have these Federal permits, the ability of maintaining this as a viable occupation is put in jeopardy. This amendment, this section fixes that. It solves that problem.

There are some other good ones. In fact, the one that I am proposing I will talk about in a minute. But for now, let me simply reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, I rise to focus attention upon one provision in this legislation, perhaps a few rose petals hidden in a very unnecessary thicket of painful thorns that are the center of this legislation.

Recently nominated as a World Heritage Site, the Spanish missions in San Antonio are a unique treasure for parishioners, for tourists, and for Texans everywhere. In 2010, our able former colleague, Ciro Rodriguez, introduced bipartisan legislation, both to expand the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park by about 151 acres and to require a study by the Secretary of the Interior about even further expansion of this important park.

In 2010, this very House approved the Rodriguez legislation. Though a companion bill was offered by Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, and she got it out of the Senate committee, the full Senate failed to act on the Rodriguez bill.

During this Congress, I have been one of five Members who joined Representative CANSECO in re-introducing the Rodriguez bill. Instead of approving our bipartisan measure, the Resources Committee has merged only a fraction of that bill into a totally unrelated piece of legislation that is little more than a giant giveaway and exploitation of public property and which will endanger irreplaceable natural resources from the seashore in North Carolina to the Tongass wilderness in Alaska.

While Senator HUTCHISON continues to work on a bipartisan basis, this particular measure really includes little of the protection that our missions deserve. Now any purchase of additional land for this park, an original purpose of the bill, that's prohibited, and even a mere study of the possibility of additional park expansion, that's denied in this bill.

Now, the only way that the park can be expanded is if a private or public owner donates land to the park. In other words, it makes future expansion and protection of these San Antonio missions dependent entirely upon charity.

No matter how public-minded some private property owners may be, some are likely to be unable to afford to donate the land.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. DOGGETT. So some property owners will be unable to donate their land. Instead of continuing the previous bipartisan commitment to the missions, this bill reflects the same ideological extreme so evident in our larger public policy debates, like that over the future of our national transportation system. Yes, our Republican House colleagues are all for good transportation. It's just paying for that transportation that they're opposed to.

And so today we hear about private property rights. Well, what about the private property right of an individual landowner to sell their property for a legitimate public purpose such as expanding this vital national park? That is denied in today's bill.

This bill will not grow the park in the way necessary to fully enhance the missions that are so very significant to San Antonio and to the culture and history of our Nation. The better approach is to wait and follow Senator HUTCHISON's lead and to approve a freestanding, bipartisan bill and give these missions the protection they deserve.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Once again, I appreciate the opportunity of talking about a couple of other elements in this bill. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas and his comments.

Unfortunately, yes, the study was taken out because it would be a replication of what has already been done; and the land that could be used to expand this is already in the public domain. And what we are simply saying with this particular bill is, no, we don't need to try and force private property owners to sell their lands. If they want to donate it, that's fine. It's not essential to the expansion of this particular park. I think it's the appropriate thing to do.

Let me, though, Madam Speaker, if I could, talk about the other provision,

title XIV in there, which deals with our border security. It's one of those things that I happen to think fairly significant.

If I could start with just a few charts so that people understand what is going on. This chart is simply the division of this country by Border Patrol sections. You'll find out that certain sections have a lot more people coming into this country illegally than other sections.

For 2009 and 2010—those are the last 2 years for which we have full data—there were about a half million people that were illegally apprehended, just apprehended coming into this country. But of those half million, a quarter million, 51 percent or more, were coming through one sector which happens to be the Tucson, Arizona sector. That's not even the entire State of Arizona.

So the question has to be asked, why are 200,000-plus people being apprehended in Arizona when in Maine it looks like about 39 people were apprehended? Why is this area the entrance of choice?

I think it's undeniably that one of the reasons is simply because of the territory on that southern border. Everything in red on this border is land that is owned by the Federal Government. You'll see that 80 percent of Arizona is Federal land, much of that being wilderness and endangered species habitat or conservation rights-of-way.

One of the ironies is our Border Patrol, which is tasked with securing our border, has almost unlimited rights to do what they need to do to protect our border on private property and no one objects to it, which is why the statement of the gentlelady from New York is somewhat disingenuous, because most of her district is, indeed, private property. Border Patrol already has these kinds of options.

□ 1240

It is only on Federal property that the Federal Border Patrol is prohibited from doing its Federal job, and that seems bizarre and, indeed, unusual.

See, this is what the border actually looks like. That's the fence, and that's the one road that the Border Patrol is allowed to use if this happens to be a Federal wilderness designation. The break in the fence, by the way, happens to be there so that animals can go freely from Mexico into the United States and back and forth. I think I could contend that not only animals are using that kind of break in the fence.

Needless to say, the issue at hand simply is: Why is the Border Patrol prohibited from going into certain Federal areas when they need to do it even though the bad guys—the drug cartels, the human traffickers, the kidnapping rings, the prostitution rings—are allowed to go in there?

We have in these Federal wilderness areas 8,000 miles of illegal roads, created by illegal drug traffickers, going into this area, and the Border Patrol by our rules and regulations and laws is prohibited from going into that same area. Is it right that they, in hot pursuit, should have to go to the edge of one of those wilderness areas and then have to wait? Indeed, that is what has happened.

Secretary Napolitano, when she was first put in there, simply said:

> One of the issues is, at the Southwest border, it can be detrimental to the effective accomplishment of our mission. In fact, it may be inadvisable for officers' safety to wait for the arrival of horses for pursuit purposes or to attempt to apprehend smuggling vehicles within wilderness with less than capable forms of transportation.

The Border Patrol clearly recognizes this. They actually tell us they don't need more money, that they don't need more manpower. What they need is access into that area, which currently they are denied. Let me show you how that works.

This is simply one of the sensors that's used. Instead of having an actual fence, you use the sensor. It's a truck with a sensor on the back of it. In this Federal national monument, which is almost all wilderness designation, the Border Patrol wanted to move this truck from point A to point B. It took the land manager 3 months to grant approval to back up the truck and move it to some other place. During that 3 months, there was a 7-mile blackout area in which there was no surveillance possible. At the end of that 7 months, if the land manager had said, ''No, that area is too sensitive. I don't think you should go there,'' I would have objected, but I would have understood. Unfortunately, after 3 months of review, he let them move the truck, and it was too late to do it then.

That kind of example of what is happening on our border is replicated time and time again. Let me give you some examples.

In 2007, the Border Patrol asked permission to improve two forest roads in the Coronado National Forest, a total of 4 or 5 miles on the border at the edge of this area. They wanted to be able to move their mobile surveillance systems to higher ground to actually get control of the particular area. They would use the road at most once a day, but the Fish and Wildlife Service delayed the decision because they were afraid some of the dirt may eventually get into one of the streams in the particular area. The net result is, in 2011, permission still not being granted in this particular area, a catastrophic wildfire burned 68,000 acres. Three illegal aliens were arrested, and one admitted actually starting the blaze.

In 2010, the Border Patrol requested three helicopter landing sites in the Miller Peak Wilderness. The Forest Service liked the idea because they could use those sites also for fire suppression. Once again, the Fish and Wildlife Service, a competing agency, had concerns because it would have an impact on the Mexican Spotted Owl. Unfortunately, when they did a survey, they found that there were no spotted owls in the area. Nonetheless, the Fish and Wildlife Service stopped the construction of those helicopter pads. Then in 2011—you guessed it—1 year later, a 32,000-acre fire, which destroyed dozens of homes, took place. Once again, it was found that illegals coming into this country started those fires.

The citizens of Tombstone, Arizona, are allowed to go five at a time with hand tools into these wilderness areas in order to repair the pipeline, which supplies water to the city, that was damaged in these fires. Once again, the Fish and Wildlife Service said the Mexican Spotted Owl was the reason for those limitations.

GAO did a survey, a report: 17 of the 26 Border Patrol stations experienced delays, and 14 of those 17 reported being unable to obtain permits or permission from land managers to use it. Stations that were found in California, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico confirmed that they were unable to control the border due to land management positions. Even on the northern border, in the Spokane sector, they found, once again, they were being blocked from existing roads on national forest land due to environmental concerns.

The GAO report found that it could take 6 months or more for permission to improve roads needed for patrolling in New Mexico. Another Border Patrol station reported 8 months in delay for the permission to move a sensor as the land manager required an historic property assessment. A station in California reported that it took 9 months for permission to do road maintenance on Federal land.

These are the factors that are inhibiting our Border Patrol from doing their job.

Now, in the GAO report—and some people look at the executive summary, and they are looking at it improperly—it said that 22 of the 26 agents in charge reported that the overall security status had not been affected. What that meant was their status of being a controlled sector, a managed sector, or a monitored sector had not been changed; but what they did say is they were being inhibited and impeded in doing their job to try and control our particular borders.

Look, those who are coming in—the drug cartels, the human traffickers—they don't care about our laws. This is an endangered species. This cactus was cut down, but it was cut down by the drug cartel to do a roadblock across a public road in the United States so they could use it to stop cars and then mug the participants of those cars, and this is whether in those cars were Americans or other foreign nationals coming in there.

What is probably worst of all are the rape trees that are taking place—violence against women who are coming

down on American land in these areas. That simply means, as the coyotes lead these women across the border, at the end of that road, as the final payment, they will rape the women and then leave an article of clothing on one of the trees as a trophy for their actions.

This heinous activity taking place on American land is not being prohibited now and will not be prohibited unless the Border Patrol is allowed to maintain access on this property. That's why this bill, this section, is so essential. It is the war on women.

We had 19 people in the month of May of this year who died in the Tucson sector alone. Unfortunately, that is an increase from what happened a year ago in May. We need to end this problem. There are three reasons why this section is important:

One, sovereign countries control their borders. We need to be able to say we control our borders.

Two, I want to see a comprehensive immigration package go forward, but every time I hold a public town hall meeting, I know the first question that will be asked of me, which is: When will we control the border? There is a great deal of anger and anxiety out there, and it is very clear that we will never get consensus for other immigration reforms to take place until we have first reduced the anger and anxiety.

C.S. Lewis said, You do first things first, and second things will be added to it. If you do second things first, you will accomplish neither first nor second things.

This administration seems to be intent on trying to do, for whatever political purpose it may have, second things first. The first thing is to control the border. When we can truly look with an honest answer in the eye of our fellow citizens and say, ''America's borders are secure,'' then there will be a reduction in the anger and the anxiety that will allow us to move forward.

Three, we have to stop the violence against women. These rapes that take place on rape trees on American property—on Federal land on American property—because the Border Patrol does not have access to this area to patrol it effectively must stop. It's our duty and obligation to make that stop.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a member of the Committee on Natural Resources, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. I rise today to speak in opposition to the rule for H.R. 2578, the Conservation and Economic Growth Act.

First, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York for allowing me some time to speak on what I think are some of the good things in this package. Unfortunately, I don't think this is the appropriate way we ought to be debating some elements of the challenging issues of immigration reform in the House of Representatives.

First, these bills should be taken on their individual merits, not as a package. If we consider them together, we should then have an open rule that would allow us to then debate the merits of each individual bill.

□ 1250

Some of the bills contained in H.R. 2578 are helpful to my constituents, and I've supported them in the past. As an example, the measure offered by Mr. DENHAM allows the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to consider spillway improvements on the project by the Merced Irrigation District. This would allow an expansion of the capacity of that reservoir. Some 1,800 feet of the Merced River would be impacted; but as a result of it, we would gain perhaps as much as 78,000 acre feet of additional water supply that is much needed in the San Joaquin Valley. That is a good portion of this package.

There are also other areas that I support, language within the bill, to provide certainty to the grazing community that I am an original cosponsor for: grazing land, public lands that provide opportunities for America's beef industry that is very essential and very important.

However, this bill also contains controversial provisions that would be damaging to my constituents. H.R. 1505 gives the Customs and Border Protection authority to waive numerous laws pertaining to Federal land management.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. COSTA. I thank the gentlewoman.

H.R. 1505, as I was indicating, would waive numerous laws that pertain to very important elements of not only the coastal zone, but mining, public health, safety, and public review within 100 miles of the U.S. border. I oppose this measure because it is too sweeping in its efforts.

This bill also portends to provide border security problems on land management laws. We have challenges with our border; there is no question about it. I've supported additional funding for the Border Patrol agency. We must protect our borders, but to do so in a land management bill simply makes no sense. We should be taking up comprehensive immigration reform separately from land management bills. That is, I think, the method that we ought to apply.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Once again, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California's comments, although I'm going to have to push back slightly on a few of those, if it's at all possible.

This particular bill deals with 100 miles from the border simply because that is the legal definition of border land by both statute and judicial decree. It does not deal with coastal areas. In the committee, those areas were taken out because it is maritime area. The Border Patrol deals only with land borders and those particular areas.

The 36 rules that are waivable is precedent established by this Congress. In California, where the gentleman resides, when they wanted to finish the fence and it was being withheld by certain kinds of litigation, Homeland Security came up with 36 specific rules and regulations they wanted to be able to waive so they could do it. That was the precedent. The rules and regulations that are in this particular bill that's now title 15 are the exact same 36. That's where the precedent comes. That's why Homeland Security wanted that time to finish their job. That's what they needed this time.

However, I'm also making an amendment to this bill that will reduce those 36 because, to be honest, some of those never really were a problem. It will reduce it now to the 12 that the Border Patrol thinks are the most egregious. But there is precedent for that particular thing. All we are doing is trying to give the Border Patrol the same rights on Federal lands that they currently have on private property. There is no expansion of power and no expansion of jurisdiction. It's the ability to say our number one goal is to have border security; and if there is a rule or regulation getting in the way—and there are according to the GAO reports—those should be waived for the purpose of border security. That's the whole purpose. We're not expanding a power. We're not taking anything more than that in particular away.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), who would like to speak about this particular rule.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding, and I particularly appreciate it, given the subject matter I'm about to bring up.

Madam Speaker, I had introduced legislation months ago in this Congress, in fact, as far back as last August, H.R. 2942. It's the result of the massive flooding that we have suffered in the Missouri River bottom last summer.

The Corps of Engineers released unprecedented discharges of water coming down the Missouri River; 70,000 cubic feet per second was the previous high. We went through 160,000 cubic feet per second. It was a secret flood. No one could drive there, and no one could boat there. You had to fly over it to see it, and it was water that was perhaps a mile and a half wide downstream from Sioux City, Iowa, to just a few miles south of there, 8 miles wide at Blencoe, 11 miles wide upstream of Omaha. And south of Omaha downstream below Glenwood, it became 4 to 6 miles wide all the way down into Missouri, St. Joseph, Kansas City, and on about halfway towards St. Louis.

This was a massive flood of historic proportions. It could have been prevented; yet I have not challenged the Corps of Engineers on that. I've just said to them we need to fix the problem so it doesn't happen again. They have declared that this was a 500-year event, even though the USGS statistician said it is somewhere between a 70- and a 1,000-year event.

H.R. 2942 enjoys the support of almost everyone that represents the Missouri River watershed area. And, yes, naturally, it will be more downstream. But from Sioux City downstream to the mouth, there's only one that represents the river that has not signed onto this bill. It's bipartisan; it's the entire Iowa delegation and most of Nebraska. Yet the Rules Committee turned down my request to offer an amendment even though there is no discussion and no disagreement. My amendment was germane to the bill. They raised an issue of jurisdiction after I was dismissed from the committee. I don't think that was by plan or strategy.

My preparation is this: if a Member of Congress can't have their voice heard on an amendment that's germane when all of the boxes are checked and everything was done right to present it before the committee—by the way, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for calling for a recorded vote on this, a party-line vote. This time it was Democrats siding with STEVE KING. It's the second time the Rules Committee has turned me down this year on a legitimate request.

But I'd ask, if the House is going to work its will, as Speaker BOEHNER has said, we must have a Rules Committee that will allow when it's in proper form to allow that kind of a vote here on the House floor. I'm not going to get that debate. I'm not going to get that vote. And the people that I represent and all of us from Sioux City downstream to St. Louis now have been covered by not just water for an entire summer, more than 3 months of epic-proportions flooding, but now what's left for us, Madam Speaker, is sand and camel habitat.

I'll vote ''no,'' but I don't intend to try to bring down the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a valued member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlelady for the time as I rise in opposition to the rule.

I agree with my colleague from Iowa. I voted for the amendment to the rule offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida that would have allowed his amendment and others.

What are we scared of here? This is what we do. We are the House of Representatives. Let us work our will. Some of us will be for amendments, and some of us will be against amendments. But to hold all that power to a select group of people rather than allow the entire membership of this body to offer—again, we're talking about relevant amendments that meet the requirements, meet the rules of the House. What are we scared of in bringing that forward? Let's have a discussion on the merits.

Instead, what do we have here under this rule? We have 14 separate bills all cobbled together with a limited period of time to debate all of them and without an opportunity to amend them from both sides of the aisle that would have been afforded under either an open process or a structured process that allowed all the rules that met the requirements to be debated under this bill each for their own period of time.

Now, I want to discuss in particular what I find to be one of the most egregious provisions of the bill, which is really a solution in search of a problem, namely, this is an aspect of the bill that would waive over 40 environmental safety and public health laws and give Department of Homeland Security complete authority to seize control of Federal lands within 100 miles of our northern and southern borders.

□ 1300

Now this provision's reach is broad. It rolls back all of the relevant protection laws. And again, for what purpose? We had a discussion in the Rules Committee yesterday, and I, with my colleague Mr. BISHOP from Utah, had the opportunity to follow up.

And it is very clear in statute that in any wilderness or any Federal lands, under any level of protection, if they are in hot pursuit of a suspect, they are allowed to continue that pursuit in the wilderness. Wilderness areas are not some sort of legal sanctuary where criminals can go and not be pursued. That has nothing to do with the purpose of wilderness, and it has nothing to do with the reality of wilderness. Much of my district in Colorado has wilderness areas. And if, in fact, there were these lawless areas that the police couldn't go to pursue suspects, all the criminals would live in the wilderness, and they would simply come out to commit crimes and then go back in. That is simply not the case. Law enforcement officials assure me that whenever they're engaged in hot pursuit, they are able to, of course, continue to pursue immigrants or others, criminal aliens, et cetera, into wilderness territories.

Now this is a problem, the immigration issue, that cannot simply be enforced away. When we're talking about immigrants without papers, they are in our cities and towns. They are in our schools. They are the grandmother of the American grandkids. They are residents of our communities. They are people who I meet with on a regular basis. We try to help our immigrants get on with their lives, contribute to our country, and make it stronger.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I will be glad to yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. POLIS. Yes, there's a problem here. And thankfully, President Obama took a bold first step and reduced the number of illegal immigrants in this country by 800,000 to 1 million with one stroke of his pen. But frankly, the presence of any illegal immigrants in this country is an affront to our law and an affront to our national sovereignty.

We owe it to the American people to take up real immigration reform to ensure that there are not 15 million people here illegally, not 10 million people here illegally, but there are zero people here illegally through comprehensive immigration reform, of which President Obama took the bold first step of ensuring that young de facto Americans have their permission to work.

Look, our undocumented population is not fleeing into the wilderness, and the problem with immigration is not that we are not able to pursue them. It's simply not the facts on the ground. Let's deal with the real issue and replace our broken immigration issue with one that works and makes our country stronger.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I'm going to offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to consider the United States Call Center Worker and Consumer Protection Act. Call centers have been outsourced more than pretty much any other type of job from the United States. This bill will help keep call center jobs in America.

And to discuss his call center proposal, I'm pleased to yield 5 minutes to my colleague from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the U.S. Call Center Worker and Consumer Protection Act, H.R. 3596, is a bipartisan bill. It has 128 Democratic sponsors. It has seven Republican sponsors. And the bill is very straightforward.

It would do four things. It would require companies that plan to move a call center overseas to notify the Secretary of Labor no less than 120 days before the relocation occurs. If a company does move a call center overseas, that company would be ineligible for any Federal grants, contracts, or loans during the time that the call center workers are overseas. It would require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center overseas. And it would allow customers who are calling customer service communications at the beginning of the call to request that the call be transferred to a U.S.-based call center, if they so chose.

There are two dimensions to this bill: one is about jobs, and the other is about the security of consumer data. They are both very important. But let me start with the more important, which is jobs.

Now we talk a great deal in this Congress about how the number one priority has to be the creation of jobs. It does. And we have to move beyond the lip service that I think the Republican majority has given to the creation of jobs and actually put policies in place that will create jobs. But we also have to protect the jobs that we have. And one of the scourges of our economy right now is the outsourcing of jobs. Just in call centers alone, in the last 5 years, we have lost over 500,000 call center jobs. These are good, solid middle class jobs. To add insult to injury, the companies that are offshoring the jobs have taken millions of dollars of incentives from local taxpayers to open call centers in the U.S., only to offshore those jobs a short time later and leave local communities devastated and still paying the bill.

And the U.S. consumers are getting it. U.S. consumers have become more and more skeptical of the toll that outsourcing plays on the American economy. A paper by the Council on Foreign Relations noted that over two-thirds of Americans think companies sending jobs overseas is a major reason why the economy is ailing. In a paper done by a Harvard economist, more recent polling data suggests that these feelings have increased, where now over half of all Americans are ''resentful of businesses that send jobs overseas,'' and over 80 percent have ''concern for their family future'' due to outsourcing. So this job creation and job protection dimension of the bill that I have filed—as I say, with bipartisan support—would address these issues at least in one piece of our economy, and that is call centers.

Let me move to the issue of the protection and security of consumer data. Outsourcing call center work exposes the confidential and vulnerable personal information of American consumers to foreign workers. Foreign call centers are not subject to the same rigorous oversight as American call centers. As American companies look to less developed countries for offshoring their jobs, call center companies are actually subsourcing call center work without their American customers' knowledge.

It's expensive and difficult to conduct proper background checks on foreign call center workers, and up to one-quarter of all foreign call center applicants provide false or incorrect information. Foreign call center workers have been caught offering to sell personal consumer data to undercover journalists, threatening to release Americans' medical records and employment disputes, misleading American bank customers in schemes to bolster sales, and attempting to sell trade secrets to their employers' competitors.

A March 18, 2012, article published in The Times of London cited that undercover journalists were offered data such as credit card numbers, medical records, and loan data for hundreds of clients for just pennies. So clearly, from both dimensions here—from a job protection dimension and from a consumer data security dimension—this bill addresses both of these issues; and we simply must put in place these kinds of protections.

States have already done this. State legislatures in Florida, Georgia, and New Jersey have all passed bills that are very similar to the bill that we have before us. This is a commonsense proposal that enjoys bipartisan support. Let's vote ''no'' on the previous question so that we may consider this job-saving bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the efforts of my namesake from New York. I appreciate what he is doing. Chairman HASTINGS of the Resources Committee was extremely specific in which he said that after the Democrat Senate had sent over that atrocious omnibus bill with over 100 bills cobbled together, 75 of which have never had a hearing over here, we would only put together this type of regulation if it had gone through regular order. Unfortunately, the gentleman's bill has not had a hearing in any committee. It has not actually been reported yet, which is one of the reasons why it has not been included in this particular list. Although I'm not denigrating his efforts whatsoever.

I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Speaker, back in the nineties, I introduced a bill dealing with the wilderness area along the border. Originally, those on the other side of the aisle in the Clinton administration opposed the inclusion of roads in that wilderness area—and they opposed it strongly—until the Secretary of the Interior came down to the border and saw the habitat destruction being caused by a lack of proper enforcement.

This situation that's being proposed now is actually to try to get this issue addressed appropriately because you have individuals who are using environmental issues as a way of blocking the enforcement of law along the border.

And let me say this to both sides of the aisle: If you really do care about the habitat destruction along the border, if you really do care about the preservation of the wildlife opportunities down there, will you ask yourself, Why are you or the Republican side not addressing the issue that the Federal Government today has not taken care of the problem at the border because it hasn't taken care of the real source of the problem of the out-of-control borders, and that is employers hiring illegals.

I challenge you: Why does the Federal Government allow businesses to deduct the price of hiring illegals? Why isn't every Democrat and Republican on the New IDEA bill cutting off the tax deduction and the ability for people to profit from the tax code by profiting from illegal immigration?

□ 1310

Your impact on the border will be addressed more by changing your enforcement at the workplace and your Tax Code than it will be with whatever you do at the border. So I just ask you, if you care about the environment, if you care about eliminating the scourge of illegal immigration and all the problems, why aren't you stopping the subsidy of those who are creating the problem by employing them?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, ROB ANDREWS.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend, and it's so good to see her energy and enthusiasm back on this floor with us today. We welcome her.

286 days ago, the President of the United States came to this Chamber and addressed the number one problem that I hear about from my constituents, which is jobs for the American people.

I know that this bill raises very serious and important issues, and I applaud its authors and sponsors for bringing it to the House floor, but I think it's the wrong bill on the wrong day.

The President said that we should cut taxes for small businesses if they hire people. But we haven't taken a vote on that proposal, and we're not going to take one today.

The President said that we should put construction workers back to work building bridges and roads and our electric infrastructure, our intellectual infrastructure, but we're not voting on that proposal today.

The President said that firefighters and police officers and teachers who have been taken off the job should be put back on the job so they can spend money in the stores and the restaurants, but we're not voting on that proposal today, and we haven't voted it on it on any of the 286 days since the President proposed it.

Instead, we have the proposal in front of us that, again, is very serious, raises a lot of issues. But I suspect if most of us went back to our district today and said, ''What would you rather have us do, vote on three simple, clear ideas up or down on whether to create jobs for the American people or vote on this?'' I think they'd want us voting on the jobs bill.

Now, we have a version of that jobs bill that we have a chance to get on the floor, and that is Mr. BISHOP's proposal that says the following: If you do business in the United States of America, if you sell your products to the American consumer, then your call center ought to be in the United States of America.

How many of our constituents, Madam Speaker, are tired of placing a call to a call center and you don't know where it is, the person at the other end of the phone doesn't know what you're saying and doesn't understand what you're asking about.

Should we be using American tax dollars to reward companies that outsource call center jobs? I think the answer is no.

This would be one simple and clear idea that we ought to put on this floor so the Members have a chance, by voting ''no'' on the previous question, to say, Let's take a vote on the proposition that you can't use American taxpayers' dollars to outsource American jobs in call centers. And then maybe some day, after 286 days, we'll finally get around to the President's idea to create jobs in small businesses in this country.

Vote ''no'' on the previous question, ''no'' on the rule.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague, the ranking member on the Rules Committee, for allowing me to speak.

I'm a strong supporter and an original cosponsor or of the U.S. Call Center Worker and Consumer Protection Act. This legislation will help us protect U.S. consumers and level the playing field for American workers who have seen thousands of call center jobs needlessly sent offshore in recent years. Namely, this bill would require the call center to notify the Secretary of Labor at least 120 days before relocating outside the United States. It would require the Department of Labor to publicly list the firms that have moved call center jobs overseas and then make those very firms ineligible for any direct or indirect Federal loan for 5 years. To protect consumers, this legislation requires call center employees to notify U.S. consumers where they are located, if asked, and will require that call center to transfer calls to an American call center for questions.

The U.S. Call Center Worker and Consumer Protection Act has support of both sides of the aisle, and I ask all my colleagues in the Chamber to stand with American consumers particularly, but also with these American jobs, and support this legislation and, again, support the effort to make sure we can have a vote on the House floor for that.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I appreciate many of the comments that have been made here. I'm glad the gentleman from Colorado is still here, because in the memo of understanding which controls what the Border Patrol does, Border Patrol is able to go anywhere they want to on foot or horseback. They may go on a motorized vehicle on existing public administrative roads. But there is nothing in the memo of understanding that extends there to prevent them unless it is an existing exigent emergency. And the problem the Border Patrol actually has is no one really knows how to define exigent emergencies. That's one of the reasons why they want to have something specific in the memo of understanding—nor the statute does not help them in those particular areas—because, indeed, land managers have handled those exigent circumstances differently.

I would like to say one other thing as well, because there are some places in this Nation in which the idea of title XIV in this bill, which is the bill that deals with border security, has been expanded with information that is simply inaccurate. Montana, for example, has a 545-mile border with Canada. It has different issues than the southern border—but it's not numbers—but it is remote, and who can cross that border illegally is significant.

The junior Senator from Montana actually asked the GAO to come up with a study on border security in the North, and the report was only 1 percent of the northern border is secure. That was his study that he wanted. Despite the fact that the Missoulian has warned about al-Qaeda plots in Montana, that the Border Patrol chief from Montana has begged some kind of action—indeed, this month the Border Patrol has sent out a warning of the use of terrorists who are talking about—chatter abusing wildfires as an area to distract so they can come in entrance, and one of the States they specifically mentioned was Montana.

Even though that is taking place, there is a campaign going on where this particular issue, border security, has been hijacked in the name of politics. And only because it is my idea that's being the center of this, I find that somewhat unusual, somewhat offensive. It is an effort to say that this effort to try to control our borders is related in some way to the PATRIOT Act or the REAL ID Act or, indeed, that it deals with some other element of expansion of power. Some people have gone as far as saying it is a land grab.

It is unusual to me that this concept of border security was presented in the Senate on an appropriations bill and was passed by a voice vote. Then the bill in which this amendment was placed was then passed by the Senate, and the junior Senator from Montana did not object to the voice vote and actually voted for it and now claims that this same idea is an expansion of government power, thus, something not work.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

What I also found somewhat distressing is that in this campaign in Montana there is another group called Montana Hunters and Anglers, who, unfortunately, are simply a partisan hit group that are taking out ads directly against this particular provision and saying that other members in the delegation from Montana are supporting something that is wrong. Unfortunately, the members of that hit group have ties to Democrat organizations. The secretary is part of the Obama Committee in the State of Montana. The treasurer is a former Democratic staffer up there.

This group, the Montana Hunters and Anglers, are a faux group. The real supporters of this bill are people like the Montana Wool Growers Association, the Montana Association of State Grazing Districts, the Montana Public Lands Council, Montana Stock Growers Association. These are real groups, and they all support this particular provision and this particular bill because they realize the value of border security that takes place. They also realize what Secretary Napolitano recognized: that if you improve border security in the area by removing violators from public lands—those are the people that destroy things—the land value is enhanced. It is better for Border Patrol if they have enhanced ability to control those particular borders.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is advised that he has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York has 6½ minutes remaining.

□ 1320

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlelady. And in response to my friend from Utah, I want to quote the MOU specifically. It says:

> Nothing in this MOU is intended to prevent CBP-BP agents from exercising existing exigent/emergency authorities to access lands, including authority to conduct motorized off-road pursuit of suspected CBVs at any time.

And it goes on to say in wilderness and wilderness study areas, and all different areas.

In fact, the committee had a hearing on this very topic. There were three instances cited by Chairman BISHOP on this, and it was determined that those were incorrect interpretations of this existing MOU by local managers, and it would be addressed through the command structure. So again, a solution in search of a problem.

We all want to address the problem of illegal immigration in this country, but that problem cannot be characterized as illegal immigrants fleeing into the wilderness. It simply isn't the problem. If there are suspects of any type of criminal nature fleeing into wilderness and there is law enforcement in hot pursuit, they continue; they continue, and they don't stop. If they stop, they'll be in trouble with their superiors, and we'll work it out through the command change.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, we have wasted yet another opportunity to pass some bipartisan legislation here. Everybody

knows this bill is not going to be taken up in the Senate, so it's again a day and a half of exercise in some kind of procedure by the House of Representatives. By combining worthwhile proposals with extreme and partisan proposals, they've continued to move forward with an ineffective and unnecessary partisan agenda.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. In my last minute, Madam Speaker, there are a couple of things I would like to say. First of all, I appreciate the words that were read. Unfortunately, reality is different. One of the reasons why this particular provision is supported by the Border Patrol Union as well as the Association of Retired Border Patrol Agents, reality is sometimes different than what we think it should be. And I also have a list of three pages worth of groups who support not only this provision but the other 13 provisions.

I must in closing, though, bid the apology of the gentlelady of New York for one thing. One of the former Parliamentarians wrote a book and said when we put C–SPAN cameras in here, everyone started to read their speeches, and our debates became extremely dull. That's true. But when you read something, you don't make a misstatement. I did. I did a couple. My amendment does not reduce it from 36 down to 12; it reduces it from 36 to 16. I also used the ''disingenuine'' in talking about the gentlelady's remarks. That was the wrong word. That was, indeed, the word I said, but it is not what I meant to say, and I apologize for saying that. That goes over the line of comity and I'm sorry, and I just want you to know that I apologize for ''oopsing.'' That should only be done by Governors, not by Members of Congress.

Madam Speaker, in conclusion, each of these bills in here has been heard by the committee of jurisdiction. It's had a hearing. It's had a markup. The difference between this and other bills that we have seen in the past is that everything had to go through regular order first. Nothing was included in this rule that had not gone through regular order through this particular committee.

It's a good bill. It's a good rule. It's a fair rule, and I urge its adoption.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 688 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3596) to require a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center overseas and to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2 of this resolution.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. With that, 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 on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam 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 the electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 178, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 381]

YEAS—238

Adams	Bishop (UT)	Canseco
Aderholt	Black	Cantor
Akin	Blackburn	Capito
Alexander	Bonner	Carter
Altmire	Bono Mack	Cassidy
Amash	Boren	Chabot
Amodei	Boustany	Chaffetz
Austria	Brady (TX)	Coble
Bachmann	Brooks	Coffman (CO)
Barletta	Broun (GA)	Cole
Bartlett	Buchanan	Conaway
Barton (TX)	Bucshon	Cravaack
Bass (NH)	Buerkle	Crawford
Benishek	Burgess	Crenshaw
Berg	Burton (IN)	Culberson
Biggert	Calvert	Davis (KY)
Bilbray	Camp	Denham
Bilirakis	Campbell	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)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
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
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
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
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—178

Ackerman
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
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
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)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Bachus
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Crowley
Griffin (AR)
Holden
Huizenga (MI)
Jackson (IL)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Miller (FL)
Nugent
Sánchez, Linda T.
Towns
Young (FL)

□ 1350

Messrs. HINOJOSA, ELLISON, McNERNEY, and CLYBURN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 13, 2012.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a scanned copy of a letter received from Ms. Amy B. Chan, State Election Director, Office of the Secretary of State, State of Arizona, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held June 12, 2012, the Honorable Ron Barber was elected Representative to Congress for the Eighth Congressional District, State of Arizona.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

KEN BENNETT, SECRETARY OF STATE,
STATE OF ARIZONA,
Phoenix, AZ, June 13, 2012.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Tuesday, June 12, 2012, for Representative in Congress from the Eighth Congressional District of Arizona, show that Ron Barber received 101,559 or 52.02 percent of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Ron Barber was elected as Representative in Congress from the Eighth Congressional District of Arizona.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all counties involved and the election has been officially canvassed, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

AMY B. CHAN,
State Election Director.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE RON BARBER, OF ARIZONA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona, the Honorable RON BARBER, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect BARBER and the members of the Arizona delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and Representative-elect BARBER will please raise his right hand.

Mr. BARBER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 112th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE RON BARBER TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

(Mr. PASTOR of Arizona asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the world sometimes leads us down strange and troubling paths, and the fact that we are gathered today swearing in a new Member of Congress into the most deliberative body in the world is a tribute to our former colleague Gabby Giffords. It is a tribute to the resilience of the people of Arizona, a tribute to our strong and fruitful democracy that has continually endured hard and challenging times, and it is a tribute to our new colleague, RON BARBER.

So it is with great pride and renewed zeal for the strength of the American

people and for our system of governing that I introduce our newest colleague, Congressman RON BARBER.

I have gotten to know RON better over the last few months, and there is no one who will work harder to make sure that the people of the Eighth District are treated fairly, with dignity and with honor.

RON and his wife, Nancy, have dedicated their lives to southern Arizona. They have run a business for more than 30-some-odd years, a business that helps young parents provide for their own children. They've raised their two daughters, Jenny and Crissi, right here at home in Tucson. They are watching their four grandchildren grow up in Tucson.

But RON also wanted to do more for his community, so he spent 30 years with the Arizona Division of Developmental Disabilities, where he worked countless hours helping people with disabilities get out of government-run institutions and back into their communities, fully employed, contributing to their society, and living with their families. His service then expanded beyond those with disabilities, becoming Gabby's district director and coordinating all her efforts to assist her constituents experiencing personal problems with the Federal Government. And now these same people are RON's constituents.

Welcome to the House, RON BARBER.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my distinguished colleague, JEFF FLAKE.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On behalf of the Republican members of the Arizona delegation, welcome, RON BARBER. We are glad to have you here.

Nobody would have wished for the circumstances that made this seat vacant. We all miss our colleague Gabby Giffords, but it was her wish that you fill this seat for the remainder of her term. She got her wish as was the wish of so many Arizonans. Those of us who have worked with your office, with the capable staff during this trying time, have been very impressed with your commitment to the State of Arizona, and that commitment will now continue with your being a Member of Congress.

We welcome you here.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is now with great pride that I yield to our distinguished new Member, Congressman RON BARBER.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. BARBER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I would like to thank the Arizona delegation for that warm welcome—and all of you—for this amazing welcome on my first day here.

I also want to thank Speaker BOEHNER for his long and dedicated service to our country and for swearing me in today.

And to my family in the gallery and to my grandchildren who are here on the floor, thank you, all of you, my family, for your support and love, without which I would not be here today.

□ 1400

I have the most amazing family. I think everyone would say that, but I am very blessed to have them in my life, especially over this past year and a half. And to my high school sweetheart and wife, Nancy, I love you dearly and look forward to celebrating our 45th wedding anniversary tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here on the floor of the House in the very spot where 5 months ago my friend and my predecessor, Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords, bravely delivered her resignation from Congress. I want to thank the Congresswoman for her vision and leadership and the inspiration she continues to give to our country. Gabby, southern Arizona misses you dearly, and we cannot wait to have you home.

Today, as I begin my service in this, the people's House, I'm mindful that the stakes for our Nation are very high. They are too high not to set aside political division in favor of seeking common ground, too high to use our words as weapons, too high to think of those with whom we disagree as villains. As an Arizonan, I look to the example of Congressman Mo Udall and Senator Barry Goldwater, two leaders in their respective parties who disagreed much, but did so without being disagreeable. They came together many times to do what was right for their State and their country. I'm going to approach my work for the people of southern Arizona with an eye not toward partisan victory, but toward American achievement.

We as a country have much to achieve. We must protect middle class families at a time when our middle class is slowly disappearing. We must honor our veterans and military families by ensuring that the more than 100,000 veterans I represent in southern Arizona and every other American veteran and servicemember receives the services and benefits they have earned.

We must ensure the dignity and health of every American senior in retirement. We must secure our border so that border residents are safe on their land, and impede the flow of drugs into our communities and the illegal drug money out of our country. And we must create jobs with innovative energy technologies, improvements in our essential infrastructure, and by supporting local small businesses to grow.

I look forward to working across party lines to achieve these goals for the good of my constituents and for all Americans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Arizona, the whole number of the House is 433.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2578, CONSERVATION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH ACT

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 175, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

AYES—240

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
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
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
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
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
Shuler
Shuster

Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
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 (IN)

NOES—175

Ackerman
Altmire
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
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
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews
Cardoza
Crowley
Frank (MA)
Griffin (AR)
Holden
Huizenga (MI)
Jackson (IL)
Kaptur
Lewis (CA)
Miller (FL)
Pingree (ME)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Towns
Velázquez
Young (FL)

□ 1411

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.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 4348.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. McKinley moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4348 be instructed to insist on the provisions contained in title V of the House bill (relating to coal combustion residuals).

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 3238

Mr. PASCRELL. I ask unanimous consent to remove Congressman HAROLD ROGERS and Congressman RICK BERG from H.R. 3238.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CONSERVATION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill H.R. 2578.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 688 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2578.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1415

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2578) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act related to a segment of the Lower Merced River in California, and for other purposes, with Mr. BASS of New Hampshire in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Conservation and Economic Growth Act is aimed squarely at cutting government red tape and bureaucracy to boost local economic development and job creation. This legislation contains 14 commonsense bills from the House Natural Resources Committee, nearly all of which have received bipartisan support.

By solving problems and reducing red tape, this legislation will have a real impact on the people it affects. Among its many economic and job creation benefits, the bill will encourage tourism and recreation by ensuring public access to public lands. It will promote responsible use of our resources. It will protect the environment. It will secure Federal lands along our borders. And it promotes clean and renewable hydropower.

Month after month, Mr. Chairman, Republicans in Congress have been focused on encouraging and supporting new job creation. The House has passed over 30 job creation bills that sit in the Senate, where Democrat leaders have refused to take any action.

By reducing red tape, promoting American-made energy, and streamlining bureaucracy, we can start creating jobs for tens of millions of Americans who are looking for work. The Conservation and Economic Growth Act fits into this same job creation mold.

When it comes to the Environmental Protection Agency, the American public is well aware of the ability of this Federal agency to slow our economy with debilitating regulations. And when it comes to our Federal lands, which are predominated located in the Western part of the United States, there is plenty of bureaucracy and red tape to go around.

In that regard, there are four primary Federal land management agencies: the Bureau of Land Management; the Forest Service; the Fish & Wildlife Service; and the National Park Service. Combined, they manage over 600 million acres of Federal land and have over 60,000 Federal employees. Many of these Federal employees do important, helpful work. But there are many times when their actions or outdated Federal laws have a tremendous negative impact on their surrounding communities. But these Federal policies, restrictions, lawsuits, and the bureaucratic decisions can harm local economies and the public's ability to access public lands for the multiple uses for which these public lands were intended.

It doesn't have to take Federal spending or taxpayer money to solve these problems. It simply takes Congress making commonsense changes in laws and regulations to restore reasonableness, transparency, accountability, and, yes, Mr. Chairman, sometimes sanity to the actions of the Federal Government.

That is the purpose of this underlying legislation: to fix local and national problems caused by Federal red tape and policies that are harming the public and our economy throughout America. We will hear more specific information from the sponsors of these solutions during the debate this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation also reflects the promises of House Republicans when they were elected as a new

majority in 2010. The Conservation and Economic Growth Act is an efficient way to uphold Republicans' commitment to an open and transparent House.

The text of the act has been online since last Tuesday and available for Members and the public to read now for a week. Each and every one of the 14 bills that is in this package has had a public hearing, has been open to amendment in the committee, has been voted on in the committee, and amendments will be debated and voted on here today by the full House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this stands in stark contrast to the previous way of doing business, when we had monster omnibus bills that were forced through the House without any chance of amendment. In fact, one can compare this small 14-bill package that has undergone full public and legislative review with the 2009 monster omnibus lands bill enacted into law when the Democrats controlled both houses of Congress. The 2009 omnibus bill was over 1,200 pages in length, it cost $10 billion, and it contained over 170 bills, including 75 that had never been considered in the House.

□ 1420

Yet through all of this process, not one single amendment was allowed to be offered, and even the minority—the Republicans at that time—were denied an opportunity with the motion to recommit.

Well, those days of the monster omnibus are over. No longer will controversial bills that haven't seen the light of day be hidden deep inside a thousand-page bill. Since the start of this Congress, we reviewed bills one by one in the Natural Resources Committee. Each has had a public subcommittee hearing; and once the committee acts, the full House considers them in a transparent manner.

This bill, the underlying legislation we're dealing with, lives up to this standard. It is an antidote to the abusive processes of the past. It is a bite-sized package that can be easily read and today is getting a thorough debate on the House floor.

So now the House can act to approve this bill to roll back red tape, to restore some commonsense to solve problems, and to boost economic activity. This bill deserves bipartisan support, and I urge my colleagues to vote for its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2578.

Now, some of you may recall the old Rod Serling television show, ''The Twilight Zone.'' At the beginning of each episode, Serling would explain that viewers were ''about to enter another dimension—a dimension not only of sight and sound, but of mind, a journey into a wondrous land of imagination. Next stop, the Twilight Zone.''

Well, that is very much where we are this week on the House floor. We are truly entering another dimension—a wondrous land of paranoid imagination. Republicans call it the ''Operational Control Zone,'' but it is really the ''Drone Zone.''

Submitted for your consideration are the following facts:

This week, world leaders are gathering in Rio to deal with the threat of global warming. Meanwhile, the majority has us gathered here to address the threat sea lions pose to salmon. Right now, firefighters are working day and night to try to contain wildfires in forests in Colorado and New Mexico, and the majority has us working here to give away old-growth Alaskan forest.

We have just 2 weeks before the transportation authorization bill expires and student loan rates double. And what are we doing? We are spending an entire day on a piece of legislation that has zero chance of being enacted into law. It is a package of bad ideas that are largely irrelevant to the real issues facing our Nation.

Title I of this bill would flood part of a Wild and Scenic River. Title III is an earmark to an Alaskan Native corporation that will facilitate clear-cutting in the Tongass National Forest. Titles IV and V appear to create new parks, but include harmful provisions that would cripple the management of these parks. Title VII would authorize the death penalty for sea lions whose only crime is eating fish. Title X would overturn the protections for endangered turtles from being run over by off-road vehicles. Title XI would extend the practice of below-cost grazing on public lands—a bargain-basement discount for cattlemen all across this country not paying their fair share. Actually, being a type of Federal welfare for cattlemen. And unbelievably, title XIV would create a 100-mile ''drone zone'' along our northern and southern borders within which the Border Patrol could suspend 36 environmental laws and seize control of all public land management.

Let me spend a moment here talking about what I find to be the most offensive part of this legislation: title XIV. This is the national map. What the Republicans do here today is they take a 100-mile area all along the northern border of the United States and the southern border of the United States and they create a new area. And this new area is really a drone zone. The reason that it's a drone zone is that it allows for 36 health and safety and environmental laws to be overridden, and it would expand the area where the Department of Homeland Security could use drones for surveillance. It allows the Department of Homeland Security to shut down national parks at a moment's notice. So all of a sudden the Department of Homeland Security can start using drones in this area.

Now, when you add up all of the space that is now included, it is equal to the total area of California, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut combined, which will now be in this new special area that has the Department of Homeland Security determining where drones can be used. And as we know, that won't be just for ensuring environmental laws not being violated. They'll be over this whole area.

Now, if you take a look at this map, I understand why the gentleman from Utah introduced this bill. Utah is far away from the Republican drone zone. They're not within the hundred miles of the border of the Mexican or Canadian people. But what if you live in Maine? Nearly your entire State is in this drone zone. Want to go to Acadia National Park? Better check with the Department of Homeland Security and the Republicans first. Or Minnesota: maybe you want to take a trip up to the Boundary Waters. Better check with the Department of Homeland Security and the Republicans first. Or Olympia National Park in Washington State: better check with the Department of Homeland Security or the Republicans first.

Want clean air in the drone zone? Better make sure the Department of Homeland Security and the Republicans haven't exempted the Clean Air Act. Want to drink some water after a long hike? Better make sure the Department of Homeland Security and the Republicans haven't waived the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Make no mistake, this isn't a bill that actually addresses America's immigration issues. Neither the Department of Homeland Security nor its Customs and Border Protection division support this bill. They don't want this authority, but the Republicans are insisting on giving them this authority—100 miles along the Mexican and Canadian borders.

The GOP's drone zone bill does not increase resources for border agents, but instead turns over our natural resources to the Department of Homeland Security. Passing this bill does not increase the number of Border Patrol agent boots on the ground. It just ignores the protections against trampling on sovereign and sacred ground like tribal grave sites. It does not look for a path toward citizenship. It tells families on vacation or a picnic that the Department of Homeland Security can kick you off a path at any moment.

Under this bill, ranchers and their cattle can be herded away by border agents, jeopardizing their entire ranching operation. Families and visitors to public parks can have their trips canceled. And the water, the air, and the land will be left unprotected.

Instead of working to pass a DREAM Act to help solve the immigration challenge, House Republicans instead want to create a nightmare scenario at our borders. That's why more than 50 Hispanic and Latino groups have joined with environmental organizations,

tribal groups, and organizations representing sportsmen and hunters to oppose the Republican drone zone bill. Fifty Hispanic and Latino groups opposing this bill.

We might be spending 4 hours here today on the House floor in a legislative twilight zone created by the majority considering a bill that isn't grounded in reality. But as we do, let us not forget that there are millions of Americans outside of this alternative reality who are trying to make ends meet, trying to keep their families together and safe, and hoping to maintain the environmental protections which make our country great.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), the primary sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. DENHAM. First, let me thank the chairman for not only allowing all of these bills to come up, but doing it in a very transparent fashion, allowing debate from both sides of the aisle and amendments from both sides of the aisle. This truly has been a transparent debate, giving the American public a chance to see exactly what we are doing here.

But let me talk about this unimaginable place that some of the extremists like to talk about. The unimaginable place I'm talking about is California's Central Valley, where you have twice the national average of unemployment, where some areas of the district are 30 to 40 percent unemployment. That's truly un-American, when you have a solution for Republicans and Democrats to come together, and yet you have some extremists who are willing to ignore putting people back to work. It is an unimaginable place, but one that both parties should take note of it, one that the President should not only take note of, but the President should actually come out and visit. Now the President likes to come to L.A. and San Francisco quite frequently. He's been there over a dozen times, but yet not once when Republicans and Democrats have invited him to come to the Central Valley and see the devastation, see the unimaginable place that this high unemployment leaves our community in. That's why you've got both Republicans and Democrats coming together and supporting this bill in a bipartisan fashion.

When the Merced Wild and Scenic River was designated, it encroached nearly half a mile into an Federal Energy Regulatory Commission operational boundary for New Exchequer Dam. Aligning the Merced Wild and Scenic River boundary with the standing FERC project boundary will allow FERC to considered MID's proposal to raise their spillway gates by just 10 feet. We're talking about 70,000 acre feet of water that'll create 840 jobs. Now, this is not the 5 to 6 million acre feet that we need, but it's a small step. But if the extremists cannot even support this small step where you've got Valley Republicans and Democrats coming together, the question is, what really is this unimaginable, un-American place that they talk about? We need thousands of jobs in the Central Valley. We need many more projects like this. We need Los Vaqueros, Exchequer. We need Temperance Flat. We need to raise Shasta in a fashion that Republicans and Democrats continue to agree on.

While some say that this will set a precedent for undoing Wild and Scenic designations, this area being discussed naturally—naturally—floods already, and it will impact less than 1 mile of the 122.5 miles of the Merced River. Again this is one small project. One desperately needed project, but one very small project in this unimaginable place.

Title I of H.R. 2578 is commonsense legislation that will allow for desperately needed storage; again, up to 70,000 acre feet, which has the potential for generation of an additional 10,000 megawatt hours of clean, renewable electricity. Why wouldn't we want clean, renewable electricity? Hydro is not necessarily the clean energy they like to talk about.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DENHAM. This will also create increased recreational activity in the area and agricultural benefits.

Furthermore, if a Wild and Scenic River designation is made by congressional or administrative action, we should be able to adjust those boundaries, especially if it serves the greater good. Again, this is not the greater good that some like to talk about because they're not focused on American jobs. They're focused on a small set of criteria that they don't understand in our agricultural areas.

To not adjust the boundary because it has never been done before is an inadequate justification. Again, this is a bipartisan bill that has support on both sides of the aisle from Members of the Central Valley, and one that was open for public debate, was open for amendments. And again, I'd like to thank the chairman for having such a transparent process. I encourage Member support of H.R. 2578.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water and Power.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member on the committee for allowing me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to H.R. 2578, the Republican lands package. Specifically, I do oppose title XIV, which is H.R. 1565 of H.R. 2578, the National Security and Federal Lands Protection Act.

This legislation creates a 100-mile—as explained by Mr. MARKEY—from the north border and 100 miles from the south border inland. You might call it operational control, or if you want to call it drone zone, it still waives over 36 landmark laws to give Homeland Security complete operational control and immediate access to these lands.

Some of these 36 laws that would be suspended in all or part of the 18 States affected would include the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Clean Air Act, hazardous waste laws, tribal preservation law, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and the National Park Service Organic Act. This legislation overreaches in waiving dozens of environmental laws disguised as a solution for immigration reform. Guess again.

I was born and raised in the border town of Brownsville, Texas. My hometown is within this Operational Control Zone, or drone zone, if you want to call it that. I am currently the ranking member of the Water and Power Subcommittee, with jurisdiction over the Bureau of Reclamation, and several of the projects owned and operated by Reclamation are in this drone zone. There is concern about how the projects could be managed or mismanaged and its impact in this zone.

Title XIV, which also includes Canada, would disrupt longstanding treaty agreements between the United States and Mexico, and again with Canada, on how we manage our water and power resources. And, of course, the drought planning for the Colorado River.

The projects are part of the Colorado River basin system, like Reclamation's Yuma desalting plant, and are also in the drone zone. One thousand miles of canal and related water delivery infrastructure that provides for a $5 billion economy—$5 billion for the States of Arizona and California—would be compromised as they are in this drone zone.

The proposed legislation will also impede Reclamation from meeting its mission requirements in water delivery obligations pursuant to the 1944 treaty between the U.S. and Mexico on the use of the Colorado and Tijuana rivers, and the Rio Grande. Title XIV also impacts the United States' ability to negotiate with Canada regarding the Columbia River. In fact, several projects of the Federal Columbia River power system in Washington State and Montana are in this operating zone. Water has no international boundary. This is a blatant attack on the environment, on the lives of American citizens, and it threatens their health and safety.

We strongly believe that compliance with laws and regulations is key to ensuring the rights of borderland landowners so rural communities are protected. Ensuring the security of America's borders is an important goal. This bill will not enhance our Nation's border security and will do great harm to our borders and our environment.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 2578. I have a list of 54 organizations in opposition, and I would like

just a moment to read some of them—my colleague has already mentioned the Latino organization:

Alaska Wilderness League; American Civil Liberties Union; BorderLinks; California Coastal Commission; Center for Biological Diversity; Citizens for a Safe and Secure Border; Citizens for Border Solution; Coastal States Organization; Cochise County Chapter Progressive Democrats of America; Defenders of Wildlife; Earthjustice; Equality Alliance of San Diego County; Escondido Human Rights Committee; Green Valley Samaritans; Klamath Forest Alliance; Labor Council for Latin American Advancement; League of Conservation Voters; Hispanic National Bar Association; National Estuarine Research Reserve Association; National Parks Conservation Association; National Resources Defense Council; No More Deaths Tucson; Northern Alaska Environmental Center; San Diego Foundation for Change; Southern Border Communities Coalition; and the list goes on.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND LATINO ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING TITLE XIV, H.R. 1505, THE NATIONAL SECURITY AND FEDERAL LANDS PROTECTION ACT

1. Alaska Wilderness League
2. American Civil Liberties Union
3. BorderLinks
4. California Coastal Commission
5. Center for Biological Diversity
6. Citizens for a Safe and Secure Border
7. Citizens for Border Solutions
8. Coastal States Organization
9. Cochise County Chapter Progressive Democrats of America
10. Defenders of Wildlife
11. Earthjustice
12. Equality Alliance of San Diego County
13. Escondido Human Rights Committee
14. Green Valley Samaritans
15. Hispanic Access Foundation
16. Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities
17. Hispanic Federation
18. Hispanic National Bar Association
19. Klamath Forest Alliance
20. Labor Council for Latin American Advancement
21. Latino and Latina Roundtable of the San Gabriel and Pomona Valley
22. League of Conservation Voters
23. League of United Latin American Citizens
24. National Association of Hispanic Federal Executives
25. National Association of Hispanic Publications
26. National Association of Latin American and Caribbean Communities
27. National Conference of Puerto Rican Women
28. National Council of La Raza
29. National Estuarine Research Reserve Association
30. National Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities
31. National Hispanic Coalition on Aging
32. National Hispanic Environmental Council
33. National Hispanic Medical Association
34. National Institute for Latino Policy
35. National Latino Coalition on Climate Change
36. National Parks Conservation Association
37. Natural Resources Defense Council
38. No More Deaths—Tucson
39. Northern Alaska Environmental Center
40. San Diego Foundation for Change
41. School Sisters of Notre Dame, Douglas, AZ
42. Southern Border Communities Coalition
43. Southern Border Communities Coalition, Arizona Chapter
44. Southwest Voter Registration and Education Project
45. St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
46. Texas Border Coalition
47. The Sierra Club
48. The Wilderness Society
49. Tucson Samaritans
50. U.S. Hispanic Leadership Institute
51. United States-Mexico Chamber of Commerce
52. Vet Voices
53. Voces Verdes
54. Western Environmental Law Center

□ 1440

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, just to correct the record, there is nothing in this bill that affects the Bureau of Reclamation or the hydro-dams on the Columbia River in my district.

I'm very pleased right now to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), who is the author of title III of this bill.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2578. I'm primarily interested in the Sealaska provision. It's very important to understand something: the Alaska Tongass National Forest is 17 million acres of land. We're asking for 77,000 acres of land to be transferred to the Sealaska Corporation that has already been cut.

There is no old-growth timber involved in this. It gets Sealaska away from sensitive areas, including municipal watersheds, and onto areas already zoned for timber management on a road system. The exchange lands are near Native villages on Prince of Wales Island where unemployment is about 25 percent.

This bill supports the Forest Service by making Sealaska timberlands more accessible to rural and mostly Native communities, where unemployment is above 25 percent. Sealaska's land base will then support a sustainable timber rotation in perpetuity.

This bill affects approximately 77,000 acres in the 17 million-acre Tongass forest. It's already protected by designation, so it cannot be harvested.

Sealaska and its contractors combined make up the largest for-profit sector employer in southeast Alaska, providing over 360 jobs. Including direct and indirect payroll, it's almost 500 jobs.

This bill also finalizes Sealaska's Native land claim rights passed in 1971, and it does not entitle the Natives to an acre above what the 1971 Native Claims Settlement this Congress passed that limits it to them.

H.R. 2578 supports timber jobs while conserving environmentally sensitive lands in community watersheds. Failure to pass this bill may spell the end of Sealaska's timber program as early as 2012 and the loss of timber jobs in an Alaska private industry that's decreased 90 percent since 1990 because of action of this Congress when they passed the Alaska National Lands Act and put most of the land off limits.

Because the Forest Service is either unwilling or unable to offer an adequate timber supply in southeast Alaska, the remaining industry relies on Sealaska timber. The Alaska Forest Association testified:

AFA strongly supports the passage of H.R. 2578 without delay. Passage of this bill is critical to the future of our remaining industry.

Most importantly, the bill finalizes the land claim settlement for 20,000 Alaska Native jobs in southeast Alaska.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go to the ''Bull Dip'' awards, the Bull Dip awards for information put out on this legislation. We're talking about 77,000 acres that have already been cut. The Bull Dip award goes to those people who say there's transfer of over 50,000 miles of road. There may be 5,000 miles' worth, maybe 500 miles of road, but it's already roads that have been built on acreage that has already been harvested.

The other area of the Bull Dip award is the fact that the road will not be accessible to public use. It will be used for public use. There are no restrictions, not any action that will be taken to prohibit anybody from choosing these lands or moving on these lands.

All I'm asking today is give—an action of this Congress in 1971—the right to the Native people to land that's not old-growth timber.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. It's not old-growth timber. This is land that's already been cut over, but they want to use it like Silviculture, growing timber forever, not like the Forest Service now, keeping old timber not cut. This is the right thing to do.

The idea that we would have people sending out propaganda—I know there's an outfit called Red States saying this is going to cost the Federal Government money and it's a giveaway. It's strange that that same operation doesn't like the Federal Government. I'm asking that this Federal land that's already been harvested over be given to the Alaska Native people, as they should have it. And they're trying to stay away from the old-growth timber. That's what they're trying to do. If I was doing it myself, I'd cut the old-growth timber; it's dying anyway. But nobody wants to do it; they don't recognize it.

I sat on this floor and watched the Alaska National Lands Act under GEORGE MILLER, my good friend, say: don't worry, we'll have a timber industry. We've lost 15,000 jobs in southeast

Alaska—high-paying jobs—because of the so-called ''environmental movement.'' That does not make sense. That does not make sense for America. This is a renewable resource that should be utilized correctly. Let's pass this legislation.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from the State of Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill, which would result in the Tongass National Forest in Alaska, our Nation's largest and wildest national forest, being opened to additional logging. At 17 million acres—roughly the size of West Virginia—the Tongass is the crown jewel of our forest system.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I would love to do that, dear colleague, but I can't. I need to be back in Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Seventeen million acres are set aside already.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut controls the time.

Ms. DELAURO. If the gentleman would just back off. Okay?

At 17 million acres—roughly the size of West Virginia—the Tongass is the crown jewel of our forest system. Along with the Chugach National Forest in Alaska, it boasts the world's most intact temperate rainforest, with centuries-old trees providing critical habitat for wolves, grizzly bears, wild salmon, bald eagles and other wildlife. The Tongass is also a vital piece of the tourism industry in Alaska, allowing visitors from around the world to take in a true environmental spectacle.

I have experienced the beauty of the Tongass firsthand when I got to travel through the forest on an old Navy minesweeper 10 years ago. It's hard to imagine why anyone would want to spoil such a perfect example of nature's magnificence, but the bill before us would do exactly that. It removes 100,000 acres of some of the most used and visited lands in southeast Alaska from public ownership and gives them to the Sealaska Corporation, who plans to clear-cut the vast majority of its land selections for timber. This is approximately 20,000 acres over Sealaska's legal entitlement under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement of 1971.

With 290,000 acres of land and an additional 560,000 acres of subsurface rights, Sealaska is already the largest private landholder in southeast Alaska. And after three decades of extensive and intensive logging, they have left a legacy of expansive clear-cuts of the lands they already own. If this bill passes, they will do the same to some of the most biologically and culturally valuable lands within the Tongass.

Over the last 50 years, this national forest has already lost 550,000 acres of old-growth trees and been marked by 5,000 miles of logging roads. This bill further threatens what is left of this national forest. It also endangers the economy of southeast Alaska by privatizing lands and waters that are used by guides and commercial fishermen, industries that employ over 17,000 men and women, 20 percent of the Alaskans in the region.

The Forest Service currently manages these lands for multiple uses and has announced a transition plan to ensure a sustainable future for the Tongass. We should not deliver this national treasure—and one of Alaska's most substantial tourism draws—over solely to one private corporation for timber rights.

I urge my colleagues to protect the Tongass for generations of Americans to come and to vote against this amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the author of title XIV, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the minority insists that we are creating some sort of drone zone in title XIV. Now, I understand the intent of that is to muddy the waters on what is otherwise a very clear issue. Can I tell you, I like that phrase, I'm going to use it in the future, but it is also as cute as it is totally inaccurate.

Members should understand that this title specifically and intentionally deals with Federal lands on the northern and southern borders. It does not include private property. The use of the size characteristics are as cute as they are inaccurate.

The legislation does not expand the current reach of the Border Patrol. The Border Patrol already has enforcement authority out to 100 miles today. That's why the 100-mile figure is in there.

The gentleman is also late in his authorization of drones. The use of drones is not authorized by this legislation. The fact is the Border Patrol already uses drones, regardless of what the Federal or the land designation happens to be. With passage of this title and this bill, the impact on drone use will be zero. Whether you support drones or are concerned with drones, this bill doesn't address it. Once again, it's cute as it is inaccurate.

This legislation does not increase or create new enforcement authority. It does not limit constitutional rights. The only source of this bill, this title, is to allow the Border Patrol to have on Federal property the same rights they exercise on State and private property.

□ 1450

These lands will still be managed and administered by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, but border security will no longer be a second to the whims of Federal land managers. It becomes the priority.

The idea of rounding up cattle by the Border Patrol is as cute as it is inaccurate, but I am going to use it because it's cute.

This bill specifically protects legal uses, including recreation, and specifically prohibits the Border Patrol from limiting public access.

Now, some people have said on the other side they object to this operational control of these areas by the Border Patrol.

What does ''operational control'' mean? It's in the title. It is to prevent all unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics and other contraband through the international land borders with the United States.

You're actually opposed to that? You're opposed to doing that? You're opposed to actually allowing our Border Patrol to make sure that is the purpose and that is what is happening?

This bill is about giving the Border Patrol access to Federal lands so they can do their Federal responsibility instead of being prohibited from fulfilling their Federal responsibility by certain Federal regulations. That's silly. That's wrong. It's cute, but it's also inaccurate.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman very much.

This, as we have heard, is a package of bills dealing with lands, and it is as partisan as can be. I wish that we were working in a bipartisan way. We could have a real lands package that would go somewhere. We could have addressed preservation of open space. This is important all across the country.

I often hear from my colleague from Utah and others that, well, people in New Jersey don't have a lot of Federal lands. Let me tell you, this is important for people in New Jersey and every one of the other 49 States and in the territories of the United States. My constituents, who live in the most densely populated State in the Union, have demonstrated again and again their support for open space preservation, for fighting sprawl, for providing for their kids and their kids' kids with safe places to experience the outdoors.

This legislation does so many bad things I hardly know where to begin. It's another attempt to remove most of the protections of environmental laws. And as you've heard from the ranking member, Mr. MARKEY, it establishes an intrusive domestic security enforcement zone, a drone zone.

Call it cute if you want, but as the ranking member said, if you're going to go to Big Bend or Acadia or any of the other national parks that fall in this, you'd better pay attention. It will do nothing to make us more secure.

I could talk all day about the problems in this bill, but let me just focus on one. One reason that this bill is not going anywhere legislatively, because it is so extreme, is the controversial provision it contains on the brazen effort to give away part of the Tongass National Forest.

The Tongass National Forest is known as a crown jewel of the National Forest System. Encompassing 17 million acres in southeast Alaska's panhandle, it's the last remaining intact temperate rainforest. It's the only remnant of the temperate rainforests that used to stretch from Northern California to Prince William Sound. Only half of the very large old-growth tree stands that used to cover the Tongass remain, and even the second growth land is spectacular. The other side was talking about how, well, some of this is not first-growth forest and, therefore, it's okay to give away to spoil. Now over a million people throughout the country—really, throughout the world—visit the Tongass National Forest annually to view the forest virtually unspoiled.

The bill before us today transfers 100,000 acres of the best of the best lands in southeast Alaska to the Sealaska Corporation, including the fine salmon streams, the areas most visited, recreational sites and tourist sites, as well as subsistence sites. This bill gives public lands to a private company, which some might call an earmark. Well, whatever you call it, it's an unjustified giveaway.

And since we're speaking of lands, I'd like to point out that I have introduced legislation to help preserve battlefields from the American Revolution and the War of 1812, legislation based on and including a very successful program to preserve civil war battlefields. This legislation, my bill, passed out of committee unanimously. Why was this not included in this bill? We could have been more bipartisan.

My colleague, Mr. MARKEY, has gone through a long list and others have gone through a long list of the problems with this legislation. Suffice it to say, this is not about preserving lands for the long-term enjoyment and benefit of the American people.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), the author of title XIII of this legislation.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, today's a proud moment for Virginia and the entire Chesapeake Bay community as the House is poised to pass legislation to aid in the cleanup of one of the Nation's most prized historic natural resources, the Chesapeake Bay. This body of water provides habitat for plants and animals, and it is these resources that drive local economies, recreation, and a way of life for so many that live on and around its shores.

I rise in support of H.R. 2578, especially title XIII, the Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act. I'm proud to author this measure, which receives broad support throughout the watershed. In fact, during the 111th Congress, the House passed similar legislation by a vote of 418–1.

These provisions would implement and strengthen management techniques to ensure we get more bang for our buck and are more aggressive in pursuing progress in bay restoration efforts. This bill will also ensure coordination of how restoration dollars are spent and that everyone understands how individual projects fit in the bigger picture in eliminating duplication and waste.

I urge my colleagues to support the health of the Chesapeake Bay, this provision, and H.R. 2578.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), the author of title IX of this bill.

Mr. AMODEI. Thank you to my colleague from the Evergreen State.

Twilight zone, partisan as can be, package of bad ideas for the Nation. Interesting phrases when you look at title IX.

Title IX is about 10,500 acres adjacent to the city of Yerington. This 10,500 acres is a known copper and iron ore deposit since about 1975. On this 10,000 acres and in title IX, you are seeing nothing that waives anything of environmental significance, not NEPA, not the National Historic Preservation Act.

The city's going to pay for the land. We're not giving it away. All the costs associated with transferring the land are to be borne, no cost to the government.

The District and State Bureau of Land Management offices were silent in terms of this proposal. There are no mining issues, cleanup issues, surface water, groundwater, environmental, none of those issues, none at all, abandoned mine sites.

And by the way, in this particular county, which is the leading county for unemployment in the State of Nevada, which I am sorry to inform you, we still lead the Nation in unemployment, this represents a transfer of less than 1 percent of Federal land in Lyon County.

□ 1500

So, when we talk about open space preservation, guess what? There is 99 percent left. Don't think you've got that one either.

Oh, by the way, there were some concerns about 90 days being too soon to transfer this, and there were some concerns about whether it was mandatory or not. Did you hear the part about 1975 known deposits? So you want to change the bill to ''if you feel like doing it, go ahead, and by the way, take as much time as you want''? No, thank you. No, thank you to ''if you feel like it, and take as much time as you want.''

So, when you hear about bad ideas for the Nation, this is about the responsible, multiple use of public resources that gores no one's environmental ox.

Oh, and here is another part that may be of significance: 800 jobs—no cost to the Federal Government. This is a State where there are loan guarantees for renewable energy to the tune of $1.5 billion, and we've got 136 jobs to show for it. Eight hundred jobs—no cost to the government.

When the Office of Management and Budget talks about ''they like to work through the community,'' I've got news for you: title IX is supported by everyone in the State of Nevada who has a voice as a shareholder in these. There hasn't been a single voice raised in opposition to this. By the way, they've been working on it for 4 years. So, if you think there's a problem with the appraisal process, did I mention it's going to be appraised for the value? There is nothing more transparent, nothing more responsible for land use that can be 800 jobs—oh, oh, and the average pay is about $75,000-plus per job. Did I say ''no cost to the government''? I'll quit saying that.

If you want to do something for the people of the State of Nevada, get behind this bill. I want to thank my Democratic colleagues who supported the bill in committee, and I look forward to their being advocates on the north side of the building.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I inquire as to the time available.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 23½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 24½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the author of title V of this bill, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2578. Title V of this bill incorporates my legislation, H.R. 1545, and would recognize and establish the Waco Mammoth Site as a national monument.

In 1978, Waco residents Paul Barron and Eddie Bufkin were out looking for arrowheads and fossils along the Bosque River. During their journey, they happened to come across a large bone protruding from the Earth. Realizing the possible significance of this discovery, Mr. Barron and Mr. Bufkin immediately took the bone to the Strecker Museum at Baylor University for further analysis.

Over a period of nearly 30 years following their discovery, crews of paleontological and archaeological experts, scientists, and volunteers slowly excavated this lost world, eventually unearthing more than two-dozen mammoths and other artifacts. In 2006, the Waco Mammoth Foundation, a nonprofit organization of local citizens, helped make the site a public park. The city of Waco and Baylor University have been working together since to protect the site and to develop further research and educational opportunities at the site.

This legislation will recognize the unique discovery of an extinct species while providing education and enjoyment for families and students visiting from all over the country and throughout the world while benefiting future generations for many years to come.

A special resource study on the Waco Mammoth Site was conducted by the National Park Service and was completed in 2008. This study concluded that the site possesses national significant resources, is a suitable addition to the system, and would be a feasible addition to the system. The study cites an appropriateness to investigate a partnership arrangement between the city of Waco, Baylor University, and NPS. Given our current fiscal situation, the legislation included in this title has been drafted to provide the national recognition that the site deserves without its adding additional burdens to the Federal budget or to the backlog at NPS.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, which will establish the Waco Mammoth National Monument and give this Central Texas treasure the national recognition it deserves, all at no cost to hardworking American taxpayers.

CITY OF WACO,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Waco, TX, June 12, 2012.

Re H.R. 1545.

Congressman BILL FLORES,
Longworth HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLORES: We respectfully request your support on H.R. 1545 designating the Waco Mammoth Site as a National Monument. A special Resource Study was completed on the Waco Mammoth Site in July 2008 which clearly concluded that the site meets all four criteria necessary to be added to the National Park system. To date we have raised more than $4.4 million locally to construct a climate controlled protective structure for the in situ remains along with associated infrastructure to allow for visitation by the public. We also have formed the Waco Mammoth Foundation as formal partnership between the City of Waco and Baylor University along with an active friends group for fund raising activities.

There will be no cost to the Federal Government for the transfer of this five acre site with its improvements from the City of Waco to the National Park Services (NPS). Support of the Waco Mammoth Site will not be a drain on federal funding. It will provide national attention to a national treasure. If the site receives national recognition, we would desire a management and operations partnership be developed with the NPS, the City, and Baylor. This anticipated partnership would capitalize on the strengths of each of the participating groups and ensure that the Waco Mammoth Site would receive the same protections and operate under the same guidance required of all other units of the NPS.

Your favorable support on H. R. 1545 will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

MALCOLM DUNCAN, Jr.,
Mayor.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR), who is the author of title XI of this bill.

Mr. LABRADOR. I rise in support of title XI, the Grazing Improvement Act of 2012.

Livestock grazing is an important part of the rich ranching tradition in America. One need look no further than at the iconic images of cowboys driving huge herds of cattle across open land to realize how big a part ranching has played in American history. Today, my home state of Idaho produces some of the world's finest-tasting lamb and beef, which makes its way to dinner tables across America and as far away as Korea. Food production is a major part of Idaho's history and is an integral part of our cultural fabric and our economic security. These traditions are under attack, and we must preserve them for future generations.

Ranchers are proud stewards of the land. Their reputations and financial security depend on this basic fact. Yet, the process to review the very permits which allow them to produce food has become severely backlogged due to lawsuits aimed at eliminating livestock from public lands. The local Federal land managing office, staffed by fine men and women, cannot keep up with the pace of litigation and the endless environmental analysis. This diverts the already limited resources from these offices and leaves ranchers at risk of losing their grazing permits and of jeopardizing their livelihoods.

Agriculture is a difficult way to make a living, but producers choose this path because it is their livelihood, their passion, and their way of life. When my constituent, Owyhee County rancher Brenda Richards, testified in March on behalf of H.R. 4234, she talked not just about the efficiencies the bill would bring to the overall system, providing cost savings to taxpayers, but she passionately expressed the unstable situation facing ranchers like her: 78 percent of Owyhee County is public land, making local ranchers and the county economy dependent on reliable, yet responsible, access to public land forage.

According to Richards, ranchers not only face uncertainty each year about whether permits will be renewed, but they are also being threatened with new bureaucratic red tape when it comes to crossing and trailing their animals across public lands. Radical special interest litigants have driven the agencies to consider this low-impact activity a ''major agency action'' that requires full environmental analysis under NEPA.

The Grazing Improvement Act of 2012 would accomplish three important goals. First, it extends livestock grazing permits from 10 to 20 years in order to give producers adequate stability. Second, it reduces the workload on overburdened Federal land managers at the local level, and it allows them to get out into the field, which is where they belong. Finally, the legislation includes bipartisan language to encourage land managers to use existing tools in order to expedite permit processing.

We can be good stewards of our land and resources without hurting American ranchers. We must alleviate the problems caused by a tedious bureaucratic process that was created only to respond to the litigious environmental agenda. We can no longer allow the Federal Government to maintain an enormous backlog in processing grazing permits. My legislation aims to ensure grazing certainty and stability for America's livestock producers. Our ranchers depend upon it.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I wanted to talk, and maybe list, so that the American people and the Members of Congress understand the scope and the depth of H.R. 2578, in particular, title XIV: National Park Service Units within 100 Miles of the U.S.-Mexico and U.S.-Canadian Borders. There are 54 National Park Service units and 11 National Park Service wilderness areas:

Acadia National Park; Amistad National Recreation Area; Apostle Islands National Lakeshore-Gaylord Nelson Wilderness; Big Bend National Park; Cabrillo National Monument; Carlsbad Caverns National Park-Carlsbad Caverns Wilderness; Casa Grande Ruins National Monument; Chamizal National Memorial; Chiricahua National Monument-Chiricahua Wilderness; Coronado National Memorial; Isle Royale National Park-Isle Royale Wilderness; James A. Garfield National Historic Site; Joshua Tree National Park; Keweenaw National Historical Park; Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park; Lake Chelan National Recreation Area; Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area; Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historic Park; Nez Perce National Historical Park; North Cascades National Park-Stephen Mather Wilderness; Olympic National Park-Olympic Wilderness; Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument; Organ Pipe Wilderness; Padre Island National Seashore; Palo Alto Battlefield National Historical Park; Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial; Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore; River Raisin National Battlefield Park; Ross Lake National Recreation Area; Saguaro National Park-Saguaro Wilderness; St. Croix Island International Historic Site; San Juan Island National Historical Park; Theodore Roosevelt Inaugural National Historic Site; Theodore Roosevelt National Park; Tumacacori National Historical Park; Voyageurs National Park; White Sands National Monument; Women's Rights National Historical Park; Wrangell-St. Elias National Park; Wrangell-St. Elias National Preserve; Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve.

□ 1510

I list those because turning these shared treasures of the American people from the land managers that provide the access, the interpretation, and the multiuse mandate to these areas to an agency like Homeland Security with no expertise, no track record, no history, and giving them carte blanche, almost czar-like control over these valuable legacy parks of our Nation, is one of the reasons that we have 66 organizations—environmental, Latino, and consumer organizations—opposed to the legislation and opposed in particular to title XIV.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CANSECO), who is the author of title IV of this bill.

Mr. CANSECO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman, Mr. HASTINGS, the park subcommittee chairman, Mr. BISHOP, and the staff of the Natural Resources Committee for working with me to move my legislation, the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park Boundary Expansion Act, through the committee and have it included as part of the bill before us.

Would the chairman enter into a brief colloquy with me?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. CANSECO. Is it the chairman's understanding that, after adoption of the manager's amendment, the bill contains reforms that would only allow for lands to come into the park via donation or exchange, and that these reforms apply only to the land coming into the park boundary as a result of the legislation before us?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. The gentleman is correct, with the adoption of the manager's amendment.

Mr. CANSECO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm pleased to rise in support of the underlying legislation which contains my legislation, the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park Boundary Expansion Act, which I introduced with the entire Bexar County, Texas delegation.

In efforts to settle North America, the English founded Jamestown, Plymouth Rock, and other colonial settlements that schoolchildren learn about in U.S. history classes. The Spanish took a very different approach in their efforts to settle their possessions in North America. Instead of sending ships full of families to found new towns, the Spanish sent Franciscan priests to establish missions. At the missions, the Spanish priests would bring local Native Americans to live at the mission, teach them farming, educate them, and ultimately convert them to Christianity.

The San Antonio Missions National Historical Park is an important asset to the community in San Antonio, Texas, and one of our Nation's historic treasures. The San Antonio Missions National Historical Park is comprised of four mission churches: Mission Concepcion, Mission San Jose, Mission San Juan, and Mission Espada.

Adjusting the boundaries of the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park is absolutely critical to protecting these treasures and allowing the park to continue thriving and further enhance the visitors' experience. It is also a critical part of the redevelopment taking place on the south side of San Antonio.

A recent study found that the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park supported over 1,000 local jobs and almost $100 million in economic activity. This boundary adjustment will help reconnect the missions to the San Antonio River, where the Mission Reach Project is taking place to extend to the south side the economic prosperity and job opportunities enjoyed in other parts of San Antonio. Such redevelopment will allow for significant job and economic opportunities that currently do not exist in parts of San Antonio.

The San Antonio missions are important to the Nation in that they help visitors understand the history of our Nation, its diverse origins, as well as the history of San Antonio and the history of Texas. I would also add that the four missions that comprise the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park are still functioning parish churches, continuing to fulfill the role in the San Antonio community for which they were founded almost 300 years ago.

The San Antonio missions are just as important to understanding the story and the history of America as other historic places like Jamestown, Independence Hall, or Mount Vernon, and this legislation will help protect and preserve them for future generations of Americans to enjoy, all the while helping to create jobs and economic opportunity on the south side of San Antonio.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), who is the author of title II of this bill.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS, my colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BISHOP, for his support in this bill that we introduced, the section that will be included in this bill dealing with the Diamond Fork System.

In Utah, we're blessed to live in one of the most beautiful parts of the word. We're also one of the fastest growing States in the Nation.

The Diamond Fork System, which is included as part of the Central Utah Project, has the capacity to generate up to 50 megawatts of hydroelectric power. Currently, thousands of acre-feet of water flow through the Diamond Fork System through tunnels, pipes, and canals each and every second. This water is necessarily slowed through energy dissipaters as they travel from Strawberry Reservoir to the Wasatch Front. This bill would allow those dissipaters to be easily converted into turbines, thus being able to generate the necessary energy that we need along the Wasatch Front.

The purpose of this bill, which has been included in H.R. 2578, is to waive the unrecoverable sunk cost payment requirements that are inhibiting development of the hydropower at a Bureau of Reclamation facility in Utah. Existing Department of the Interior regulation inhibits hydropower development on the Diamond Fork unit. If the sunk cost recovery requirement is waived, the project will go forward, thus being able to yield the following benefits:

The Treasury is expected, according to the CBO, to get $2 million in revenue over 10 years that it otherwise would not have received. Let me repeat this. This is a net increase to the revenues to the Treasury. It is not an expense to the United States Treasury. In fact, if we don't pass this bill, we won't be able to recover some of those sunk costs. So the net increase to the revenue to the Treasury will go up.

Energy consumers in my district—which this is so desperately needed—will get up to 50 megawatts of new power. And the environmental benefits of this energy are numerous, given that it's clean and it's renewable.

I would also like to remind my colleagues that this bill passed the previous Congress through a voice vote. We introduced this in a bipartisan way. We have Democrats who sponsored this bill as well as Republicans.

With that, I encourage its passage.

□ 1520

Mr. GRIJALVA. I think the purpose of title XIV of H.R. 2578 is not to make the border more secure. Rather, the purpose of the bill is to use border security as cover to effectively repeal more than a century of environmental protections for Americans living and working along our borders with Canada and Mexico.

In April, the Natural Resources Committee held a joint oversight hearing with the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, during which the Government Accountability Office, the Interior Department, the Agriculture Department, and the Border Patrol all testified under oath that Federal land management laws do not impair border security. According to the GAO report, 22 of 26 Border Patrol agents-in-charge that were interviewed reported that Federal land management laws had no impact on the overall security status of their jurisdiction.

In summary, the number of Border Patrol agents-in-charge who found that Federal land management laws were impeding border security but were prevented from fixing the problems by the Interior Department was exactly zero. The administration concurred with this finding at multiple hearings. The

record is clear. And the problem this bill claims to solve does not exist.

The true purpose of this legislation is also clear. The proponents oppose the more-than-30 bedrock environmental protections that will be effectively repealed by this legislation, including the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Clean Drinking Water Act, everywhere, not just within 100 miles of the border. Title XIV employs a manufactured conflict with border security to weaken their application.

The laws to be waived by this act are the work product of dozens of administrations and Congresses, developed after thousands of hours of negotiation and compromise and, in most cases, were enacted with strong bipartisan support. Title XIV hands the Border Patrol a unilateral veto over all of these laws, all this work, and all this bipartisan effort.

Enactment of this legislation and title XIV would not only allow DHS to trample the ground near the border. It would also allow the Agency to trample the rights of States and Native people. This legislation would empower individual patrol agents to enter tribal land without notice and conduct any and all activities, including excavation and construction, without regard for the presence of tribal sites or tribal leadership.

The real problem of border enforcement is one of manpower, budgets, economic incentives, and difficult terrain. This bill addresses none of those concerns. We will not secure our borders by allowing our waters to be polluted. We will not secure our borders by allowing our air to be dirtier, by ignoring the laws that have protected the environment and the American people. That will not bring security to the border.

This legislation and title XIV reduce the number of immigrants coming to this country. If it does, it will only be because the water, air, and economics of our border communities are so degraded that no one wants to come there anymore. This legislation is sweeping. It's reactionary. This bill is not what it appears to be. And it should be rejected.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) who is the author of title X of this bill.

Mr. JONES. I thank the chairman for his support of this provision in this bill.

The title of my provision is the Preserving Access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Act. The Cape Hatteras act is about jobs. Its about taxpayers' rights to access the recreational areas they own. It's about restoring balance and common sense to National Park Service management.

This language would overturn a final rule implemented by the Park Service earlier this year that excessively restricts taxpayers' access to the Cape Hatteras seashore and is unnecessary to protect the wildlife. It would reinstitute the Park Service's 2007 interim management strategy to govern visitor access and species protection at Cape Hatteras. The interim strategy was backed by a 113-page biological opinion issued by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, which found that it would not jeopardize piping plover, sea turtles, or other species of concern.

In addition to adequately protecting wildlife, this bill would give taxpayers more reasonable access to the land they own. It would reopen 26 miles of beach that are now permanently closed to motorized beach access and give seashore managers flexibility to implement more balanced measures that maximize both recreational access and species protection.

By doing so, this bill would reverse the significant job loss and economic decline that Hatteras Island has experienced. I want to repeat that, Mr. Chair: by doing so, the bill would reverse the significant job loss and economic decline that Hatteras Island has experienced since the Park Service cut off access to the most powerful area of the seashore.

My bill and now this bill has bipartisan support in Dare County. The county commissioners in Dare County are predominantly Democrats. They support this bill 100 percent. They ask that this bill move through the House. I am pleased to say that the North Carolina Senators, Republican Senator RICHARD BURR and Democrat Senator KAY HAGAN, have introduced a companion bill that says exactly on the Senate side what this bill says on the House side. The bill is also supported by a national sportsmen's group, including the American Sportfishing Association and the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation.

Mr. Chair, that's why I am honored today to be on the floor with my colleagues to support this legislation. It is time for the taxpayers to be considered, and it's time that we protect the species that are endangered. This is a balanced piece of legislation, not just talking about my aspect of it, but the bill itself. So I hope that my colleagues will support this legislation in a bipartisan way, and let's send this bill to the Senate.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Without a doubt, proponents of H.R. 2578 and, in particular, title XIV, the border bill portion, claim this legislation will end the horrors of the border, that it will secure the border and, finally, Arizona and the rest of the Nation will be ready to sit down, conduct real work, and reach comprehensive immigration reform.

The horrors they will describe—the rape tree, the murders, the abuse of people—some are quite real. The violence is conducted by criminal organizations that prey on desperate and poor people, fueled by a drug trade that produces billions upon billions of dollars for these very criminals that create the violence.

In the last decade, over 4,000 souls have died trying to cross through the most desolate parts of the Arizona desert. And this human tragedy should not be the excuse to undo environmental and public protection laws, which the majority has been attacking on all fronts since the beginning of this Congress. This is a dangerous precedent, that in order to secure the border we must lose those protections. It's an absurd connection, and there is no correlation.

It is interesting that in the list of laws to be waived, if we are truly to make a dent in that violence, we find no mention of suspending the unregulated gun shows that happen in border regions. Eighty-five percent of the assault rifles used by cartels and organized crime syndicates along the border and in Mexico originate in the United States from these gun shows. It is interesting that there is no mention of suspending Federal support for U.S. financial interests that harbor and launder money from Mexican crime syndicates here in the United States.

The environmental laws and protections being eliminated under title XIV will not bring long-term solutions to our beleaguered southern border. These laws are not the reasons for the stress. The reason for the stress is the unwillingness of this Congress to deal with immigration reform and the broken immigration system. Enforcement is part of the solution; it is not the only part of the solution.

□ 1530

The stress is caused by politicians who either exploit the issue for their own gain or run away from the issue because of their own fear of it. To begin to deal with this issue, we need the resolve to work toward comprehensive immigration reform. But all the majority wants to do is scapegoat its lack of resolve to deal with this real issue in order to advance an agenda to hijack the laws that have served our public lands and our citizens well for decades.

This is a terrible precedent. It's backdoor amnesty for polluters, developers, and mining industries. And those extremists want all these protections and environmental laws eliminated. The border is the excuse; the target is the environment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), who is the author of title VIII of this bill.

Mr. HERGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in support of H.R. 2578, the Conservation and Economic Growth Act, which would extend the bipartisan Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Recovery Act for 7 more years, ensuring that the Forest Service has a stable

and consistent period to fully implement it. At the discretion of the Forest Service, the bill would also allow for its expansion to all National Forest system lands within parts of California and Nevada. The expansion of the pilot project will enable the Forest Service to use the effective QLG approach in additional forest communities.

The northern California congressional district I represent includes all or parts of seven national forests. The rural forest communities near to them have been devastated by years of mismanagement of our national forests. Nearly 20 years ago, a group of local environmentalists and citizens formed the Quincy Library Group to develop a collaborative and locally driven solution to bring health and stability to our communities and the forests they live in. The QLG's efforts brought about the bipartisan Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery Act.

Mr. Chairman, we need commonsense forest management that allows communities to utilize their natural resources and create jobs while also restoring the health of our forests. The Quincy Library Group pilot project can provide a model for achieving these critical goals.

In 2007, the 64,000-acre Moonlight fire occurred in the Plumas National Forest. That fire came to an abrupt halt when it reached Antelope, a QLG-constructed defensible fuel profile zone. It saved tens of thousands of spotted owl habitat from burning.

Mr. Chairman, this is the solution to our catastrophic wildfire problem that can and should be replicated. I urge my colleagues to extend and expand this balanced and collaborative project.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of my friend from Arizona, we have no more requests for time, and I'm prepared to close, if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Yes, we are.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

This package of 14 bills is an unwarranted combination of individual bills that would do serious and lasting damage to communities and people across this country. Many of the individual pieces are controversial, but they are overshadowed by title XIV, the drone zone title.

The drone zone created by this bill would trample the environment and the personal freedoms of millions of people living within 100 miles of the border. At a time when the clock is ticking on the reauthorization of the highway trust fund, where real jobs can be created, we are wasting time on this misguided package. At a time when the clock is ticking on making college loans remain affordable, we are wasting time on this package. We should reject H.R. 2578 and get down to the serious work, which is to create jobs and help middle class families make ends meet.

Mr. DEFAZIO and Ranking Member MARKEY and I will be offering amendments to address the absolute worst aspects of this package. I urge my colleagues to support the amendments. Unfortunately, even those amendments cannot fix all that is wrong with this package, and I ask my colleagues to reject H.R. 2578. There is a point in which common sense and sanity should prevail in this House. We have a piece of legislation that begs the question on both before us, and I would urge its defeat.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 8 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, let's go back to the basic issue, really, that's facing this country—and I alluded to it in my opening statement. What Americans really want is jobs. And while this package of bills is in line with that, what it really does is add some certainty to those that live in and around Federal lands. Therefore, allowing for at least some certainty as it relates to jobs, but probably as important, if not more important, is access to our public lands for those that want to utilize our public lands.

There's been much discussion here about how this bill does some damage to the environment. Well, let me just touch on a couple of issues that were mentioned on the other side and I think it needs to be clarified, at least here, before this debate is over.

First, the reference was made to sea lions that were guilty of one thing, and that was eating only fish. Well, I happen to be the author of the title of that bill. Let me clarify. There's a rest-of-the-story here. We had a hearing in the full committee of the Natural Resources Committee today on the Endangered Species Act. I think, frankly, it hasn't been reauthorized for 25 years, and I think we need to update that act to make sure that we recover species. And my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said it's a great act. That's good. We at least have some establishment of commonality.

The reason that provision is in the bill regarding sea lions is that salmon are listed as threatened on the Columbia River. And as they move upstream after coming back from the ocean, they get crowded going up Bonneville Dam. Now, there's a nonindigenous animal called the California sea lion that comes up there and feasts on these fish as they're going through the Bonneville Dam. So it's destroying an endangered species. The California sea lion is not listed as endangered, and they're not indigenous.

So that part of the legislation simply allows for lethal taking of those sea lions so the fish can pass upstream and spawn. Nothing more than that. It's a cute way, to borrow a phrase, to say that they're guilty of only eating fish. But there's more to that story.

This legislation also encourages the development of renewable hydropower. What could be cleaner than that? It promotes healthy forest and prevents forest fires, as my colleague from northern California just said in regard to the title of the act he has in there. It restores access to different parks for recreational purposes in the North Cascades and at Cape Hatteras on the Atlantic Coast, and it preserves old growth in Alaska.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is a lot to be liked about this bill, but it seems most of the discussion is around title XIV.

Let me read the title of title XIV one more time. It is the National Security and Federal Lands Protection Act. Now why do we need that? Because, unfortunately, there are those that want to come into our country illegally, and they don't have the same feelings as we do about our public lands. When they come through illegally, in many cases, they trash those lands. We're simply giving the Border Patrol more tools to protect those public lands and to provide for our national security. I don't know why anybody on the floor of this House should be opposed to that aspect. That's all that title XIV does, as was explained very well by the author of that provision, Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

So, Mr. Chairman, this bill is worth supporting. It has been developed in a bipartisan method. It has been developed in a transparent method, having gone through the committee process.

I urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to the so-called Conservation and Economic Growth Act, H.R. 2578. On behalf of my constituents and millions of other Americans who believe in protecting our public lands and natural resources, I am opposed to this bill.

This bill is yet another in a long string of anti-environmental assaults that the Republican majority has put forth relentlessly throughout the last two years. Most of its 14 titles do nothing to promote conservation or economic growth. Rather, they advance ineffective and unnecessary policies that undermine long-standing, successful laws like the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Wilderness Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act.

One of the most concerning provisions of this bill seeks to create a 100-mile zone along the northern and southern U.S. borders that would allow U.S. Customs and Border Protection to circumvent laws protecting Native rights, clean water, clean air, wildlife habitat and recreational opportunities in areas rich in hunting, fishing and outdoor recreation opportunities in National Parks, Forests, refuges and recreation areas. This undermines the balance between security and preservation of public lands, putting at risk some of America's

most renowned natural treasures such as Joshua Tree National Park in my home state of California. And the Department of Homeland Security doesn't even want it, calling this provision ''unnecessary and bad policy.''

Another provision would reverse, for the first time in Congressional history, the National Wild and Scenic River designation for part of the Lower Merced River in California. The Merced River was given this designation in 1992, under the administration of George H.W. Bush, and Wild and Scenic River protections have successfully preserved miles of pristine U.S. waters, enjoyed by a vast outdoor tourism, sporting and recreation industry. The Merced River runs through Yosemite Valley, one of America's most popular natural wonders, and is a tributary to the San Joaquin River that provides most of the water supply for California's agricultural industry. This provision would remove vital protections for one of California's most important water life-lines in a never-before-seen manner, and undermine valuable economic activity among some of the most hard-hit California communities.

The bill would allow the clear-cutting of America's largest remaining old-growth temperate rainforest in the Tsongas National Forest of Alaska; reverse the prohibition of vehicle use on the fragile habitats of Cape Hatteras National Seashore; and mandate the killing of sea lions in the Pacific Northwest in order to protect endangered fish species. . . . This is the Republicans' conservation and jobs bill: killing sea lions and destroying landscapes and habitat across the nation.

As a leading member on the House Small Business Committee and a firm defender of environmental protection, I believe striking the right balance of policy has always been key to our economic growth and our strength as a nation. H.R. 2578 does not accomplish that goal. In fact it does much to undermine it. H.R. 2578 is wrong for America.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to oppose this bill, and any measure introduced that undermines the conservation of America's treasured public lands and natural resources.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, Americans have a penchant for believing that more is always better.

That unfettered and unabridged access will solve problems.

H.R. 2578, the Conservation and Economic Growth Act, purports to create jobs by violating or eliminating over 35 laws that currently govern our land, air, water, and importantly, our Nation's borders.

The idea follows that in giving the Department of Homeland Security free rein to traverse the roughshod lands around our borders, we'll be safer.

But, the Department of Homeland Security didn't ask for this access, nor do they believe it's warranted.

Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano told a Senate subcommittee in March that unrestricted authority over public lands was unnecessary for the Border Patrol to do its job and was ''bad policy.''

And, we're not just talking the lands on the collar of America's borders.

No, this bill would disrupt your vacation in Cape Hatteras by lifting necessary current restrictions regarding the use of off-road vehicles.

The bill would allow corporations to dip right into Alaska's Tongass National Forest, allowing for trees that started growing before the Revolutionary War to be felled.

And, if someone decided that development of surveillance equipment in a national park was a good idea—say on Chief Mountain in Glacier National Park—it could be installed without any public comment or even internal review process.

This last point was made by two farmers and ranchers from the Mexico and Canadian borders, with more than a century of land-use between the two.

These folks who work the land, who have toiled to create and produce what the land will provide to them and their families for years, those who know it best—oppose this bill.

''In Arizona,'' the gentlemen write, ''we are concerned that poorly designed roads and fences will damage ongoing range land restoration work.

Private landowners have spent thousands of dollars and manpower hours restoring these lands to their original state, which could all be compromised by these bills.''

Another veteran publically denounced the bill in an op-ed, stating, ''As a veteran, a patriot of this nation and a Californian, I can't stand by while these lands are threatened. I'm proud to have worn this country's uniform and I want to continue serving. That's why I've chosen to follow in the path of the great Teddy Roosevelt—a man who was both a soldier and a conservationist—and stand up for our public lands.''

That's right.

A veteran, a rancher, a farmer, the Secretary of Homeland Security, are NOT extolling the virtues of a true wild, wild west.

The stewards of the land know that in order for crops to flourish;

In order to protect the Sweet Grass Hills, in Montana, a sacred location for many tribal ceremonies—and a vital source of water for surrounding communities that it is protected from mining and most motorized travel;

In order to preserve the incredible natural beauty and uniqueness that makes this land great;

We must protect it.

Over 100 years ago, Teddy Roosevelt addressed a crowd in Kansas, a state that knows its lands.

''I recognize the right and duty of this generation to develop and use the natural resources of our land,'' he said, ''but I do not recognize the right to waste them, or to rob, by wasteful use, the generations that come after us . . .''

''Of all the questions which can come before this nation, short of the actual preservation of its existence in a great war—

There is none which compares in importance with the great central task of leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us.

I fear we miss the mark on today's legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in my opposition.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, today's Conservation and Economic Growth Act is an amalgam of 14 separate public lands bills that have little to do with conservation or economic growth.

Indeed, while a few of the provisions—like Rep. WITTMAN's proposal to create an interagency cross-cut budget for Chesapeake Bay restoration efforts—have merit, many more run directly counter to sound natural resource management.

For example, under the guise of border control, Title 14 of today's bill would create a 100 mile zone along our borders with Canada and Mexico where over thirty of environmental laws—including the Clean Air Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act and the National Environmental Protection Act—would not apply. There is no evidence that any of these laws are hindering border enforcement, and the Department of Homeland Security is firmly opposed to this measure. Title 11 of this legislation would similarly undermine the National Environmental Protection Act while providing a windfall to those who graze livestock on federal lands by doubling the current term limits for grazing permits. And Title 3 of H.R. 2578 is essentially an earmark for a single corporation in the state of Alaska, which threatens both the local economy as well as the largest tracts of remaining old growth forest in the United States.

Mr. Chair, I support environmental conservation and meaningful steps to accelerate economic growth—which is why I will be opposing today's legislation.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112–25. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2578

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 ''Conservation and Economic Growth Act''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

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

TITLE I—LOWER MERCED RIVER

Sec. 101. Lower Merced River.

TITLE II—BONNEVILLE UNIT CLEAN HYDROPOWER FACILITATION ACT

Sec. 201. Short title.
Sec. 202. Diamond Fork System defined.
Sec. 203. Cost allocations.
Sec. 204. No purchase or market obligation; no costs assigned to power.
Sec. 205. Prohibition on tax-exempt financing.
Sec. 206. Reporting requirement.
Sec. 207. PayGo.
Sec. 208. Limitation on the use of funds.

TITLE III—SOUTHEAST ALASKA NATIVE LAND ENTITLEMENT FINALIZATION AND JOBS PROTECTION ACT

Sec. 301. Short title.
Sec. 302. Definitions.
Sec. 303. Findings; purpose.
Sec. 304. Selections in southeast Alaska.
Sec. 305. Conveyances to Sealaska.
Sec. 306. Miscellaneous.
Sec. 307. Maps.

TITLE IV—SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK BOUNDARY EXPANSION ACT

Sec. 401. Short title.
Sec. 402. Findings.
Sec. 403. Boundary expansion.

TITLE V—WACO MAMMOTH NATIONAL MONUMENT ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 2012

Sec. 501. Short title.

Sec. 502. Findings.
Sec. 503. Definitions.
Sec. 504. Waco Mammoth National Monument, Texas.
Sec. 505. Administration of monument.
Sec. 506. No buffer zones.

TITLE VI—NORTH CASCADES NATIONAL PARK ACCESS

Sec. 601. Findings.
Sec. 602. Authorization for boundary adjustments.

TITLE VII—ENDANGERED SALMON AND FISHERIES PREDATION PREVENTION ACT

Sec. 701. Short title.
Sec. 702. Findings.
Sec. 703. Taking of sea lions on the Columbia River and its tributaries to protect endangered and threatened species of salmon and other nonlisted fish species.
Sec. 704. Sense of Congress.
Sec. 705. Treaty rights of federally recognized Indian tribes.

TITLE VIII—REAUTHORIZATION OF HERGER-FEINSTEIN QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP FOREST RECOVERY ACT

Sec. 801. Reauthorization of Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery Act.

TITLE IX—YERINGTON LAND CONVEYANCE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ACT

Sec. 901. Short title.
Sec. 902. Findings.
Sec. 903. Definitions.
Sec. 904. Conveyances of land to City of Yerington, Nevada.
Sec. 905. Release of the United States.

TITLE X—PRESERVING ACCESS TO CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA ACT

Sec. 1001. Short title.
Sec. 1002. Reinstatement of Interim Management Strategy.
Sec. 1003. Additional restrictions on access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area for species protection.
Sec. 1004. Inapplicability of final rule and consent degree.

TITLE XI—GRAZING IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2012

Sec. 1101. Short title.
Sec. 1102. Terms of grazing permits and leases.
Sec. 1103. Renewal, transfer, and reissuance of grazing permits and leases.

TITLE XII—TARGET PRACTICE AND MARKSMANSHIP TRAINING SUPPORT ACT

Sec. 1201. Short title.
Sec. 1202. Findings; purpose.
Sec. 1203. Definition of public target range.
Sec. 1204. Amendments to Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act.
Sec. 1205. Limits on liability.
Sec. 1206. Sense of Congress regarding cooperation.

TITLE XIII—CHESAPEAKE BAY ACCOUNTABILITY AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2012

Sec. 1301. Short title.
Sec. 1302. Chesapeake Bay Crosscut Budget.
Sec. 1303. Adaptive Management Plan.
Sec. 1304. Independent Evaluator for the Chesapeake Bay Program.
Sec. 1305. Definitions.

TITLE XIV—NATIONAL SECURITY AND FEDERAL LANDS PROTECTION ACT

Sec. 1401. Short title.
Sec. 1402. Prohibition on impeding certain activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection related to border security.
Sec. 1403. Sunset.

TITLE I—LOWER MERCED RIVER

SEC. 101. LOWER MERCED RIVER.

(a) WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT.—Section 3(a)(62)(B)(i) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)(62)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''the normal maximum'' the first place that it appears and all that follows through ''April, 1990.'' and inserting the following: ''the boundary of FERC Project No. 2179 as it existed on July 18, 2011, consisting of a point approximately 2,480 feet downstream of the confluence with the North Fork of the Merced River, consisting of approximately 7.4 miles.''; and

(2) by striking ''the normal maximum operating pool water surface level of Lake McClure'' the second time that it occurs and inserting ''the boundary of FERC Project No. 2179 as it existed on July 18, 2011, consisting of a point approximately 2,480 feet downstream of the confluence with the North Fork of the Merced River''.

(b) EXCHEQUER PROJECT.—Section 3 of Public Law 102–432 is amended by striking ''Act:'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''Act.''.

TITLE II—BONNEVILLE UNIT CLEAN HYDROPOWER FACILITATION ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Bonneville Unit Clean Hydropower Facilitation Act''.

SEC. 202. DIAMOND FORK SYSTEM DEFINED.

For the purposes of this title, the term ''Diamond Fork System'' means the facilities described in chapter 4 of the October 2004 Supplement to the 1988 Definite Plan Report for the Bonneville Unit.

SEC. 203. COST ALLOCATIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to facilitate hydropower development on the Diamond Fork System, the amount of reimbursable costs allocated to project power in Chapter 6 of the Power Appendix in the October 2004 Supplement to the 1988 Bonneville Unit Definite Plan Report, with regard to power development upstream of the Diamond Fork System, shall be considered final costs as well as costs in excess of the total maximum repayment obligation as defined in section 211 of the Central Utah Project Completion Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–575), and shall be subject to the same terms and conditions.

SEC. 204. NO PURCHASE OR MARKET OBLIGATION; NO COSTS ASSIGNED TO POWER.

Nothing in this title shall obligate the Western Area Power Administration to purchase or market any of the power produced by the Diamond Fork power plant and none of the costs associated with development of transmission facilities to transmit power from the Diamond Fork power plant shall be assigned to power for the purpose of Colorado River Storage Project ratemaking.

SEC. 205. PROHIBITION ON TAX-EXEMPT FINANCING.

No facility for the generation or transmission of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System may be financed or refinanced, in whole or in part, with proceeds of any obligation—

(1) the interest on which is exempt from the tax imposed under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or

(2) with respect to which credit is allowable under subpart I or J of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code.

SEC. 206. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

If, 24 months after the date of the enactment of this title, hydropower production on the Diamond Fork System has not commenced, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit a report to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate stating this fact, the reasons such production has not yet commenced, and a detailed timeline for future hydropower production.

SEC. 207. PAYGO.

The budgetary effects of this title, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this title, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

SEC. 208. LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS.

The authority under the provisions of section 301 of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (Public Law 98–381; 42 U.S.C. 16421a) shall not be used to fund any study or construction of transmission facilities developed as a result of this title.

TITLE III—SOUTHEAST ALASKA NATIVE LAND ENTITLEMENT FINALIZATION AND JOBS PROTECTION ACT

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Southeast Alaska Native Land Entitlement Finalization and Jobs Protection Act''.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CONSERVATION SYSTEM UNIT.—The term ''conservation system unit'' has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3102).

(2) SEALASKA.—The term ''Sealaska'' means the Sealaska Corporation, a Regional Native Corporation created under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 303. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1)(A) in 1971, Congress enacted the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) to recognize and settle the aboriginal claims of Alaska Natives to land historically used by Alaska Natives for traditional, cultural, and spiritual purposes; and

(B) that Act declared that the land settlement ''should be accomplished rapidly, with certainty, in conformity with the real economic and social needs of Natives'';

(2) the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.)—

(A) authorized the distribution of approximately $1,000,000,000 and 44,000,000 acres of land to Alaska Natives; and

(B) provided for the establishment of Native Corporations to receive and manage the funds and that land to meet the cultural, social, and economic needs of Native shareholders;

(3) under section 12 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1611), each Regional Corporation, other than Sealaska (the Regional Corporation for southeast Alaska), was authorized to receive a share of land based on the proportion that the number of Alaska Native shareholders residing in the region of the Regional Corporation bore to the total number of Alaska Native shareholders, or the relative size of the area to which the Regional Corporation had an aboriginal land claim bore to the size of the area to which all Regional Corporations had aboriginal land claims;

(4)(A) Sealaska, the Regional Corporation for southeast Alaska, 1 of the Regional Corporations with the largest number of Alaska Native shareholders, with more than 21 percent of all original Alaska Native shareholders, received less than 1 percent of the lands set aside for Alaska Natives, and received no land under section 12 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1611);

(B) the Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska was 1 of the entities representing the Alaska Natives of southeast Alaska before the date of enactment of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.); and

(C) Sealaska did not receive land in proportion to the number of Alaska Native shareholders, or in proportion to the size of the area to which Sealaska had an aboriginal land claim, in part because of a United States Court of Claims cash settlement to the Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska in 1968 for land previously taken to create the Tongass National Forest and Glacier Bay National Monument;

(5) the 1968 Court of Claims cash settlement of $7,500,000 did not—

(A) adequately compensate the Alaska Natives of southeast Alaska for the significant quantity of land and resources lost as a result of the creation of the Tongass National Forest and Glacier Bay National Monument or other losses of land and resources; or

(B) justify the significant disparate treatment of Sealaska under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1611) in 1971;

(6)(A) while each other Regional Corporation received a significant quantity of land under sections 12 and 14 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1611, 1613), Sealaska only received land under section 14(h) of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h));

(B) section 14(h) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)) authorized the Secretary to withdraw and convey 2,000,000-acres of ''unreserved and unappropriated'' public lands in Alaska from which Alaska Native selections could be made for historic sites, cemetery sites, Urban Corporation land, Native group land, and Native Allotments;

(C) under section 14(h)(8) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(8)), after selections are made under paragraphs (1) through (7) of that section, the land remaining in the 2,000,000-acre land pool is allocated based on the proportion that the original Alaska Native shareholder population of a Regional Corporation bore to the original Alaska Native shareholder population of all Regional Corporations;

(D) the only Native land entitlement of Sealaska derives from a proportion of leftover land remaining from the 2,000,000-acre land pool, estimated as of the date of enactment of this Act at approximately 1,700,000 acres;

(E) because at the time of enactment of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) all public land in the Tongass National Forest had been reserved for purposes of creating the national forest, the Secretary was not able to withdraw any public land in the Tongass National Forest for selection by and conveyance to Sealaska;

(F) at the time of enactment of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) other public lands in southeast Alaska not located in the Tongass National Forest were not suitable for selection by and conveyance to Sealaska because such lands were located in Glacier Bay National Monument, were included in a withdrawal effected pursuant to section 17(d)(2) of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1616(d)(2)) and slated to become part of the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park, or essentially consisted of mountain tops;

(G) Sealaska in 1975 requested that Congress amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) to permit the Regional Corporation to select lands inside of the withdrawal areas established for southeast Alaska Native villages under section 16 of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1615); and

(H) in 1976, Congress amended section 16 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1615) to allow Sealaska to select lands under section 14(h)(8) of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(8)) from land located inside, rather than outside, the withdrawal areas established for southeast Alaska Native villages;

(7) the 10 Alaska Native village withdrawal areas in southeast Alaska surround the Alaska Native communities of Yakutat, Hoonah, Angoon, Kake, Kasaan, Klawock, Craig, Hydaburg, Klukwan, and Saxman;

(8)(A) the existing conveyance requirements of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) for southeast Alaska limit the land eligible for conveyance to Sealaska to the original withdrawal areas surrounding 10 Alaska Native villages in southeast Alaska, which precludes Sealaska from selecting land located—

(i) in any withdrawal area established for the Urban Corporations for Sitka and Juneau, Alaska; or

(ii) outside the 10 Alaska Native village withdrawal areas; and

(B) unlike other Regional Corporations, Sealaska is not authorized to request land located outside the withdrawal areas described in subparagraph (A) if the withdrawal areas are insufficient to complete the land entitlement of Sealaska under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.);

(9)(A) the deadline for applications for selection of cemetery sites and historic places on land outside withdrawal areas established under section 14 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613) was July 1, 1976;

(B)(i) as of that date, the Bureau of Land Management notified Sealaska that the total entitlement of Sealaska would be approximately 200,000 acres; and

(ii) Sealaska made entitlement allocation decisions for cultural sites and economic development sites based on that original estimate; and

(C) as a result of the Alaska Land Transfer Acceleration Act (Public Law 108–452; 118 Stat. 3575) and subsequent related determinations and actions of the Bureau of Land Management, it became clear within the last decade that Sealaska will receive significantly more than 200,000 acres pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.);

(10) in light of the revised Bureau of Land Management estimate of the total number of acres that Sealaska will receive pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), and in consultation with Members of Alaska's congressional delegation, Sealaska and its shareholders believe that it is appropriate to allocate more of the entitlement of Sealaska to—

(A) the acquisition of places of sacred, cultural, traditional, and historical significance;

(B) the acquisition of sites with traditional and recreational use value and sites suitable for renewable energy development; and

(C) the acquisition of lands that are not within the watersheds of Native and non-Native communities and are suitable economically and environmentally for natural resource development;

(11)(A) pursuant to section 11(a)(1) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1610(a)(1)), Sealaska was not authorized to select under section 14(h)(1) of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(1)) any site within Glacier Bay National Park, despite the abundance of cultural sites within that Park;

(B) Sealaska seeks cooperative agreements to ensure that cultural sites within Glacier Bay National Park are subject to cooperative management by Sealaska, Village and Urban Corporations, and federally recognized tribes with ties to the cultural sites and history of the Park; and

(C) Congress recognizes that there is an existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Park Service and the Hoonah Indian Association, and does not intend to circumvent the MOU; rather the intent is to ensure that this and similar mechanisms for cooperative management in Glacier Bay are required by law;

(12)(A) the cemetery sites and historic places conveyed to Sealaska pursuant to section 14(h)(1) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(1)) are subject to a restrictive covenant not required by the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) that hinders the ability of Sealaska to use the sites for cultural, educational, or research purposes for Alaska Natives and others;

(B) historic sites managed by the Forest Service are not subject to the limitations referred to in subparagraph (A); and

(C) Alaska Natives of southeast Alaska should be permitted to use cemetery sites and historic places in a manner that is—

(i) consistent with the sacred, cultural, traditional, or historic nature of the site; and

(ii) not inconsistent with the management plans for adjacent public land;

(13) 44 percent (820,000 acres) of the 10 Alaska Native village withdrawal areas established under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) described in paragraphs (7) and (8) are composed of salt water and not available for selection;

(14) of land subject to the selection rights of Sealaska, 110,000 acres are encumbered by gubernatorial consent requirements under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.);

(15) in each withdrawal area, there exist factors that limit the ability of Sealaska to select sufficient land, and, in particular, economically viable land, to fulfill the land entitlement of Sealaska, including factors such as—

(A) with respect to the Yakutat withdrawal area—

(i) 46 percent of the area is salt water;

(ii) 10 sections (6,400 acres) around the Situk Lake were restricted from selection, with no consideration provided for the restriction; and

(iii)(I) 70,000 acres are subject to a gubernatorial consent requirement before selection; and

(II) Sealaska received no consideration with respect to the consent restriction;

(B) with respect to the Hoonah withdrawal area, 51 percent of the area is salt water;

(C) with respect to the Angoon withdrawal area—

(i) 120,000 acres of the area is salt water;

(ii) Sealaska received no consideration regarding the prohibition on selecting land from the 80,000 acres located within the Admiralty Island National Monument; and

(iii)(I) the Village Corporation for Angoon was allowed to select land located outside the withdrawal area on Prince of Wales Island, subject to the condition that the Village Corporation shall not select land located on Admiralty Island; but

(II) no alternative land adjacent to the out-of-withdrawal land of the Village Corporation was made available for selection by Sealaska;

(D) with respect to the Kake withdrawal area—

(i) 64 percent of the area is salt water; and

(ii) extensive timber harvesting by the Forest Service occurred in the area before 1971 that significantly reduced the value of land available for selection by, and conveyance to, Sealaska;

(E) with respect to the Kasaan withdrawal area—

(i) 54 percent of the area is salt water; and

(ii) the Forest Service previously harvested in the area;

(F) with respect to the Klawock withdrawal area—

(i) the area consists of only 5 townships, as compared to the usual withdrawal area of 9 townships, because of the proximity of the Klawock withdrawal area to the Village of Craig, which reduces the selection area by 92,160 acres; and

(ii) the Klawock and Craig withdrawal areas are 35 percent salt water;

(G) with respect to the Craig withdrawal area, the withdrawal area consists of only 6 townships, as compared to the usual withdrawal area of 9 townships, because of the proximity of the Craig withdrawal area to the Village of Klawock, which reduces the selection area by 69,120 acres;

(H) with respect to the Hydaburg withdrawal area—

(i) 36 percent of the area is salt water; and

(ii) Sealaska received no consideration under the Haida Land Exchange Act of 1986 (Public Law No. 99–664; 100 Stat. 4303) for relinquishing selection rights to land within the withdrawal area that the Haida Corporation exchanged to the Forest Service;

(I) with respect to the Klukwan withdrawal area—

(i) 27 percent of the area is salt water; and

(ii) the withdrawal area is only 70,000 acres, as compared to the usual withdrawal area of 207,360 acres, which reduces the selection area by 137,360 acres; and

(J) with respect to the Saxman withdrawal area—

(i) 29 percent of the area is salt water;

(ii) Sealaska received no consideration for the 50,576 acres within the withdrawal area adjacent to the first-class city of Ketchikan that were excluded from selection;

(iii) Sealaska received no consideration with respect to the 1977 amendment to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) requiring gubernatorial consent for selection of 58,000 acres in that area; and

(iv) 23,888 acres are located within the Annette Island Indian Reservation for the Metlakatla Indian Tribe and are not available for selection;

(16) the selection limitations and guidelines applicable to Sealaska under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.)—

(A) are inequitable and inconsistent with the purposes of that Act because there is insufficient land remaining in the withdrawal areas to meet the traditional, cultural, and socioeconomic needs of the shareholders of Sealaska; and

(B) make it difficult for Sealaska to select—

(i) places of sacred, cultural, traditional, and historical significance;

(ii) sites with traditional and recreation use value and sites suitable for renewable energy development; and

(iii) lands that meet the real economic needs of the shareholders of Sealaska;

(17) unless Sealaska is allowed to select land outside designated withdrawal areas in southeast Alaska, Sealaska will not be able to—

(A) complete the land entitlement selections of Sealaska under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) in a manner that meets the cultural, social, and economic needs of Native shareholders;

(B) avoid land selections in watersheds that are the exclusive drinking water supply for regional communities, support world class salmon streams, have been identified as important habitat, or would otherwise be managed by the Forest Service as roadless and old growth forest reserves;

(C) secure ownership of places of sacred, cultural, traditional, and historical importance to the Alaska Natives of southeast Alaska; and

(D) continue to support forestry jobs and economic opportunities for Alaska Natives and other residents of rural southeast Alaska;

(18)(A) the rate of unemployment in southeast Alaska exceeds the statewide rate of unemployment on a non-seasonally adjusted basis;

(B) in January 2011, the Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development reported the unemployment rate for the Prince of Wales—Outer Ketchikan census area at approximately 16.2 percent;

(C) in October 2007, the Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development projected population losses between 1996 and 2030 for the Prince of Wales—Outer Ketchikan census area at 56.6 percent;

(D) official unemployment rates severely underreport the actual level of regional unemployment, particularly in Native villages; and

(E) additional job losses will exacerbate outmigration from Native and non-Native communities in southeast Alaska;

(19) Sealaska has played, and is expected to continue to play, a significant role in the health of the southeast Alaska economy;

(20) despite the small land base of Sealaska as compared to other Regional Corporations (less than 1 percent of the total quantity of land allocated pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.)), Sealaska has—

(A) provided considerable benefits to Alaska Native shareholders;

(B) supported hundreds of jobs for Alaska Native shareholders and non-shareholders in southeast Alaska for more than 30 years; and

(C) been a significant economic force in southeast Alaska;

(21) pursuant to the revenue sharing provisions of section 7(i) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1606(i)), Sealaska has distributed more than $300,000,000 during the period beginning on January 1, 1971, and ending on December 31, 2005, to Native Corporations throughout the State of Alaska from the development of natural resources, which accounts for 42 percent of the total revenues shared under that section during that period;

(22) resource development operations maintained by Sealaska—

(A) support hundreds of jobs in the southeast Alaska region;

(B) make timber available to local and domestic sawmills and other wood products businesses such as guitar manufacturers;

(C) support firewood programs for local communities;

(D) support maintenance of roads utilized by local communities for subsistence and recreation uses;

(E) support development of new biomass energy opportunities in southeast Alaska, reducing dependence on high-cost diesel fuel for the generation of energy;

(F) provide start-up capital for innovative business models in southeast Alaska that create new opportunities for non-timber economic development in the region, including support for renewable biomass initiatives, Alaska Native artisans, and rural mariculture farming; and

(G) support Native education and cultural and language preservation activities;

(23) if the resource development operations of Sealaska cease on land appropriate for those operations, there will be a significant negative impact on—

(A) southeast Alaska Native shareholders;

(B) the cultural preservation activities of Sealaska;

(C) the economy of southeast Alaska; and

(D) the Alaska Native community that benefits from the revenue-sharing requirements under the Alaska Native claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.);

(24) it is critical that the remaining land entitlement conveyances to Sealaska under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) are fulfilled to continue to meet the economic, social, and cultural needs of the Alaska Native shareholders of southeast Alaska and the Alaska Native community throughout Alaska;

(25) in order to realize cultural preservation goals while also diversifying economic opportunities, Sealaska should be authorized to select and receive conveyance of—

(A) sacred, cultural, traditional, and historic sites and other places of traditional cultural significance, including traditional and customary trade and migration routes, to facilitate the perpetuation and preservation of Alaska Native culture and history;

(B) other sites with traditional and recreation use value and sites suitable for renewable energy development to facilitate appropriate tourism and outdoor recreation enterprises and renewable energy development for rural southeast Alaska communities; and

(C) lands that are suitable economically and environmentally for natural resource development;

(26) on completion of the conveyances of land of Sealaska to fulfill the full land entitlement of Sealaska under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), the encumbrances on 327,000 acres of Federal land created by the withdrawal of land for selection by Native Corporations in southeast Alaska should be removed, which will facilitate thorough and complete planning and efficient management relating to national forest land in southeast Alaska by the Forest Service;

(27) although the Tribal Forest Protection Act (25 U.S.C. 3101 note; Public Law 108–278) defines the term ''Indian tribe'' to include Indian tribes under section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b), a term which includes ''any Alaska Native village or regional or village corporation as defined in or established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act . . .'', the Tribal Forest Protection Act does not define the term ''Indian forest land or rangeland'' to include lands owned by Alaska Native Corporations, including Sealaska, which are the primary Indian forest land owners in Alaska, and therefore, the Tribal Forest Protection Act should be amended in a manner that will—

(A) permit Native Corporations, including Sealaska, as Indian forest land owners in Alaska, to work with the Secretary of Agriculture under the Tribal Forest Protection Act to address forest fire and insect infestation issues, including the spread of the spruce bark beetle in southeast and southcentral Alaska, which threaten the health of the Native forestlands; and

(B) ensure that Native Corporations, including Sealaska, can participate in programs administered by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Tribal Forest Protection Act without including Native Corporations under the definition in that Act of ''Indian forest land or rangeland'' or otherwise amending that Act in a manner that validates, invalidates, or otherwise affects any claim regarding the existence of Indian country in the State of Alaska; and

(28) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.) defines the term ''Indian tribe'' to include any ''Native village, Regional Corporation or Village Corporation, as those terms are defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act'' but does not define the term ''Tribal lands'' to include lands owned by Alaska Native Corporations, thereby excluding from the National Historic Preservation Act cemetery sites and historical places transferred to Native Corporations, including Sealaska, pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and therefore, the National Historic Preservation Act should be amended in a manner that will—

(A) permit Native Corporations, including Sealaska, as owners of Indian cemetery sites and historical places in Alaska, to work with the Secretary of the Interior under the National Historic Preservation Act to secure grants and other support to manage their own historic sites and programs pursuant to that Act; and

(B) ensure that Native Corporations, including Sealaska, can participate in programs administered by the Secretary of the Interior under the National Historic Preservation Act without including Native Corporations under the definition in that Act of ''Tribal lands'' or otherwise amending that Act in a manner that validates, invalidates, or otherwise affects any claim regarding the existence of Indian country in the State of Alaska.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to address the inequitable treatment of Sealaska by allowing Sealaska to select the remaining land entitlement of Sealaska under section 14 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613) from designated Federal land in southeast Alaska located outside the 10 southeast Alaska Native village withdrawal areas in a manner that meets the cultural, social, and economic needs of Native shareholders, including the need to maintain jobs supported by Sealaska in rural southeast Alaska communities.

SEC. 304. SELECTIONS IN SOUTHEAST ALASKA.

(a) SELECTION BY SEALASKA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 14(h)(8) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(8)), Sealaska is authorized to select and receive conveyance of the remaining land entitlement of Sealaska under that Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) from Federal

land located in southeast Alaska from each category described in subsections (b) and (c).

(2) TREATMENT OF LAND CONVEYED.—Land conveyed pursuant to this title are to be treated as land conveyed pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) subject to, but not limited to—

(A) reservation of public easements across land pursuant to section 17(b) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1616(b));

(B) valid existing rights pursuant to section 14(g) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(g)); and

(C) the land bank protections of section 907(d) of the Alaska National Interest and Lands Conservation Act (43 U.S.C. 1636(d)).

(b) WITHDRAWAL OF LAND.—The following public land is withdrawn, subject to valid existing rights, from all forms of appropriation under public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, and from selection under the Act of July 7, 1958 (commonly known as the ''Alaska Statehood Act'') (48 U.S.C. note prec. 21; Public Law 85–508), and shall be available for selection by and conveyance to Sealaska to complete the remaining land entitlement of Sealaska under section 14(h)(8) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(8)):

(1) Land identified on the maps dated February 1, 2011, and labeled ''Attachment A (Maps 1 through 8)''.

(2) Sites with traditional, recreational, and renewable energy use value, as identified on the map entitled ''Sites with Traditional, Recreational, and Renewable Energy Use Value'', dated February 1, 2011, and labeled ''Attachment D'', subject to the condition that not more than 5,000 acres shall be selected for those purposes.

(3) Sites identified on the map entitled ''Traditional and Customary Trade and Migration Routes'', dated February 1, 2011, and labeled ''Attachment C'', which includes an identification of—

(A) a conveyance of land 25 feet in width, together with 1-acre sites at each terminus and at 8 locations along the route, with the route, location, and boundaries of the conveyance described on the map inset entitled ''Yakutat to Dry Bay Trade and Migration Route'' on the map entitled ''Traditional and Customary Trade and Migration Routes'', dated February 1, 2011, and labeled ''Attachment C'';

(B) a conveyance of land 25 feet in width, together with 1-acre sites at each terminus, with the route, location, and boundaries of the conveyance described on the map inset entitled ''Bay of Pillars to Port Camden Trade and Migration Route'' on the map entitled ''Traditional and Customary Trade and Migration Routes'', dated February 1, 2011, and labeled ''Attachment C''; and

(C) a conveyance of land 25 feet in width, together with 1-acre sites at each terminus, with the route, location, and boundaries of the conveyance described on the map inset entitled ''Portage Bay to Duncan Canal Trade and Migration Route'' on the map entitled ''Traditional and Customary Trade and Migration Routes'', dated February 1, 2011, and labeled ''Attachment C''.

(c) SITES WITH SACRED, CULTURAL, TRADITIONAL, OR HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE.—Subject to the criteria and procedures applicable to land selected pursuant to section 14(h)(1) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(1)) and set forth in the regulations promulgated at section 2653.5 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), except as otherwise provided in this title—

(1) Sealaska shall have a right to identify up to 3,600 acres of sites with sacred, cultural, traditional, or historic significance, including archeological sites, cultural landscapes, and natural features having cultural significance; and

(2) on identification of the land by Sealaska under paragraph (1), the identified land shall be—

(A) withdrawn, subject to valid existing rights, from all forms of appropriation under public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, and from selection under the Act of July 7, 1958 (commonly known as the ''Alaska Statehood Act'') (48 U.S.C. note prec. 21; Public Law 85–508); and

(B) available for selection by and conveyance to Sealaska to complete the remaining land entitlement of Sealaska under section 14(h)(8) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(8)) subject to the conditions that—

(i) no sites with sacred, cultural, traditional, or historic significance may be selected from within a unit of the National Park System; and

(ii) beginning on the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act, Sealaska shall be limited to identifying not more than 360 acres of sites with sacred, cultural, traditional, or historic significance under this subsection.

(d) FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS.—Sealaska shall receive from the United States, subject to all necessary State and Federal permits, nonexclusive easements to Sealaska to allow—

(1) access on the forest development road and use of the log transfer site identified in paragraphs (3)(b), (3)(c) and (3)(d) of the patent numbered 50–85–0112 and dated January 4, 1985;

(2) access on the forest development road identified in paragraphs (2)(a) and (2)(b) of the patent numbered 50–92–0203 and dated February 24, 1992;

(3) access on the forest development road identified in paragraph (2)(a) of the patent numbered 50–94–0046 and dated December 17, 1993;

(4) access on the forest development roads and use of the log transfer facilities identified on the maps dated February 1, 2011, and labeled ''Attachment A (Maps 1 through 8)'';

(5) a reservation of a right to construct a new road to connect to existing forest development roads as generally identified on the maps identified in paragraph (4); and

(6) access to and reservation of a right to construct a new log transfer facility and log storage area at the location identified on the maps identified in paragraph (4).

SEC. 305. CONVEYANCES TO SEALASKA.

(a) TIMELINE FOR CONVEYANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), the Secretary shall work with Sealaska to develop a mutually agreeable schedule to complete the conveyance of land to Sealaska under this title.

(2) FINAL PRIORITIES.—Consistent with the provisions of section 403 of the Alaska Land Transfer Acceleration Act (43 U.S.C. 1611 note; Public Law 108–452), not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, Sealaska shall submit to the Secretary the final, irrevocable priorities for selection of land withdrawn under section 304(b)(1).

(3) SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION REQUIRED.—Not later than two years after the date of selection by Sealaska of land withdrawn under section 304(b)(1), the Secretary shall substantially complete the conveyance of the land to Sealaska under this title.

(4) EFFECT.—Nothing in this title shall interfere with or cause any delay in the duty of the Secretary to convey land to the State of Alaska under section 6 of the Act of July 7, 1958 (commonly known as the ''Alaska Statehood Act'') (48 U.S.C. note prec. 21; Public Law 85–508).

(b) EXPIRATION OF WITHDRAWALS.—On completion of the selection by Sealaska and the conveyances to Sealaska of land under subsection (a) in a manner that is sufficient to fulfill the land entitlement of Sealaska under section 14(h)(8) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(8))—

(1) the right of Sealaska to receive any land under that Act from within a withdrawal area established under subsections (a) and (d) of section 16 of that Act shall be terminated;

(2) the withdrawal areas set aside for selection by Native Corporations in southeast Alaska under subsections (a) and (d) of section 16 of that Act shall be rescinded; and

(3) land located within a withdrawal area that is not conveyed to Sealaska or to a southeast Alaska Village Corporation or Urban Corporation shall be returned to the unencumbered management of the Forest Service as part of the Tongass National Forest.

(c) LIMITATION.—Sealaska shall not select or receive under this title any conveyance of land pursuant to paragraphs (1) or (2) of section 304(b) located within any conservation system unit.

(d) APPLICABLE EASEMENTS AND PUBLIC ACCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the reservation of public easements under section 304(a)(2)(A), the conveyance to Sealaska of land withdrawn pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (3) of section 304(b) that are located outside a withdrawal area designated under section 16(a) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1615(a)) shall be subject to—

(A) a reservation for easements for public access on the public roads depicted on the maps dated February 1, 2011, and labeled ''Attachment A (Maps 1 through 8)'';

(B) a reservation for easements for public access on the temporary roads designated by the Forest Service as of the date of the enactment of this Act for the public access trails depicted on the maps described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) the right of noncommercial public access for subsistence uses, consistent with title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3111 et seq.), and recreational access, without liability to Sealaska, subject to—

(i) the right of Sealaska to regulate access to ensure public safety, to protect cultural or scientific resources, and to provide environmental protection; and

(ii) the condition that Sealaska shall post on any applicable property, in accordance with State law, notices of the conditions on use.

(2) SACRED, CULTURAL, TRADITIONAL AND HISTORIC SITES.—The conveyance to Sealaska of land withdrawn pursuant to section 304(c) that is located outside of a withdrawal area designated under section 16(a) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1615(a)) shall be subject to—

(A) the right of public access across the conveyances where no reasonable alternative access around the land is available without liability to Sealaska; and

(B) the right of Sealaska to regulate access across the conveyances to ensure public safety, to protect cultural or scientific resources, to provide environmental protection, or to prohibit activities incompatible with the use and enjoyment of the land by Sealaska, subject to the condition that Sealaska shall post on any applicable property, in accordance with State law, notices of any such condition.

(3) TRADITIONAL AND CUSTOMARY TRADE AND MIGRATION ROUTES.—The conveyance to Sealaska of land withdrawn pursuant to section 304(b)(3) that is located outside of a withdrawal area designated under section 16(a) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1615(a)) shall be subject to a requirement that Sealaska provide public access across such linear conveyances if an adjacent landowner or the public has a legal right to use the adjacent private or public land.

(4) SITES WITH TRADITIONAL, RECREATIONAL, AND RENEWABLE ENERGY USE VALUE.—The conveyance to Sealaska of land withdrawn pursuant to section 304(b)(2) that is located outside of a withdrawal area designated under section 16(a) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1615(a)) shall be subject to—

(A) the right of public access across the land without liability to Sealaska; and

(B) the condition that public access across the land would not be unreasonably restricted or impaired.

(5) EFFECT.—No right of access provided to any individual or entity (other than Sealaska) by this subsection—

(A) creates any interest, other than an interest retained by the United States, of such an individual or entity in the land conveyed to Sealaska in excess of that right of access; or

(B) provides standing in any review of, or challenge to, any determination by Sealaska with respect to the management or development of the applicable land.

(e) CONDITIONS ON SACRED, CULTURAL, AND HISTORIC SITES AND TRADITIONAL AND CUSTOMARY TRADE AND MIGRATION ROUTES.—The conveyance to Sealaska of land withdrawn pursuant to sections 304(b)(3) and 304(c)—

(1) shall be subject to a covenant prohibiting any commercial timber harvest or mineral development on the land;

(2) shall allow use of the land as described in subsection (f); and

(3) shall not be subject to any additional restrictive covenant based on cultural or historic values, or any other restriction, encumbrance, or easement, except as provided in sections 14(g) and 17(b) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(g), 1616(b)).

(f) USES OF SACRED, CULTURAL, TRADITIONAL, AND HISTORIC SITES AND TRADITIONAL AND CUSTOMARY TRADE AND MIGRATION ROUTES.—Any land conveyed to Sealaska from land withdrawn pursuant to sections 304(b)(3) and 304(c) may be used for—

(1) preservation of cultural knowledge and traditions associated with the site;

(2) historical, cultural, and scientific research and education;

(3) public interpretation and education regarding the cultural significance of the site to Alaska Natives;

(4) protection and management of the site to preserve the natural and cultural features of the site, including cultural traditions, values, songs, stories, names, crests, and clan usage, for the benefit of future generations; and

(5) site improvement activities for any purpose described in paragraphs (1) through (4), subject to the condition that the activities—

(A) are consistent with the sacred, cultural, traditional, or historic nature of the site; and

(B) are not inconsistent with the management plans for adjacent public land.

(g) TERMINATION OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each restrictive covenant regarding cultural or historical values with respect to any interim conveyance or patent for a historic or cemetery site issued to Sealaska pursuant to the Federal regulations contained in sections 2653.5(a) and 2653.11 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), in accordance with section 14(h)(1) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(1)), terminates as a matter of law on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) REMAINING CONDITIONS.—Land subject to a covenant described in paragraph (1) on the day before the date of enactment of this Act shall be subject to the conditions described in subsection (e).

(3) RECORDS.—Sealaska shall be responsible for recording with the land title recorders office of the State of Alaska any modification to an existing conveyance of land under section 14(h)(1) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(1)) as a result of this title.

(h) CONDITIONS ON SITES WITH TRADITIONAL, RECREATIONAL, AND RENEWABLE ENERGY USE VALUE.—Each conveyance of land to Sealaska from land withdrawn pursuant to section 304(b)(2) shall be subject to a covenant prohibiting any commercial timber harvest or mineral development.

(i) ESCROW FUNDS FOR WITHDRAWN LAND.—On the withdrawal by this title of land identified for selection by Sealaska, the escrow requirements of section 2 of Public Law 94–204 (43 U.S.C. 1613 note), shall thereafter apply to the withdrawn land.

(j) GUIDING AND OUTFITTING SPECIAL USE PERMITS OR AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the provisions of section 14(g) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(g)), except as modified herein, on land conveyed to Sealaska from land withdrawn pursuant to sections 304(b)(1) and 304(b)(2), an existing holder of a guiding or outfitting special use permit or authorization issued by the Forest Service shall be entitled to its rights and privileges on the land for the remaining term of the permit, as of the date of conveyance to Sealaska, and for 1 subsequent 10-year renewal of the permit, subject to the condition that the rights shall be considered a valid existing right reserved pursuant to section 14(g) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(g)), and shall be managed accordingly.

(2) NOTICE OF COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES.—Sealaska, with respect to the holder of a guiding or outfitting special use permit or authorization under this subsection, and a permit holder referenced in this subsection, with respect to Sealaska, shall have an obligation to inform the other party of their respective commercial activities before engaging in the activities on land, which has been conveyed to Sealaska under this title, subject to the permit or authorization.

(3) NEGOTIATION OF NEW TERMS.—Nothing in this subsection precludes Sealaska and a permit holder under this subsection from negotiating new mutually agreeable permit terms that supersede the requirements of—

(A) this subsection;

(B) section 14(g) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(g)); or

(C) any deed covenant.

(4) LIABILITY.—Sealaska shall bear no liability regarding use and occupancy pursuant to special use permits or authorizations on land selected or conveyed pursuant to this title.

SEC. 306. MISCELLANEOUS.

(a) STATUS OF CONVEYED LAND.—Each conveyance of Federal land to Sealaska pursuant to this title, and each Federal action carried out to achieve the purpose of this title, shall be considered to be conveyed or acted on, as applicable, pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION AND INCENTIVES.—Notwithstanding subsection (e) and (h) of section 305, all land conveyed to Sealaska pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) and this title shall be considered to be qualified to receive or participate in, as applicable—

(1) any federally authorized carbon sequestration program, ecological services program, or environmental mitigation credit; and

(2) any other federally authorized environmental incentive credit or program.

(c) NO MATERIAL EFFECT ON FOREST PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as required by paragraph (2), implementation of this title, including the conveyance of land to Sealaska, alone or in combination with any other factor, shall not require an amendment of, or revision to, the Tongass National Forest Land and Resources Management Plan before the first revision of that Plan scheduled to occur after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall implement any land ownership boundary adjustments to the Tongass National Forest Land and Resources Management Plan resulting from the implementation of this title through a technical amendment to that Plan.

(d) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—

(1) TRIBAL FOREST PROTECTION.—Section 2 of the Tribal Forest Protection Act of 2004 (25 U.S.C. 3115a) is amended by adding at the end a new subsection (h):

''(h)(1) Land owned by an Alaska Native Corporation pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) that is forest land or formerly had a forest cover or vegetative cover that is capable of restoration shall be eligible for agreements and contracts authorized under this Act and administered by the Secretary.

''(2) Nothing in this subsection validates, invalidates, or otherwise affects any claim regarding the existence of Indian country (as defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code) in the State of Alaska.''.

(2) NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION.—Section 101(d) of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470a(d)), is amended by adding at the end a new paragraph (7):

''(7)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an Alaska Native tribe, band, nation or other organized group or community, including a Native village, Regional Corporation, or Village Corporation, shall be eligible to participate in all programs administered by the Secretary under this Act on behalf of Indian tribes, including, but not limited to, securing grants and other support to manage their own historic preservation sites and programs on lands held by the Alaska Native tribe, band, nation or other organized group or community, including a Native village, Regional Corporation, or Village Corporation.

''(B) Nothing in this paragraph validates, invalidates, or otherwise affects any claim regarding the existence of Indian country (as defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code) in the State of Alaska.''.

(e) EFFECT ON ENTITLEMENT.—Nothing in this title shall have any effect upon the entitlement due to any Native Corporation, other than Sealaska, under—

(1) the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.); or

(2) the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.).

SEC. 307. MAPS.

(a) AVAILABILITY.—Each map referred to in this title shall be maintained on file in—

(1) the office of the Chief of the Forest Service; and

(2) the office of the Secretary.

(b) CORRECTIONS.—The Secretary or the Chief of the Forest Service may make any necessary correction to a clerical or typographical error in a map referred to in this title.

(c) TREATMENT.—No map referred to in this title shall be considered to be an attempt by the Federal Government to convey any State or private land.

TITLE IV—SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK BOUNDARY EXPANSION ACT

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''San Antonio Missions National Historical Park Boundary Expansion Act''.

SEC. 402. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park is important to understanding the history and development of the City of San Antonio, Bexar County, the State of Texas, and the United States;

(2) understanding the connection between the San Antonio River and the San Antonio Missions is critical to understanding mission life in colonial Texas; and

(3) the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park enjoys the strong support of the City of San Antonio, Bexar County, and their citizens and businesses.

SEC. 403. BOUNDARY EXPANSION.

Section 201(a) of Public Law 95–629 (16 U.S.C. 410ee(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''In order'' and inserting ''(1) In order'';

(2) by striking ''The park shall also'' and inserting ''(2) The park shall also'';

(3) by striking ''After advising the'' and inserting ''(5) After advising the'';

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2) (as so designated by paragraph (2) above) the following:

''(3) The boundary of the park is further modified to include approximately 151 acres, as depicted on the map titled 'San Antonio Missions National Historical Park Proposed Boundary Addition 2009', numbered 472/468,027, and dated November 2009. The map shall be on file and available for inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.

''(4) The Secretary may not acquire by condemnation any land or interest in land within the boundaries of the park. The Secretary is authorized to acquire land and interests in land that are within the boundaries of the park pursuant to paragraph (3) by donation only. No private property or non-Federal public property shall be included within the boundaries of the park without the written consent of the owner of such property. Nothing in this Act, the establishment of park, or the management plan of the park shall be construed create buffer zones outside of the park. That an activity or use can be seen or heard from within the park shall not preclude the conduct of that activity or use outside the park.''.

TITLE V—WACO MAMMOTH NATIONAL MONUMENT ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 2012

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Waco Mammoth National Monument Establishment Act of 2012''.

SEC. 502. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Waco Mammoth Site area is located near the confluence of the Brazos River and the Bosque River in central Texas, near the city of Waco;

(2) after the discovery of bones emerging from eroding creek banks leading to the uncovering of portions of 5 mammoths, Baylor University began investigating the site in 1978;

(3) several additional mammoth remains have been uncovered making the site the largest known concentration of mammoths dying from the same event;

(4) the mammoth discoveries have received international attention; and

(5) Baylor University and the city of Waco, Texas, have been working together—

(A) to protect the site; and

(B) to develop further research and educational opportunities at the site.

SEC. 503. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the city of Waco, Texas.

(2) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term ''management plan'' means the management plan for the Monument prepared under section 505(c)(1).

(3) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Proposed Boundary Waco-Mammoth National Monument'', numbered T21/80,000, and dated April 2009.

(4) MONUMENT.—The term ''Monument'' means the Waco Mammoth National Monument established by section 504(a).

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Texas.

(7) UNIVERSITY.—The term ''University'' means Baylor University in the State.

SEC. 504. WACO MAMMOTH NATIONAL MONUMENT, TEXAS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the State, as a unit of the National Park System, the Waco Mammoth National Monument, as generally depicted on the map.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

SEC. 505. ADMINISTRATION OF MONUMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the Monument in accordance with—

(1) this title; and

(2) any cooperative agreements entered into under subsection (b)(1).

(b) AUTHORITIES OF SECRETARY.—

(1) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative management agreements with the University and the City, in accordance with section 3(l) of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–2(l)).

(2) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—The Secretary may acquire by donation only from the City any land or interest in land owned by the City within the proposed boundary of the Monument.

(c) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the University and the City, shall complete a general management plan for the Monument.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The management plan shall include, at a minimum—

(A) measures for the preservation of the resources of the Monument;

(B) requirements for the type and extent of development and use of the Monument;

(C) identification of the capacity of the Monument for accommodating visitors; and

(D) opportunities for involvement by the University, City, State, and other local and national entities in—

(i) developing educational programs for the Monument; and

(ii) developing and supporting the Monument.

(d) PROHIBITION OF USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—No Federal funds may be used to pay the costs of—

(1) carrying out a cooperative agreement under subsection (b)(1);

(2) acquiring land for inclusion in the Monument under subsection (b)(2);

(3) developing a visitor center for the Monument;

(4) operating or maintaining the Monument;

(5) constructing exhibits for the Monument; or

(6) developing the general management plan under subsection (c).

(e) USE OF NON-FEDERAL FUNDS.—Non-Federal funds may be used to pay any costs that may be incurred by the Secretary or the National Park Service in carrying out this section.

(f) EFFECT ON ELIGIBILITY FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—Nothing in this title affects the eligibility of the Monument for Federal grants or other forms of financial assistance that the Monument would have been eligible to apply for had National Park System status not been conferred to the Monument under this title.

(g) TERMINATION OF NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM STATUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Designation of the Monument as a unit of the National Park System shall terminate if the Secretary determines that Federal funds are required to operate and maintain the Monument.

(2) REVERSION.—If the designation of the Monument as a unit of the National Park System is terminated under paragraph (1), any land acquired by the Secretary from the City under subsection (b)(2) shall revert to the City.

(h) PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.—No private property may be made part of the Monument without the written consent of the owner of that private property.

SEC. 506. NO BUFFER ZONES.

Nothing in this title, the establishment of national monument, or the management plan shall be construed create buffer zones outside of the national monument. That an activity or use can be seen or heard from within the Monument shall not preclude the conduct of that activity or use outside the Monument.

TITLE VI—NORTH CASCADES NATIONAL PARK ACCESS

SEC. 601. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) In 1988, 93 percent of the North Cascades National Park Complex was designated the Stephen Mather Wilderness.

(2) A road corridor was deliberately excluded from the wilderness designation to provide for the continued use and maintenance of the upper Stehekin Valley Road.

(3) The upper Stehekin Valley Road provides access to Stephen Mather Wilderness trailheads and North Cascades National Park from the Lake Chelan National Recreation Area.

(4) Record flooding in 1995 and again in 2003 caused severe damage to the upper Stehekin Valley Road and led to the closure of a 9.9-mile section of the road between Car Wash Falls and Cottonwood Camp.

(5) The National Park Service currently does not have the flexibility to rebuild the upper Stehekin Valley Road away from the Stehekin River due to the current location of the non-wilderness road corridor provided by Congress in 1988.

(6) It is a high priority that the people of the United States, including families, the disabled, and the elderly, have reasonable access to the National Parks system and their public lands.

(7) The 1995 Lake Chelan National Recreation Area General Management Plan calls for retaining vehicle access to Cottonwood Camp.

(8) Tourism associated with the North Cascades National Park Complex is an important part of the economy for rural communities in the area.

(9) Additional management flexibility would allow the National Park Service to consider retention of the upper Stehekin Valley Road in a manner that provides for no net loss of wilderness.

SEC. 602. AUTHORIZATION FOR BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS.

The Washington Park Wilderness Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–668) is amended by inserting after section 206 the following:

''SEC. 207. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS FOR ROAD.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may adjust the boundaries of the North Cascades National Park and the Stephen Mather Wilderness in order to provide a 100-foot-wide corridor along which the Stehekin Valley Road may be rebuilt—

''(1) outside of the floodplain between milepost 12.9 and milepost 22.8;

''(2) within the boundaries of the North Cascades National Park; and

''(3) outside of the boundaries of the Stephen Mather Wilderness.

''(b) NO NET LOSS OF LANDS.—The boundary adjustments made under this section shall be such that equal acreage amounts are exchanged between the Stephen Mather Wilderness and the North Cascades National Park, resulting in no net loss of acreage to either the Stephen Mather Wilderness or the North Cascades National Park.''.

TITLE VII—ENDANGERED SALMON AND FISHERIES PREDATION PREVENTION ACT

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Endangered Salmon and Fisheries Predation Prevention Act''.

SEC. 702. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) There are 13 groups of salmon and steelhead that are listed as threatened species or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 that migrate through the lower Columbia River.

(2) The people of the Northwest United States are united in their desire to restore healthy salmon and steelhead runs, as they are integral to the region's culture and economy.

(3) The Columbia River treaty tribes retain important rights with respect to salmon and steelhead.

(4) Federal, State, and tribal governments have spent billions of dollars to assist the recovery of Columbia River salmon and steelhead populations.

(5) One of the factors impacting salmonid populations is increased predation by marine mammals, including California sea lions.

(6) The population of California sea lions has increased 6-fold over the last 3 decades, and is currently greater than 250,000 animals.

(7) In recent years, more than 1,000 California sea lions have been foraging in the lower 145 miles of the Columbia River up to Bonneville Dam during the peak spring salmonid run before returning to the California coast to mate.

(8) The percentage of the spring salmonid run that has been eaten or killed by California sea lions at Bonneville Dam has increased 7-fold since 2002.

(9) In recent years, California sea lions have with greater frequency congregated near Bonneville Dam and have entered the fish ladders.

(10) These California sea lions have not been responsive to extensive hazing methods employed near Bonneville Dam to discourage this behavior.

(11) The process established under the 1994 amendment to the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to address aggressive sea lion behavior is protracted and will not work in a timely enough manner to protect threatened and endangered salmonids in the near term.

(12) In the interest of protecting Columbia River threatened and endangered salmonids, a temporary expedited procedure is urgently needed to allow removal of the minimum number of California sea lions as is necessary to protect the passage of threatened and endangered salmonids in the Columbia River and its tributaries.

(13) On December 21, 2010, the independent Pinniped-Fishery Interaction Task Force recommended lethally removing more of the California sea lions in 2011.

(14) On August 18, 2011, the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho applied to the National Marine Fisheries Service, under section 120(b)(1)(A) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1389(b)(1)(A)), for the lethal removal of sea lions that the States determined are having a ''significant negative impact'' on the recovery of Columbia River and Snake River salmon and steelhead.

(15) On September 12, 2011, the National Marine Fisheries Service announced it was accepting the States' application for lethal removal of sea lions and that it would reconvene the Pinniped-Fishery Interaction Task Force to consider the States' application. This title will ensure the necessary authority for permits under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to be issued in a timely fashion.

(16) During a June 14, 2011, hearing, the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives received testimony from State and tribal witnesses expressing concern that significant pinniped predation of important Northwest fish resources other than salmonids is severely impacting fish stocks determined by both Federal and State fishery management agencies to be at low levels of abundance, and that this cannot be addressed by section 120 of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1389), which as in effect before the enactment of this Act restricted control of predatory pinnipeds' impact only with respect to endangered salmonids.

SEC. 703. TAKING OF SEA LIONS ON THE COLUMBIA RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES TO PROTECT ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES OF SALMON AND OTHER NONLISTED FISH SPECIES.

Section 120 of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1389) is amended by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

''(f) TEMPORARY MARINE MAMMAL REMOVAL AUTHORITY ON THE WATERS OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER OR ITS TRIBUTARIES.—

''(1) REMOVAL AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary may issue a permit to an eligible entity authorizing the intentional lethal taking on the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries of sea lions that are part of a healthy population that is not listed as an endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), to protect endangered and threatened species of salmon and other nonlisted fish species.

''(2) PERMIT PROCESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity may apply to the Secretary for a permit under this subsection.

''(B) DEADLINE FOR CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATION.—The Secretary shall approve or deny an application for a permit under this subsection by not later than 30 days after receiving the application.

''(C) DURATION OF PERMIT.—A permit under this subsection shall be effective for no more than one year after the date it is issued, but may be renewed by the Secretary.

''(3) LIMITATIONS.—

''(A) LIMITATION ON PERMIT AUTHORITY.—Subject to subparagraph (B), a permit issued under this subsection shall not authorize the lethal taking of more than 10 sea lions during the duration of the permit.

''(B) LIMITATION ON ANNUAL TAKINGS.—The cumulative number of sea lions authorized to be taken each year under all permits in effect under this subsection shall not exceed one percent of the annual potential biological removal level.

''(4) DELEGATION OF PERMIT AUTHORITY.—Any eligible entity may delegate to any other eligible entity the authority to administer its permit authority under this subsection.

''(5) NEPA.—Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) shall not apply with respect to this subsection and the issuance of any permit under this subsection during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection.

''(6) SUSPENSION OF PERMITTING AUTHORITY.—If, 5 years after enactment, the Secretary, after consulting with State and tribal fishery managers, determines that lethal removal authority is no longer necessary to protect salmonid and other fish species from sea lion predation, may suspend the issuance of permits under this subsection.

''(7) ELIGIBLE ENTITY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'eligible entity' means each of the State of Washington, the State of Oregon, the State of Idaho, the Nez Perce Tribe, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation, and the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission.''.

SEC. 704. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) preventing predation by sea lions, recovery of listed salmonid stocks, and preventing future listings of fish stocks in the Columbia River is a vital priority;

(2) permit holders exercising lethal removal authority pursuant to the amendment made by this title should be trained in wildlife management; and

(3) the Federal Government should continue to fund lethal and nonlethal removal measures for preventing such predation.

SEC. 705. TREATY RIGHTS OF FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED INDIAN TRIBES.

Nothing in this title or the amendment made by this title shall be construed to affect or modify any treaty or other right of any federally recognized Indian tribe.

TITLE VIII—REAUTHORIZATION OF HERGER-FEINSTEIN QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP FOREST RECOVERY ACT

SEC. 801. REAUTHORIZATION OF HERGER-FEINSTEIN QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP FOREST RECOVERY ACT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subsection (g) of the Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery Act (title IV of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999, as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) TERM OF PILOT PROJECT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct the pilot project until the earlier of the following:

''(A) September 30, 2022.

''(B) The date on which the Secretary completes amendment or revision of the land and resource management plans for the National Forest System lands included in the pilot project area.

''(2) FOREST PLAN AMENDMENTS.—When the Regional Forester for Region 5 initiates the process to amend or revise the land and resource management plans for the pilot project area, the process shall include preparation of at least one alternative that incorporates the pilot project and area designations under subsection (b), the resource management activities described in subsection (d), and other aspects of the Quincy Library Group Community Stability Proposal.''.

(b) EXPANSION OF PILOT PROJECT AREA.—Subsection (b) of the Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery Act is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) EXPANSION OF PILOT PROJECT AREA.—The Secretary may expand the pilot project area to include all National Forest System lands within California or Nevada that lie within the Sierra Nevada and Cascade Province, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, and Inyo National Forest. These lands may be managed using the same strategy, guidelines and resource management activities outlined in this section or developed to meet local forest and community needs and conditions.''.

(c) ROADLESS AREA PROTECTION.—Subsection (c)(4) of the Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery Act is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''However, those areas designated as 'Deferred' on the map, but located in Tehama County, south and west of Lassen Peak, are deemed to be designated as 'Available for Group Selection' and shall be managed accordingly under subsection (d).''.

(d) GROUP SELECTION REQUIREMENT.—Subparagraph (A) of subsection (d)(2) of the Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery Act is amended to read as follows:

''(A) GROUP SELECTION.—After September 30, 2012, group selection on an average acreage of .57 percent of the pilot project area land shall occur each year of the pilot project.''.

TITLE IX—YERINGTON LAND CONVEYANCE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ACT

SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Yerington Land Conveyance and Sustainable Development Act''.

SEC. 902. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the city of Yerington, Nevada, which has an unemployment rate of 16 percent, has the highest unemployment rate in the State of Nevada;

(2) for over 4 years, the city of Yerington and Lyon County, Nevada, have been working with private business partners to develop a sustainable development plan that would enable all parties to benefit from the use of private land adjacent to the city of Yerington for potential commercial and industrial development, mining activities, recreation opportunities, and the expansion of community and cultural events;

(3) the sustainable development plan referred to in paragraph (2) requires the conveyance of certain Federal land administered by the Bureau of Land Management to the City for consideration in an amount equal to the fair market value of the Federal land;

(4) the Federal land to be conveyed to the City under the sustainable development plan has

very few environmental, historical, wildlife, or cultural resources of value to the public, but is appropriate for responsible development;

(5) the Federal land that would be conveyed to the City under the sustainable development plan—

(A) is adjacent to the boundaries of the City; and

(B) would be used—

(i) to enhance recreational, cultural, commercial, and industrial development opportunities in the City;

(ii) for future economic development, regional use, and as an open space buffer to the City; and

(iii) to allow the City to provide critical infrastructure services;

(6) commercial and industrial development of the Federal land would enable the community to benefit from the transportation, power, and water infrastructure that would be put in place with the concurrent development of commercial and industrial operations;

(7) the conveyance of the Federal land would—

(A) help the City and County to grow; and

(B) provide additional tax revenue to the City and County;

(8) industrial and commercial development of the Federal land would create thousands of long-term, high-paying jobs for the City and County; and

(9) the Lyon County Commission and the City unanimously approved resolutions in support of the conveyance of the Federal land because the conveyance would facilitate a sustainable model for long-term economic and industrial development.

SEC. 903. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the city of Yerington, Nevada.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the land located in Lyon County and Mineral County, Nevada, that is identified on the map as ''City of Yerington Sustainable Development Conveyance Lands''.

(3) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Yerington Land Conveyance and Sustainable Development Act'' and dated May 31, 2012.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 904. CONVEYANCES OF LAND TO CITY OF YERINGTON, NEVADA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this title, subject to valid existing rights, and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall convey to the City, subject to the City's agreement and in exchange for consideration in an amount equal to the fair market value of the Federal land, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land identified on the map.

(b) APPRAISAL TO DETERMINE OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the Federal land to be conveyed—

(1) in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(2) based on an appraisal that is conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including—

(A) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition; and

(B) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(d) APPLICABLE LAW.—Beginning on the date on which the Federal land is conveyed to the City, the development of and conduct of activities on the Federal land shall be subject to all applicable Federal laws (including regulations).

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The City shall be responsible for all survey, appraisal, and other administrative costs associated with the conveyance of the Federal land to the City under this title.

SEC. 905. RELEASE OF THE UNITED STATES.

Upon making the conveyance under section 904, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States is released from any and all liabilities or claims of any kind or nature arising from the presence, release, or threat of release of any hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, petroleum product (or derivative of a petroleum product of any kind), solid waste, mine materials or mining related features (including tailings, overburden, waste rock, mill remnants, pits, or other hazards resulting from the presence of mining related features) on the Federal Land in existence on or before the date of the conveyance.

TITLE X—PRESERVING ACCESS TO CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA ACT

SEC. 1001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Preserving Access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Act''.

SEC. 1002. REINSTATEMENT OF INTERIM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY.

(a) MANAGEMENT.—After the date of the enactment of this title, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area shall be managed in accordance with the Interim Protected Species Management Strategy/Environmental Assessment issued by the National Park Service on June 13, 2007, for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, North Carolina, unless the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this title referred to as the ''Secretary'') issues a new final rule that meets the requirements set forth in section 1003.

(b) RESTRICTIONS.—The Secretary shall not impose any additional restrictions on pedestrian or motorized vehicular access to any portion of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area for species protection beyond those in the Interim Management Strategy, other than as specifically authorized pursuant to section 1003 of this title.

SEC. 1003. ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS ON ACCESS TO CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA FOR SPECIES PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If, based on peer-reviewed science and after public comment, the Secretary determines that additional restrictions on access to a portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area are necessary to protect species listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the Secretary may only restrict, by limitation, closure, buffer, or otherwise, pedestrian and motorized vehicular access for recreational activities for the shortest possible time and on the smallest possible portions of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

(b) LIMITATION ON RESTRICTIONS.—Restrictions imposed under this section for protection of species listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) shall not be greater than the restrictions in effect for that species at any other National Seashore.

(c) CORRIDORS AROUND CLOSURES.—To the maximum extent possible, the Secretary shall designate pedestrian and vehicular corridors of minimal distance on the beach or interdunal area around closures implemented under this section to allow access to areas not closed.

SEC. 1004. INAPPLICABILITY OF FINAL RULE AND CONSENT DEGREE.

(a) FINAL RULE.—The final rule titled ''Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Cape Hatteras National Seashore—Off-Road Vehicle Management'' (77 Fed. Reg. 3123–3144) shall have no force or effect after the date of the enactment of this title.

(b) CONSENT DECREE.—The April 30, 2008, consent decree filed in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina regarding off-road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore in North Carolina shall not apply after the date of the enactment of this title.

TITLE XI—GRAZING IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2012

SEC. 1101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Grazing Improvement Act of 2012''.

SEC. 1102. TERMS OF GRAZING PERMITS AND LEASES.

Section 402 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1752) is amended—

(1) by striking ''ten years'' each place it appears and inserting ''20 years''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''or'' at the end of each of paragraphs (1) and (2);

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) the initial environmental analysis under National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) regarding a grazing allotment, permit, or lease has not been completed.''.

SEC. 1103. RENEWAL, TRANSFER, AND REISSUANCE OF GRAZING PERMITS AND LEASES.

Title IV of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 405. RENEWAL, TRANSFER, AND REISSUANCE OF GRAZING PERMITS AND LEASES.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CURRENT GRAZING MANAGEMENT.—The term 'current grazing management' means grazing in accordance with the terms and conditions of an existing permit or lease and includes any modifications that are consistent with an applicable Department of Interior resource management plan or Department of Agriculture land use plan.

''(2) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term 'Secretary concerned' means—

''(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to National Forest System land; and

''(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

''(b) RENEWAL, TRANSFER, REISSUANCE, AND PENDING PROCESSING.—A grazing permit or lease issued by the Secretary of the Interior, or a grazing permit issued by the Secretary of Agriculture regarding National Forest System land, that expires, is transferred, or is waived shall be renewed or reissued under, as appropriate—

''(1) section 402;

''(2) section 19 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (commonly known as the 'Granger-Thye Act'; 16 U.S.C. 580l);

''(3) title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1010 et seq.); or

''(4) section 510 the California Desert Protection Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 410aaa–50).

''(c) TERMS; CONDITIONS.—The terms and conditions (except the termination date) contained in an expired, transferred, or waived permit or lease described in subsection (b) shall continue in effect under a renewed or reissued permit or lease until the date on which the Secretary concerned completes the processing of the renewed or reissued permit or lease that is the subject of the expired, transferred, or waived permit or lease, in compliance with each applicable law.

''(d) CANCELLATION; SUSPENSION; MODIFICATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), a permit or lease described in subsection (b) may be cancelled, suspended, or modified in accordance with applicable law.

''(e) RENEWAL TRANSFER REISSUANCE AFTER PROCESSING.—When the Secretary concerned has completed the processing of the renewed or reissued permit or lease that is the subject of the expired, transferred, or waived permit or lease, the Secretary concerned may renew or reissue the permit or lease for a term of 20 years after completion of processing.

''(f) COMPLIANCE WITH NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969.—The renewal, reissuance, or transfer of a grazing permit or lease by the Secretary concerned may, at their sole discretion, be categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement if—

''(1) the decision to renew, reissue, or transfer continues the current grazing management of the allotment;

''(2) monitoring of the allotment has indicated that the current grazing management has met, or has satisfactorily progressed towards meeting, objectives contained in the land use and resource management plan of the allotment, as determined by the Secretary concerned; or

''(3) the decision is consistent with the policy of the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, as appropriate, regarding extraordinary circumstances.

''(g) PRIORITY AND TIMING FOR COMPLETING ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES.—The Secretary concerned, in the sole discretion of the Secretary concerned, shall determine the priority and timing for completing each required environmental analysis regarding any grazing allotment, permit, or lease based on the environmental significance of the allotment, permit, or lease and available funding for that purpose.

''(h) NEPA EXEMPTIONS.—The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall not apply to the following:

''(1) Crossing and trailing authorizations of domestic livestock.

''(2) Transfer of grazing preference.''.

TITLE XII—TARGET PRACTICE AND MARKSMANSHIP TRAINING SUPPORT ACT

SEC. 1201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Target Practice and Marksmanship Training Support Act''.

SEC. 1202. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the use of firearms and archery equipment for target practice and marksmanship training activities on Federal land is allowed, except to the extent specific portions of that land have been closed to those activities;

(2) in recent years preceding the date of enactment of this title, portions of Federal land have been closed to target practice and marksmanship training for many reasons;

(3) the availability of public target ranges on non-Federal land has been declining for a variety of reasons, including continued population growth and development near former ranges;

(4) providing opportunities for target practice and marksmanship training at public target ranges on Federal and non-Federal land can help—

(A) to promote enjoyment of shooting, recreational, and hunting activities; and

(B) to ensure safe and convenient locations for those activities;

(5) Federal law in effect on the date of enactment of this title, including the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.), provides Federal support for construction and expansion of public target ranges by making available to States amounts that may be used for construction, operation, and maintenance of public target ranges; and

(6) it is in the public interest to provide increased Federal support to facilitate the construction or expansion of public target ranges.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to facilitate the construction and expansion of public target ranges, including ranges on Federal land managed by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 1203. DEFINITION OF PUBLIC TARGET RANGE.

In this title, the term ''public target range'' means a specific location that—

(1) is identified by a governmental agency for recreational shooting;

(2) is open to the public;

(3) may be supervised; and

(4) may accommodate archery or rifle, pistol, or shotgun shooting.

SEC. 1204. AMENDMENTS TO PITTMAN-ROBERTSON WILDLIFE RESTORATION ACT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (8) as paragraphs (3) through (9), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) the term 'public target range' means a specific location that—

''(A) is identified by a governmental agency for recreational shooting;

''(B) is open to the public;

''(C) may be supervised; and

''(D) may accommodate archery or rifle, pistol, or shotgun shooting;''.

(b) EXPENDITURES FOR MANAGEMENT OF WILDLIFE AREAS AND RESOURCES.—Section 8(b) of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669g(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b) Each State'' and inserting the following:

''(b) EXPENDITURES FOR MANAGEMENT OF WILDLIFE AREAS AND RESOURCES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each State'';

(2) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), by striking ''construction, operation,'' and inserting ''operation'';

(3) in the second sentence, by striking ''The non-Federal share'' and inserting the following:

''(3) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share'';

(4) in the third sentence, by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(4) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary''; and

(5) by inserting after paragraph (1) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection) the following:

''(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding the limitation described in paragraph (1), a State may pay up to 90 percent of the cost of acquiring land for, expanding, or constructing a public target range.''.

(c) FIREARM AND BOW HUNTER EDUCATION AND SAFETY PROGRAM GRANTS.—Section 10 of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669h–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

''(3) ALLOCATION OF ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS.—Of the amount apportioned to a State for any fiscal year under section 4(b), the State may elect to allocate not more than 10 percent, to be combined with the amount apportioned to the State under paragraph (1) for that fiscal year, for acquiring land for, expanding, or constructing a public target range.'';

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) COST SHARING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Federal share of the cost of any activity carried out using a grant under this section shall not exceed 75 percent of the total cost of the activity.

''(2) PUBLIC TARGET RANGE CONSTRUCTION OR EXPANSION.—The Federal share of the cost of acquiring land for, expanding, or constructing a public target range in a State on Federal or non-Federal land pursuant to this section or section 8(b) shall not exceed 90 percent of the cost of the activity.''; and

(3) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) by striking ''Amounts made'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), amounts made''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Amounts provided for acquiring land for, constructing, or expanding a public target range shall remain available for expenditure and obligation during the 5-fiscal-year period beginning on October 1 of the first fiscal year for which the amounts are made available.''.

SEC. 1205. LIMITS ON LIABILITY.

(a) DISCRETIONARY FUNCTION.—For purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Federal Tort Claims Act''), any action by an agent or employee of the United States to manage or allow the use of Federal land for purposes of target practice or marksmanship training by a member of the public shall be considered to be the exercise or performance of a discretionary function.

(b) CIVIL ACTION OR CLAIMS.—Except to the extent provided in chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, the United States shall not be subject to any civil action or claim for money damages for any injury to or loss of property, personal injury, or death caused by an activity occurring at a public target range that is—

(1) funded in whole or in part by the Federal Government pursuant to the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.); or

(2) located on Federal land.

SEC. 1206. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING COOPERATION.

It is the sense of Congress that, consistent with applicable laws and regulations, the Chief of the Forest Service and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management should cooperate with State and local authorities and other entities to carry out waste removal and other activities on any Federal land used as a public target range to encourage continued use of that land for target practice or marksmanship training.

TITLE XIII—CHESAPEAKE BAY ACCOUNTABILITY AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2012

SEC. 1301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2012''.

SEC. 1302. CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSCUT BUDGET.

(a) CROSSCUT BUDGET.—The Director, in consultation with the Chesapeake Executive Council, the chief executive of each Chesapeake Bay State, and the Chesapeake Bay Commission, shall submit to Congress a financial report containing—

(1) an interagency crosscut budget that displays—

(A) the proposed funding for any Federal restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year, including any planned interagency or intra-agency transfer, for each of the Federal agencies that carry out restoration activities;

(B) to the extent that information is available, the estimated funding for any State restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year;

(C) all expenditures for Federal restoration activities from the preceding 2 fiscal years, the current fiscal year, and the succeeding fiscal year; and

(D) all expenditures, to the extent that information is available, for State restoration activities during the equivalent time period described in subparagraph (C);

(2) a detailed accounting of all funds received and obligated by all Federal agencies for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years, including the identification of funds which were transferred to a Chesapeake Bay State for restoration activities;

(3) to the extent that information is available, a detailed accounting from each State of all funds received and obligated from a Federal agency for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years; and

(4) a description of each of the proposed Federal and State restoration activities to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year (corresponding to those activities listed in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1)), including the—

(A) project description;

(B) current status of the project;

(C) Federal or State statutory or regulatory authority, programs, or responsible agencies;

(D) authorization level for appropriations;

(E) project timeline, including benchmarks;

(F) references to project documents;

(G) descriptions of risks and uncertainties of project implementation;

(H) adaptive management actions or framework;

(I) coordinating entities;

(J) funding history;

(K) cost-sharing; and

(L) alignment with existing Chesapeake Bay Agreement and Chesapeake Executive Council goals and priorities.

(b) MINIMUM FUNDING LEVELS.—The Director shall only describe restoration activities in the report required under subsection (a) that—

(1) for Federal restoration activities, have funding amounts greater than or equal to $100,000; and

(2) for State restoration activities, have funding amounts greater than or equal to $50,000.

(c) DEADLINE.—The Director shall submit to Congress the report required by subsection (a) not later than 30 days after the submission by the President of the President's annual budget to Congress.

(d) REPORT.—Copies of the financial report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations, Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations, Environment and Public Works, and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply beginning with the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this title for which the President submits a budget to Congress.

SEC. 1303. ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this title, the Administrator, in consultation with other Federal and State agencies, shall develop an adaptive management plan for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed that includes—

(1) definition of specific and measurable objectives to improve water quality, habitat, and fisheries;

(2) a process for stakeholder participation;

(3) monitoring, modeling, experimentation, and other research and evaluation practices;

(4) a process for modification of restoration activities that have not attained or will not attain the specific and measurable objectives set forth under paragraph (1); and

(5) a process for prioritizing restoration activities and programs to which adaptive management shall be applied.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Administrator shall implement the adaptive management plan developed under subsection (a).

(c) UPDATES.—The Administrator shall update the adaptive management plan developed under subsection (a) every 2 years.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the end of a fiscal year, the Administrator shall transmit to Congress an annual report on the implementation of the adaptive management plan required under this section for such fiscal year.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall contain information about the application of adaptive management to restoration activities and programs, including programmatic and project level changes implemented through the process of adaptive management.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) shall apply to the first fiscal year that begins after the date of enactment of this title.

(e) INCLUSION OF PLAN IN ANNUAL ACTION PLAN AND ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT.—The Administrator shall ensure that the Annual Action Plan and Annual Progress Report required by section 205 of Executive Order 13508 includes the adaptive management plan outlined in subsection (a).

SEC. 1304. INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR FOR THE CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be an Independent Evaluator for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, who shall review and report on restoration activities and the use of adaptive management in restoration activities, including on such related topics as are suggested by the Chesapeake Executive Council.

(b) APPOINTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Independent Evaluator shall be appointed by the Administrator from among nominees submitted by the Chesapeake Executive Council.

(2) NOMINATIONS.—The Chesapeake Executive Council may submit to the Administrator 4 nominees for appointment to any vacancy in the office of the Independent Evaluator.

(c) REPORTS.—The Independent Evaluator shall submit a report to the Congress every 2 years in the findings and recommendations of reviews under this section.

(d) CHESAPEAKE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.—In this section, the term ''Chesapeake Executive Council'' has the meaning given that term by section 307 of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–567; 15 U.S.C. 1511d).

SEC. 1305. DEFINITIONS.

In this title, the following definitions apply:

(1) ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT.—The term ''adaptive management'' means a type of natural resource management in which project and program decisions are made as part of an ongoing science-based process. Adaptive management involves testing, monitoring, and evaluating applied strategies and incorporating new knowledge into programs and restoration activities that are based on scientific findings and the needs of society. Results are used to modify management policy, strategies, practices, programs, and restoration activities.

(2) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(3) CHESAPEAKE BAY STATE.—The term ''Chesapeake Bay State'' or ''State'' means the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Delaware, and New York, the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia.

(4) CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED.—The term ''Chesapeake Bay watershed'' means the Chesapeake Bay and the geographic area, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, consisting of 36 tributary basins, within the Chesapeake Bay States, through which precipitation drains into the Chesapeake Bay.

(5) CHIEF EXECUTIVE.—The term ''chief executive'' means, in the case of a State or Commonwealth, the Governor of each such State or Commonwealth and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(6) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(7) RESTORATION ACTIVITIES.—The term ''restoration activities'' means any Federal or State programs or projects that directly or indirectly protect, conserve, or restore living resources, habitat, water resources, or water quality in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including programs or projects that promote responsible land use, stewardship, and community engagement in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Restoration activities may be categorized as follows:

(A) Physical restoration.

(B) Planning.

(C) Feasibility studies.

(D) Scientific research.

(E) Monitoring.

(F) Education.

(G) Infrastructure Development.

TITLE XIV—NATIONAL SECURITY AND FEDERAL LANDS PROTECTION ACT

SEC. 1401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''National Security and Federal Lands Protection Act''.

SEC. 1402. PROHIBITION ON IMPEDING CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION RELATED TO BORDER SECURITY.

(a) PROHIBITION ON SECRETARIES OF THE INTERIOR AND AGRICULTURE.—The Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture shall not impede, prohibit, or restrict activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection on land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to achieve operational control (as defined in section 2(b) of the Secure Fence Act of 2006 (8 U.S.C. 1701 note; Public Law 109–367)) over the international land borders of the United States.

(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall have immediate access to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture for purposes of conducting the following activities on such land that assist in securing the international land borders of the United States:

(A) Construction and maintenance of roads.

(B) Construction and maintenance of fences.

(C) Use vehicles to patrol.

(D) Installation, maintenance, and operation of surveillance equipment and sensors.

(E) Use of aircraft.

(F) Deployment of temporary tactical infrastructure, including forward operating bases.

(c) CLARIFICATION RELATING TO WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including any termination date relating to the waiver referred to in this subsection), the waiver by the Secretary of Homeland Security on April 1, 2008, under section 102(c)(1) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1103 note; Public Law 104–208) of the laws described in paragraph (2) with respect to certain sections of the international border between the United States and Mexico and between the United States and Canada shall be considered to apply to all land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture within 100 miles of the international land borders of the United States for the activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection described in subsection (b).

(2) DESCRIPTION OF LAWS WAIVED.—The laws referred to in paragraph (1) are the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.), the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470aa et seq.), the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.), the Noise Control Act of 1972 (42 U.S.C. 4901 et seq.), the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), Public Law 86–523 (16 U.S.C. 469 et seq.), the Act of June 8, 1906 (commonly known as the ''Antiquities Act of 1906'') (16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.), the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.), the Farmland Protection Policy Act (7 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.), the

Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.), the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.), the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742a et seq.), the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Administrative Procedure Act''), the Otay Mountain Wilderness Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–145, 113 Stat. 1711), sections 102(29) and 103 of California Desert Protection Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 410aaa et seq.), the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–1 et seq.), sections 401(7), 403, and 404 of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–625, 92 Stat. 3467), the Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 101–628), section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 403), the Act of June 8, 1940 (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), (25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.), Public Law 95–341 (42 U.S.C. 1996), Public Law 103–141 (42 U.S.C. 2000bb et seq.), the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.), the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960 (16 U.S.C. 528 et seq.), the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181, et seq.), the Materials Act of 1947 (30 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), and the General Mining Act of 1872 (30 U.S.C. 22 note).

(d) PROTECTION OF LEGAL USES.—This section shall not be construed to provide—

(1) authority to restrict legal uses, such as grazing, hunting, or mining, on land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture; or

(2) any additional authority to restrict legal access to such land.

SEC. 1403. SUNSET.

This title shall have no force or effect after the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 112–539. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1540

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 112–539.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 52, line 13, strike ''151'' and insert ''137''.

Page 52, line 15, strike ''2009''.

Page 52, strike line 16 and insert ''numbered 472/113,006A, and dated June 2012.''.

Page 52, strike line 25, and insert ''(3) by donation or exchange only (and in the case of an exchange, no payment may be made by the Secretary to any landowner). No private property or non-''.

Page 53, line 4, insert ''to'' after ''construed''.

Page 60, beginning on line 22, strike ''100-foot-wide corridor'' and insert ''corridor of not more than 100 feet in width''.

Page 61, after line 2, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

''(2) within one mile of the route, on the date of the enactment of this section, of the Stehekin Valley Road;''.

Page 61, strike lines 7 through 13 and insert the following:

''(b) NO NET LOSS OF LANDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The boundary adjustments made under this section shall be such that equal amounts of federally owned acreage are exchanged between the Stephen Mather Wilderness and the North Cascades National Park, resulting in no net loss of acreage to either the Stephen Mather Wilderness or the North Cascades National Park.

''(2) STEHEKIN VALLEY ROAD LANDS.—The newly designated wilderness shall include the lands along the route of the Stehekin Valley Road that are replaced by the reconstruction.

''(3) EQUALIZATION OF LAND.—If the lands described in paragraph (2) contain fewer acres than the corridor described in subsection (a), the Secretary may designate additional Federal lands in the North Cascades National Park as wilderness, but such designation may not exceed the amount needed to equalize the exchange and these additional lands must be selected from lands that qualify as wilderness under section 2(c) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131(c)).

''(c) NO SALE OR ACQUISITION AUTHORIZED.—Nothing in this title authorizes the sale or acquisition of any land or interest in land.

''(d) NO PRIORITY REQUIRED.—Nothing in this title shall be construed as requiring the Secretary to give this project precedence over the construction or repair of other similarly damaged roads in units of the National Park System.''.

Page 69, line 17, strike ''2022'' and insert ''2019''.

Page 71, after line 13, insert the following:

(e) FUNDING.—Subsection (f) of the Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery Act is amended by striking paragraph (6) and redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (6).

Page 87, strike lines 22 and 23 and insert ''to 90 percent of the funds apportioned to it under section 669c(c) of this title to acquire land for, expand, or construct a public target range.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 688, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

This amendment makes some technical, clarifying, and conforming changes to the underlying bill. It amends title IV to delete a portion of the land that the National Park Service does not want to acquire for the San Antonio missions and which would expose it to liability for cleanup costs.

It conforms the text of title VI to match what the House passed in the 111th Congress in H.R. 2806.

And it conforms title VIII with the leadership protocols regarding length and amount of authorizations.

And, finally, it clarifies what funds States may use to increase access to target ranges under title XII.

With that, I urge adoption and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the manager's amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. On the manager's amendment, we have no problem with the technical changes to the legislation. The content remains the same and the opposition remains the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 112–539.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 47, after line 16, insert the following new subsection:

(k) CONDITION ON SEALASKA EXPORT OF UNPROCESSED TIMBER.—The conveyance to Sealaska of Federal land under this title shall be subject to an additional covenant that Sealaska comply with the export restrictions on unprocessed timber contained in the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 620 et seq.) regarding any timber removed from the conveyed land notwithstanding the geographical limitation on the applicability of such Act only to timber originating from lands west of the 100th meridian in the contiguous 48 States.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 688, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. What it says is that should this legislation pass and the 100,000 acres of forest pass over to the Sealaska Native corporation, a for-profit corporation, that we would ban the export of unprocessed logs from those lands. This would be consistent with the law that applies to the lower 48 west of the Mississippi River.

In 1990, I partnered with Senator Bob Packwood from Oregon to make permanent what had then been an appropriations rider ban since the era of Wayne Morris, and the rationale for that was that we should not be a tree farm for other nations. We want to be an industrial Nation. We want to get value added. We want to export finished products overseas.

We've seen in the last couple of years a flood of private-lands exports from Oregon and Washington, which is timber actually being wasted. Until very recently, the Chinese were paying above-market prices for raw logs,

Douglas fir logs, which they were using, prime timber, one time in construction forms, and then discarding, an incredible waste of a resource and also an economic loss to the Pacific Northwest.

Despite the fact that Washington State exported $1 billion worth of non-Federal raw logs last year, which is twice the amount that they exported just 2 years before, the number of logging jobs did not increase despite this export, and the number of sawmill jobs dropped by a third in Washington State. We're exporting a limited natural resource to which we could add value through what we have, the most productive mills in the world in the United States of America. And instead, those logs are going overseas, and we're actually losing jobs.

Yes, it is profitable for the private landowners, and we don't have restrictions on the export of private logs. But this is public forest lands today which would be converted to private forest lands, and we believe that the potential benefits should be maximized should this happen and that these logs should be manufactured before being exported. If they were exported, I would say in fact there would be a substantial raw-log market in my State because my mills are importing timber from around the world, actually, and from other States in the U.S. to keep their mills running.

In Oregon, non-Federal raw-log exports, again private-land exports, have doubled over the last 3 years to $2.3 billion in value while my sawmills and logging industry reached new lows. This harvesting for export of raw logs is not benefiting the local economies or the United States of America. And in Alaska, raw-log exports from Alaska to China have increased 16-fold over the last decade. Yet the economic benefits of running those logs or potentially running those logs through sawmills was not realized, benefiting rural communities.

I have many depressed rural areas that I represent. We're fighting over how we can get some more logs off Federal lands, logs which can't be exported. These logs could not only benefit Alaskans who could use the manufacturing jobs, and perhaps would see some new investment in sawmill capacity should this amount of timber come onto the market, but also potentially other west coast States, including Oregon and Washington, where our sawmills are struggling to find adequate supply.

So I believe this would be a beneficial, commonsense amendment. It would bring Federal logs, Federal trees, Federal forests, and would make the use of those logs, should they be harvested, consistent with the rest of the Federal lands in the western United States.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I strongly oppose this amendment. I know this amendment may have good intentions, but it is misguided. It will hurt the employment in the Native villages of Alaska. We have studies that show that the employment would not increase if we cannot export some of our logs.

By the way, this amendment was in the Natural Resources Committee, and it was defeated 30–13.

Last night, the Alaska Forest Association wrote in strong opposition to the amendment. And, very frankly, it is not right for the government to tell somebody on private land where they can sell their product. The only person who should be able to do this is the owner of a product. We don't tell where the Californians can sell their rice. We don't tell Weyerhaeuser where they should sell their timber. And so we shouldn't be telling a private landowner where to sell their timber.

In fact, if we had the Tongass National Forest, what little land we have left of less than a million and a half acres that is federally owned as far as harvesting capability, if the Forest Service would do their job, we'd have some timber to harvest, but they're not doing it. But what timber they do harvest on Federal land, they allow 50 percent of old-growth timber sales and 100 percent of new growth, 100 percent to be sold. So this is a little bit, I say, not sincere in the sense that this is not going to create jobs, and the Federal Government is already allowing timber to be sold wherever they wish to.

I would suggest respectfully that the amendment is not placed correctly. I would like to keep the timber in the United States, but if the market's not there, or if the bid is not as high as overseas people who bid on it, then you have to let the private person, in fact, sell his timber.

I would suggest respectfully that the thing that concerns me the most in this whole argument is some of the arguments against this legislation. This is about a Native group. It's a corporation, but it's a Native group of villages put together that have a high unemployment. We're getting all kinds of bull dip all across the Internet now saying that this, in fact, is going to give away. It's talk about roads being given away. This is timber area that has already been cut, and they do not want to cut the old timber area.

□ 1550

They're trying to have a good industry built by silviculture, and this is what's so important here. But for some reason, like I say, they're winning the ''bull dip'' awards of the whole year on this legislation.

Now, I understand what the gentleman is trying to do, but it's not right to have a private entity be told by the Federal Government where they can sell their product. We don't tell rice growers or tell anybody else where to sell their product. They sell it to the best market, and this is about the best market.

This would be wrong because they will have timber in a few years. I'd say maybe 50 years they'll have the best timber stand in the whole State of Alaska because this area has already been cut. They'll take them thin, and they'll be able to sell this timber at a high price, probably to the United States by then because we'll all be long gone.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 30 seconds remaining.

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

I certainly respect the gentleman from Alaska, and I know that it's his intention to benefit the people of Alaska. I've been involved in this issue now for almost—well, for 22 years on the issue of exporting raw logs. In fact, I did try and restrict the export of private logs back there in 1990 and couldn't get that, but at least we got the Federal and at least we've kept the State, and we do get value added. And for every 1,000 board feet of timber harvested, we get more jobs than just a logging job, a trucking job, and a loading it on the ship job. We get the jobs in the mills. I would argue that the same would flow to Alaska should this amendment pass.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time and urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 2 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, obviously, to this amendment because this amendment would single out one particular group of Native Alaskans for restrictions that currently only apply to timber harvested from certain Federal lands in the lower 48.

Now, the irony here, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Alaska, is that the Forest Service in the Tongass allows for 100 percent export of red cedar harvested in the Tongass and 50 percent of old growth harvested in the Tongass. So I think it is, in all honesty, Mr. Chairman, a bit hypocritical to impose the domestic limitations on Natives while the Forest Service is doing just exactly the opposite.

Now, I'll also add that this amendment does not affect other landowners on the Tongass; it only affects the Natives of Sealaska. Now, I don't think that's really what we should be doing here on the floor of the House is singling out one group for a penalty, and that's precisely what this amendment does.

So I urge rejection of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112–539.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 83, after line 21, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1104. GRAZING FEE PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to conduct a pilot program in fiscal years 2013 through 2016 to collect an administrative fee to offset the increased cost of administering the livestock grazing program on public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

(b) FEE AMOUNT AND COLLECTION.—

(1) AMOUNT.—The fee authorized by this section shall be in the amount of $1 per Animal Unit Month, and shall be billed, collected, and subject to the penalties using the same process as the annual grazing fee under section 4130.8–1 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) DEPOSIT OF PENALTIES.—Penalties assessed under this subsection shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

(3) APPLICABILITY.—Nothing in this section affects the calculation, collection, distribution, or use of the grazing fee under 43 U.S.C. 315 et seq., section 205(b) of Public Law 94–579 (43 U.S.C. 1751(b)), section 6(a) of Public Law 95–514 (43 U.S.C. 1905), Executive Order 12548, or any administrative regulation.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 688, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, we're about to talk about grazing fees. For people in many parts of the country, they may not know what that is. That is that, on Federal lands across the country, cattlemen can bring their cattle onto Federal lands—that is, the public lands of the United States—and graze. And what are they charged? Well, they're charged $1.35. That's exactly what they were charged in 1986.

Now, right next to this Federal land, in many States, there is State land. That State land in Colorado is very valuable; but they ensure, the Governor of Colorado, that the cattlemen there in that State pay $10 to graze, not 1.35. In Montana, cattlemen have to pay $7.90. In Utah, they have to pay $7.30. But on the public lands in each of those States—that is, the Federal lands—it's 1.35, just hasn't increased. And who pays the price? Well, the Federal taxpayer pays the price because the cattlemen get to basically have this incredible subsidy.

So, just to use the analogy, when I started working, I got paid $1.35 when I was a kid. I'm sure there are many people who would still like to just pay $1.35 for a kid to work in the supermarket, but they can't do it because time moves on—unless you're a cattleman, where they have locked that minimum price into a hermetically sealed, cryogenically frozen price, $1.35. That's great, except for the Federal taxpayer who cannot collect all of the money they need.

Or should we just say, for the sake of discussion, that you happen to have a rent-controlled apartment in New York City. The rent was set back in 1986 or 1976, and now the markets have raised that price up to perhaps $4,000. The Republicans would say, well, rent control, that's good; we like keeping the price that way because it benefits a certain class of people. And I understand the Republican philosophy of freezing in prices that way—keeping the minimum wage as low as possible, keeping the rent control price for an apartment as low as possible. I understand the government intervention role of the Federal Government not allowing the free market to determine the price of something. But here what happens is that it balloons the Federal deficit because people aren't able to collect what we absolutely know to be the price to graze for a cow per day. We know what the price is because, in the adjoining land in Colorado or Utah or in Montana or in Washington State, we know what the State is charging on State public lands.

So this is just an attempt to give the Department of the Interior the ability to raise by $1—not all the way up to $10, not all the way up to $7, but just $1 from $1.35 up to $2.35—just as a little experiment just to see what happens out there in the market when people actually have to pay something that even remotely approximates what the price to graze would be.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR), the author of the title of this bill.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, and let's talk about some facts and some figures and some numbers.

The good gentleman from Massachusetts continues to say that we need to treat this land the same as private land. The thing that's really fascinating to me is that we have in Colorado and Utah and Idaho many people who would like to actually do their grazing on State lands or private lands, but the difference is that in Massachusetts only 1.6 percent of the land is actually Federal land. In fact, if you look at the acreage, 81,000 acres in Massachusetts are Federal lands. That's why they can actually rely on many other things for their grazing and many other things that they do.

In Idaho, 68 percent of the land is Federal land. In fact, we're talking about 32.5 million acres in Idaho that are actually having to be managed by the Federal Government and that we have to deal with on a daily basis in the State of Idaho.

I think most grazers, most producers would actually like to be doing it on State lands where they actually will be paying more, but they actually receive more benefit for being on the State-owned lands than the State-managed lands. My question to the gentleman is: Why doesn't he allow Idaho and other States in the West to do what we want to do, which what we want to do is we actually want to manage our own lands. We have been asking that for a long time.

But it's interesting to me that the States that only have 1.4 percent of Federal lands continue to tell the States that have 68 percent of Federal lands that they cannot manage their own land. If we were allowed to manage our own lands, we would actually be able to charge a little bit more, but we would do away with all the NEPA requirements and all the other requirements that we have to deal with right now when we're on Federal lands.

So I think it's a little bit hypocritical for somebody to come here to the House floor and object to something that they don't even have to deal with in their own State.

□ 1600

Mr. MARKEY. Would the Chair please inform us as to how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MARKEY. I will, at this point, continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washngton. Mr. Chairman, I would advise my friend from Massachusetts that I am the last speaker on this amendment, so if he's prepared to close, I'll close.

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

So this argument that's being made by the Republicans is nonsensical. What you're saying is, that in your home State, on State land, you charge 10 bucks or 7 bucks to the cattlemen to graze. But on Federal land it's only a buck 35 in your State. And your answer to raising the price for cattlemen is that we should be having a debate over whether or not the State of Colorado or Montana controls all of the Federal land in your State. Then you'll begin to debate whether or not cattlemen should get away with only a buck 35?

You know, you're giving new definition to the term ''free range beef.''

You're allowing for the cattlemen in these States to get away with murder, and you're not even debating the issue of how they get away with this.

That's all we want from you. Tell us why you think they deserve a buck 35. You don't even want to reach that issue. You want to go off on the secondary issue of how much land in each State is controlled by the Federal Government, which is not what we are debating. We're debating how cattlemen get away with this bargain basement price that then comes to every other State to make up the difference in the Federal deficit because you're unwilling to collect it.

Meanwhile, you say to Grandma, higher rates for Medicare. You say to kids in school, higher payback for the loans that you take out. But for the cattlemen in your home State, somehow or other you don't understand that this is a debate that goes to the heart of why it is the people are very unhappy with the way the Federal Government operates.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting debate. But let's just put some facts as to what this amendment would do. It would amount to a nearly 75 percent increase on the fees for public land grazers. Now, let me emphasize the word ''public land,'' because we hear this all the time, and the idea is that public land is owned by all Americans, even people that live in States where there's not any Federal lands.

But I would just, Mr. Chairman, advise my colleagues that people that live on public lands own the public lands too. If the first argument is correct, then the second argument is also correct.

What is interesting about this grazing fee debate is, if this gazing fee is raised, it could potentially put livestock producers out of business. Now, maybe that is what the goal is of my good friend from Massachusetts, because that is certainly the stated goal of some environmental extremist groups.

What is also interesting and, as was pointed out by my colleague from Idaho, when you operate on Federal lands you are subjected to endless litigation and review stemming from NEPA and outside attacks by environmental groups.

But probably more important, and this is the distinguishing part on this whole debate: some people claim that these ranchers are subsidized. But the fact is, when the West was settled, we were never given an opportunity to buy these lands for State purposes, and they remained in Federal control. And so as a result, everybody has a say in public lands.

What my colleague from Idaho is simply saying is, if we had control of our public lands, whether it's State land or private or county, we would probably manage it better. But we don't have that opportunity because we were never given the opportunity. And so, as a result, we have to fight off these huge increases that come from people that probably have a different notion, different idea of what it's like.

So I think this is an ill-advised amendment, and I urge its rejection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 112–539.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 1401, 1402, and 1403, and insert the following:

SEC. 1401. WAIVER OF FEDERAL LAWS WITH RESPECT TO BORDER SECURITY ACTIONS ON DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE LANDS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''National Security and Federal Lands Protection Act''.

(b) PROHIBITION ON SECRETARIES OF THE INTERIOR AND AGRICULTURE.—The Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture shall not impede, prohibit, or restrict activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection on Federal land located within 100 miles of an international land border, that is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent all unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband through the international land borders of the United States.

(c) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.—U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall have access to Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture for purposes of conducting the following activities on such land that assist in securing the international land borders of the United States:

(1) Construction and maintenance of roads.

(2) Construction and maintenance of fences.

(3) Use of vehicles to patrol.

(4) Installation, maintenance, and operation of surveillance equipment and sensors.

(5) Use of aircraft.

(6) Deployment of temporary tactical infrastructure, including forward operating bases.

(d) CLARIFICATION RELATING TO WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including any termination date relating to the waiver referred to in this subsection), the waiver by the Secretary of Homeland Security on April 1, 2008, under section 102(c)(1) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1103 note; Public Law 104–208) of the laws described in paragraph (2) with respect to certain sections of the international border between the United States and Mexico and between the United States and Canada shall be considered to apply to all Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture within 100 miles of the international land borders of the United States for the activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection described in subsection (c).

(2) DESCRIPTION OF LAWS WAIVED.—The laws referred to in paragraph (1) are limited to the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.), Public Law 86–523 (16 U.S.C. 469 et seq.), the Act of June 8, 1906 (commonly known as the ''Antiquities Act of 1906''; 16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.), the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.), the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742a et seq.), the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Administrative Procedure Act''), the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), the General Authorities Act of 1970 (Public Law 91–383) (16 U.S.C. 1a-1 et seq.), sections 401(7), 403, and 404 of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–625, 92 Stat. 3467), and the Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 101–628).

(e) PROTECTION OF LEGAL USES.—This section shall not be construed to provide—

(1) authority to restrict legal uses, such as grazing, hunting, mining, or public-use recreational and backcountry airstrips on land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture;

(2) any additional authority to restrict legal access to such land; or

(3) any additional authority or access to private or State land.

(f) TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY.—Nothing in this section supersedes, replaces, negates, or diminishes treaties or other agreements between the United States and Indian tribes

(g) SUNSET.—This section shall have no force or effect after the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 688, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, there are basically four elements that are involved in the amendment that I am proposing. The first one is to narrow the list of laws that can be waived by the Border Patrol on these areas to maintain operational control of the land. Presently, it lists 36 bills that could be waived.

Now I want you to know that that number was not irrational. It was not picked out of the air. Thirty-six bills have precedence of what this House has already done.

When the government was trying to finish the fence in California, there were litigations and environmental laws that were prohibiting them from doing that, so the Department of Homeland Security recommended the 36 laws that they thought did or could impede the building of that particular wall along our border. Congress agreed with them and, for the purpose of concluding that wall, we allowed them to waive those 36 rules, regulations, or laws.

Those are the same 36 in this bill. It's nothing additional to it. Well, I take that back. Democrats add one bill in committee that was not part of the original list, and that was fine as well.

What we are now trying to do is admit that about 20 of those really are not going to be a problem, but 16 still could be. So it limits it from 36 to 16, as those that can be waived for the purpose of allowing Border Patrol and Homeland Security to do the job for which they are paid to do.

The second thing, it specifically prohibits any additional access to private property. It eliminates the possibility of Border Patrol reducing public access to any Federal lands, and that includes for purposes of hunting or fishing or off-road vehicles.

It adds a provision to ensure that we are to protect tribal sovereignty, that nothing in this bill may supersede, replace, negate, or diminish treaty obligations or agreements with Indian tribes. Existing practices and negotiation cooperation between the Border Patrol and the tribes will continue.

It also clarifies what is the purpose of operation control, which is to prevent all unlawful entry into the United States, including entry by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband through the international land borders of the United States.

There are three reasons why this amendment, indeed, the underlying bill is important. Number 1, a sovereign country controls its own borders. We are not doing that here. We need to.

Number 2, we will never solve our overall immigration issue until we can guarantee that we can, in some way, lower the anger and the rage and the anxiety that is out there. If indeed we can look at our fellow citizens and, with a straight face, say we have control of the border, all of a sudden the ability of solving other problems, some of which are easy and some of which are complex, the ability to do that increases.

And third, and most importantly, the violence against women—the women who are raped along these trails, whose garments are left on these trees as a trophy to the coyote who raped these women, these woman who have absolutely no other source to go, they have no one to complain to, they have no one to ask for protection. This must stop.

The Border Patrol can't stop this practice. Right now, what we're doing is simply putting up signs saying areas are off limits to Americans, but that does not stop this practice. And unless we can give the Border Patrol access to this territory so they can stop this practice, we're not doing anything about it. We are not solving this particular issue.

I'll add one more time. We have talked about the ''drone zone'' in here, which is something, once again, it's cute and inaccurate. This amendment has nothing do with the ''drone zone.'' It does not authorize, nor does it stop drones. It doesn't authorize black helicopters or stop them, or red-headed stepchildren, or illegal Druids coming to this country as well.

But what it does do is allow our professional Border Patrol to have the same rights of access to Federal land that they have on private property and State land. And it says that we will control our border, we will solve our immigration problem, and we will stop the rape trees. We will stop this heinous practice from going forward, and we will do it positively. That's the purpose of this amendment to this title of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1610

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. This amendment is just further evidence that the problem this drone zone bill claims to be solving does not exist and that the underlying bill is a dangerous overreach.

When this legislation was first introduced, we were told that it was necessary to establish this 100-mile drone zone around the entire United States—east coast, west coast, Hawaii, and Alaska. That version of the drone zone looked like a giant red belt surrounding the entire country. Then supporters of the bill decided that they'd gone too far. The bill was altered to say the drone zone would only cover a 100-mile stretch along our northern and southern borders and along the eastern border of Alaska. Even with that change, we were still assured that a blanket waiver of the full list of 36 bedrock environmental laws was absolutely necessary for our border security.

Now we have a further change.

This amendment will reduce the list of laws weighed by the drone zone from 36 environmental laws down to 16 environmental laws. This is the ever-shrinking bill. It gets smaller and smaller as people realize that environmental laws are not the problem when it comes to border security and that the zone created by this bill would harm the environment and individual freedoms for millions of Americans.

The Bishop amendment proves that the underlying bill has always been an extreme and extremely harmful solution to a problem that does not exist. Perhaps if we give supporters enough time, they can shrink this idea down to waiving parking enforcement in a small area around Tucson. This amendment reduces the damage this bill would do, but it does not begin to prevent that damage. Waiving 36 laws was an unnecessary overreach, and waiving 16 laws would be as well.

Limiting the scope of this terrible bill is a small step in the right direction, so there is no reason to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Would the Chair please inform the Members as to the time remaining on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 minutes. The gentleman from Utah has 30 seconds.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. I thank you, Mr. MARKEY.

I rise in opposition to the bill, especially to the border provisions of the bill, and I rise in support of the Grijalva amendment that is going to be coming.

I represent the entire California-Mexico border. I know how harmful this bill can be. As I read the exemptions from laws, I can see—I don't know—undocumented child labor filling in wetlands.

I mean, come on.

Our natural beauty depends on these protections. These laws protect us, and the Department of Homeland Security, as I understand it, is not in support of these provisions. They testified in July of 2011:

> The U.S. Customs and Border Protection Agency enjoys a close working relationship with the Department of the Interior and with the Department of Agriculture that allows us to fulfill our border enforcement responsibilities while respecting and enhancing the environment.

This excessive exemption from a century's worth of environmental protection laws would affect public lands and national parks all across the country.

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

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

Mr. FILNER. This would put in danger important parks and monuments, not only in my area, but those such as the Statue of Liberty National Monument, Cape Cod in Massachusetts, Point Reyes in California, Cape Hatteras National Seashore in North Carolina, and scores of others. We must protect these important national parks, recreation areas, and wilderness lands for future generations.

Mr. Chairman, I also invited the gentleman, Mr. DENHAM, whose bill this is, to join me at the border to see what we would be protecting. I don't think he ever answered my letter.

Mr. MARKEY. I am the final speaker on our side if the gentleman from Utah is ready to conclude debate.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am prepared to close when you are ready to close.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. The 36 laws that were originally placed were there when Homeland Security asked for those and when Congress agreed to it. It is the precedent. I am lowering it to 16 out of benefit to you.

I have been on the border. I have been on the border, and I have seen the rape trees. This must stop. I have also been on the border to see there are 48 different organizations that have endorsed the underlying bill, including the National Association of Former Border Patrol Officers, the National Border Patrol Council, the local Border Patrol Council in Arizona, and the National Association of Police Organizations. Those who work this realize the importance of this, and that's why they are supporting it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 112–539.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike title XIV.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 688, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Out of all the titles cobbled together under this one piece of legislation, title XIV is the most alarming, so I have introduced this amendment to strike it all from the bill.

Not only is it the text of one of the most controversial bills introduced in this Congress, its intent is to expand the scope and the authority of one government agency to achieve a loosely defined objective, an agency that has not even asked for this expanded authority. Title XIV of this legislation would supersize Customs and Border Protection so they could seize control of Federal lands within 100 miles of the northern and southern borders. It would be at their discretion and without any recourse by the public to be able to counter that.

If this bill were to become law, families who use our parks, forests, and wildlife areas in all of these States could be subject to increased surveillance without any notification. We already know what happens to the economic welfare of families and what has happened to the economies of the States of Alabama and Arizona when States pass hostile anti-immigrant laws. This takes the same concept and spreads it across our northern and southern borders.

Right now, Customs and Border Protection isn't suffering from a lack of authority. If anything, it is suffering from a lack of focus. The ability to access Federal lands isn't causing Border Patrol problems. In the most recent GAO report, radios that don't work and the lack of infrastructure and personnel are what they have cited as being barriers.

Yesterday, during the debate over the rule for the bill, the sponsor of the legislation that has become title XIV claimed that we can't deal with the issue of immigration reform before securing our land borders. He went on to say that people are angry about the situation at the border and that, before this anger is addressed, we can't do anything about our broken immigration system, so we are going to pay some lip service to border security to advance what is essentially an anti-environment and anti-immigrant agenda.

That should make many of us angry because it adds to the division in our Nation and to the sense of millions of families in the border region and across this country who feel they are political pawns in a system—in a game—that is never ending. Millions of people live along these 100 miles, and they deserve the same protection from environmental pollution or government overreach that the rest of us in the country enjoy.

The original bill granted DHS a waiver of 36 laws. The recently introduced amendment would allow that list to be 16. The fact that we were able to concede half of the original list proves that the bill is, from the outset, an unnecessary overreach. The 16 laws left in the legislation are not minor statutes. They include the National Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Antiquities Act, the Wilderness Act, and the Administrative Procedure Act.

The solution to a broken system along the border is comprehensive immigration reform. If you took that 100-mile zone along the southern border and made it into a State, it would lead the Nation in poverty, unemployment, educational attainment, the lowest wages, the most uninsured, and the lowest economic growth. Yet this legislation and title XIV, once again, take this region, and instead of providing support and comprehensive attention to it, we further marginalize and isolate it.

□ 1620

All the laws that are being waived and eliminated are all landmark pieces of legislation that guide and manage our Federal lands, resources that belong to every single American taxpayer. Throwing away decades of law that help protect and preserve our Federal lands makes no sense. The supporters of this legislation will say it is necessary to address the horrors and violence that occur on the border. That's not true. It's back-door amnesty for extremist anti-environmental groups, industries, and developers who lust after our public resources for private profit at taxpayers' expense.

That is why I've introduced my amendment to strike the title from the bill. I encourage its support and reserve my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I hope I will not take the 5 minutes of this time.

With all due respect for my good friend from Arizona, for whom I have a great deal of admiration, I would emphasize again that the title of this section is National Security and Federal Lands Protection. It does not extend to any other property except those that belong to the Federal Government on our borders. It has a 5-year limitation on it. There is a sunset provision so it can be reviewed. But more importantly, the elements that are in this particular title are there for a reason, there is precedent for them. One hundred miles is what the legal definition of border land actually is. The 36 laws—I'm ready to go back to those. The 36 laws were the laws that were presented by the Department of Homeland Security as those potential laws that could cause them damage, and this Congress agreed to that precedent. Congress established that they could be waived for that specific purpose.

I want to once again tell you what Secretary Napolitano said about this particular issue of border security when she first came into office: The removal of cross-border violators from public lands is a value to the environment.

You want to protect the environment, get the drug cartels and the human traffickers off of that particular area. It is the removal of those violators from public lands that is a value to the environment, as well as to the mission of the land managers, which is once again the 48 groups that talk about and support this. They come from conservation groups, they come from agriculture groups, but more importantly, they come from the Border Patrol agents themselves. Those are the ones who have come forth and testified that they need special ability of having access to this land if we're going to control the border, which is what a sovereign country does.

Mr. Chairman, this is the word of what their responsibilities are. This is what we have told the Border Patrol they have to do: Prevent all unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband through the international land borders

of the United States. That's in this title. That's their job. That's what the Border Patrol has requested to do.

All we need to do is give them the tools they need to be able to accomplish that, tools on Federal land that will mirror the tools they have on private and State lands. Let them do their job. They need access to this area to patrol it and to apprehend the bad guys. Give them that opportunity.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, if I may inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from North Carolina, the ranking member of DHS appropriations, Mr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Grijalva amendment, which would restore proper environmental oversight and protections to construction performed by the Border Patrol.

Even with the Bishop amendment just adopted, the bill waives 16 different environmental laws—for example, the National Environmental Policy Act and wildlife refuge laws—to give DHS operational control over these lands.

Mr. Chairman, that would mean that on our northwest border, the Border Patrol would have largely unfettered access, and environmental protections would be waived, within 10 miles of Seattle. In Arizona, this would encompass all of Tucson. In New York, land in Buffalo and Syracuse could come under control. These are sweeping and unnecessary provisions, and the Department of Homeland Security has said it does not want them.

Having worked on this issue for years as chairman and ranking member of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee, I urge my colleagues to adopt the amendment.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, can I just inquire if there is any time left from either side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah has 2¼ minutes remaining. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Let me just say once again, I appreciate the arguments that are given.

When I have been on the border and have been able to talk to the people who work on the border about what they need to protect the border, once again they're telling us that they need the access. The ability to waive these law, these rules, these regulations is what we have done in the past. Congress already did it once before. There is precedent. This is not something that is new, but this is what is definitely needed. This is the right thing to do.

I urge you to reject this particular amendment.

And in all fairness, Mr. Chair, I would like to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona so he has a chance to close on his particular amendment.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your courtesy.

I would at this point say that I appreciate the time, and I'll wait to call for a vote. Thank you very much.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 112–539.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 104, after line 8, insert the following new subsection:

(e) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION WITH RESPECT TO HAWAII.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply with respect to activities by U.S. Customs and Border Protection on land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture in Hawaii.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 688, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chair, first I would like to begin by saying that we've had my amendment before the committee and the representations that were made with it were that it did not cover Hawaii. I'm here to basically reaffirm that on the floor of the House.

This all started because when I was home, I was the speaker at the 50th anniversary of the USS Arizona Memorial. As I sat there, I began to understand that, in fact, the National Park Service has jurisdiction over the *Arizona* and all of its facilities in Pearl Harbor. So it caused me to go back and check exactly how many lands are under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service and Fish and Wildlife, which would fall within this law.

There are 357,772 acres in the National Park Service and 298,980 acres under the Fish and Wildlife Service. As you all know, with 100 miles from any border, it would cover the whole State of Hawaii. But, Mr. Chair, I believe with the representation from the gentleman from Utah, I would be willing to withdraw my amendment if I'm again assured that this is not intended to cover Hawaii.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. HANABUSA. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Yes, Hawaii was taken out in committee. It is not put in with the amendment that was just passed.

Ms. HANABUSA. With that, Mr. Chair, I respectfully ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 7 will not be offered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112–539 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 236, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

AYES—184

Ackerman	Clay	Frank (MA)
Andrews	Cleaver	Fudge
Baldwin	Clyburn	Garamendi
Barber	Cohen	Gerlach
Barrow	Connolly (VA)	Gonzalez
Bartlett	Conyers	Green, Al
Bass (CA)	Cooper	Green, Gene
Becerra	Costa	Grijalva
Berkley	Costello	Gutierrez
Berman	Courtney	Hahn
Bishop (GA)	Critz	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Crowley	Heinrich
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Higgins
Bonamici	Cummings	Himes
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Hinchey
Brady (PA)	Davis (IL)	Hinojosa
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Hochul
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Holden
Butterfield	DeLauro	Holt
Capps	Deutch	Hoyer
Capuano	Dicks	Israel
Cardoza	Doggett	Jackson Lee (TX)
Carnahan	Doyle	Johnson (GA)
Carney	Edwards	Johnson (IL)
Carson (IN)	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Castor (FL)	Engel	Jones
Chandler	Eshoo	Kaptur
Chu	Farr	Keating
Cicilline	Fattah	Kildee
Clarke (MI)	Filner	Kind
Clarke (NY)	Fitzpatrick	

Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
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

NOES—236

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hirono
Honda
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
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 (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
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 (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Altmire
Davis (KY)
Dingell
Hayworth
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Jackson (IL)
Lewis (CA)
Miller (FL)
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Young (FL)

□ 1655

Messrs. SMITH of Texas, BARTON of Texas, and TIPTON changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. PETRI, MCDERMOTT, COSTA, and BARTLETT changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. EMERSON was allowed to speak out of order.)

WOMEN'S CONGRESSIONAL SOFTBALL

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, my softball co-captain, my colleague from Florida, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and I would like to remind all of you, all of our colleagues, that tomorrow night, once again the bicameral, bipartisan softball team plans to beat the Washington news media in a softball game; and we want to make sure that all of you know the details so you can join us in the very oppressive heat that we will be playing in.

I yield to my co-captain.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. We are really excited. This is the fourth annual congressional women's softball game. We are the defending champions. We beat the Bad News Babes last year. We have expanded our team. We have the gentlelady from Alabama who's a ringer this year, Mrs. ROBY. You should come out and see her play; she's got some skills.

So even though the press corps has been talking some good trash, and they're even apparently practicing on the beach while at the G–20, we have jelled as a team, come together in a bipartisan, bicameral way. And between our superior fielding, hitting, and strategic approach to the game, we look forward to continuing as the champions of the Annual Congressional Women's Softball Game. It's 7 p.m. tomorrow night, Watkins Recreation Center. Come on out, encourage your staff. This year it is a $10 entry fee, but all for a good cause, to raise money for the Young Survival Coalition, which is an organization that raises awareness and supports young survivors of breast cancer.

And I would just conclude by thanking all Members and staff, as a breast cancer survivor myself, and a young one at that, it is so personally and deeply meaningful to me that the congressional family is always so supportive of the women Members. Thank you to my congressional sisters. You guys are awesome.

Mrs. EMERSON. And I want to just thank MARTHA ROBY for helping our average age go way, way, way down.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 268, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—156

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

NOES—268

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
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 (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Altmire
Dingell
Huizenga (MI)
Jackson (IL)
Lewis (CA)
Miller (FL)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1702

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 247, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 385]

AYES—177

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

NOES—247

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
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
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Altmire
Dingell
Huizenga (MI)
Jackson (IL)
Lewis (CA)
Miller (FL)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Young (FL)

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

□ 1707

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOODALL). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOODALL, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2578) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act related to a segment of the Lower Merced River in California, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 688, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

□ 1710

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. In its current form, I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Perlmutter moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2578, to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

TITLE XV—REDUCING THE RISK OF WILDFIRE; PROTECTING TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY; MAKE IT IN AMERICA

SEC. 1501. REDUCING THE RISK OF WILDFIRE.

The Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior are authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with a State to permit the State to treat insect-infected trees and remove hazardous fuels on Federal land located in the State, in order to reduce the risk of wildfire. Priority shall be given to the protection of homes, schools, and healthcare, nursing, and assisted living facilities.

SEC. 1502. PROTECTING TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY.

Nothing in this Act shall override Tribal sovereignty, including with respect to Native American burial or other sacred sites.

SEC. 1503. MAKE IT IN AMERICA.

The Secretary of the Interior shall ensure that all items offered for sale in any gift shop or visitor center located within a unit of the National Park System are produced in the United States.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to recommit. It is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill and, if adopted, the House will vote on final passage in this series of votes.

The amendment has three parts. They are short and direct. The first involves wildfires and the ability and the authority of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into contracts with the States to clear hazardous fuel to prevent wildfires, as well as treat insect-infested trees. And we'll get into that.

The second part is very clear. Just says, nothing in this act shall override tribal sovereignty, including with respect to Native American burial or other sacred sites. It speaks for itself.

Finally, it's about making sure that in the parks and in the gift shops, that the goods that are sold there are made in America.

So let's just begin with the wildfire piece. As Smokey the Bear says, ''Only you can prevent forest fires.''

Right now, across the West and throughout America we have wildfires dotting our country: 500,000 acres across our country are on fire right now, in Alaska, Arizona, California, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Wyoming, and in my home State of Colorado.

Right now we're battling a very big wildfire just north of where I live called the High Park fire—60,000 acres are currently burning. We have about 50 percent contained through the efforts of 1,800 firefighters, some of the best Federal firefighters we have, as well as State and local firefighters who are doing a tremendous job in a situation where we have very dry conditions, record temperatures, and a very erratic fire.

Now, what we can do and what is missing from this bill is any public policy concerning what to do with insect-infested forests. And we've had a terrible infestation of what they called the pine beetle. And it makes tremendous fuel.

And so what this bill does is it gives the authority to the Agriculture Department and the Interior Department to work with the States to clear these insect-ravaged forests. We need to have that done to prevent forest fires in the future. It's as simple as that. It ought to be very easy for everyone to support that.

Secondly, again, this amendment says specifically, the act shall not override tribal sovereignty. We've reached treaties with the various tribes. Those things control, not this particular bill, and we state that specifically.

Finally, we address something that I think irks many of us in this Chamber. When we have a visitors center in our national parks which is selling goods made in other countries, it just seems wrong. We want to make things in America. Manufacturing in America is key to this country's economic growth and prosperity. We have a saying, ''If we make it in America, we'll make it in America.''

So three very simple, very direct amendments to this bill which make the bill much better, address public policy that is not addressed in the bill that should have been addressed in the bill, especially the wildfire mitigation piece, something that you would have expected to be right in the heart of this thing after Texas was ravaged by so many wildfires last year, and we knew dry conditions existed across the West.

So I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to support this commonsense amendment to mitigate and prevent forest fires, to make sure that tribal sovereignty is respected, and that we make things in America so that we make it here in America.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I've had an opportunity several times to come down here to debate the motions to recommit, and I've prefaced virtually every time I've come down here with, history repeats itself.

Mr. Speaker, history is repeating itself one more time. Why do I say that? Because probably the biggest issue that Americans are concerned about is jobs. This is another effort that deals with American jobs by dealing with regulation that slows down economic activity.

So what does the other side do? They try to put up another impediment to a bill that is straightforward, had transparency in committee, had a full debate in committee, and put together to debate on the floor. It's the same arguments that we have that, frankly, are meaningless.

Now, to the essence of what the gentleman's amendment does. All of this is essentially redundant. It's in law right now.

Is this just a political move on the minority's part? Is that what it is?

If the issue is really trying to deal with firefighting in the West, I would remind this body, Mr. Speaker, that 2 weeks ago, we passed legislation to allow the Forest Service to buy tankers to fight forest fires. We've already done that.

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that history repeats itself. Let's vote down this motion to recommit and let's vote for the jobs bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was 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, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2938.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 234, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

AYES—188

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
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
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
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)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—234

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
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
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
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
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
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
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Altmire
Cummings
Dingell
Huizenga (MI)
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Lewis (CA)
Miller (FL)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1735

Messrs. ROYCE, COFFMAN of Colorado, and TIPTON changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 188, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

YEAS—232

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Holden
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
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 (IN)

NAYS—188

Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bartlett

Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
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—12

Altmire
Cummings
Dingell
Huizenga (MI)
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Lewis (CA)
Miller (FL)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schock
Schwartz
Young (FL)

□ 1742

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:

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 387, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

GILA BEND INDIAN RESERVATION LANDS REPLACEMENT CLARIFICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2938) to prohibit certain gaming activities on certain Indian lands in Arizona, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 343, nays 78, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

YEAS—343

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Towns
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—78

Amash
Barber
Bass (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Castor (FL)
Cicilline
Costello
Critz
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutch
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Filner
Frank (MA)
Grijalva
Higgins
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lummis
Lynch
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McDermott
McNerney
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Owens
Paul
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Yarmuth

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Chu
LaTourette

NOT VOTING—9

Altmire
Dingell
Hirono
Huizenga (MI)
Jackson (IL)
Lewis (CA)
Miller (FL)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Young (FL)

□ 1749

Messrs. LEVIN and WELCH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 388, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4480, DOMESTIC ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–540) on the resolution (H. Res. 691) providing for consideration of

the bill (H.R. 4480) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in response to a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have a previous noticed motion at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Walz of Minnesota moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4348 be instructed to resolve all issues and file a conference report not later than June 22, 2012.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee for being here. I know his commitment to building infrastructure in this Nation is unquestioned. He's been a good friend and a gentleman on the committee.

I think what we're here for today, Mr. Speaker, is the American people deserve better from us. We have a need in this country that is obvious to everyone. The infrastructure in this country is crumbling: 70,000 deficient bridges; nearly half our highways in disrepair. And being a Member from Minnesota, that hot August day almost 5 years ago when the I–35W bridge fell into the Mississippi River is a stark testament of what we can do.

The Transportation Committee, by command of the Constitution, if you will, has always been there to build the post roads. This Nation has built canals, locks, dams, and ports. We've built railroads that connected the continent and spurred the industrial revolution. We've built an interstate highway system that made the American economy the envy of the world. We have possessed vision, we've possessed willpower, and we've done it in a manner that incorporated bipartisan support and, at the end of the day, compromise.

The last bill that passed, SAFETEA-LU, passed by a vote in this House in 2005 of 412–8; in the Senate, 91–4. The previous bill, 2007, 297–86, and 88–5 in the Senate. In 1991, 372–47; the Senate, 79–8. In 1987, over the last 25 years, 350–73. We have the will. We simply need to exercise the political willpower to move this piece of legislation.

So this motion to instruct is very simple. A hundred days ago, the Senate passed their version. It received a vote of 74–22. It is a bipartisan bill.

Now, I will be the first to tell you the prerogative of the House to lead is sacred to us here. We need to have a say in this. We need to make sure that the people's House has their voice in things. The problem we have is we've been sitting in conference committee for 45 days with a deadlock and no end in sight.

So this motion to instruct, yes, it's a nonbinding sense of the House, but I would argue it's far more than that. This is a sense of the American public. They sent us here to do some basic work. They did not send us here to agree with each other on everything, but they did have that understanding that the glue that binds the Nation together is compromise. And there are a very few things that historically have been bipartisan. The transportation bill has been one of those.

So what this MTI asks is: rectify the differences and compromise to the point that we can get something on the floor and finish the work by June 22, this Friday. Then give us the opportunity to exercise the American will by having their Representatives discuss what needs to be there. If we can't come to a compromise, bring us the Senate bill and let's have the up-or-down vote. If it passes, we can move forward. If it doesn't, then we start and go on from there. But I have to tell you, we can't afford to kick this can down the road—and I would say the proverbial ''crumbling road.''

The Chamber of Commerce has made the case:

Failure to keep up with infrastructure needs in the U.S. cost this economy $2 trillion between 2008 and 2009.

Every year we do nothing, we spend over $100 billion on idling tax. We waste 1.9 billion gallons of fuel yearly. That's 5 percent of our fuel needs. That's money going to foreign countries who hate us. They'll hate us for free. We can be more efficient. We cannot waste Americans' hard-earned dollars staring at the bumper in front of them. We can do it safely, and we can move our products to market faster; and we have that power.

I said it this morning. I'll continue to say it. Up above the Speaker's chair up there is the quote from Daniel Webster. How about we do something worthy to be remembered for. How about we come together and pass a bill that the people say, They did the peoples' work. They compromised.

It's not about getting what each of us wants. It's about getting what the American public needs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind words from the gentleman from Minnesota. He is correct in that I am very much committed to trying to produce and pass a good transportation bill in this Congress. When the gentleman's party was in control of the House and the Senate and the White House a couple of years ago, they couldn't, for various reasons, pass the bill. And I certainly hope we can in this Congress.

For the past 3½ years, about half the time when I've come to the floor I've had some Members on both sides come up to me and say, When are we going to pass a highway bill? And this is my 24th year in this body and I have been involved actively with all of those bills that the gentleman from Minnesota mentioned, all of which passed by overwhelming margins. And as he said, the last highway bill that was passed in 2005 passed with only 8 votes in opposition.

I agree and I think all of the people on our side of the aisle agree in principle with Mr. WALZ's motion to instruct. We should focus our efforts on completing the conference report and delivering a bill to the President's desk before the surface transportation programs expire at the end of this month. Unfortunately, up until this moment, the Senate has not shown a sufficient willingness to address the House's top four priorities: streamlining project delivery; program consolidation; State funding flexibility; and equitable funding formulas not based on past earmarks.

When the average transportation project, Mr. Speaker, takes 15 years to complete, I cannot help but think there's something wrong with the current system. And as the gentleman from Minnesota mentioned, when the will is there, these projects can be completed in record time, such as the I–35 bridge in Minnesota after it collapsed.

Bureaucratic red tape is the main culprit, and much more must be done in the reauthorization bill to accelerate the process by which projects are approved. Every other developed nation is doing similar types of projects in a third or half the time that we are, and it is ridiculous that we are wasting so much money dragging these projects out for so many years. We can accomplish the goal of accelerating the process without harming the environment, but the Senate so far has shown more interest in catering to radical environmentalists than building infrastructure projects.

Program consolidation is another important reform that the House is pushing for in this bill. The Senate insists on including two new programs at the cost of $3 billion a year that would allow the administration to play politics with the funding that should go directly to the States. At a time when the highway trust fund is going broke, we should focus our limited transportation dollars on consolidating programs and eliminating wasteful programs, not creating new ones. Funding

flexibility for the States is critical to allowing the States to fund the most economically significant highway and bridge projects.

□ 1800

The Federal Government should not mandate that States spend their limited Federal aid funding on flower plantings and transportation museums and other questionable projects, while State budgets are squeezed to the breaking point. States need to be given flexibility. Some States need to spend more on bridge replacement. Some States need to spend more on crumbling highways. Some States have done more already on highway beautification and other enhancement-type projects and don't need to spend so much in that area as possibly some other States. States need to be given flexibility.

Most States have a backlog of crumbling bridges and highways needing to be rehabilitated. Why not allow them to focus their limited resources on the greatest needs in their State? The needs vary from State to State.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the funding formula for how Federal highway funding is distributed to States is based in part at least on the number of earmarks the States received in the last reauthorization bill. Funding formulas should be based on the most equitable factors that are part of a State's transportation system, not which Member of Congress fared the best in the last go around.

I hope these reasonable issues can be resolved before the end of the week.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend allowing me to speak on this.

There is no one I have more respect for than my good friend from Tennessee. I had a great time working with him on a variety of things when I was on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. But with all due respect, I think the issue here is what we're going to do to renew and rebuild America.

For the first time in history, our Republican friends gave us a partisan transportation reauthorization. Never before have we seen anything like this offered up. There wasn't even a hearing before the full committee before it was advanced. It went right to work session. There was no effort to involve people on the other side of the aisle. We were given a piece of legislation that attacked transit, that scaled down funding, that was against the most popular programs, the ones that have the greatest local involvement, the enhancements. It was an environmental catastrophe. It was so bad that my Republican colleagues couldn't even bring their bill to the floor. They withdrew it. And so we had the ninth extension.

We have been given a bill in the other body that, as my good friend from Minnesota pointed out, received 74 votes. It will give us two complete construction cycles. It does, in fact, accelerate environmental processes. There is a compromise, a bipartisan compromise, on the previous contentious area of enhancements. It is a reasonable way for us to go forward.

Mr. Speaker, in contrast to this, we have a Republican budget that will not even fund the current obligations. It will cut out entirely the ability to move forward with any new Federal partnership for infrastructure.

I think the motion to instruct is a modest step forward. I respectfully suggest that what we ought to do is not just approve the motion to instruct; we ought to approve the Senate bill and get on with business.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on transportation issues, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), a leading member of our committee.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of the motion to instruct.

Passing a transportation bill is about jobs. It's about keeping America competitive in the world. So I, for one, am urging a ''yes'' vote on this motion to instruct. I believe it is critical to America that we pass a transportation bill.

I would like to correct a few facts that my good friend from Oregon just put forward. The gentleman to my recollection has been on the Ways and Means Committee for the past couple of years, 4 years I believe it has been, so I don't know how privy he was to what we did in the House Transportation Committee to try to be inclusive to our Democratic colleagues, to work with them. We worked with them as openly, if not more openly, than Chairman Oberstar when he chaired the committee. We did have a full committee hearing on it. In fact, we had 18 hours of debate. And as I recall, when Chairman Oberstar chaired the committee, we had zero hours of debate in the full committee because a bill from the Democratic-controlled House didn't even make it to the full committee. So we worked hard and we talked with our colleagues. Unfortunately, being bipartisan is not just one party saying that they can't work with another party. It takes two of us to tango. We did in the last bill. I wasn't happy with much of Chairman Oberstar's bill, but to move a bill forward, we said okay, we're with you, we'll move the bill. Our Democratic colleagues chose to make it a partisan fight by not getting together with us.

But I applaud my friend from Minnesota with this motion to instruct. We need to move forward. What we have been negotiating in the Senate, really five provisions on our streamlining that are extremely important—eliminating duplication, where you have a State that's environmental review process is as strong or stronger than the Federal review process, that should take the place. It should substitute for the Federal review process. The number one example of that is California. California is far stricter on environmental reviews than the EPA is. So why don't we allow California to move forward rather than having to go through a NEPA review at the Federal level?

Hard deadlines; concurrent rather than consecutive reviews with hard deadlines. We've been talking with the Senate for the past couple of months about this, but they insist upon having safety valves. What does safety valves mean? That means that an agency can go to the Secretary of Transportation and ask for a waiver and say they need more time. That's not going to help to streamline this process because we know what will happen: it'll continue to prolong these review processes.

Funding thresholds for a NEPA review. If a project receives de minimis amounts of Federal funding, it should not be subject to a Federal NEPA review but should go through the same regulations as a State project. And we've already moved on this. We sent a counteroffer to the Senate moving on our position. So in good faith, that's what we've been doing in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SHUSTER. Categorical exclusions in rights of way. If you're going to replace a bridge in the same footprint, we shouldn't have to go through these endless, long environmental reviews. We should be able to build that quickly and efficiently. In fact, my colleague from Oregon, who is the ranking member on the Highway Subcommittee, has suggested that there is some common ground there. In fact, I quote him, he said, and it had to do with putting streetcars back on the streets:

We're going to have fewer cars on the road, why should we spend a lot of time and money studying it?

And I agree with him.

And finally, when there's a disaster, to eliminate or to reduce significantly these reviews they have to go through, just as in the case of I–35, as was mentioned earlier, to be able to build that bridge in a much more efficient, faster time to get it up and running.

I support the gentleman's motion to instruct, and I stand ready as a Republican on the conference committee to put a bill forward that we can pass here, and I would urge all of my colleagues in the House to support this motion to instruct.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He's a good friend and colleague and an honest broker on things.

I agree with the gentleman on the categorically excluded bridges; 96 percent are now. So we can decide now, do we want to bog down on that last 4 percent, or do we want to get a bill forward? I think there's agreement here. I think we're in a clear-cut case of if the perfect gets in the way of the good, the American public pays for that. But I appreciate his support on this and his desire to get a bill done. And I think it's been obvious that he wants this transportation bill done, so I thank the gentleman.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

□ 1810

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Since the founding of our Nation, there has been bipartisan agreement on the need for the Federal Government to play a strong role in interconnecting the States of our country. It was George Washington who said:

> The only binding cement, and no otherwise to be effected but by opening such communications as will make it easier and cheaper for them to bring the product of their labor to our markets.

And that's relevant today, I'll address that in a moment.

The second quote which is relevant to the dispute today is:

> We are either united people under one head for Federal purposes, or we are 13 independent sovereign entities eternally counteracting each other.

This is the need—and the gentleman knows this photo well. There are more than 70,000 bridges that are structurally deficient in this country, load limited; there are another 70,000 or so that are functionally obsolete or need substantial repair—150,000 bridges. Forty percent of the pavement on the National Highway System doesn't just need an overlay; it needs to be dug up; it needs underlayment and restructuring. And a $70 billion backlog on our transit systems.

We are actually killing people because we aren't investing in our infrastructure, let alone losing the opportunities for millions of jobs and economic competitiveness and more fuel efficiency.

People died right here in Washington, D.C., on the Metro because they're running cars that don't work anymore in the middle of trains, surrounded by cars that are supposed to work and help the ones that don't work.

People died here because this bridge collapsed.

We need to make these investments. With the Made In America requirements in the transportation portions of our government—which are the strongest and we hope to make even stronger in this bill, working with the Republican side of the aisle here—we could put millions to work, not just construction workers who certainly need the jobs, but also small businesses that supply, fabrication firms, manufacturing firms, steel manufacturers, and others across the board would be put to work rebuilding our infrastructure.

What's the problem?

Here's the problem: The second thing that George Washington talked about, saying that we're either united or we're going to be internally counteracting one another. There are, unfortunately, a substantial number of Republicans in their conference who have blocked movement on a bill because they don't believe, unlike George Washington, that the Federal Government has a role to play in coordinating a national transportation system. They want to devolve to the States. They want to go back to the good old days before Dwight David Eisenhower brought us into the modern era with the National Highway System. Here's the good old days. That's the brand-spanking-new Kansas turnpike—oops, it ends in Amos Schweizer's field. That's the Oklahoma State line.

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. DEFAZIO. That's the Oklahoma State line.

Oklahoma had promised to build their section, but they couldn't because they had a funding dispute. And they didn't—until the Eisenhower bill passed and we had Federal aid to help Oklahoma build their section.

Now, we should go back to those good old days?

But there are some 85-odd members of the Republican Conference who are opposing a well-funded, longer term bill because this is their belief: These were better days for the United States of America.

Well, I'll tell you what. We could do a bill, and we could do a bill that does accommodate some of the concerns on the Republican side of the aisle with a serious conference over the next few days, with a will just to get it done, put America back to work, and rebuild our infrastructure. And you're going to have to have, unfortunately, because of your devolutionists, some Democratic votes to pass it.

Let's go back to the days of Denny Hastert: A majority of the majority need to vote for a bill, but it doesn't have to be passed only with Republican votes. We're not going to ever get a bill done if it's done on a partisan basis.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND), a very active member of our committee.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. I'd like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding time.

As a new Member of this body, it was quite an honor to be appointed a conferee to go to conference. Those who are a part of this body recognize that, that it's usually something that obviously senior Members are appointed to. It was a great honor and it still is, even though we have yet to have a product that we can vote upon.

You can imagine my disappointment when, after attending five working group meetings, I did not have a single individual to look at on the other side of the table representing the other body. You see, when the American people sent us here, I believe they sent us here to change the way we do business. And I'm pleased that we were sent to be involved in those five meetings.

I keep hearing oftentimes in the media, Mr. Speaker, that it is the Republican side that isn't perhaps interested in a bill. But I would say, if that were true, then why did I attend five working group meetings only to have no counterpart on the other side of the table?

We recognize not just words; we recognize actions.

I think the American people are so tired of words. I think that they would be terribly disappointed if they knew that their elected Members did not even attend meetings. And if they did not attend these working group meetings, then how could they be serious and expecting us to believe that they're interested in a bill? I think that we trample on their trust when we don't do the people's work. It's terribly, terribly disappointing.

I want the reforms. I believe they're important. I believe that if we can build a bridge like I–35 through Minnesota, if we can rebuild it in 437 days, I think it makes sense to include streamlining provisions in this bill that say that every project around the country is just as important as I–35, and so, therefore, we need to build all bridges back to their original state without having to go through long, laborious, expensive environmental impact studies if we're rebuilding that bridge back or repaving that road back on the original footprint. I think that makes sense.

I think the American people want us to do their work. They want us to create a bill of value and a bill that is paid for. I think that what we have voted upon and the reforms that we have asked to be considered, not only have they not been answered or even addressed, but we haven't even had the opportunity to even look at one of our counterparts on the other side of the aisle and speak to them at conference. It's terribly disappointing.

With that, I rise in support of this motion to instruct because I believe that we need to have Members come and we need to debate and we need to do the people's business.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman for his support.

At this time, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to a senior member of the Transportation Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank my friend from Minnesota for yielding.

I rise in support of the motion to instruct conferees.

Let me start by just making clear that this issue of categorical exclusion is one that's important for us to all

recognize. The 35W bridge, the rebuild was subject to a categorical exclusion, so it was not held up.

Again, I will repeat what my friend from Minnesota said: 96 percent of the projects that go forward with highway bill funding are subject to a categorical exclusion. We really have to ask ourselves if we are going to continue to allow unemployment in the construction industry at 35 percent for 4 percent of the projects that are constructed under the highway bill.

This motion would direct conferees to adopt a final conference report no later than this Friday, June 22. In fact, June 22 represents the 100th day since the Senate passed MAP–21 with an overwhelming bipartisan majority of 74–22. It's fully paid for, and it will save or create an estimated 3 million jobs. In fact, in my State alone, at least 115,000 jobs will be saved or created if we can get either a successful conference report or the passage of MAP–21.

It's been 126 days since the House Rules Committee began considering H.R. 7 for floor consideration, which faltered soon thereafter when my Republican colleagues could not gain consensus within their own caucus and the bill died. It's now been 62 days since the House passed a shell bill to allow conference negotiations to begin.

Finally, and most importantly, we are a mere 6 legislative days away from the expiration of our highway programs when the current 90-day extension expires on June 30.

During this entire time, one fact has been a constant: that the men and women of our construction industry continue to suffer with one of the highest rates of unemployment for any industry. We continue the lack of certainty that a multiyear highway bill would provide. It would provide States the ability to plan and initiate projects, to put people back to work and begin the much-needed improvements to our roadways, bridges, and transit systems desperately needed.

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

□ 1820

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I applaud my Senate colleagues who put aside partisan politics to advance a bipartisan bill. To their credit, the Senate put forward that which they could agree on and set aside to a later date that on which they could not agree. It was a sensible and successful strategy.

With Senate Democrats, Senate Republicans, House Democrats and the White House all supporting MAP–21, it is clear that if we can just get the House Republicans on board we can get a bill, and that's what we need to do. We can get a bill, because a temporary extension—yet another—is not a strategy that works. A temporary extension is not the answer. We will soon exhaust the trust fund, States and municipalities will not have the certainty they need to plan, thus construction companies will not be able to hire, and we will lose yet another construction season.

A temporary extension is not the answer. Passing a conference report by June 30, or passing MAP–21, is the answer.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), who has been one of our lead negotiators on trying to come up with a transportation bill in our conference.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank my colleague from Tennessee.

It is interesting for me to be able to hear the indignation and saying we've got to get this bill done. It's important that it gets resolved, and I would have to say I completely agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

This is a very important bill. Every person who gets in a vehicle, gets in a bus, gets in a truck, or has any piece or item in their home that's delivered by truck, train, whatever it may be, is affected by this. So it's very important.

But just a quick history lesson. When I arrived here in January of last year, we were on extension No. 6 because the previous highway bill expired in 2009. And when Democrats had the House and the Senate, and the Presidency, and they loaded their bill up with earmarks to get it passed, they did not get a bill passed.

So it's interesting to hear the conversation about, well, if Republicans in the House could get this resolved, then we'd get this settled, when, in reality, there are a lot of technical details that better be right that even when Democrats had the House, the Senate, and the Presidency for 2 years could not get this bill done, even with all the earmarks.

This is a different day. We're trying to work together between the House and the Senate. One body doesn't pass a bill and the other body just says, I'll tell you what, you passed it; we'll just go ahead and do that. If so, I would love for the Senate to take up many of the bills that we passed in the House and just have the Senate go ahead and pass those. But this has to be a bicameral agreement.

We're not going to do this with earmarks. That's a big difference. In the past, these bills had thousands upon thousands of earmarks, and we have determined no more, we're not going to do it that way. We have to live within the budget, and we have to be able to help a few things work a lot better than they have in the past.

Major highways right now take about 15 years in construction. We think that's way too long. The first 7 years of that is just in permitting and process and this repetitive process that we have with the Federal Government with this linear permitting. We just want to be able to stack those permits up, allow people to be able to take the first step on it, still have all the same environmental reviews, but do it in a way that's faster and is more streamlined. It saves time. It saves money. It actually builds those roads a lot faster than waiting all of this time.

I can tell you, many people in Oklahoma stare at the engineering work on both sides of the road and hear about new construction that's happening, but they hear about it and hear about it and hear about it and hear about it before the dirt ever gets turned. We want to try to get these road projects started and completed.

We want to allow road money to actually be used for roads. Now, I know that's a crazy idea, but we'd like highway money to be used for highways. We'd like to stay within budget, and we'd like the States to be able to have the flexibility to spend their money, remembering it's their money, not Washington, D.C.'s money.

That 18.4 cents that came out of that State is going back into that State in gas tax. We want the individuals that actually paid that gas tax to be able to help resolve how that's going to best be used.

If they have bridges that are coming down, let's fix bridges.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota and the manager, and my friends on the other side of the aisle.

This is an important, crucial motion to instruct. Crucial is the word. And I thank the gentleman for recognizing that while we are here, others are languishing, bridges are languishing, highways are languishing, ports, and even our mass transit concerns are languishing because we have not moved forward. One, two, three, four, five—I think we're up to five extensions the last 5 to 7 years, if my counting is correct.

But most importantly, let me congratulate Members from both sides of the aisle that have come forward to support the gentleman's motion to instruct, which evidences how crucial this motion is and how we need to move beyond the many, many conference calls that I know that those conferees who are in are getting from so many interest groups, and indicate that we need to move forward and bring a report forward that will not stop us from continuing to negotiate on some of the many sidebar issues.

But as we languish, we're losing jobs. As we languish, Americans are unemployed. As we languish, bridges continue to crumble.

I remember our good friend, Chairman Oberstar, who taught us a few years ago that if you pass a transportation and infrastructure bill, you put America back to work. Tragically, as he was speaking some years ago, tragically one of his own bridges in that area had a very devastating impact in the fracturing of that bridge.

We don't want to see that anymore. We want to be able to see people going to work. And so I simply would ask that this motion to instruct be followed. Bring to the floor in a conference report not later than June 22, 2012, the ability to pass this legislation.

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Bring to the floor this conference report, put to work people in Texas, fix bridges and put to work people in Minnesota, Virginia, New York, across the Nation, south, north, east and west, and begin to solve separate difficult problems, if I might say, on the side.

I want to see our workers working, many of our friends in the IBEW and building trades and many other supporting unions for the machinists and others, working. I believe this is a bipartisan message. Let's do it now.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. CRAVAACK), a very important member of our conference.

Mr. CRAVAACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree more with my colleague from Minnesota, and I rise in support of his motion to instruct. We will continue to stand ready to negotiate with the Senate.

As a conferee, I have partaken in some of these meetings myself and have negotiated in good faith with Senate staff. Unfortunately, no Senators.

The highway trust fund is bankrupt, and the Federal highway program is in need of serious reform. Congressman WALZ is quite correct in that we cannot continue to kick this can down the road. And I will say the conferee House positions are fair and practical.

Allowing States the flexibility in order to address their specific transportation needs just makes sense. We have a $15.7 trillion debt; 46 percent of our debt is foreign owned, 30 percent owned by one country, China. We do not have the luxury, as the Senate bill requires, to spend money on things like wildflowers and, at the same time, the trust fund is bankrupt.

And as Mr. WALZ and Mr. DEFAZIO point out, bridges are in disrepair and roads are crumbling. We need to get our priorities in order.

The House bill consolidates and eliminates programs, as opposed to creating $3 billion a year and increasing new programs like the Senate bill. This is not extreme; it's fiscally responsible.

The 293 bipartisan House Members voted to approve the Keystone pipeline, a fair and practical approach to helping lower gas prices at the pump and creating tens of thousands of jobs without hurting the environment.

Finally, the House positions of streamlining and significantly reducing the time it takes, without harming the environment, to build a major road project in this country is a practicable position; 15 years to permit, design, and build is not.

The Senate steadfastly refuses to cut any bureaucratic red tape that is associated with building a highway or bridge. We need to stop good-paying construction jobs from being endlessly tied up.

If the Senate is serious, as we are, to get this done early next week, I hope that they engage in good faith in a bicameral fashion.

I thank my colleague from Minnesota again for bringing this up. This is a very important position, I support his motion to instruct, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

□ 1830

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman for his support.

At this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans are doing nothing short of sabotaging our economy and jeopardizing millions of jobs by refusing to pass a long-term, well-funded transportation bill like the bipartisan Senate bill. There were 74 Senators, including 22 Republicans, who voted in favor of S. 1813, MAP–21. At one point, Speaker of the House JOHN BOEHNER expressed his support for the bipartisan Senate bill. It is time for us to pass that legislation.

The unemployment rate in the construction industry remains nearly triple the national average. Construction workers, engineers, architects, managers, contractors, and developers tell me that another short-term extension will not bring enough certainty to the industry. In Illinois, my State, the failure to pass a long-term transportation extension at the peak of the construction season has kept many unemployed and put thousands of other jobs at risk. Our States, our localities, our businessowners, and our workers deserve better.

MAP–21 is the single largest jobs bill passed by either body in this 112th Congress. In my home State of Illinois alone, MAP–21 will save or create 70,000 jobs. Nationwide, the bill will save or create nearly 2 million jobs and spur 1 million additional jobs through the leveraging of transit funds.

I am a strong supporter of MAP–21, and we should send it to the President's desk this week. I can't support and our workers can't support another short-term extension that will leave thousands of Illinois jobs hanging in the balance. We need to move forward with legislation that does more than kick the can down the road.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana, Dr. BUCSHON, who has been a lead negotiator on our conference committee for the Republican side.

Mr. BUCSHON. I would like to thank Mr. WALZ for bringing this to the floor. I believe that we all can agree we must pass a long-term highway bill.

In my home State of Indiana, Interstate 69 is being constructed through my district, connecting my district to our State's capital. When I return home every weekend, I see how important Federal dollars are to the construction industry and how necessary infrastructure is to the economic development of our cities and towns.

As a member of the conference committee for the highway bill, I have personally been involved in this process. My House colleagues and I have attended several negotiation sessions and have discussed this legislation at length with the Senate staff. I wish our friends in the Senate were as involved in the process, because we could have resolved many of these issues weeks ago.

I think my friends on the other side of the aisle here in the House seem to forget that we don't just rubberstamp Senate bills and that they don't rubberstamp ours. If that were the case, they'd take up the 30 House-passed job-creating bills that we've sent over to them in the last year.

Nobody is more committed to this legislation than Members of the House on the Republican side. We want to streamline the project delivery process, eliminate duplicative programs, give more power back to the States, and stretch our limited dollars further. These are proposals that every Member of this body should support. We need a long-term reauthorization that will provide certainty to our Nation's job creators.

I support this motion, and I look forward to the completion of this conference.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman for his support and for his work on this.

At this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding time for me to discuss this.

During this approximately 1 hour of debate, it pays to listen to what has actually been said. What has been said by my Republican colleagues is: It's our way or no highway. We're going to have our way or no highway.

What is their way? What is it that the Republicans are demanding? Get past the nice rhetoric, and look at the detail underlying the words: eliminate duplication. What does that mean? Well, it basically means eliminating the environmental laws. Oh, we don't need them. The States can take care of it.

I think not.

They want to focus on highways. Well, we all do; but what does that mean? It means that they want to eliminate the public transportation portion of this legislation. Okay. So no buses, no trains, no light rail funding. Get into the details about what is actually being demanded by our Republican

colleagues, and you begin to say, Well, wait a minute. I think we can understand why there has not been progress here.

We need to really move forward. Some 60,000 construction workers have lost their jobs in the last 5 months. As our Republican colleagues have laid out their demands, which they have essentially said are nonnegotiable—their way or no highway—they're holding this country hostage. They're holding the construction industry hostage so that they can have their way. Understand what their way means: no public transportation programs. Oh, we'll repair bridges and we'll do highways—and that's good—but there's more to it than this: no bike paths, no safety for men and women who are walking along our highways.

That's their way. That's not what America's way needs to be.

We need to pass a bill. Two million people want to go to work. Yes, they agree with Mr. WALZ' proposal, which is to get this thing done. What they're really saying is: Get it done our way or there will be no highway. The Senate has passed a bill, and 74 Democrats and Republicans agreed to it. Let's get it done.

If you can get it your way in the next 3 days, fine. Otherwise, give us the Senate bill, and let's put men and women to work here in this country. We cannot afford any more layoffs in the construction industry. We can no longer afford to wait. A 2-year bill is essential.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers on our side, so I will close by saying just a couple of things.

The last highway bill that passed with only eight dissenting votes, which has been mentioned here a couple of times tonight, was passed when the Republicans were in control of the Congress. I think that shows very clearly that the overwhelming majority of Republicans in the Congress supports highway bills and that we want to do one this year.

One of the main sticking points for us, one of the problems, is that in my almost quarter century in this body we've been talking about giving lip service to environmental streamlining all through those years, but we really never have accomplished anything. You've heard it said several times tonight that the Federal Highway Administration says the average highway project—and these are not transcontinental roads—takes 15 years to build when all of these other developed nations are doing these projects in a third or in half the time that we are. We have got to do more with less during this time of budgetary constraints. We want to do these things because these are jobs that can't be outsourced to foreign countries. They are jobs that will be done here. They're important to this economy.

The Republicans believe that there is an important and legitimate role for the Federal Government in transportation projects. People in California use the airports in Texas and vice versa. People in New York sometimes drink the water in Florida and vice versa. People in Ohio sometimes drive on the highways in Tennessee and vice versa. All people benefit from lower prices when our ports operate efficiently.

All of the things that we deal with on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Republicans believe in, and they want to see a good, legitimate—but not dictatorial—Federal role in those projects. We believe that the role of the States is very important, and we believe that the role of the local governments and the local people should be paramount because they know the needs of their States and of their localities better than almost anyone.

We are supportive of the gentleman from Minnesota, and we are supportive of his motion to instruct because our goal is the same as his in that we want to produce a good, conservative, reasonable transportation bill for this Nation, and we want to do it sooner rather than later.

□ 1840

We would like to do it within the next few days. Before we can do that—the other body does not control this process. They have to take into consideration what the House wants as well. That's what we're talking about.

With that, I support the motion to instruct by the gentleman from Minnesota, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee, a leader on this. He has the institutional experience and knowledge and is always gracious. I would have to say you're going to find a lot of agreement from me on this. I certainly think that is the case.

The American public deserves better. I think they deserve a debate like they're seeing tonight. They see a sense of respect that goes back and forth. Frustrations get high in this House, but I keep thinking back to the immeasurable sacrifices that went into self-governances. It would be a lot easier—I had a gentleman one time tell me that there's too many Members of Congress; we should cut the numbers in half. I said, Why think so small? Get rid of all of us and just name a king, and then you don't have to worry about this messy democracy.

That's not what Americans do. We understand that there's 435 good opinions here, differences, strong opinions for the right things about this country, but we disagree on how some of those things should get done. At the end of the day, those differences are a strength if we can get the glue that holds us together as a Nation in a compromise. I will be the first to say that I certainly don't want to see this House capitulate its responsibility, but I also understand that at times there are certain realities of what can move and what cannot. I think deadlines like this motion to instruct puts in makes that deadline solid and it asks what can we give.

Many of the provisions my colleagues were talking about, whether it is Keystone pipeline—I am personally supportive of that. If it's in here, I think that's a good thing. But I understand that a lot of my colleagues don't, and there's no way the Senate does that. The American people have elected us. They've elected a Senate that doesn't agree with that. So at the end of the day, I have to make a choice and all of us do. Is it worth holding up a highway bill over a piece of legislation that I personally like but don't believe that it outpaces the point of getting these roads built?

I think the public wants to see us do that. I certainly am willing to compromise, as my friend from Tennessee has always proven to me, to try and get it right. And I think the public wants us to stand by our principles of trying to get it there. But at the end of the day, something has to be done, something has to move forward. The country depends on a workable infrastructure.

I can't tell you, in watching this happen, of seeing how important moving those products is when the I–35W bridge was in the river, not just in terms of the loss of life, the tragedy that happened there, but the disruptions that happened also, that sprung out and rippled into the economy. I think all of us understand that tragic incident, that we don't want to see it replicated, and we also know that smart investments prevent it from happening.

Mr. Speaker, I am appreciative of the Members who came and spoke passionately tonight. I'm appreciative of the folks who understand that this deliberative body has to come to some type of resolution. I would urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct, simply asking us to do the work we were sent here to do, get it done on time, and get America working and moving again.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the Appropriations Committee voted to report the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill to the full House. This bill makes an insufficient investment in our national transportation system in part because the Committee had to insert placeholder language for several important transportation provisions, notably the Federal highway system and transit programs, due to the lack of an agreement on long-term funding.

The House Republicans' inability to work in a bipartisan manner to reach a compromise on surface transportation reauthorization conference committee negotiations is preventing us from fully investing in our Nation's transportation systems to put people back to work and grow our economy.

For every $1 billion of infrastructure investment, we create at least 30,000 jobs and generate more than $6 billion worth of economic

activity that reverberates throughout our economy, improving our national competitiveness and spurring job creation for years to come.

With the national construction unemployment around 14 percent and upwards of 40 percent in my area in recent years, workers need and want to get back on the job.

Despite being a priority for the Department of Transportation, the Tappan Zee Bridge Replacement project in my district is stalled because the current Federal financing pipeline is too small.

I join Mr. WALZ in urging the conferees to file a conference report so that we can get on with our work to make the vital investments in our national infrastructure system.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

COMPROMISE FOR THE GOOD OF ALL

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, tonight we saw what's possible. When we come together and know that the good of the American public, their will, if it is worked in this House as it has for 236 years, as we began to deliberate and try and move forward on what helps the American public, bringing in our differences, debating, and at times passionately debating what we feel, but at the end of the day understanding the ultimate goal is what strengthens and moves this country forward; and I think tonight, in seeing an agreement on a bipartisan motion to instruct, just asking us to do the public's work, get a transportation bill done, put people back to work, build our highways, bridges, and infrastructure necessary to move people safely back and forth, but also to move goods to compete in the 21st century, it's not that big a lift. We can do it in a safe, efficient, and modern manner, and we can pay for it in a responsible way. The American public are willing to invest in America. They're simply asking us to do it smartly and do it in a way that compromises for the good of all.

I'm incredibly proud, as always, of this deliberative body. We have the ability to move it forward.

OBSTRUCTION AND DELAY

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, our most pressing legislative items were nowhere to be seen on the House floor today. We had an opportunity to make headway on critical legislation, but Republicans have not provided action or solutions, only obstruction and delay. Student loan interest rates will double on July 1 if Congress does nothing.

After losing an estimated 28,000 construction jobs last month, Congress still hasn't passed a highway bill. The Republican leadership in the House refuses to bring the bipartisan Senate transportation bill to the floor for a vote, even though it would support 1 million construction jobs right away, including more than 8,000 in the State of Rhode Island.

Our middle class families, our small businesses, and our students and manufacturers deserve greater certainty so they can better plan their lives and companies, grow jobs and strengthen our economy. Yet another day has passed without action to avoid sequestration or address expiring tax provisions or prevent rising costs for higher education. Instead, Republicans plan to waste more time this week with partisan anti-environment messaging bills with little or no hope of passage in the Senate and veto threats that have already been issued by the administration.

We cannot let this become another wasted week. Our constituents deserve more. This Congress has to take action now, not delay until it's too late.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCSHON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for this opportunity.

We have been engaged for this last hour in a discussion about what to do with one of the most important parts of America's public agenda, which is the transportation systems of this Nation.

We've heard a lot of back-and-forth. We actually heard that there was some agreement that we ought to get on with it. Indeed, we ought to get on with it. We ought to get a transportation bill before the American public, and we ought to get it to the President. Unfortunately, there is a gridlock and a deadlock. Behind all of the gentle rhetoric on the floor this evening, there are some profound differences in how we move forward with the transportation bill. We'll discuss some of those as we journey through this 1 hour or some portion of this 1 hour.

I think I would like to start maybe more than 200 years ago. There is a lot of discussion that we often hear here on the floor and in the rhetoric across the Nation that the Founding Fathers would do it this way or that way, and if we only listened to the Founding Fathers most of our problems would be resolved. Usually, those discussions really speak to not doing something. It turns out that the Founding Fathers really did have a great deal of wisdom.

□ 1850

I came across a book written by Mr. Thom Hartmann called ''Rebooting the American Dream.'' And in it, in his very first chapter, he goes back to the Founding Fathers, and he talks about what George Washington and George Washington's Secretary of Treasury actually did. On the day he was inaugurated, Mr. Washington said that he did not want to wear a suit made in England. He wanted to wear something made in America. Well, Make It in America is one of the principal things that my colleagues and I on the Democratic side have been talking about for some time.

So when I came across this book, I said, Wow, this is interesting. George Washington instructed his Secretary of Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, to develop a manufacturing program for the United States; and Alexander Hamilton did that. He didn't do it in 2,000 or 3,000 pages, as we might do it today. He did it in just a short, maybe 20 or 30 pages. And he developed an 11-point plan for America's manufacturers. It turns out that many of those 11 points are what we have been proposing on the Democratic side here for our Make It in America agenda.

But tonight I want to pick up one of those 11 points. And it happens to be the 11th of the 11 points that Alexander Hamilton presented to George Washington in 1790, and it was on American manufacturers. So point No. 11: ''Facilitating of the transportation of commodities.'' The language is rather ancient English, but it still speaks to the following:

> Improvements favoring this object intimately concern all the domestic interests of a community; but they may without impropriety be mentioned as having an important relation to manufacturers. There is perhaps scarcely anything, which has been better calculated to assist the manufacturers of Great Britain, than the meliorations of the public roads of that kingdom, and the great progress which has been of late made in opening canals. Of the former, the United States stands much in need.

He goes on to talk about the necessity for transportation here and copying what had gone on in Great Britain, that is, the development of public roads.

Then he says:

> The following remarks are sufficiently judicious and pertinent to deserve a literal quotation: Good roads, canals, and navigable rivers, by diminishing the expense of carriage, put the remote parts of a country more nearly upon a level with those in the neighborhood of a town. They are upon that account, the greatest of all improvements.

So here we are in Mr. Hartmann's book, ''Rebooting the American Dream,'' talking about what the

Founding Fathers wanted to do in 1790. I would also point out that by 1792 nearly all of those 11 points had become law and laid the foundation for the great American industrial revolution.

So back to ''infrastructure,'' the word we use today. We use infrastructure when we talk about our highways, our canals, our roads, and our transportation systems. There were, in fact, some public transportation systems at that time.

Now, speaking specifically of roads and jobs, we often talk about jobs here. We need to understand that today, if we were to pass the Senate version of the public transportation bill, we would put 2 million unemployed construction workers back to work this year. This year, 2 million would go back to work if we were to take up the Senate bill. Unfortunately, we have been in a gridlock, and there has been no effort to compromise.

My colleagues on the Republican side are demanding fundamental changes in the transportation systems and the way in which we apportion that money. Those changes have not been acceptable to the Senate; and, indeed, those changes were not acceptable to even their own caucus. The Republican Caucus was unable to reach agreement—they have more than enough votes to pass a bill out of this House—but they could not reach agreement among themselves, let alone with the Senate. And yet they are demanding that the Senate take up what they could not agree to.

On our side, we have simply said, let's go with the Senate bill. After all, 74 Senators—both Democrats and Republicans—voted for it, leaving some 26 that chose not to support it.

So 2 million Americans are waiting for action by the House of Representatives and the Senate; 2 million Americans want to go to work. And yet we have this deadlock. We just found some support amongst ourselves to tell the conferees, Get it done by the end of this week or take up the Senate bill.

Listening carefully to what we heard on the floor not more than an hour ago, compromise is not going to be found. Keystone pipeline. No public transportation funding. Eliminate the environmental protections that have been in place for more than 40 years. Streamline, meaning ''eliminate'' programs. So compromise is not there.

What has happened over the last several months? Well, while our Republican colleagues have been trying to get their own act together, here is what's happened to employment in the construction industry: way back in January, some 5,570,000 Americans were working in the highway construction and public transportation and construction sector. In May, that number had fallen to 5,510,000. Some 60,000 Americans lost their jobs while the Republicans were trying to figure out how they could come to an agreement with themselves on a transportation bill. They couldn't. So 60,000 Americans, 60,000 families lost their ability to earn a living as the majority in this House failed to even agree amongst themselves on what to do.

The Senate moved forward with a bill. It's been there nearly 2 months, before this House, available. A conference committee was formed, and gridlock continues. So now there are 60,000 families without an income as a result of the gridlock and the inability of our colleagues to come to an agreement.

It's time for us to move on. It's time for us to put a 2-year bill in place, as the Senate has proposed, one that would put 2 million Americans back to work immediately. States could move forward. States would know that over the next 2 years, there would be funding from the Federal Government. Right now, the word from my friends on the other side of the aisle is, Well, we're going to go with the 60-day extension. States cannot work with that. They don't know what would be available at the end of the 60 days. They don't know what's available today because we're up against a deadline.

It's time for us to move with the Senate bill. It's time for us to end this continuing decline. This is May. If we were to take the June figures—which are now, unfortunately, coming forward—more and more construction workers have lost their jobs. They are in my district.

Contractors in my district are saying, There is no further contract available to us. We won't be able to put our people to work. We don't have a contract. The States can't offer new contracts. So it won't be just 60,000. At the end of June, it will probably be 70,000 or 75,000, or perhaps more, that have lost their jobs as this gridlock continues here in the House of Representatives. We can do better.

□ 1900

How important is this to the economy? It's very important to the economy and not just the construction workers, not just their families, the 2 million that could go to work if we accepted the Senate bill. And it's a good bill. It provides adequate funding for transportation, for repairing the bridges that we heard so much discussion of, for paving the roads that we heard so much discussion of just less than an hour ago, of providing the money for the public transportation sector so that the buses, the trains, the planes can continue to operate. It's a good bill, but not perfect, not as large as many would want. It doesn't have the Keystone pipeline in it. It doesn't eviscerate the environmental protections that are necessary as we build these projects.

So what would happen if we were to accept the Senate bill? End the gridlock, put 2 million American workers back to work, end the decline. For every dollar we invest in infrastructure—that's the highway bill and the transportation bill—$1.57 is pumped into the American economy. That comes from Mark Zandi, chief economist for Moody Analytics. Spend a dollar on transportation and you increase the GDP; you increase the economic activity of this Nation by $1.57.

So there's more than just transportation at stake here. What is at stake here, as we see, is the continuing decline of the transportation and construction sector as a result of the gridlock that's been with us nearly this entire year. What is at stake is the growth of the American economy. It's the grocery store that will have a customer coming in and not spending an unemployment check but, rather, spending a check that's given to them by the contractor. And that money circulates in the economy so that the hair dresser, the barber, maybe even the gun shop owner will see their business increase 57 percent. For every dollar spent, $1.57 is generated in the economy, putting other people to work beyond the construction industry.

Now, there's more to it than that. One of the provisions that we would like to see in the bill, which actually is in the Senate bill, is a tightening of the waivers that have been so injurious to the American economy, the waivers that have been overused in the last two decades, waivers that push aside the Buy America provisions that we presently have in the law, push those aside and say, We don't care whether that money is spent on American-made equipment. We don't care whether that money is spent on jobs in America. Just pushing aside the Buy America provisions.

The Senate bill has a very important provision that will create even more jobs in America because it tightens up the waiver provisions and says to the Department of Transportation, no, you cannot just willy-nilly provide a waiver. You must adhere to the law that says Buy America: a 60 percent minimum American content in the steel in the bridge that's going to be repaired, in the asphalt and concrete that's going to be laid over the roads. Minimum of 60 percent content on the buses and the trains that are going to be paid for with your tax dollars.

What that means is: Make It in America. That provision that is in the Senate bill will enhance American manufacturing by limiting the waivers that have been so numerous over the last two decades as to hollow out the American manufacturing sector. Manufacturing matters. This is the American middle class. The construction industry and the manufacturing industry is the heart and the soul and the foundation of America's middle class. And so in the Senate bill it tightens up the waiver provisions and says that Americans will have the jobs, not some foreign employee of a company that has gained the contract.

I want to give you a specific example. In California, the largest public works project ever is the reconstruction and

the rebuilding of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, a new bridge, billions of dollars. The steel in that bridge was made in China. Six thousand jobs in China, no jobs in America. It's said to be 10 percent cheaper. It turned out that at the outset, the Chinese steel manufacturers could not produce the steel. But they got the contract and what they did was to figure out how to produce the steel. They built a new steel mill. Six thousand jobs. In America, no. In China, yes.

It turned out that the steel was not 10 percent cheaper. It was shoddy. The welds were not adequate. They had to go back. Delays occurred. It turned out to be even more expensive. Had that occurred in America, that new steel mill would have been built in America, and it would be there for the next contract, the next bridge to be built in America, or around the world. But, oh, no, we're going to save 10 percent. We lost American jobs.

If the Senate bill were to come to this floor and become law, the waiver that was allowed and given to the State of California, a waiver that allowed the Chinese steel company to have the contract, would not have been allowed. Six thousand jobs would have been in America, and we would once again make it in America and Americans would make it. But, oh, no, it didn't happen. Manufacturing matters.

I would like to see another provision in the bill, but I won't demand this and my Democratic colleagues who support this are not going to demand it because we want to get on with providing those 2 million jobs for American workers in the construction industry. But let me take a moment to explain what it is.

This is a bill that I introduced at the beginning of last year. It's H.R. 613. And what it says is that our tax money, the money that is being spent by every American when they buy a gallon of gasoline or a gallon of diesel, that that money goes into the highway trust fund. And H.R. 613 says it must be spent on American-made equipment. Highways. This is the steel that's in the bridges. This is the rebar that's in the roads. This is the concrete, the asphalt—American made.

If you want to build a high-speed rail, as we do in California, then that high-speed rail is going to be financed with your tax dollars, and it will be an American-made high-speed rail train. You want a train? You want to improve your transit system? It will be American made. Is it possible? Does this work? Let me give you have an example.

In the American Recovery Act, sometimes known as the stimulus bill, there is a provision for Amtrak trains. Upgrade the Amtrak system. I think it was a little over $12 billion. Some wise staffer wrote next to that $12 billion a sentence that said: This money must be spent on American-made equipment.

One hundred percent American-made equipment. Oh, you can't do that. Well, it turns out that you can do that. A German company, one of the largest industrial companies in the world, looked at it and said, $12 billion? We can build it in America. And they did. They built a manufacturing plant in Sacramento, California; and they are producing 100 percent American-made locomotives because the law said that it must be done.

H.R. 613 says precisely that. If you want the tax money, then it must be American-made equipment. Use our tax dollars to create American-made jobs, not steel made in China, not trains made in Germany, not locomotives from Japan. It's our tax money. It will be spent on American-made equipment.

That's what this does. And we have the proof that it can be done. It's being done today in Sacramento, California, by Siemens, a German company that built a manufacturing plant to take advantage of money that was available if the product was made in America.

□ 1910

Another sad example, the Bay Area Rapid Transit system, BART, needs to replace its 40-year-old trains, $3.2 billion. The minimum in the law today is 60 percent. The bids went out. Two bidders were in the finals. One, a French company, Alsthom; another, a Canadian company, Bombardier. Bombardier's bid was 2–3 percent lower than Alsthom's. However, there was a significant difference. Bombardier said we will build 66 percent American content. Alsthom, the French company, said we can do better. A little bit higher price, but we can do better. We will build 95 percent American content. The difference: $1 billion in American jobs. Sixty-six percent/95 percent; a 2 percent, 3 percent difference in price.

The BART board of directors refused to go back to a second bidding process that would have taken 60 or 90 days. Alsthom said we'll cut our price. We want these jobs in America. It turns out most would be in New York, not California. We want these jobs in America. Go back to another round of bidding, and we'll get out a sharp pencil and we'll come down. The BART board of directors let that opportunity for a billion dollars in jobs go by.

Many of us believe that Alsthom would have matched or even outperformed the Bombardier bid. Or maybe Bombardier would come back and say, okay, we'll go to 95 percent. We don't know. We'll never know. But what we do know is that a billion dollars of American jobs were lost.

So now, as we continue to debate and dally and let time go by, as American jobs, as American workers in the construction industry see the continued decline month by month in the number of men and women that are employed, as layoffs continue—between January and May, more than 60,000 construction workers in the United States have lost their jobs while we continue to fight over issues here.

But the fundamental issue is the issue of jobs. You can talk about the Keystone pipeline, and there are jobs there. And maybe some day that pipeline will be built.

You can talk about the environmental processes that have protected the environment of this Nation for the last 40 years, and maybe there ought to be some adjustments there.

You can talk about giving States the power which basically means there is no money set aside for public transportation. We can talk about those things. But as we wrestle back and forth on what one or another of us think is so critically important, every day another construction worker has lost their job. Another family has lost their opportunity to make the payment on their home. Another community has seen the economy in their area diminish.

We have a reasonably good bill available to us and we could vote on it tomorrow. That's the Senate bill. It protects American jobs. It protects the public transportation system. It is fully funded, not with some hypothetical money that may come in some day, but rather real dollars. It says that our tax dollars must be spent on American-made equipment, on American jobs. It's a good bill.

We had a motion to instruct here on the floor just a few moments ago. And as you listened to the debate, you'd think there was agreement. And there is agreement—we've got to get this job done. We have to put Americans back to work. Two million Americans await our decision. Are we going to continue to fight for some perceived issue that is important to a small group of people? Or are we going to look at the larger picture here, the picture of American workers, of American jobs.

I suppose tomorrow we'll take up that motion to instruct and we'll see if by the end of this week we're willing to compromise. Are we willing to put Americans back to work, 2 million Americans? Or are we going to hold fast to perhaps a funding scheme that has been proposed and can't even be agreed to by the members of the Republican caucus, or an elimination of certain categories of funding like public transportation which couldn't even be agreed to by the Republican caucus, let alone the Democrats.

It's time to look at the bigger picture. It's time to look at that construction worker in our community, the ones we represent and say I want you to go back to work. We'll fight this out another day. But the most fundamental, the most important issue confronting this American economy and each and every individual in America is, where are the jobs? Where is my job? How can I support my family?

It's time to put the bickering aside. It's time to accept the fact that Americans want to go to work, and 2 million Americans are out there looking for their opportunity. And their opportunity rests with us. It rests with the House of Representatives. The Senate has done its work. It's put a 2 year, fully funded transportation bill that

meets the needs of this Nation for the next 2 years. They passed it out. This House has not passed a transportation bill.

We put a stopgap thing out so we can go to conference, but it wasn't a transportation bill. It didn't do the job. Maybe Wednesday, Thursday, or maybe some time Friday there can be an agreement between the two houses. But if there is not an agreement, then as I heard not more than an hour ago from my Republican colleagues, in agreeing to the motion to instruct, that if there is no agreement, then take up the Senate bill. That was in fact the motion. Take up the Senate bill if there is no agreement. Put 2 million Americans back to work. Repair our highways. Repair our bridges. Buy American. Enhance the buy American provisions.

We've got work to do. Americans have work to do. Americans want to work, and it's time for this House to work. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

OBAMACARE'S BROKEN PROMISES

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with many of my freshman colleagues to talk about the impact of a very important bill, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, commonly called ObamaCare, on our economy, our caregivers, and most importantly, the American people seeking care. Any day now the Supreme Court is expected to announce its decision on ObamaCare. And while I hope that the Supreme Court rules on the side of the Constitution and the American people, no matter what happens, the fact remains, this law is bad policy. It's bad for health care, it's bad for the economy, and it's bad for the future of our country.

The rhetoric of the bold promises used to pass ObamaCare into law simply cannot be reconciled with reality. The more the law is implemented, the more the American people don't want it. The President's promises on quality of care, lower insurance premiums, no increase in taxes, and no effect on the deficit, in just 3 years have been broken time and time again.

□ 1920

Broken promise number one: President Obama said in March of 2010:

> If you like your doctor, you're going to be able to keep your doctor. If you like your plan, keep your plan.

The reality is, President Obama's very own administration now estimates that the new regulations contained in ObamaCare will force up to 80 percent of small businesses to give up their current plans by 2013. The Congressional Budget Office also estimates that between 3 million and 5 million people will be dropped from their employer-based coverage by the time the law is fully implemented.

When I visit businesses in my district, I always ask: Have you done the math? Will you keep your insurance or will you pay the fine? Time and time again I get the same answer: We'd like to keep insuring our employees, but it doesn't make good business sense to do so.

Yesterday, in fact, I participated in a field hearing in Murfreesboro, Tennessee, on the effects of government regulation on the economy. We heard from several business owners and State leaders. A gentleman by the name of H. Grady Payne of Conner Industries, which has a plant in Fayetteville, discussed the impact of ObamaCare on his business. He said his company has about 450 employees, and he struggles each year to encourage them to participate in health insurance. The company has had to create different employee groups in order to create an employee base which would have 75 percent participation as required by most insurance companies.

Now, Payne said that the nondiscrimination provisions of the health care reform would prohibit this, forcing the company into several expensive options. It could switch from full insurance to self-insurance; it could expand coverage to all employees and have the employee cost set according to an affordability formula; or it could stop offering health insurance altogether and instead pay a penalty of $2,000 for each employee. Payne said any of the three options would cost the company more than $1 million compared to current costs.

I'll talk about other broken promises, but I would like to yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), representing the Ninth District of beautiful Bloomington.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I thank the gentlelady, my hardworking colleague from Tennessee, who is also a health care professional and quite conversant on these issues. You speak with some authority. So thank you very much.

I come from the State of Indiana with internationally renowned medical device manufacturers, manufacturers like Cook Group in Bloomington, or smaller entrepreneurial companies like MedVenture in Jeffersonville. Indiana, in fact, is a global leader in the medical device industry. Scores of successful medical device businesses are headquartered in the Hoosier State, and they provide nearly 20,000 hardworking Hoosiers with good-paying jobs. Now, these jobs, by the way, provide wages that are over 40 percent higher than the State average. These are exactly the sort of businesses we need to expand and grow right here in America if we want to create a healthy economy.

I bring this up because the President's health care law—what most Americans now know as ObamaCare—would shrink the number of American jobs in the medical device industry. This is because the law contains a 2.3 percent industry-specific excise tax that will cripple the sale of these medical devices. It would cripple the entire sector and hurt American jobs.

Now, back in October, a bipartisan group of us from Indiana held a field hearing in Indianapolis to discuss this very issue with industry leaders. The response from businesses was unanimous: this device tax would be, across the board, harmful to these manufacturers throughout the industry. Many admitted that they would have to move jobs to Europe. Now, when is the last time that we heard it was cheaper to move American jobs to Europe?

For the sake of keeping these high-paying, advanced manufacturing jobs here in the United States, this tax must be repealed. In fact, the medical device excise tax is so harmful to the American economy that the House voted just 2 weeks ago to repeal this narrow part of ObamaCare. It's one in a long string of votes that we've cast in this House to repeal or replace a portion of this law.

Now, there's a better way to address increasing health care costs than by imposing additional taxes on the American people. I say, let's start over. If the Supreme Court doesn't do our work for us, let's repeal the Affordable Care Act. Then, let's get to work and pass bipartisan legislation that would actually bring down the cost of health care—what this whole exercise was supposed to be about in the beginning. Our constituents deserve no less. They expect us to engage in this effort. I'm certainly committed to it, and I know my colleagues here on the Republican side in the House are committed to it as well.

Mrs. BLACK. Thank you, Mr. YOUNG. I appreciate his comments about starting over. Certainly, we do feel that that is the direction that we need to go. As a matter of fact, we've had over two dozen votes on repealing and replacing this very onerous bill that has affected our businesses, as has just been said.

Now I'd like to yield 5 minutes to our class president, as a matter of fact, AUSTIN SCOTT, who represents the Sixth Congressional District in Georgia, and he represents Warner Robins.

I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. My father, as you, is a health care professional, an orthopedic surgeon who came out of med school when I was just a child. I spent a lot of time in a physician's office and in a not-for-profit hospital watching my dad take care of patients and helping them. And certainly that doctor-patient relationship is something that has been stripped away in this bill.

But I want to talk about the numbers, not just the relationships right now, because I think it's important to reflect on what happened 833 days ago

when then-Speaker NANCY PELOSI told the American public that Congress must pass the bill so they could find out what was in it.

Now, I have no doubt that the President, in his endorsement of the bill, surely he read it and knew exactly what was in it. And the Speaker of the House of Representatives, it would have been irresponsible for her to endorse a bill without knowing what was in it. They had to understand it would negatively affect our economy.

The gentleman who was just in the well talking about Americans wanting to going to work, he's absolutely right. The Republicans in this House have passed a tremendous number of jobs bills that would help put Americans back to work, help reduce the cost of petroleum in this country; and yet they sit over in the Senate idle, along with a bill that would actually repeal this national health care law that has kept us in a recession.

Now, they forged ahead with this legislation instead of working on the economic issues that so many Americans needed them to work on and, quite honestly, despite the protest of the American public. They simply thumbed their nose at the American citizens. That's why, when it came time to go to the polls, 87 new freshman Republicans came to Washington. Districts where the President had gotten almost 60 percent of the vote, those people, who Americans who understood that their rights had been stripped from them, absolutely rejected the President's health care bill.

Now, 822 days since the Democratic-controlled House passed the President's health care bill. I would remind you it was just a few days before that when, in order to get the votes to pass it, he met with pro-life Democrats and assured them that in no way, shape or form would abortions be funded in the bill. That was his commitment to pro-life Democrats to get them to vote for the bill. Obviously, we now know that that wasn't necessarily true. We all know where the mandate has come out that he has told people that he really doesn't care if it violates their faith or their religious principles, they're going to do what he says, not what their faith tells them to do—certainly a direct violation of people's constitutional rights.

Now, it's 820 days since the President signed it into law. There's been no recovery, and there could have been. There's no ifs, ands, or buts about it: more Americans would be at work today right now if that bill had not been passed. And the sooner it is undone, the sooner Americans will be able to get back to work.

Eighty-nine days since the Supreme Court began hearing oral arguments about the constitutionality of the law, 89 days. Now, Mr. Speaker, the American people began feeling the negative impact of this bill, quite honestly, as soon as it was passed on day one. Unfortunately, they will continue to feel the impact of this legislation until Congress fully repeals and replaces it.

Some more numbers for you. In the past year, the average cost of health care per active worker rose to $11,176. The increase was $800, almost $1,000 a month per worker. The employee share of premium contributions increased by 63 percent, and there was a 62 percent increase for dependent coverage. Yes, all of this, all of this because of the increasing cost and the mandates in the health care bill.

Eighty-one percent of companies said the health care law had increased administrative burdens on their human resources department; and they are not, in many cases, hiring people because of the unknown cost of the legislation. One in six firms said the cost of complying with the law is one of their top challenges in maintaining affordable coverage.

Mr. Speaker, while it's my firm hope that the Supreme Court will find this law unconstitutional—which I believe it is—we must continue the effort to repeal and replace this bill.

□ 1930

We can't wait for the November election, Mr. Speaker. The American people need this bill repealed right now.

Mrs. BLACK. Thank you so much, Representative SCOTT, for coming here today and talking about the negative impact on our economy. Certainly, we know that that is true.

I want to talk about broken promise number 2, and how this is a negative impact on our seniors.

Broken promise number 2 is proponents of ObamaCare claimed that it would protect Medicare. That couldn't be further from the truth. The health care law cuts more than $500 billion from Medicare, and it threatens the choice seniors currently have in deciding which kind of health care best fits their individual needs. And thanks to ObamaCare, Medicare Advantage enrollment will be cut in half by 2017. The only thing this law does for Medicare is ensures bankruptcy in 8 years.

Now, instead of structurally reforming Medicare and building on what is working with Medicare Advantage, ObamaCare further weakens Medicare's fiscal state and punts the difficult health care decisions to unelected bureaucrats. This is clearly not the way to preserve care for our current or future retirees. Real, sustainable reforms must be made for those under 55 in order to keep our promises to current seniors.

This law hurts seniors today, and it stands in the way of protecting this program for our future children and grandchildren.

Now I'd like to yield 5 minutes to a friend of mine from Las Vegas, Nevada, Representative JOE HECK, representing Nevada's Third District, who is a physician and a health care provider.

Mr. HECK. I thank my colleague from Tennessee and my fellow health care practitioner for heading up this most important discussion this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to talk about something that a majority of Americans actually already know. The health care overhaul that was forced through Congress on a party line vote in the dead of night with special interest provisions like the ''Cornhusker kickback'' and the ''Louisiana purchase'' is a bad piece of legislation that should be repealed. In fact, a recent New York Times poll showed that 68 percent of respondents want to see the law partially or fully repealed.

It's no surprise that the American people are frustrated and want to scrap this law and start over. The law has failed to deliver on all of its major promises. We were told that the law would reduce costs, reduce the deficit, create jobs, and allow people who liked their insurance plan to stay on it. Well, we now know that it has fallen far short of these goals as we continue to read stories and studies outlining just how harmful this law will be for patients and for the economy.

We know that this law will not reduce the deficit. In March, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office released a report in which they projected the costs of the health care overhaul out to the year 2022. They found that the bill will cost $1.7 trillion between now and then. That is twice as much as the bill was originally intended to cost. And this, of course, would be added to a national debt of over $15 trillion.

We know this law will hurt access to care for patients, especially our seniors. In addition to gimmick accounting that essentially cuts $500 billion from Medicare and disproportionately affecting Medicare Advantage beneficiaries, the health care overhaul established the Independent Payment Advisory Board. This board of unelected Washington bureaucrats, this Medicare IRS, will be handpicked by the administration to cut funding for Medicare.

Make no mistake about it. The bill is very clear about the aim of this board, and I quote:

> It is the purpose of this section to, in accordance with the following provisions of this section, reduce the per capita rate of growth in Medicare spending.

The board will be unaccountable to the American people. It will be unaccountable to the Congress, and it will even be unaccountable to the President, and will stand between seniors and the services they receive from Medicare.

As a doctor, I fear that when forced to reduce the Medicare costs, the actions of this board will have serious implications for access to care for seniors. That is not what my constituents and the people of Nevada want in a health care system.

We know that this law is going to increase health care costs for patients. As was mentioned, we just voted to repeal the medical device tax contained

in the health care overhaul, one of many such taxes contained therein, that would have imposed a 2.3 percent tax on medical device manufacturers and was projected to increase taxes by $28.5 million over the next 10 years. This tax would result in higher costs for medical device manufacturers and would be passed on to patients in the form of more expensive medical bills. Increased costs for doctor and hospital visits will widen the access to care gap, even as individuals and families are struggling to keep pace with the current skyrocketing health care costs. In my home State of Nevada, this increased tax on device manufacturers would put over 1,000 jobs at risk.

We know that this law will cause people to be dropped from coverage plans that they like. I have heard from concerned small businesses in my own district like Imagine Communications, a marketing firm in Henderson, Nevada, that employs 11 people. When they started out, they paid 100 percent of their employees' insurance premiums because they saw it as a way to attract and retain quality employees. But due to skyrocketing costs, they have been forced to cut back to only providing 50 percent of premiums, and they hope they can continue to do just that. But the way things are going, they aren't sure how much longer they will be able to be sustainable. They are looking at having to drop employees from coverage because of the increased cost of providing insurance.

As we stand here today, we await a landmark ruling from the highest court in the country on whether key components of the law are even constitutional. The individual mandate, the provision that forces every American to buy insurance or pay a fine, a tax, is the wrong approach to take on health care reform. Instead of penalizing nonaction, we should be incentivizing people to take responsible action in making their own personal health care decisions.

I stand with the nearly 70 percent of Americans who want to see this law repealed and replaced with commonsense, patient-centered reforms that truly increase access to primary care and help people avoid costly procedures and trips to the emergency departments.

Instead of injecting more government into our health care system, our focus should be on patients, especially our seniors who rely on access to quality health care.

Our system is working for most Americans. Almost 85 percent have health insurance, and it can work for all Americans through commonsense reforms like moving coverage towards an individual-based model, increasing competition by allowing the purchase of insurance across State lines, incentivizing the purchase of insurance through tax credits, reforming medical malpractice laws, and letting people, not government, decide what services they need and want.

Second chances don't come along very often, Mr. Speaker, but we have before us a great opportunity to get health care reform right.

As a practicing emergency medicine physician, I have worked on the front lines of health care, caring for all, regardless of chief complaint, time of day, or ability to pay. I have seen firsthand what works and what doesn't work in our health care system. That's why I've introduced two pieces of legislation aimed at repealing the onerous provisions that hurt individuals and businesses, repairing the elements of the law that have merit, and replacing the broken pieces of the law with reasonable reforms and strengthening Medicare. I look forward to advancing these pieces of legislation in the wake of the Court's decision.

We have the best health care system in the world, and we should look for ways to include as many Americans as possible in it. But we also have a duty to uphold the Constitution and pass laws that will achieve their stated goal. The Affordable Care Act missed the mark in both respects, and I look forward to joining my colleagues in delivering a health care solution that will benefit the American people.

Again, I thank my colleague from Tennessee for organizing this Special Order.

Mrs. BLACK. Thank you, Dr. HECK.

And Dr. HECK talked, as we all know, about the major costs that are involved in this ObamaCare, and I want to talk about broken promise number 3. It will not add, and I quote, ''one dime to our deficit.'' That was a laughable assertion then, and now, 3 years later, it is clear that it could not be further from the truth. The law will add trillions to our deficit in the years to come.

Former Congressional Budget Office Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin estimates that the law will increase the national debt by at least $500 billion in the first 10 years, and over $1.5 trillion in the second decade, not to mention the $115 billion needed to implement the law. That is more than $2 trillion in new debt that will be passed on to our children and our grandchildren.

Now I would like to yield 5 minutes to my good friend, MIKE KELLY, who represents Pennsylvania Three, and he hails from Erie, Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY. I thank my colleague from Tennessee.

I really appreciate the opportunity to talk tonight. And I think what I've found unusual in my 18 months here is that when I look at a lot of the legislation that comes forward, a lot of it is proposed by people who've never actually done what they're mandating people to do.

For most of my life, I was a small business person, still am. And when I get back home and I walk in the district and I talk to the people that are doing the same things that I've done all my life—I'm talking about small business people—they keep talking about the same thing. And the one thing that resonates with me all the time is the uncertainty of what this government does to them, the uncertainty of what this law, in particular, does to them.

□ 1940

When I talk about uncertainty in business, you cannot begin to project what your future costs are going to be on legislation for which the rules and regs still haven't been put in place. So we ask people to take this blind-faith leap—to go ahead, to go along with it.

The truth of the matter is you can't. You can't when it's your own skin in the game. You can't when it's your business that's at risk. You can't hire people when you don't know ultimately what the cost of those people is going to be.

Now, people say, Why is that a big problem? It's because it drives the cost of whatever it is that you do. Your personnel costs have an effect on whether it's the service you provide or the goods that you provide.

So the confusion that goes along with this bill is what puts job creators, small business people, in a quandary. They just don't know what to do because the law doesn't specifically tell them what it's going to cost. Again, because I've done it all my life and it has always been my skin in the game and it has always been my blood on the floor at the end of the day by making a bad decision, if it were about jobs, if it were about creating jobs, then this legislation surely didn't get the job done:

Between January of 2009 and April of 2010, private sector job creation improved by about 67,000 jobs a month. President Obama signed the PPACA into law at the end of March 2010. Since May of 2010, private sector job growth has improved at a rate of only 4,600 jobs per month.

Once people get a look at this law, it puts them on the sidelines. Once again, a law passed by this House and by the Senate and signed by the President puts the people who really do create jobs in a quandary. They look at us and they say, Please do something about this. Please get the government's boot off our throats. I can't continue to plan for the future with a law that doesn't project the total costs.

Look, we can talk about this on and on and on, but the American people know better than anybody else the effect that this has had on them. The job creators know better than anybody else what effect this has had on them. People in business who were never at the table know better than anybody else. Now I've gotten to the point where I understand, if you're not at the table, you're on the menu. I've got to tell you that job creators were put on the menu. They are getting eaten alive by a piece of legislation that drives their costs of operation up and that mandates them to do something under penalty of law or to pay a fine that they don't want to pay.

The funny thing about it is, a guy like me, I wasn't given the opportunity. I wasn't given a waiver. Do you know what, KELLY? It may not work for you, so we're going to give you a waiver. But who did get waivers? There were some people who got waivers out there. But who were the people who got the waivers? Why did they get the waivers? We wonder why the American people don't trust this government and this administration. Why would you trust people who pick and choose winners and losers and who say, You will follow the law. You get a waiver? Really? Why? It's because we can do it.

That's not the America I know. That's not the America that my father fought for. That's just something that's inherently wrong with the way business is being done in this town.

So we can talk about this, and we can talk about all the good things and the bad things and the pieces we ought to keep and the pieces we ought to reject, and we can talk about the fact that we don't know what it's going to ultimately cost us. I'll tell you one thing: if you're starting a business now—and people start businesses all over the world—at one time, we were No. 4, the country that people wanted to start a business in. Now we've fallen way down. We trail now Macedonia, Georgia, Rwanda, Belarus, Saudi Arabia, and Armenia.

It's more attractive to start a business in those countries than in the United States of America. And we wonder why? We wonder why so many millions of Americans are out of work? We wonder why job creators, small business people, won't hire people? We tell them, You're going to follow the letter of the law, or you're going to be fined. Then we wonder why they leave our shores and go to other countries?

If we're still wondering, we're either poorly informed or in denial. We have made it too hard for job creators to stay here. We have made it too hard for businesspeople to make decisions to hire people. We have made it too expensive for them, and we leave them no alternative but to stay on the sidelines. So when the President asks, Why are these people on the sidelines? Why aren't they investing? I will say, Please find the nearest mirror. Look in there. It is this administration and these laws that have put a choke hold on our economy.

Too many Americans have been waiting too long now for answers from a government that just doesn't have the right answers, but that tells them the way it's going to be without ever bringing them to the table in order to ask them, What is the effect on you, Mr. Businessman? How badly does this hurt you? At the end of the day, it's not about how bad it hurts the businesspeople. There is very little consideration given to us.

I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for taking the time to bring this up in order for us to talk about it. We need to continue to talk about it, and we need to fix something that is very badly broken.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania, who is a job creator.

We are talking about how this bill is affecting our job creators and our economy, which leads right into my broken promise number 4.

It was said that it will not raise any of your taxes. The President's health care law broke this promise with 20 different tax hikes, placing a tremendous burden on American families and small businesses—the engines of job growth. Americans are already facing a barrage of Washington-created headwinds from the avalanche of new regulations to the impending fiscal cliff on January 1. On top of that, job creators also must work against the velocity of the massive $5 billion ObamaCare tax increase that will be coming at them over the next decade.

This year, the ObamaCare tax burden comes in at around $15 billion, as you can see here on the chart, which represents about $190 for each family of four, but we see it increase 20-fold by the year 2040 when the tax burden will be $320 billion and when the amount for a family of four will be $3,290.

With the cost of living—with gas and food and all of these other crushing burdens on our people—they just cannot afford another increase in taxes. Every dollar businesses are holding back in anticipation of this tax hike or new regulation is a dollar not spent on hiring Americans who are out of work.

With that, I would like to yield 5 minutes of my time to ROB WOODALL, my good colleague from Lawrenceville, Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Thank you very much. I thank my friend from Tennessee for yielding.

I just have to say, for folks who haven't been following your short 15 months here closely, they don't usually put freshmen on the Ways and Means Committee. They just don't. I mean, this is not a meritocracy. This is an organization that's often run by tenures, a little like a labor union shop. You put in your time. You play by the rules. You eventually get promoted. Yet, when this freshman class came in and when you looked at the kind of challenges that were facing the Nation, they looked at folks like you, Mrs. BLACK, who have invested a career in health care—not in talking about health care, but in implementing health care—they said, Where can we make folks the most valuable?

I hear that time and time again back home. Folks say, ROB, why is it all the bureaucrats are making all the decisions in Washington, D.C.?

What I get to say to them is, You know, that might have been the way it was, but today we have folks like Dr. BUCSHON, like Dr. HECK, and we have folks like DIANE BLACK, who are in the places where they can bring their real-life experiences to bear.

I listened to my colleague, MIKE KELLY, talk about how folks just discount job creators as they're passing legislation like this. You wonder why it is we're in the worst recession in my lifetime. We have folks who you could consult. We have folks that you could speak with. We have folks whose advice you could seek and employ. Yet Washington knows best.

I actually saw your tax chart from my office, so I came down here. I thought that was going to be something about improving outcomes. I thought that was going to be something about how more folks have health insurance today than yesterday. What I see is that it is a chart of tax burdens—tax burdens. We knew that was going to come. We knew that was going to come because the promise was within that that we were going to provide more care to folks, that we were going to do more things for folks; and, more importantly, health care premiums for the average American family were going to come down by $2,500 per family. That was the promise the President gave us.

I see you've brought out another chart. I would ask my colleague, what are we seeing here?

Mrs. BLACK. Yes, that's exactly what you're seeing here. It is the rhetoric versus the reality on premium costs.

We can see that the promise was that we'll bring down the premiums by $2,500 for the typical family. We see here is the line of the rhetoric and here is the reality, and we can see that it did not bring it down. As a matter of fact, they're going to continue to go up. It's estimated, by the time we reach 2015, the premiums will actually have increased by almost $2,400. A broken promise.

□ 1950

My concern is when folks see that chart back home, they are not aghast. Because candidly, that's what they expected. They expected good rhetoric out of Washington, D.C., and they expected abysmal results. Candidly, I don't know why they wouldn't. It doesn't matter whether it's a Republican administration or a Democratic administration, Washington, D.C., is famous in its one-size-fits-all solutions for overpromising and underdelivering.

But you always have hope. You always have hope that this time it's going to be different. Say what you want to about hope and change. I remember when the President was rolling out this provision. I thought, Golly, if we would just pass this bill 10 pages at a time, there probably would be some meritorious parts of it, there would probably be some provisions that the American people would want. I might not want them, and leave me alone in the world that I live in, but other folks would want them, it would pass by 218 votes, If we would only look at it one small part at a time.

But there were some ugly things in the bill, ugly things that I hope the Supreme Court solves and releases to us

next week and shares with us. There were things that folks wanted to hide in all of these other provisions in the health care bill. One of the things that I pride myself on in this Congress, what we've seen out of the Ways and Means Committee, is we haven't seen any 2,000-page bills in the 15 months that you and I have been in Congress. We haven't seen any 1,500-page bills when my freshman colleague from Alabama has been here in Congress. We've seen limited bills with limited ideas that the American people can digest and understand.

I know that we can deliver that, with the help of colleagues like the gentlelady from Tennessee, with the Doctors Caucus here in this House, the largest Doctors Caucus that we have ever had in this House. I know that we can implement solutions that make sense 10 pages at a time in consultation with the American people, not an end-run around the American people.

I just keep staring at this chart behind you—promises that insurance costs would go down, and the reality that a command-and-control government structure has driven those costs up.

I was a staffer here before I ran for Congress, and I was here when this bill was being passed. I remember the phone calls coming in, when folks started to say, What's the rush? I'm a Democrat. I'm an independent. I'm someone who wants the government involved in health care, but what's the rush? I'm concerned that there is something hidden in there that you folks in Congress want to push it all through before we've had a chance to see what's in it.

Chart after chart that you brought down here tonight brings back those memories, that that's exactly right. There were things hidden in there. Folks did not know what was in it. But we now have a chance to do it better. With your leadership on the Ways and Means Committee, I'm certain that we will.

I thank the gentlelady for the time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank my colleague from Georgia for all those kind comments.

Once again, looking at this chart, we see the broken promises over and over and over again. And not only the cost to our job creators, which certainly is affecting our economy, but also those to the typical families who are already struggling to get health care. Now we have increased that cost to them by almost $2,400 in just a few short years.

Now it is my honor to yield to a gentlelady from Alabama, MARTHA ROBY, who represents Montgomery.

Mrs. ROBY. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for your leadership tonight on this most important and timely subject. And to the gentleman from Georgia, I appreciate all of your remarks because I do believe that we have shown through our campaign promises that we were going to put forth legislation that's not just commonsensical, but that all Americans have the ability to digest and understand in a way that gives them the ability to provide feedback to us as Members of Congress as to what makes sense and what they are for and what they're not for.

The 3-day rule that we implemented certainly has provided us with an opportunity to give our constituents time to learn. So we're not finding ourselves in the same situation as they were in the previous Congress with this massive health care law. I'm proud to say that one of our first votes in Congress was to repeal this law in its entirety.

Most of us can agree that this law has very little to do with commonsense health care reform, but that it translates into substantial costs, well over $500 billion that has to be paid by hard-working, tax-paying Americans.

I would think that if this room was filled with colleagues from this side of the aisle and the other, that what we could all nod and agree upon is that we need health care in this country, that it's more accessible and more affordable. We just have different ways of getting there. And over the course of this Congress, all of my colleagues here, we've cast over 27 votes to repeal or defund this current law.

Soon—and maybe sooner than later—the Supreme Court is going to hand down this landmark decision regarding the constitutionality of this very law that we're discussing here tonight. Of course, just like all of your districts, it will affect my home district in Alabama. And regardless of the Supreme Court's decision, I believe that many of the problems that we have with health care in this country will continue to be present, and they have a significant impact on small business in this country. Despite rhetoric, we have a responsibility in this majority to maintain our focus on jobs and the economy because that is what Americans are concerned about.

Today, I asked in anticipation of being here with you tonight, my constituents from the Second District of Alabama, to share with me on Facebook their concerns surrounding ObamaCare. So I just want to quote a few of my constituents:

> ObamaCare violates the Constitution and the rights of the American people.
>
> ObamaCare is not the answer.
>
> A board of laymen should not decide what treatment I can get. That is between me and my doctor, not some committee with no medical experience.

One of their largest fears is IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, labeled by critics the ''death panel.''

Under current law, this 15-member board will be empowered to find cost savings in Medicare by rationing health care services to senior citizens. You know what? Like the President's czars, this board will be handpicked by the President and will not be accountable to the American people or any person that they elected to the Congress to represent them.

One Montgomery, Alabama, physician, who provides care to Medicare recipients claims that the cuts in payments to doctors will be devastating to his ability just to stay in business. We've heard testimony about how difficult it will be to then recruit family practitioners and internal medicine doctors into the community. IPAB's recommendations to reduce health care costs will unfairly and disproportionately fall on physicians just like him, since the law prohibits any reductions in payments to hospitals and hospices until 2020.

So many doctors in Alabama are already faced with the painful decision of staying in business or not seeing Medicare patients, all because of ObamaCare. Not because of the decisions that this Republican majority in this House have made. Not only will IPAB have a devastating effect on businesses, it will have a disastrous effect and negative consequences on a patient's access to care.

Another concern of my constituents is the employer mandated health insurance provision. The Obama administration is encouraging employers to retain and expand health care coverage to their employees by 2014. My question is this: How can a business owner retain insurance coverage if it forces him into bankruptcy? This is what all of us here, when we travel throughout our districts during district work week, this is the number one concern of uncertainty provided by this law.

I recently heard from another constituent who owns independent grocery stores throughout Alabama who employs over 500 workers. This means 500 families are making a living from this business. And when he's required by law to provide all of his employees with health insurance, his grocery stores will go bankrupt, causing significant layoffs to his employees. When a kumquat producer from a southern State is threatened to go out of business, this is evidence that we have left no stone unturned when it comes to the loss of jobs.

On a national perspective, the employer mandated health insurance provision could cause the elimination of 1.6 million jobs, with 66 percent of those coming from small businesses alone. Who wins in this situation? No one. Every thriving business that is able to sustain the heavy financial burden of this law is not hiring and growing their workforce due to the uncertainty.

□ 2000

As we continue during this 112th Congress, we must remain committed to reforming health care without the threat of new taxes and regulations that burden small businesses and the American people. Congress must be aggressive but responsible and make these reforms as we stay focused on making America strong and prosperous for future generations.

I look forward to working with all of you here tonight. And to the gentlelady from Tennessee, thank you for your leadership. It could not have come at a more important time. We need to continue this discussion.

Again, I cannot emphasize enough that the uncertainty surrounding this law is stifling job creation. And as we are accused day after day of not presenting jobs bills, this is it. This is the number one jobs bill. When we repeal this law, we will lift the heavy hand of government. And we believe—and I know—that the private sector will, with that certainty, once again begin hiring those people who desperately need these jobs all over this country.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentlelady from Alabama for coming to the floor and giving us some very real situations and quotes from people right back in your district. I was writing down here that you had folks who were providers of health care, people who were job creators. I'm talking about the patients, talking about whether this is really what our government was set up to do, and bringing these very real situations here so that we can let the American people know how this bill is affecting every segment of our society. I thank you so much for coming, especially with those remarks of the people from your district because these are the people who are living this and are every day having to deal with what is being placed as a burden upon them. So thank you so much for sharing that. That's the purpose of this Special Order tonight.

I would now like to yield 5 minutes to my good friend and colleague from Cincinnati, Ohio, STEVE CHABOT.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for yielding. I also want to thank her for organizing this Special Order this evening on such an important issue.

None of us knows for sure what the United States Supreme Court is going to do in the next few days, the next week, maybe 10 days. None of us even knows for sure when it's going to happen, but I think we all anticipate that it will be soon. I think none of us would disagree with the fact that whatever they do, it's going to have significant and real implications to an awful lot of people all across this country.

I think it's important to remember how we got into this position—this mess, quite frankly—that we're in right now relative to health care and what happened. The Democrats were in complete control. President Obama had been elected, and they controlled the House and the Senate. And rather than act in a bipartisan manner on something as important as this, which is what they should have done—they should have gotten input from both sides and done what was in the best interest of the people when you are dealing with something as important as health care—they basically rammed through a bill. Unfortunately, few had even read the bill, as we heard over and over again. And in fact, Speaker PELOSI, who was Speaker at the time, even made a statement that it was important that they pass the bill so they could find out what was in it. What an incredible statement to make.

And unfortunately, deals were made to get people to vote for this legislation. The ones that came out that seemed to be the most egregious were maybe on the other side of the Capitol building, in the other body, some of the things that we heard about there. But this is really not the way that legislation is supposed to happen, especially something as important to people's lives as their health care is.

And I think they thought that—in fact, statements were made that—the people would like it; they'd fall in love with it once it was passed. Well, that clearly hasn't happened. There was a poll out, a New York Times and CBS News poll that just came out recently that indicates that two-thirds of the American people hope—they'd like to see the Supreme Court either strike down this health care legislation, or ObamaCare or whatever terminology one prefers to use, but they'd like to see it struck down either altogether or at least in part.

Unfortunately, when they focused so much attention on this health care bill, or ObamaCare, they should have been focused on an even bigger issue, and that is how the economy is so weak and so many people are unemployed. They were back at that time, and they still are now. Instead of devoting attention where it should have been, on the economy and on getting Americans back to work, they passed this so-called economic stimulus package, spent over $800 billion. And it did grow one thing, and that's government. But unfortunately, it did not grow jobs in the private sector.

After passing that monstrosity, they moved to health care and then passed this piece of legislation. It took them basically a year to get it passed. And what has happened is it didn't, as you indicated—and I think you did an excellent job in pointing out what was said and what actually happened. They said it's not going to raise taxes. Well, it's raised 20 different taxes. They said it was going to drive down health care costs. It's increasing health care costs. They said it was going to create jobs. It's reduced jobs. In fact, it's been a wet blanket over the whole economy.

I've talked to a lot of small business people in my district back in Cincinnati and in the greater Cincinnati area, and I have heard over and over again that small businesses are afraid to hire people. They're afraid of the new regulations, the new taxes. So people aren't getting hired and the jobs aren't being created. And this isn't the only reason, but this is one of the biggest reasons that you hear our small business folks say why they are not hiring folks.

In the small business community, about 70 percent of the jobs created in our economy over the last few decades have been in the small business sector, and those are the folks that are going to be particularly hard-hit by this ObamaCare if the Supreme Court upholds it.

Now, of course, as our colleague from Alabama mentioned previously, in the House, we passed legislation earlier in this Congress to repeal this bill. But the other body wouldn't take it up. And even if they had, I think most of us speculate that the President would have vetoed it, and we wouldn't have had two-thirds to override the repeal. So we hope the Supreme Court acts. But even if they don't, we hope that this body and the body on the other side of the building will act to repeal it.

Now, relative to one particular thing, the employer mandate, it's been estimated that that has resulted in the loss—or will result in the loss of 1.6 million jobs if that ultimately is imposed on businesses, that they have to move to this ObamaCare. And I think we all know that a lot of businesses are just going to drop coverage altogether. People that have insurance now will not have insurance if or when this goes through.

We also know there is going to be more red tape. There are going to be more regulations. There are going to be higher taxes. And it's been estimated the higher taxes alone are going to be over $500 billion—$569 billion, to be exact.

And what is all of this for? It's a law that puts government ahead of people. It's a law that consolidates power into the hands of 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats that are going to decide how much of our seniors' Medicare is going to be cut. And that estimate is about $500 billion of cuts also in Medicare. So it's just an awful piece of legislation which we certainly hope the Supreme Court strikes down in the very near future.

There were alternatives to ObamaCare, things that Republicans have been pushing for a long time. For example, allowing insurance companies to sell insurance across State lines. That means more competition. That drives the cost down so people have more access to health care coverage. Also, association health plans. That means that small businesses can join together in order to negotiate with the insurance companies. They have more power to get lower rates for their workers and their employees. Medical malpractice reform. We have far too many doctors ordering tests, very expensive tests just to prevent themselves from getting sued. At least half of these lawsuits are probably frivolous. We need medical malpractice reform. And then, finally, health savings accounts, which more and more people are finding more and more attractive, saving them money and giving them more control over their health care dollars.

Those are a few of the commonsense reforms that have been proposed over

the years but, unfortunately, have been blocked. And they put all of their money and all of their eggs in the basket of this ObamaCare, and I really think the thing is likely to be struck down in the very near future.

□ 2010

The decisions ought to be made by the people back home around their kitchen tables—people—mothers and husbands and fathers talking about what is the most important thing to their family with health care. That's where the decisions ought to be made, not in backroom deals up here on Capitol Hill.

So yes, we need health care reform. We didn't need this big government cop out, really; this monstrosity, this takeover. I know that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle cringe when we say takeover of health care, but that, in essence, is what it is—not a complete takeover, but a heck of a big takeover by Big Government. And that's the last thing we need.

So this is bad public policy. It's bad for the American people. It needs to go.

I just want to thank you again for organizing this Special Order this evening and look forward to doing future ones talking with the American people.

Mrs. BLACK. Thank you. I thank you for coming here tonight to talk about this program and how it has put a wet blanket on our economy. Not only that, you did talk about some real solutions that really could help to deliver health care and make it more accessible, increase the quality of the care, and at the same time lower the cost. So I sure do appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD). The gentlewoman from Tennessee has just under 7 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BLACK. I'm going to go quickly to my last points here.

In the coming weeks, the Supreme Court is expected to release their decision regarding the constitutionality of ObamaCare. And I stand firmly with those 26 States and the National Federation of Independent Businesses who have laid out convincing evidence that this bill seriously violates our Constitution and our founding principles. For the last 3 years, no one has known how or when the court would rule on ObamaCare so the House has worked tirelessly to repeal and defund the law. Because every day this law stands is a day that jobs are being lost, Americans' health care insurance premiums are going up, job creators and consumers are bearing the brunt of ObamaCare's tax hikes. And in just 3 short years, ObamaCare has already resulted in fewer jobs, higher health care costs, and more debt.

My first act here in Congress was repealing this law in its entirety. Subsequently, I have voted more than two dozen times to either defund or repeal ObamaCare since being elected to Congress. Unfortunately, these amendments and others like them have been blocked by the Democrat-controlled Senate. But due to the steady stream of broken promises, the growing and unrelenting public outcry, and Republican lawmakers' unwavering determination, we have been successful in getting several of the most egregious portions of ObamaCare repealed or defunded and signed into law. In fact, one of those successes was my legislation that closed the loophole in the health care law and saved taxpayers $13 billion. My bill was signed into the law by the President last November.

Six other ObamaCare provisions have been repealed or have had funding rescinded and signed into law. One of those that many of us will remember is the onerous 1099 tax provision that would have drastically affected especially our small businesses.

Now Republicans are not going to stop here. We will continue to pursue opportunities to get these and other defunding and repeal bills to President Obama's desk. Before coming to Congress, I worked in health care as a registered nurse for more than 40 years, and I have seen firsthand the problems and the obstacles that patients and the health care providers face. But ObamaCare is only serving to exacerbate the current problems and creates entirely new problems. Repealing ObamaCare is a very important first step that must be accomplished, but that simply is not enough.

For the past two sessions of Congress, the House Budget Committee has produced full repeals of ObamaCare and has also set in place a constructive framework to replace the government takeover of health care. House Republicans have built on principles that empower patients with policies that have proven records of success.

Now the House Republican budget passed last year heeds the warnings of economists around the world. The simple truth is that ObamaCare is one of the single most destructive things to happen to our economy. We cannot try to micromanage 17 percent of our economy through a maze of mandates, taxes, and price control. Our project uses models that foster competition, innovation, and choice as driving principles behind improving our health care system.

A critical part of implementing real, patient-centered reform is Medicare reform. The premium support structure would be a constructive approach to defending and saving Medicare for current and future retirees. Premium support would reflect the structure of the overwhelming successful Medicare part D program. Now Medicare's prescription drug program is succeeding beyond all expectations. It's delivering needed prescription drugs to the Medicare beneficiaries at a lower cost than expected due to the strong competition—yes, competition—among health care plans that work to keep costs down and negotiate with pharmaceutical companies for savings.

This market-based program is seen by policymakers as a model for how to restructure health care entitlement programs. The CBO estimates show that part D is costing far less than the initial projections. Total costs for part D are now estimated to be 43 percent lower than the initial projections for the initial 2004–2013 forecast period, according to CBO Medicare part D baselines for 2004–2013.

In March of 2012, the CBO reduced its Medicare part D spending projection from 2013–2022 by $107 billion. This was due to ''an increase in the number of high-volume drugs with generic substitutes available and changes in drug utilization.'' At the same time, CBO increased its projected spending for the rest of Medicare.

Now let's take a look at the average beneficiary part D premiums in 2012 that are far below the original projections. As a matter of fact, you can see here on the chart that the average monthly beneficiary premium for part D coverage is about $30 in 2012, virtually unchanged from 2011 and far below the $56 forecast that was originally projected. According to the CMS administrator, Don Berwick, these consistently low premiums, ''are going to make medications more affordable to the Medicare beneficiaries,'' and CMS officials reported in 2011 over 99 percent of part D enrollees had access to the plan with a premium that is the same or lower than their 2010 premium. And you can see that very clearly here on this chart of what the projections were and what the actual amount is coming in. The same amount of the premium in 2011 and 2012. Just remarkable.

Now research shows that increased access to medication achieved through part D is actually lowering beneficiaries' health care costs. A new study in JAMA found that the implementation of the Medicare prescription drug program was followed by a $1,200 per year decrease in nondrug medical spending among those who previously had limited drug coverage, which has been reported to generate over $12 billion per year in savings to part D from less use of hospital and skilled nursing facilities.

As a matter of fact, what this has shown is that because patients are receiving their medication and can afford them, they are not going to the hospital as much, therefore saving costs. Beneficiaries are also highly satisfied with part D. Recently released surveys showed that Medicare part D enrollees are overwhelmingly satisfied with part D coverage. Eighty-eight percent of the part D enrollees are satisfied with their coverage, and 95 percent say this coverage works well. Additionally, vulnerable beneficiaries who are dually eligible for both Medicaid and Medicare exhibit the highest satisfaction.

Now should the high court fail to overturn the law, or sever parts of this

disastrous piece of legislation, the House Republicans will continue to fight to defund and repeal ObamaCare. While the country continues to suffer from failed policies and broken promises of the Obama administration, my Republican colleagues and I will not only continue to undo the damage, but we will also rebuild a health care system that puts patients and their doctors in the driver's seat rather than the unelected bureaucrats here in Washington, D.C.

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

HOUSE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

January 31, 2012:

H.R. 3800. An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

February 1, 2012:

H.R. 3237. An Act to amend the SOAR Act by clarifying the scope of coverage of the Act.

February 10, 2012:

H.R. 3801. An Act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to clarify the definition of aircraft and the offenses penalized under the aviation smuggling provisions under that Act, and for other purposes.

February 14, 2012:

H.R. 588. An Act to redesignate the Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge as the Sam D. Hamilton Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge.

H.R. 658. An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, to streamline programs, create efficiencies, reduce waste, and improve aviation safety and capacity, to provide stable funding for the national aviation system, and for other purposes.

February 22, 2012:

H.R. 3630. An Act to provide incentives for the creation of jobs, and for other purposes.

February 27, 2012:

H.R. 1162. An Act to provide the Quileute Indian Tribe Tsunami and Flood Protection, and for other purposes.

March 8, 2012:

H.R. 347. An Act to correct and simplify the drafting of section 1752 (relating to restricted buildings or grounds) of title 18, United States Code.

March 13, 2012:

H.R. 4105. An Act to apply the countervailing duty provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 to nonmarket economy countries, and for other purposes.

March 30, 2012:

H.R. 4281. An Act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs.

April 2, 2012:

H.R. 473. An Act to provide for the conveyance of approximately 140 acres of land in the Ouachita National Forest in Oklahoma to the Indian Nations Council, Inc., of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes.

H.R. 886. An Act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 225th anniversary of the establishment of the Nation's first Federal law enforcement agency, the United States Marshals Service.

April 5, 2012:

H.R. 3606. An Act to increase American job creation and economic growth by improving access to the public capital markets for emerging growth companies.

May 15, 2012:

H.R. 298. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 East Whitestone Boulevard in Cedar Park, Texas, as the ''Army Specialist Matthew Troy Morris Post Office Building''.

H.R. 1423. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 115 4th Avenue Southwest in Ardmore, Oklahoma, as the ''Specialist Micheal E. Phillips Post Office''.

H.R. 2079. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10 Main Street in East Rockaway, New York, as the ''John J. Cook Post Office''.

H.R. 2213. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 801 West Eastport Street in Inks, Mississippi, as the ''Sergeant Jason W. Vaughn Post Office''.

H.R. 2244. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 67 Castle Street in Geneva, New York, as the ''Corporal Steven Blaine Riccione Post Office''.

H.R. 2660. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 122 North Holderrieth Boulevard in Tomball, Texas, as the ''Tomball Veterans Post Office''.

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''.

H.R. 2767. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8 West Silver Street in Westfield, Massachusetts, as the ''William T. Trent Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3004. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 260 California Drive in Yountville, California, as the ''Private First Class Alejandro R. Ruiz Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3246. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15455 Manchester Road in Ballwin, Missouri, as the ''Specialist Peter J. Navarro Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3247. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 Town and Country Commons in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the ''Lance Corporal Matthew P. Pathenos Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3248. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 112 South 5th Street in Saint Charles, Missouri, as the ''Lance Corporal Drew W. Weaver Post Office Building''.

May 25, 2012:

H.R. 4045. An Act to modify the Department of Defense Program Guidance relating to the award of Post-Deployment/Mobilization Respite Absence administrative absence days to members of the reserve components to exempt any member whose qualified mobilization commenced before October 1, 2011, and continued on, or after that date, from the changes to the program guidance that took effect on that date.

H.R. 4967. An Act to prevent the termination of the temporary office of bankruptcy judges in certain judicial districts.

May 30, 2012:

H.R. 2072. An Act to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes.

May 31, 2012:

H.R. 5740. An Act to extend the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

June 5, 2012:

H.R. 2415. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11 Dock Street in Pittston, Pennsylvania, as the ''Trooper Joshua D. Miller Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3220. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 170 Evergreen Square SW in Pine City, Minnesota, as the ''Master Sergeant Daniel L. Fedder Post Office''.

H.R. 3413. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1449 West Avenue in Bronx, New York, as the ''Private Isaac T. Cortes Post Office''.

H.R. 4119. An Act to reduce the trafficking of drugs and to prevent human smuggling across the Southwest Border by deterring the construction and use of border tunnels.

H.R. 4849. An Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue commercial use authorizations to commercial stock operators for operations in designated wilderness within the Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, and for other purposes.

June 8. 2012:

H.R. 2947. An Act to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land conveyed by the United States in 1950 for the establishment of an airport in Cook County, Minnesota.

H.R. 3992. An Act to allow otherwise eligible Israeli nationals to receive E–2 nonimmigrant visas if similarly situated United States nationals are eligible for similar nonimmigrant status in Israel.

H.R. 4097. An Act to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the Senate of the following titles:

March 14, 2012:

S. 1134. An Act to authorize the St. Croix River Crossing Project with appropriate mitigation measures to promote river values.

S. 1710. An Act to designate the United States courthouse located at 222 West 7th Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska, as the James M. Fitzgerald United States Courthouse.

April 4, 2012:

S. 2038. An Act to prohibit Members of Congress and employees of Congress from using nonpublic information derived from their official positions for personal benefit, and for other purposes.

May 15, 2012:

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.

June 13, 2012:

S. 3261. An Act to allow the Chief of the Forest Service to award certain contracts for large air tankers.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MILLER of Florida (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for June 18 and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 20, 2012, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

OATH OF OFFICE OF MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> ''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 112th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

RON BARBER, Arizona Eighth.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6476. A letter from the Director, Office of Procurement and Property Management, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Guidelines for the Transfer of Excess Computers or Other Technical Equipment Pursuant to Section 14220 of the 2008 Farm Bill (RIN: 0599-AA13) received May 15, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6477. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 1-Naphthaleneacetic acid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2004-0144; FRL-9346-9] (RIN: 2070-ZA16) received May 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6478. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — a-(p-Nonylphenol)-w-hydroxypoly(oxyethylene) Sulfate and Phosphate Esters; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0526; FRL-9340-2] received May 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6479. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — a-[p-(1,1,3,3-Tetramethylbutyl)phenyl]-w-hydroxypoly(oxyethylene) Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolernace [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0525; FRL-9340-1] received May 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6480. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ametoctradin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0261; FRL-9339-7] received May 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6481. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2012 Report to Congress on Sustainable Ranges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6482. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the twenty-second annual report on the Profitability of Credit Card Operations of Depository Institutions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6483. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6484. A letter from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Financial Stability Oversight Council, transmitting the Council's final rule — Implementation of the Freedom of Information Act (RIN: 4030-AA02) received May 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6485. A letter from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Financial Stability Oversight Council, transmitting the Council's final rule — Authority To Require Supervision and Regulation of Certain Nonbank Financial Companies (RIN: 4030-AA00) received May 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6486. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Loan Guarantees for Projects That Employ Innovative Technologies (RIN: 1901-AB32) received May 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6487. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Nonattainment New Source Review Rules [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0925; FRL-9669-3] received May 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6488. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; California; Western Mojave Desert Ozone Nonattainment Area; Reclassification to Severe [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0249; FRL-9669-7] received May 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6489. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 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 [EPA-HQ-OAR-2007-0956; FRL-9668-4] (RIN: 2060-AO96) received May 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6490. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Priorities List, Final Rule No. 54 [EPA-HQ-SFUND-2011-0644, 0645 and 0654; FRL-9668-1] received May 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6491. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Kentucky; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan; Correction [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0783; FRL-9669-2] received May 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6492. 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; West Virginia; Ohio; Determination of Clean Data for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Standard for the Steubenville-Weirton Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0556; FRL-9669-5] received May 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6493. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Designations for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0476; FRL-9668-2] (RIN: 2060-AP37) received May 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6494. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — 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 [Project No.: 753; NRC-2012-0019] received May 9, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6495. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management and Volume Reduction [NRC-2011-0183] received May 9, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6496. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 12-21, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6497. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a certification of export to China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6498. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a certification of export to China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6499. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Memorandum of Justification; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6500. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report pursuant to section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6501. A letter from the Chair, Federal Election Commission, transmitting five legislative recommendations from the Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

6502. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Virginia Regulatory Program [VA-126-FOR; OSM-2008-0012] received May 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6503. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting information on Defense of Marriage Act litigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6504. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Choptank River and Cambridge Channel, Cambridge, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2011-1164] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6505. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Anacostia River, Washington, DC [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0591] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6506. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Safety and Security Zones; Recurring Events in Captain of the Port Long Island Sound Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0384] (RIN: 1625-AA00; 1625-AA08; 1625-AA87) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6507. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Seagoing Barges [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0363] (RIN: 1625-AB71) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6508. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Damage Tolerance and Fatigue Evaluation for Composite Rotorcraft Structures, and Damage Tolerance and Fatigue Evaluation for Metallic Structures; Correction [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0660; Amdt. Nos. 27-47A, 29-54A; and Docket No. FAA-2009-0413; Amdt. No. 29-55A] (RIN: 2120-AJ52, 2120-AJ51) received May 15, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6509. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Size Standards: Transportation and Warehousing (RIN: 3245-AG08) received May 23, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

6510. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Disaster Assistance Loan Program; Maximum Term for Disaster Loans to Small Businesses With Credit Available Elsewhere (RIN: 3245-AG42) received May 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

6511. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the ninth annual report on the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6512. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department requests be enacted during the second session of the 112th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

6513. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report to Congress concerning the Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility being constructed at the Department's Savannah River Site near Aiken, South Carolina, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 4306(a)(3); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Commerce.

6514. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting second quarterly report of FY 2012 on the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

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. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 691. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4480) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in response to a drawdown on petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (Rept. 112–540). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. CHU, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 5959. A bill to place a moratorium on permitting for mountaintop removal coal mining until health studies are conducted by the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. LUJÁN):

H.R. 5960. A bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to improve the response to insect infestations and related diseases and to change the funding source for the Healthy Forests Reserve Program, to codify the stewardship end result contracting and good neighbor authorities, and to amend the emergency watershed protection program to improve post fire rehabilitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TERRY, and Mrs. NOEM):

H.R. 5961. A bill to provide reasonable limits, control, and oversight over the Environmental Protection Agency's use of aerial surveillance of America's farmers; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 5962. A bill to amend the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 to require recordkeeping and authorize investigations and enforcement actions for violations of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 5963. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for 1 year the deduction for expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers and to allow such deduction with respect to home school expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUELLAR (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 5964. A bill to provide for alternative financing arrangements for the provision of certain services and the construction and maintenance of infrastructure at land border ports of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 5965. A bill to require the Chief of the Forest Service to make the Forest Service First and Second Generation Modular Airborne FireFighting System (MAFFS) units available to units of the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve that have the aircraft capability and pilot and crew member training adequate for utilizing such firefighting systems to help alleviate the shortage of air tankers to fight wildfires; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 5966. A bill to establish a United States Boxing Commission to administer the Professional Boxing Safety Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 5967. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish a Federal renewable electricity and energy efficiency standard for certain electric utilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 5968. A bill to amend the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 to authorize the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to enter into reimbursable fee agreements for the provision of additional services at Customs ports of

entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GOWDY, and Mrs. SCHMIDT):

H.R. 5969. A bill to preserve the companionship services exemption for minimum wage and overtime pay under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GOWDY, and Mrs. SCHMIDT):

H.R. 5970. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Labor from finalizing a proposed rule relating to the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to domestic service employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALSH of Illinois:

H.R. 5971. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require each individual who desires to vote in an election for Federal office to provide the appropriate election official with a government-issued photo identification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H. Res. 690. A resolution recognizing the Proclamation of the Refugee Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H. Res. 692. A resolution recognizing the 30th Anniversary of the United States Air Force Space Command headquartered at Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H. Res. 693. A resolution expressing support for designation of June as ''National Family Reunification Month''; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII.

234. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relative to House Memorial 2002 urging the Congress to pass House Joint Resolution 106; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. KUCINICH:

H.R. 5959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause III of the Constitution.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 5960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill addresses management of federal land. Accordingly, we turn to the following constitutional authority: Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Currently, the federal government possesses approximately 1.8 billion acres of land. The land at issue in this bill is but a small part of those holdings. The U.S. Constitution specifically addresses the relationship of the federal government to lands. Article IV, Sec. 3, Clause 2—the Property Clause—gives Congress plenary power and full authority over federal property. The U.S. Supreme Court has described Congress's power to legislate under this Clause as ''without limitation.'' Because of this express Constitutional authority, Congress has the right, if not the duty, to properly manage its public lands, including establishing forestation policies, and tree harvesting and tree salvaging. This bill falls squarely within the express Constitutional power set forth in the Property Clause.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 5961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (Interstate Commerce Clause)

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and proper clause)

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 5962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 5963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 5964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 5965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, it is the power of Congress to ''make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States,''.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5966.

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. MARKEY:

H.R. 5967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 5968.

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.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 5969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 5970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. WALSH of Illinois:

H.R. 5971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1: The Times, Places, and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed by each state by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 329: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 458: Mr. BACA and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 640: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 687: Mr. RUSH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 692: Mrs. ADAMS.
H.R. 733: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 831: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 890: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 891: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 904: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 905: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 930: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 931: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 987: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.
H.R. 1063: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1084: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1116: Mr. LUJÁN and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1167: Mr. MICA.
H.R. 1172: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1236: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1277: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1283: Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 1285: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H.R. 1307: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 1394: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1523: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1533: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.
H.R. 1537: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 1546: Mr. GARDNER, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1588: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1614: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1620: Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 1639: Mr. HECK and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 1648: Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1700: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 1718: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 1755: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 1842: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 1860: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1919: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1946: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1983: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2030: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2032: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 2077: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 2104: Mr. WOMACK and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 2123: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2139: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BARROW, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2194: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H.R. 2267: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 2492: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
H.R. 2497: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. MICA, and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 2637: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2655: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
H.R. 2705: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2746: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2918: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2962: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 2967: Mr. CLEAVER and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 3158: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 3187: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 3192: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3252: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. REED.
H.R. 3264: Mr. QUAYLE.
H.R. 3357: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 3423: Mr. JONES, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.
H.R. 3435: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3496: Mr. SCHIFF and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 3555: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3563: Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 3634: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3643: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3661: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3767: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. BARTLETT.
H.R. 3798: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 3831: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 3984: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 3987: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 4055: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 4057: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 4066: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 4077: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 4091: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 4122: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 4160: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 4165: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 4169: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 4195: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4202: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4215: Mr. KISSELL and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 4235: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 4264: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JONES, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 4277: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 4287: Mr. WOMACK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 4296: Mr. BACA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. FARR, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 4353: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 4367: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 4373: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 4405: Ms. DELAURO and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 4609: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4643: Mr. CANSECO.
H.R. 4972: Mr. HINCHEY and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 5186: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 5331: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 5542: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 5647: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 5691: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 5707: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 5710: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 5741: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 5746: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 5796: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 5846: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 5850: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 5864: Mr. OWENS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 5865: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 5873: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BOREN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 5907: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 5911: Mr. KLINE and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 5912: Mr. KLINE and Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 5914: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 5942: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 5943: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 5948: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 5949: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 5953: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. GOWDY, and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 5957: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. AKIN, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 5958: Mr. REED.
H.J. Res. 81: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.J. Res. 88: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.J. Res. 90: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.J. Res. 110: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. KLINE.
H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. COHEN.
H. Con. Res. 114: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H. Con. Res. 119: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H. Con. Res. 122: Mr. LANCE.
H. Con. Res. 127: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. MACK.
H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H. Res. 20: Ms. BONAMICI.
H. Res. 111: Mr. WATT and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H. Res. 298: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CLAY, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H. Res. 387: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H. Res. 613: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. BOSWELL.
H. Res. 618: Ms. MOORE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H. Res. 630: Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. TURNER of New York, Mr. LANCE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LONG, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H. Res. 632: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H. Res. 663: Mr. YODER and Mr. KING of New York.
H. Res. 676: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. SIRES.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative HASTINGS of Washington, or a designee, to H.R. 4480, Strategic Energy Production Act of 2012, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1380: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 3238: Mr. BERG and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 19, 2012 No. 93

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal and dependable Creator, who harmonized the world with seasons and climates, sowing and reaping, color and fragrance, we praise You for sustaining us on this pilgrimage called life. Today, illumine the path of our lawmakers so that they will relinquish any motives that are contrary to Your will. Lord, strengthen them to do their part to serve You and country with faithfulness and integrity. Let Your peace radiate on wings of faith, hope, and love in their hearts this day and always.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2012.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, a Senator from the State of Connecticut, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM AND MODERNIZATION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 250, S. 1940.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 250, S. 1940, a bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, there will be 2 hours equally divided and controlled, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The hour that is under the control of the majority has been given and I ask unanimous consent now that Senator KERRY be recognized for the hour we have allotted to us.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. That will be a full hour to Senator KERRY and a full hour to the Republicans.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. The Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. to allow for our weekly caucus meetings.

Last night, we reached an agreement to complete action on the farm bill. As a result, there will be several rollcall votes beginning at 2:15 p.m. today.

Everyone who has amendments here should understand, if you know the result of your amendment—it is pretty easy to figure out most of them because Senators STABENOW and ROBERTS will tell almost everyone how the vote is going to wind up—we should be able to dispose of a lot of these by voice vote. I hope so. Otherwise, people can look to some very long nights the next night or two.

We will also begin debate today on the joint resolution of disapproval regarding the EPA's mercury and air toxics standards. That will also occur during today's session.

THE DREAM ACT

Mr. President, Republicans in Congress are fond of complaining that this country's immigration system is broken. We have heard it for months and months, going into years. But they are less interested in working with Democrats to fix this problem they say is broken. We have tried. They are totally opposed to our doing anything. We have tried, but we just get a handful of Republican votes.

No one I know disagrees that our immigration system needs repair. It certainly does. But every time we as Democrats offer to work together on comprehensive immigration reform, Republicans find an excuse to fight sensible change.

And every time Democrats propose bipartisan legislation to provide a pathway to citizenship for children brought here illegally through no fault of their own, Republicans have found an excuse to oppose our practical reforms.

There is no better illustration of Republicans' hypocrisy than their phony outrage this past weekend.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

On Friday, President Obama announced the administration would suspend deportation of young people—upstanding young people—brought here by their parents as children, provided these young people attend college or serve in the military.

More than 800,000 young people who have done well in school and stayed out of trouble will benefit from this policy and become productive members of society. That is what we should all be very happy about.

In this Congress, and the last Congress, Republicans expressed broad support for the principles of President Obama's directive.

Senator MARK RUBIO, the junior Senator from Florida, has even talked up a similar idea to the press for months, although he never actually produced a proposal. This was just talk. There was not a single word ever in writing.

Yet Republicans' glowing expressions of support for the President's decision were not forthcoming. Instead, Republicans have cried about the way the directive was issued. They prefer a long-term solution. Well, of course we all do. They do not like the timing; they should have been consulted; and an issue this important should have been left to Congress. Being left to Congress—we have tried to do that for years, and we cannot because they will not let us. They stopped us procedurally.

Their complaints are varied, but they have one thing in common: None of them actually takes issue with the substance of President Obama's directive. And with the polling results today announced in the national press, clearly, it is overwhelmingly supported by Independents, overwhelmingly supported by Democrats, and, frankly, Republicans are not that much opposed to it either. But the only Republicans who are opposed to it by a large margin are the Republicans in Congress.

Leading Republican voices on immigration have yet to actually disagree with the decision. They just do not like the way the President made the decision—I guess because he will get credit for bringing out of the shadows 800,000 trustworthy young men and women who know no other home but the United States. America is their home. It is the only home they have known.

I talked about a girl here yesterday from Nevada, Astrid. She came here to America as a tiny girl. She does not know anyplace else. This is her home. She is an American. She pledges allegiance to her flag.

So I remind my colleagues in both Houses of Congress, the next move is yours. This reprieve for DREAMers should not be seen as a free pass for Congress. We have lots of other issues we have to deal with dealing with immigration. Instead, we should see it as a chance for Democrats and Republicans to work together on a lasting answer to the serious shortfalls of our broken immigration system. And as we work, we will have the benefit of knowing the specter of deportation no longer hangs over the heads of hundreds of thousands of young people.

Now is hardly the time to walk away from the DREAM Act, which would have created a pathway to citizenship for young people brought to the country through no fault of their own. And it is certainly no time to abandon calls for comprehensive immigration reform that is tough, that is fair, and is practical. But that is exactly what Republicans are doing. They are taking their marbles and saying: Well, OK, we will quit and go home. Quite frankly, a number of them have not been here anyway to go home. They have not helped us anyway.

Since last Friday, leading Republican voices on immigration reform have all but ceded the debate until after the election. Republicans who once favored a permanent solution for America's broken immigration system are now abandoning efforts to find common ground.

And the same Republicans who complained they were not involved enough in the President's decision are now giving up any involvement in the broader immigration conversation. It makes you wonder whether they were committed to passing the DREAM Act or tackling immigration reform at all, because Senate Republicans have twice had their chance to vote for the DREAM Act. Both times they filibustered the measure to a legislative death. So perhaps it should come as no surprise that my Republican colleagues are more interested in complaining about a system that is broken than in working with Democrats to fix it.

Will the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

Under the previous order, the following 2 hours will be equally divided and controlled by the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first hour, and the Republicans controlling the second hour.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for generously yielding to me.

WIND PTC

Mr. President, I am on the Senate floor today to continue urging this body to extend the production tax credit for wind. I intend to return to the floor every morning until the PTC has been extended, and I am going to talk about the economic and jobs effect on the nonextension in each State, and I am going to press my colleagues for an immediate extension.

Today I want to focus on a wind giant in our country—Texas. Texas leads the Nation in wind energy production. The Lone Star State has more turbines than all but five countries.

As you can see, this chart I have in the Chamber outlines all the installed wind projects in Texas. You can see that across the State—from the south to the west, from El Paso to Galveston, from the Panhandle to southern Texas—the wind industry has created thousands of jobs and it has helped boost the manufacturing and construction sectors with good-paying American jobs.

For example, Sweetwater, a town of 11,000 people, has become the new Spindletop: You drive past it on the interstate and there is a forest of giant wind turbines. Among the cotton fields of this west Texas rural community, Sweetwater is home to one of the largest wind farms in Texas. And the wind industry, using Sweetwater's open spaces, constant winds, and transmission capacity, has helped revitalize this rural community—and really all of Nolan County.

Even oil-rich Houston has become something of a wind power capital in Texas—thanks to developers such as EDP Renewables Pattern Energy, and Iberdrola Renewables, as well as BP and Shell.

They say everything is bigger in Texas—and that certainly applies when it comes to their vast energy resources. Texas has it all, from traditional sources, like oil and gas, to renewable energy, like hydro and wind.

Texas' success in harnessing wind energy is no accident. Thanks to smart State policies, including a renewable portfolio standard, which passed in 1999, and was later amended in 2005, as well as strong Federal support from the wind PTC, the Texas wind industry has grown dramatically.

Texas has an all-of-the-above energy strategy. The Senator from Massachusetts supports that kind of strategy. I support that kind of a strategy. Texas embodies this. They have shown great promise when it comes to renewable resources—growing and coexisting with traditional energy sources.

So if you look at what is happening in Texas, Texas' wind energy industry supports almost 7,000 jobs. With more energy from wind than any other State in our country, wind powers over 2.7 million Texas homes, and almost 7 percent of Texas' overall electric power comes from wind. It was the first State to reach 10,000 megawatts of wind installations, and that wind power has helped avoid greenhouse gas emissions in the equivalence of 3,725,500 passenger cars.

As well, the supply chain of the manufacturing opportunities in Texas stands out. It is home to wind turbine manufacturers such as DeWind and Alstom, five major tower manufacturers, blade manufacturer Molded Fiber Glass, and many component suppliers.

This is an example of why we have to act, why we have to extend the PTC. Without certainty, wind energy companies are not able to grow, and they, frankly, will shed jobs and whole projects.

In the Senate, we have a bipartisan coalition. Senators GRASSLEY, BOOZMAN, SCOTT BROWN, HOEVEN, MORAN, and THUNE have engaged with many of us on this side to extend the wind PTC.

Let me end by quoting Karl Rove, who is known as a proud Texan and former senior adviser to President George W. Bush. He explains the wind PTC as follows:

> It is a market mechanism, you don't get paid unless you produce the power, and we're not picking winners and losers, we're simply saying for some period of time we will provide this incentive.

Let's extend the PTC now. The solution is simple. We have to act. It will help American jobs. It will help the American economy. It will help our energy security efforts.

So, Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts again, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would ask I be notified when I have consumed about 25 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will be notified.

GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, 20 years ago this month, a Republican President of the United States helped bring together all of the world's largest economies in Rio, in Brazil, to confront the issue of global climate change. The President was unequivocal about the mission. George Herbert Walker Bush said simply:

> The United States fully intends to be the world's preeminent leader in protecting the global environment. We have been that for many years. We will remain so. We believe that environment and development . . . can and should go hand in hand. A growing economy creates the resources necessary for environmental protection, and environmental protection makes growth sustainable over the long term.

When he was asked about his own target for subsequent meetings of the global stakeholders, President Bush could not have been more clear. He said the United States ''will be there with specific plans, prepared to share, but more important, that others who have signed these documents ought to have specific plans. So I think this is a leadership role. We are challenging them to come forward. We will be there. I think the Third World and others are entitled to know that the commitments made are going to be commitments kept.''

That was the President of the United States speaking on behalf of our Nation and indeed the aspirations of the world 20 years ago. How dramatic and sad it is that 20 years later, shockingly we find ourselves in a strange and dangerous place on this issue, a place this former President probably would not even recognize.

Thomas Paine actually described today's situation very well. As America fought for its independence, he said: ''It is an affront to treat falsehood with complaisance.'' Yet when it comes to the challenge of climate change, the falsehood of today's naysayers is only matched by the complacency indifference of our political system.

It is well past time that we actually heed Thomas Paine's admonition and reaffirm the commitment first made by President George Herbert Walker Bush. As a matter of conscience and common sense, we should fight today's insidious conspiracy of silence on climate change, a silence that empowers misinformation and mythology to grow where science and truth should prevail.

It is a conspiracy that has not just installed but demonized any constructive effort to put America in a position to lead the world on this issue, as President Bush promised we would, and as Americans have a right to expect we will.

The danger we face could not be more real. In the United States, a calculated campaign of disinformation has steadily beaten back the consensus momentum for action on climate change and replaced it with timidity by proponents in the face of millions of dollars of phony, contrived talking points, illogical and wholly unscientific propositions, and a general scorn for the truth wrapped in false threats about job loss and tax increases.

Yet today the naysayers escape all accountability to the truth. The media hardly murmurs when a candidate for President of the United States, in 2012, can walk away from previously held positions and blithely announce that the evidence is not yet there about the impact of greenhouse gasses on climate.

The truth is scientists have known since the 1800s that carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gasses trap heat in our atmosphere. With the right amount of those gasses, the Earth is a hospitable place for us to live. It is, indeed, the greenhouse effect that makes life possible on Earth. But if too much is added, which is what we are doing now at a record pace, temperatures inevitably rise to record-breaking levels. It is not rocket science.

Every major national science academy in the world has reported that global warming is real. It is nothing less than shocking when people in a position of authority can just stand up and say, without documentation, without accepted scientific research, without peer-reviewed analysis, just stand up and say: Oh, there is not enough evidence, and they say it because it suits their political purposes to serve some interest that does not want to change the status quo.

Facts that beg for an unprecedented public response are met with unsubstantiated, even totally contradicted denial. Those who deny the facts have never, ever met their de minimus responsibility to provide some scientific answer to what, if not human behavior, is causing the increase in greenhouse gas particulates and how, if not by curbing greenhouse gases, we will address this crisis.

In fact, when one measures the effect of taking action versus not taking action, the naysayers' case is even more confounding. Just think about it. If the proponents of action were somehow incorrect, contrary to all that science declares, but, nevertheless, if they were incorrect and we proceeded to reduce carbon and other gases released in the atmosphere, what is the worst that would happen?

Well, under that scenario the worst would be more jobs as we move to the new energy economy, the opening of a whole new $6 trillion energy market with a more sustainable policy, a healthier population because of cleaner air and reduced pollution, reduced expenditures on health care because of environmentally induced disease, an improved outlook for the oceans and the ecosystems that are affected by pollution falling to the Earth and into the sea, and surely greater security for the United States because of less dependence on foreign sources of energy and a stronger economy. That is the worst that would occur if the proponents were wrong.

But what if the naysayers are, in fact, wrong, as all the science says they are? What if because of their ignorance we fail to take the action we should? What is the worst then? The worst then is sheer, utter disaster for the planet and for all who inhabit it. So whose ''worst'' would most thinking people rather endure?

The level of dissembling—of outright falsifying of information, of greedy appeal to fear tactics that has stalled meaningful action now for 20 years—is hard to wrap one's mind around. It is so far removed from legitimate analysis that it confounds for its devilishly simple appeal to the lowest common denominator of disinformation. In the face of a massive and growing body of scientific evidence that says catastrophic climate change is knocking at our door, the naysayers just happily tell us: Climate change does not exist.

In the face of melting glaciers and ice caps in the Arctic, Greenland, and Antarctica, they say we need to ''warm up to the truth.'' And in the face of animals disappearing at alarming rates, species being destroyed, they would have us adopt an ostrich policy and just bury our heads in the sand and pretend it can go away.

Just last week, a group of State senators in North Carolina passed a bill that bans planning for rising sea levels when creating rules for housing developments and infrastructure in coastal communities. Jeffress Williams is the lead author of the U.S. National Climate Assessment Report. Ask him what he thinks about his legislation, and he will tell you it is ''not based on sound science.'' That is an understatement. But somehow the State senators who voted for this bill know better.

Al Gore spoke of the ''assault on reason.'' Well, exhibit A is staring us in the face: coalitions of politicians and special interests that peddle science fiction over scientific fact, a paid-for, multimillion-dollar effort that twists

and turns the evidence until it is gnarled beyond recognition, and tidal waves of cash that back a status quo of recklessness and inaction over responsibility and change.

In short, we are living through a story of disgraceful denial, backpedaling, and delay that has brought us perilously close to a climate change catastrophe.

Nothing underscores this Orwellian twist of logic more than the facts surrounding the now well negatively branded cap and trade program. Cap and trade was a Republican-inspired idea during the debate over ozone and the Montreal Protocol in the 1980s. It was actually inspired by conservatives looking for the least command and control, the least government-regulated way to meet pollution standards. It was implemented and it worked, and it is still working. But, lo and behold, when the strategists for the political right decided to make it a target because Democrats were leading the charge to address climate change, suddenly this free market mechanism was transformed into ''cap and tax'' and ''job killing tax.'' And guess who. Coal. Coal, the leading carbon polluter was leading the funding for those efforts. What is worse, we have all stood by and let it happen. We have treated falsehood with complacence and allowed a conspiracy of silence on climate change to infiltrate our politics. Believe me, we have had our chances to act in these last years. But every time we get close to achieving something big for our country, small-minded appeals to the politics of the moment block the way.

The conspiracy of silence that now characterizes Washington's handling of the climate issue is, in fact, dangerous. Climate change is one of two or three of the most serious threats that our country now faces, if not, in some people's minds, the most serious. The silence that has enveloped the once robust debate is staggering for its irresponsibility. The cost of inaction gets more and more expensive the longer we wait, and the longer we wait, the less likely we are to avoid the worst and to leave future generations with a sustainable planet.

In many cases what we are talking about is vast sums of money funneled into gas-guzzling industries and coal-fired powerplants. We are talking about pollution—pollution on a wide scale, the kind of dirty, thick suffocating smog that poisons our rivers, advances chronic disease like asthma, lung cancer, and creates billions in hospital costs and lost economic opportunity. It is the same pollution that Rachel Carson warned us about in ''Silent Spring'' when she said:

> Why should we tolerate a diet of weak poisons, a home in insipid surroundings, a circle of acquaintances who are not quite our enemies, the noise of motors with just enough relief to prevent insanity? Who would want to live in a world which is just not quite fatal?

Well, today we do live in a world where there is an absurdity in the air, and it has complacence written all over it. Fish are dying in water polluted with pesticides. Roadless forests are being threatened by indiscriminate drilling. Industrial chemicals are sweeping into all of us. Young children are born with a burden of chemicals unprecedented in their amount. The burning of fossil fuels has overloaded our ecosystems with nitrogen and ravaged our plant life.

Just go out and look at the forests and look at the change in the topography of our country. Bottom line: We have substituted fantasy for reason, sheer whimsy for proven epidemiology, and it is wreaking havoc on our environment. You do not have to take my word for it. I am confident a lot of our colleagues will not. But you can see it across the planet with your eyes. Ice caps are melting; seas are rising; deserts are expanding; storms are more frequent, more violent, more destructive; pollution, famine, natural disasters, killing millions of people every year.

These are changes that many experts thought were still years down the line, but climate change is now radically altering our planet at a rate much faster than the scientists or even the pessimists expected.

All you need to do is look out your window. We just had the warmest March on record for the contiguous United States. The naysayers will tell us that one hot year does not prove global warming. But just look at this chart which charts the acceleration of warming in the United States after 1970. This is not an anomaly. It is a giant step in the wrong direction, and 2010 was the hottest year on record. The last decade was the hottest decade since we have started recording the weather. April, May, and June of this year are already continuing the trend.

For the first time in memory, the Augusta National azaleas bloomed and wilted before the first golfers teed off at this year's Masters. At the Boston Marathon, temperatures hit 89 degrees in April, more than 30 degrees higher than the average. People talk about official jackets and gloves and coffee? Who are you kidding? They are talking about hats and sunscreen and Gatorade and medical tents that were filled with heat-exhausted runners starting at mile 10 of the 26-mile course from Hopkinton into Boston.

I have been working to connect the dots on this issue for a long time. In 1988, 24 years ago, on an already hot June day, Al Gore and I took part in the first hearings on climate change in the Senate with Jim Hansen, who testified then that the threat was real, that climate change was already happening in our country—24 years ago.

Four years later, we joined a delegation of Senators to attend the first Earth Summit in Rio, where we worked with 171 other nations to put into place a voluntary framework on climate change and greenhouse gas reductions. Back in 1992, we all came together for a simple reason: We accepted the science.

President George H.W. Bush personally traveled to the climate change talks in Rio to help plant the seeds of this new beginning. We knew the road ahead would be long, but we also knew this was a watershed moment; that it created the grassroots momentum that made people sit up and start to listen and understand the damage we were doing to the environment. Sit up and listen they did. The principles that came out of Rio transformed into a mandatory requirement under the Kyoto Protocol. Each of the developed nations accepted its own target goal. The European Union reduction would be 8 percent and Japan's would be 6 percent and so on. We were thinking big back then, and our goal was to reach a total decrease in global emissions of 5.2 percent below the 1990 levels and reach it by 2010.

Well, 2010 has come and gone and so, too, have the targets. We all know the story: Global political leadership was distracted or absent. International negotiations in Buenos Aires and The Hague turned tense. The less-developed nations saw the targets and timetables for greenhouse gas reductions as a Western market conspiracy. Then there were trumped up, industry-funded so-called studies that challenged the scientific assertions for climate change scenarios.

Looking back, it is not hard to understand why the final agreement got sidetracked in the Senate. After all, the developing countries were excluded from the treaty's reduction targets, even though it had already become clear by then that China and India were significant enough as industrial powers that to exempt them entirely would be a mistake. Nations left out were deemed capable of undoing all the reductions that would have been achieved by the developed nations.

It is no wonder people were reluctant, no wonder American companies were understandably reluctant to put themselves at a competitive disadvantage. Many in Congress had not yet digested the science of climate change, even though we knew climate scientists were already studying the phenomenon of greenhouse gases.

The question is not whether the Kyoto treaty had flaws; the question is whether we got the fundamentals right. I believe the evidence is overwhelming, beyond any reasonable doubt, that we did. As I remind my colleagues, the view from 2012 is a whole lot different from 1992. Countries such as China, South Africa, Brazil, and South Korea have now made far-reaching choices to reshape their economies and move forward in a new and very different global area. Take China. China is already outspending the United States three to one on public clean energy projects. In the last year alone, China accounted for almost one-

fifth of the renewable energy investments, with the United States and Germany trailing behind. Steven Chu, the Secretary of Energy, said it best:

For centuries, America has led the world in innovation. Today, that leadership is at risk.

Our indifference to climate change is putting America's economy and leadership, with respect to economics and the future of energy policy, at risk. So the United States is now the laggard. We are missing out on achieving sustained economic growth by securing enduring competitive advantage through innovation. The facts speak for themselves. Today's energy economy is a $6 trillion market, with 4 billion users worldwide, growing to 9 billion in the next 40 years. By comparison, the market that made people so wealthy in 1990s in America and created 23 million new jobs and lifted everybody was a $1 trillion market with only 1 billion users. This is $6 trillion with 4 billion users today.

The fact is it is projected to grow to a $2.3 trillion market in the year 2020. America needs to get into this. We need to get our skin in the game or we are going to miss the market of the future—if not miss the future itself. We would be delusional to believe China, given the evidence, or any of our other competitors are going to sit on the sidelines and let this market opportunity fall through the cracks. They are not doing it now and they will not do it in the future. Only the United States is sitting there with an indifference toward these alternatives and the renewable possibilities.

I realize some will argue we cannot afford to address climate change in these tough economic times. Frankly, nothing could be further from the truth. Nothing could be more self-defeating. We will recover from this slowdown. When we do, we need to emerge as the world leader in the new energy economy. That will be a crucial part of restoring America as a nation in a way that honors the hard work and innovation and measures prosperity in those terms.

Anyone who worries whether this is the right moment to tackle climate change should understand we can't afford not to do this now at the risk of our economic future. It is now that the most critical trends and facts actually all point in the wrong direction. The CO_2 emissions that caused climate change grew at a rate four times faster in the first decade of this new century than in the 1990s.

Several years ago, the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change issued a series of projections for global initiatives. Based on the likely projections of energy and land-use patterns, today our emissions have actually moved beyond—this chart shows the emissions are going up from the 1960s all the way through to 2010. Today, we have moved beyond the worst-case scenarios that were predicted by all the modeling that was done by the IPCC. Meanwhile, our oceans and forests, which act as the natural repositories of CO_2, are losing their ability to absorb more carbon dioxide. This means the effects of climate change are being felt even more powerfully than expected, faster than was expected.

The plain fact is there isn't a nation on the planet that has escaped the steady onslaught of climate change. When the desert is creeping into east Africa and ever more scarce resources push farmers and herders into deadly conflict, that is a matter of shared security for all of us. When the people of the Maldives are forced to abandon a place they have called home for hundreds of years, it is a stain on our collective conscience and a moral challenge to each of us. When our own grandchildren risk growing up in a world we can't recognize and don't want to, in the long shadow of a global failure to cooperate, then, clearly, urgently, profoundly, we need to do better.

Frankly, those who look for any excuse to continue challenging the science have a fundamental responsibility they have never fulfilled: Prove us wrong or stand down. Show with some science how this theory, in fact, is not being borne out. Prove that the pollution we put into the atmosphere is not having the harmful effects we know it is and that the science says it is. Tell us where the gases go and what they do if they don't do what the scientists are telling us they do. Pony up one single cogent, legitimate, scholarly analysis. Prove that the ocean isn't actually rising. Prove that the icecaps aren't melting or that deserts aren't expanding. Prove, above all, that human beings don't have anything to do with it.

I will tell you here right now, they cannot do it. They have not done it and they can't do it. There are over 6,000 peer-reviewed articles, all of which document clearly, irrefutably the ways in which mankind is contributing to this problem. Sure, we know the naysayers have their bought studies that don't stand up to scientific review and a few scientists who trade in doubt and misdirection about things such as Sun spots and clouds. But there is not a single credible scientist who can argue and withstand the peer review that climate change isn't happening.

In fact, even the naysayers are starting to come around, in their judgment. Just this year, a well-known climate skeptic, Dr. Richard Mueller, released a series of reports that were funded in part by the Koch brothers. Dr. Mueller thought his results were going to show something different than all the other climate studies, and what he found was not what the Koch brothers sent him looking for. Here is what Dr. Mueller, in his own words, said:

You should not be a skeptic, at least not any longer.

Bottom line: His studies found exactly what all the other credible climate studies have been telling us for decades—that global warming is real.

If we just step out and look around for a moment, we can see the effects everywhere: floods, droughts, pathogens, disease, species and habitat loss, sea level rise, storm surges that threaten our cities and coastlines. No continent is escaping unscathed: increasing ground instability in permafrost regions, increasing avalanches in mountainous zones, warmer and drier conditions in the Sahelian region of Africa leading to a shorter growing season, and coral bleaching events in the Great Barrier Reef. All these are attributed to this change in climate.

I wish to take a moment to bear down on the science, the cold, hard, stubborn facts that ought to guide us in addressing this challenge. It is detailed, to some degree, but it is the very detail that detractors can never address or refute. It is important to see the detail in its cumulative force. Unlike the naysayers, I am going to give point by point to some of the falsehoods and lay out a summary of the critical evidence that ought to lead America and the world to action.

Here is what the science is telling us: Atmospheric carbon dioxide levels have increased by nearly 40 percent in the industrial era, from 280 parts per million to over 393 parts per million in the atmosphere. Before long, we are likely to see a global average of concentration at 400 parts per million and more. Within the last few months, monitoring stations in the Arctic region, for the first time, reported average concentrations of CO_2 at 400 parts per million. Because of the remote nature of those monitors, they generally reflect long-term trends as opposed to marginal fluctuations in direct emissions near population centers.

As atmospheric scientist Pieter Tans, with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration points out:

The northern sites in our monitoring network tell us what is coming soon to the globe as a whole. . . . We will likely see global average CO_2 concentrations reach 400 ppm about 2016 [4 years from now].

Why is this important? This is important because scientists have told us that anything above 450 parts per million—a warming of 2 degrees Celsius—could lead to severe, widespread, and irreversible harm to human life on this planet. When concentrations of other greenhouse gases, such as methane and black carbon, are factored into the equation, the analysis suggests that stabilizing concentrations around 400 parts per million of equivalent carbon dioxide would give us about an 80-percent chance of avoiding a 2-degree Fahrenheit increase above the present average global temperatures.

Considering what a 2-degree Fahrenheit increase would mean, scientists obviously are urging us not to take the risk. James Hansen, Director of the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, has done the math. His analysis shows that we need to be shooting

for a stabilization level of 350 parts per million in order to increase our chances of avoiding the 2-degree Fahrenheit increase. We have already exceeded that. So we are going to have to find a way to actually go backward in order to be able to prevent what scientists are telling us could create huge damage.

Even if we slam on the brakes now, science tells us we could be headed for a global temperature increase of 2 to 4 degrees by the century's end and greater warming after that. Let me share what some of the ''postcards from the edge,'' if you will, look like when you examine what is happening to our air, our health, and our environment. Warming temperatures, first of all. The first 10 years of this century were the warmest decade on record. And 2010 was tied with 2005 as the hottest year ever recorded. NOAA has reported that 2011 was the second warmest summer on record, just .1 degrees Fahrenheit below the 1936 record, and the U.S. Climate Extreme Index—a measure of the area of the country experiencing extreme conditions—was nearly four times the average.

Last year many Northeastern States experienced their wettest summers, especially those States caught in Hurricane Irene's destructive path. Meanwhile, persistent heat and below-average precipitation across the Southern United States created recordbreaking droughts in Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas, and these were of greater intensity than the 1930s famous Dust Bowl. Texas endured the country's hottest summer ever recorded for any State, at an average temperature of 86.8 degrees.

What is shocking is that the evidence of the rate of this transformation is happening faster and to a greater degree than the scientists predicted. So one would think reasonable people would say: Wait a minute, they predicted this, but we are getting this way up here, and everyone would sort of stop and take stock of what is happening.

According to the new climate report from NOAA, the lower 48 States elbowed their way into the record books this spring with ''the warmest March, third warmest April, second warmest May . . . the first time that all three months during the spring season ranked among the 10 warmest since records began in 1895.'' In fact, the average temperature this spring was so far off the charts that the lower 48 States beat out the old 1910 record by a full 2 degrees Fahrenheit.

Inland, worsening conditions are going to create persistent drought in the Southwest and significantly increase western wildlife burn area. That is critical. We have already seen the damage done to millions of acres of forest because of the pine bark beetles, which actually live longer because it doesn't get cold and therefore they do not die in the normal cycle. But in recent years, due to warmer winters, pine beetle populations have exploded, devastating these once majestic forests.

It is also having an impact on our health. As average temperatures rise, we can expect to see more extreme heat waves during our summers, and, as we know from history, that impacts people with heart problems and asthma, the elderly, the very young, and the homeless. In the United States, Chicago is projected to have 25 percent more frequent heat wave days by the end of the century. In Los Angeles, we could see as much as a four- to eightfold increase.

Climate change may also heighten the risk of infectious diseases, particularly diseases found in warm areas and spread by mosquitoes and other insects, such as malaria, dengue fever, and yellow fever. In some places, climate change is already altering the pattern of disease. In the Kenyan Highlands, for example, it is now one of the major drivers of malaria epidemics.

It is not just the health costs that are sounding the alarm. As many have seen with their own eyes, the Arctic is among one of the most startling places to witness the adverse effects of global climate change. Great sheets of ice have been breaking off of glaciers—sheets of ice the size of the State of Rhode Island. Marine mammals are now struggling to survive. Where there used to be only frozen landscapes, there is now open water.

Every new report that is public suggests the situation is getting grimmer in the Arctic. Last year the multicountry Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Program released a new assessment of the impact of climate change in the Arctic. It found that the period from 2005 to 2010 was the warmest ever recorded. According to AMAP researchers, the changes in icemelt over the past 10 years ''are dramatic and represent an obvious departure from the long-term patterns.''

Their conclusion is startling. They expect the Arctic Ocean to be nearly ice-free within this century, likely in the next 30 to 40 years.

Think about that for a second. Within our children's lifetimes, one of Earth's polar icecaps will be completely gone. Average annual temperatures in the Arctic have increased at approximately twice the rate of average global temperatures. Within a generation, maybe two, kids will grow up learning geography on maps and globes that show simply an empty blue expanse on top of the world, no longer the white one to which we have grown accustomed.

In terms of impact, all of us who have been following this issue understand that the melting of the Arctic is at least partly mitigated by the fact that the ice is already floating, so the displacement in the ocean as it melts is not that significant. But what if there is an ice melt from the glaciers, as we are now seeing not only in the Arctic but we are seeing in Greenland and in Antarctica and across North America, South America, and Africa—when you realize that all over the globe, glaciers and icecaps are losing volume—that means other day-to-day, practical problems for our communities.

This is a photograph of the glaciers that exist out in the western part of our country, or used to. That was 1909, and this is 2004—almost gone. Here is another vision of National Glacier Park, where it has almost disappeared. It is obvious for all to see the degree to which the glaciers are disappearing.

Many people may not also realize that a lot of communities in the United States rely on annual glacial melt for municipal water supplies and for hydropower. So as this disappears, the energy sourcing and water sourcing for the United States disappears with it. Just ask Washington State, where glacial melt water provides 1.8 trillion liters of water every summer, or talk to the folks in Alaska, where glacier melt plays a key role in the circulation of the Gulf of Alaska, which is important to maintaining the valuable fisheries—the halibut and salmon—that reside in this body of water. All these impacts are interconnected.

Again, the skeptics say: Hey, there are a couple of glaciers that are actually expanding. Yes, there are some glaciers that are responding to unusual and unique local conditions and increasing in snow and ice accumulation, but the overwhelming evidence, when we look at the vast majority, shows that most of America's glaciers are shrinking. Over the last four decades of the 20th century, North American glaciers have lost 108 cubic miles of ice. That is enough ice, translated into water, to inundate California, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, and Colorado with 1 foot of water if it happened all at the same time.

In 1850 there were approximately 150 glaciers in what is now Glacier National Park. Today, due to warmer temperatures, there are only 25 named glaciers remaining, and some models predict that the park's glaciers could disappear in just a few decades. But trust your own eyes, if you prefer. The photographs here depict glacial melt over various time periods in Glacier National Park, Montana, and Holgate Glacier and Icy Bay, Alaska. As you'll see, the effects are just staggering.

We all remember Wordsworth's lines about ''the Lake that was shining clear among the hoary mountains.'' Well, these mountains are no longer hoary, and soon, lakes will reflect not snow-covered peaks, but naked ridges and sun-splashed steeps.

To make matters worse, temperatures are likely to increase exponentially in the next coming years. Because the environment is a closed system, the more conditions change, the faster they change because each change has an impact on some other interconnected component of the environment.

As the ice and permafrost melt, methane plumes from under the surface that have been trapped for hundreds of thousands of years are now emerging. During a survey last summer in the east Siberian Arctic seas, a team of scientists encountered a high density of methane plumes, some more than 1 kilometer across. They were emitting methane into the atmosphere at concentrations up to 100 times higher than normal. There are people who have stood by these methane plumes, lit a match, and they light on fire. The fact is, over a period of 100 years, methane has a warming potential roughly 25 times greater than CO_2.

So we may become the victims not just of the climate change itself but of a vicious kind of feedback and feedback cycles in the climate system. Cycles associated with less cloud cover, changes in aerosols, peatlands, soils, and Arctic ice cover all can lead to accelerated climate change. One study estimated that thawing permafrost may turn the Arctic from a carbon sink—that is to say a place that gathers and stores carbon—into a carbon source by the mid-2020s, releasing 100 billion tons of carbon by the end of the century. What does that mean? One hundred billion tons of carbon is about equal to the amount of CO_2 that would be released worldwide from 10 years of burning fossil fuels. So that is the future we are looking at if we don't respond.

Here is another postcard from the edge, Mr. President. North Carolina doesn't think they need to worry about the sea level rise, but take a look at the evidence. Our best studies predict a higher sea level rise than previously projected. With the melting of the west Antarctic ice sheet alone, global sea levels could rise by as much as 3.26 meters in the coming years, and the Pacific and Atlantic coasts could be in for a 25-percent increase above the average level by the century's end. In all, the melting of the Greenland ice sheet has the potential to raise global sea levels by about 7 meters, and the ice sheets of Antarctica have the potential to contribute to 60 meters of sea level rise.

Now, when people say, ''Well, global—it may not melt,'' there are Senators who have traveled to Greenland, who have stood on the ice sheet and looked down into it, into a hole 100-feet deep, and seen a massive, torrential river running underneath the ice out to the sea as the ice is melting.

Some scientists are even worried about the effects of that river under the ice. Could it act as a slide, where actually whole chunks of ice break off and slide down on this watery base on which the ice is sitting?

Think about what this all means. As the New York Times reported in March, some 3.7 million Americans living within a few feet of high tide are at risk from the rising sea. So all of you state senators out there, listen up: the effects of climate change will spare no one—from Tampa to Asheville, from Sausalito to Staten Island, all coastal communities are vulnerable.

NOAA's Benjamin Strauss, coauthor of a smart new study on topographic vulnerability, said the following:

> Sea level rise is like an invisible tsunami, building force while we do almost nothing. . . . We have a closing window of time to prevent the worst by preparing for higher seas.

I think that is exactly right, and that is why city officials in Boston are currently actively planning for how to manage 100-year floods that are now arriving every 20 years. We don't have 100-year floods anymore, we have them every so often—every 5 years or 20 years. In the face of a global sea level rise of 3 to 6 feet by the end of the century, there will be massive amounts of flooding. So we ought to pass legislation at the State level to plan, not to ban the planning. It is easy politics to ban it, but it is not smart politics, and it certainly isn't courageous leadership. Just ask those living in Tuvalu and the low-lying nation of Kiribati. Think they could use some advance planning to deal with the ''king'' tides that may soon drown out life on their shores? You bet. But instead of learning from them, we've succumbed to the siren call of short-term interests.

One resident of Tuvalu poignantly asked: ''What will happen to us in ten years' time?'' I wish I could delay her fears. I wish I could tell her that the climate change would only be limited to occasional sea level rise, and that—naturally, surely—the king tides would recede.

But the truth is much more harrowing. We also have raging floods and water scarcity—a dichotomy—in various parts of the world. From Veracruz to Songkhla Province in Thailand, floods are devastating crops and stealing away opportunities for millions. In my travels, I have seen children orphaned by raging flood waters, families deprived of basic necessities, such as food, clean drinking water, and medicine. I have also seen the ways in which climate change has interacted with conflicts, food insecurity, and water scarcity. People are fighting and killing each other over water scarcity in various parts of the world. In Darfur and in South Sudan, there are tensions over arable lands. Think of drought in Syria and its impact on farmers in southern Dara'a. Think of water scarcity in Yemen—and the list goes on. These are the invisible tsunamis Benjamin Strauss spoke of, and they develop slowly and quietly and determinately, and they devastate communities just as surely as they should kindle our sense of urgency about the cost of inaction.

In addition, although I am not going to go into the details now, there is major decimation of animal life and plant life and species life as a consequence of this interconnectedness. In addition, forests are under siege from drought and experiencing more fires and more die-off as a consequence of insect infestation because it doesn't get cold enough anymore to maintain the previous cycles of those insects dying off.

So the fact is that unmitigated climate change is creating enormous economic dislocations already, and it is only going to get worse if we don't act. Professor Frank Akerman, a prominent economist at Tufts University, found that inaction in the face of climate change could cost the American economy more than 3.6 percent of GDP—''or $3.8 trillion—annually by the end of the century. And he is not alone. Harvard economist Joseph Aldy estimates that if temperatures push past the 2 degrees mark, up to 2 to 4 percent of world GDP would be lost.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has used 45 minutes.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chair.

So developing countries are going to face similar costs. According to a major international initiative on ''The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity'', developing countries will spend an estimated $70 to $100 billion a year from 2010 to 2050 just to adapt to a two degrees Celsius change in global temperatures, with the majority spent on protecting infrastructure and coastal zones, managing the water supply, and protecting against the effects of floods.

The ''grow now, clean later'' approach is no longer viable—if it ever was. Before you know it, one quarter of the world's land surface will bear the marks of soil erosion, salinization, nutrient depletion and desertification. Imagine what this will do to agricultural productivity and water supplies.

Another way of looking at this is to consider not the cost, but the economic benefits of keeping our ecosystems intact.

Back in 2005 the World Bank estimated the total value of the world's natural assets to be $44 trillion. The countries that manage their forests, agricultural lands, energy, minerals, and other natural assets are going to be the economic leaders in the 21st century, and they will be able to reap the benefits of the ecosystem services like coral reefs, which provide food, water purification, tourism and genetic diversity—services valued at $172 billion annually. And they'll be able to invest more in the ''intangible'' drivers of growth like human skills, education, and innovation.

Mr. President, the message from all of this could not be more clear. Over 40 years ago, 20 million Americans—fully one-tenth of our country's population at the time—came together on one single day to demand environmental accountability.

It was called Earth Day. And they didn't stop there. They elected a Congress that passed the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act, Coastal Zone Management Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Toxic Substances Control Act. They created EPA. America didn't have an EPA

until the 1970s when people said: We don't want to live next to wells that give us cancer. We don't want to live next to rivers that actually light on fire. So we made a huge transformation.

We need Congress now to do what the science tells us we have to do, to do what our economists tell us we have to do, to do what common sense demands that we do: It's time for Congress to stand up and do its part on climate change.

I don't know how many have read David Orr's terrific book, ''Down to the Wire: Confronting Climate Collapse,'' but it is important for everyone to understand his argument. Nowhere is the challenge of our moment more clearly expressed. He says:

> The real fault line in American politics is not between liberals and conservatives . . . it is, rather, in how we orient ourselves to the generations to come who will bear the consequences, for better and for worse, of our actions.

As Orr reminds us, we are at a tipping point—and it is going to take leadership to respond to it. Unfortunately, we have been witnessing just the opposite. In a talking point memo to his fellow Republicans last summer, House majority leader ERIC CANTOR of Virginia took aim at environmental safeguards. Job killers, he called them, listing the ''top 10 job-destroying regulations,'' seven of which dealt with reducing air pollution from industrial incinerators, boilers and aging coal-fired power plants.

Job killers? The facts just don't support that.

The Labor Department, however, keeps close tabs on extended mass layoffs, and in 2010 the Department found that of the 1,256,606 mass layoffs, employers attributed just 2,971 to government regulation. That is only about two-tenths of 1 percent of all layoffs.

In fact, decreasing carbon pollution actually presents a huge economic opportunity in terms of new jobs and innovation.

For every $1 we spend, we get $30 in benefits. The U.S. environmental technology industry in 2008 generated approximately $300 billion in revenues and supported almost 1.7 billion in jobs. The air pollution sector alone produced $18 billion in revenue.

If we're going to remake the world before 2050, and this is one area where I agree with my Republican friends, we're going to have to harness the power of the good old American market economy. And one way to do that is to put a price tag on carbon and other global warming pollutants.

With a price tag, we more accurately reflect the consequences of these pollutants, not just for the environment but also for the quality of our lives and the health of our families. If we understand the consequences of our choices, especially in economic terms, we'll make better choices.

One way to do this is to levy a pollution fee that reflects the true environmental cost of coal and oil. But there's no chance the current Congress will enact any tax, especially one on smokestack industries.

Over the course of 2011, the Republican-controlled House held nearly 200 votes to weaken our environmental safeguards, including the bedrock legislation spawned by the very first Earth Day—the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, even the agency created to enforce those laws, the Environmental Protection Agency.

If we don't use the market, the other option is, inevitably, direct regulation of carbon emissions by the EPA under the Clean Air Act. The conservative-dominated Supreme Court has already given the green light to the EPA to do this. But this invites even more bitterness and political partisanship.

Besides, pricing pollution has already shown itself to be effective. During the 1980s, instead of imposting regulations, we used a cap-and-trade system to reduce the sulfur dioxide emissions from power plants that caused plant- and soil-destroying acid rain. The system included cash incentives to over comply: polluters received allowances for every ton of sulfur oxide under the limits, and they could trade, sell or bank the allowances. The system worked so well that regulated plants reduced emissions 40 percent more than required.

There is every reason to believe some variation of that system would work just as well to curb carbon emissions. But anything related to or resembling ''Cap And Trade'' isn't the best rallying cry these days thanks to the concerted, cynical re-branding of the concept. But whatever rallying cry is used, the point is the time for action is now. We need a ''Million Man-Million Woman-Million Child'' March on Washington and the voting booths of America. We need people marching up the steps of the Capitol, pounding on the doors of Congress, demanding a solution to our climate crisis.

We also know we need deadlines to instill a sense of urgency. There is a deadline coming up this week in Rio where they are now having Rio Plus 20, the 20-year anniversary of that meeting I referred to at the beginning. Much has changed since the first Earth Day summit back in 1992—and much of it for the worse. True, we're seeing innovation and entrepreneurship flourish in countries that were once considered among the poorest. We should celebrate that. But I'll tell you: Twenty years after Rio and 15 years after Kyoto, we are still further behind than ever. The science is screaming at us, and the planet is sending us an SOS.

We obviously failed to be held accountable or to implement the commitments we put in place 20 years ago. Earlier this month, the United Nations Environmental Program issued the official summit report, which noted ''significant progress'' in only 4 of 90 environmental goals over the past five years. We can—and we must—do better.

I spoke earlier of the need to take advantage of the green energy economy. Our best economists say to ward off catastrophic climate change, the green revolution has to happen three times faster than the industrial revolution did. I believe that is why America and the rest of the world are facing this moment of truth.

Will we step up and put in place the policies that galvanize our green entrepreneurs, that drive development of new clean technologies, reenergize the economy, and tackle climate change all at the same time? We are the country that invented solar and wind technology, but the Germans, the Japanese, and the Chinese are the ones who are developing it. It is a tragedy. Today, of the top thirty companies in the world in solar, wind and advanced batteries, only six are based in the United States. If we do this right, I truly believe that the next four or five Googles will emerge in the energy sector. The question is not whether the twenty-first century economy will be a green economy—it has to become one, and it will. The question is whether it happens in time to avert catastrophe, and whether America will continue to lead.

Accelerating the transition to a new energy paradigm is the most important single step the world can take in order to reduce the threat of climate change. And Rio is as good a place as any to make that happen. At the Summit, nations are expected to announce commitments to the Sustainable Energy for All initiative. Tackling the challenges of energy access, energy efficiency and renewable energy in an integrated way is absolutely essential. That's why a wide variety of stakeholders—from governments to businesses to civil society leaders—have indicated that they will be coming to Rio with national action plans in hand that can be monitored over time as part of a new mission of the United Nations and its partners.

I am convinced countries that take advantage of the opportunities are going to be the leaders of the 21st century. I have already seen that success in Massachusetts. Massachusetts was recently ranked first in the Nation in energy efficiency and clean energy leadership, edging out California for the first time ever.

I think my State is an example of the speed in which we can turn things around. Our unemployment level just went down to the 6-percent level, and it is because we do have that diversity and we are moving in that direction.

Now, obviously, the government alone can't solve this. Government can help create a structure. Private sector is the key. But we need to put in place the policies that send a message to the marketplace that we are serious about doing this.

The bottom line is we need to face up to this challenge once and for all—not just as individuals or as separate interests but as a nation, with a national

purpose. The Pew poll recently showed a 46-point gap between Republicans and Democrats on the need to protect the environment. And I'll give you one guess which party fell by 39 points in its support for protecting the environment since 1992. So I understand if there is a 46-point gap and we have had all this discounting and disinformation, this is going to be hard still.

But David Orr is right on the mark: Our challenge is fundamentally political. It is not about budgets. It is not about regulations. It is about leaders in the country who are unwilling to deal with the truth about climate change and who have cowed the silent majority into submission with their contrived and concerted attacks without facts.

I've spoken before about this country's crisis of governance and the dangers of being held hostage to one party's remarkably cynical and selfish drive for power that comes at the expense of all common sense. Today, we need a transformative moment in our politics. David Orr spoke to that in the book I already cited.

He said:

> Our situation calls for the transformation of governance and politics in ways that are somewhat comparable to that in U.S. history between the years of 1776 and 1800. In that time Americans forged the case for independence, fought a revolutionary war, crafted a distinctive political philosophy, established an enduring Constitution, created a nation, organized the first modern democratic government, and invented political parties to make the machinery of governance and democracy work tolerably well.

Colleagues, we have made transformative changes before, and there are other kinds of examples. We once burned wood for our fuel. Then we transitioned to relying on oil and coal, and now other things. We can make the leap to a mix of renewable energy sources—hydro, wind, solar, and others—but we need to set our sights on that next transformation.

As the old saying goes from the Arab oil minister in the 1970s:

> The Stone Age didn't end because we ran out of stones, and the oil age is not going to end because we run out of oil.

Truer words could not be spoken.

In the end, the question is not whether we are going to pay for climate change; we are already paying for it—in warmer temperatures, rising sea levels, melting glaciers, floods, droughts, wildfires, decimation of animal and plant life, loss of crops, insurance on homes, increased storms. We are paying for it. The real question is whether we are going to walk a path that now addresses it in a responsible way and helps us break humanity's addiction to the easy way—to oil—and turn away from the other alternatives that face us that clean up our environment and create jobs. The question is whether we are going to suffer the consequences later on a massive, unpredictable scale in the form of environmental devastation, war, human misery, famine, poverty, and reduced economic growth for decades to come.

I close by saying that the fork in the road points in two directions. The task for us is to take the one less traveled. At the height of the American revolution Thomas Paine wrote about the ''summertime soldiers and the sunshine patriots'' who abandoned the cause. The science has shown us, and continues to show us, that we cannot afford to be summertime soldiers.

So in this time of challenge and opportunity, I hope and pray colleagues will take stock of this science, will take stock of the choices in front of us, will understand the economic opportunities staring us in the face. I hope we will confront the conspiracy of silence about climate change head on and allow complacence to yield to common sense and narrow interests to bend to the common good. Future generations are counting on us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

RECENT INTELLIGENCE LEAKS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, over the last 2 weeks several Members of this body and I have raised serious concerns about a series of leaks that recently appeared in several publications concerning certain military and intelligence activities—activities the authors themselves cite as among the Nation's most highly classified and sensitive. These enormously troubling leaks have raised concerns amongst both Democrats and Republicans in Congress, including leaders of our Intelligence, Armed Services, Foreign Relations, and Homeland Security Committees.

According to Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, who chairs the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence:

> These disclosures have seriously interfered with ongoing intelligence programs and have put at jeopardy our intelligence capability to act in the future. Each disclosure puts American lives at risk, makes it more difficult to recruit assets, strains the trust of our partners, and threatens imminent and irreparable damage to our national security in the face of urgent and rapidly adapting threats worldwide.

For these reasons and more, 26 other Members and I filed a resolution that conveys the sense of the Senate that the Attorney General should appoint an outside special counsel to investigate these leaks.

I have been around for quite some time. I think there is no doubt that these leaks are almost unprecedented in that they are ongoing covert operations that are directly involved with the greatest threats to our Nation's security. I certainly understand that robust public debate about the Nation's offensive use of cyber-related and unmanned-strike capabilities is valuable and warranted, that debate and discussion is valuable and warranted. The use of these kinds of military capabilities is new, and how these secretive warfighting capabilities should be deployed by a modern democracy deserves careful and thoughtful discussion, and we will have discussions in the future about these new aspects of warfare and counterterrorism.

But the detail with which these articles lay out particular counterterrorism activities—and as one commentator recently described, the ''triumphalist tone of the leaks—the Tarzan-like chest-beating of [the] various leakers,'' greatly exceeded what is necessary or appropriate for that discussion. Something else—something very different—is going on.

Considering how closely in time these items were published and how favorable of an impression they left upon the President's approach to national security, it is not unreasonable to ask whether these leaks were part of a broader effort to paint President Obama, in the midst of an election year, as a strong leader on national security issues. That is the strong impression that is given.

The most compelling evidence is the obvious participation of some of the administration's senior-most officials. Among the sources that New York Times journalist David Sanger cited in the passage of his recent book pertaining to U.S. cyber attacks on Iran are ''administration officials'' and ''senior officials,'' ''senior aides'' to the President, ''members of the President's national security team who were in the [White House Situation Room] during key discussions,'' an official ''who requested anonymity to speak about what is still a classified program,''; ''current . . . American officials . . . [who would not] allow their names to be used because the effort remains highly classified, and parts of it continue to this day,'' and several sources who would be ''fired'' for what they divulged—presumably because what they divulged was classified or otherwise very sensitive.

Some of the sources in recent publications specifically refused to be identified because what they were talking about related to classified or ongoing programs.

In his book, which describes the administration's use of drones in Yemen, Newsweek journalist Daniel Klaidman writes:

> [W]hen I quote President Obama or other key characters, I do so only if that quote was relayed to me by a source who personally heard it.

That certainly narrows down the number of people who could be guilty of these leaks.

On Sunday, a reviewer of both Mr. Sanger's and Mr. Klaidman's books for the Washington Post found—as I did—that ''[both authors] were clearly given extraordinary access to key players in the administration to write their books . . . [i]n some cases, they appear to have talked to the same sources: [s]everal of their stories track nearly word for word.''

Perhaps most illuminating in all of the articles and books is how, taken together, they describe an overall perspective within the Obama White

House that has viewed U.S. counterterrorism and other sensitive activities in extraordinarily political terms and taken on a related approach about how classified information should be handled. Both approaches would have predisposed the administration to the most recent, egregious national security leaks.

There are plenty of examples of how the administration apparently viewed these highly sensitive matters through a political prism. In his book, Mr. Klaidman observed that then-White House Chief-of-Staff Rahm Emanuel, ''pushed the CIA to publicize'' successes associated with a covert drone program because ''the muscular attacks could have a huge political upside for Obama, insulating him from charges that he was weak on terror.'' Mr. Klaidman noted, that ''[as to the killing of a particular drone target,] [CIA] public affairs officers anonymously trumpeted their triumph, leaking colorful tidbits to trusted reporters on the intelligence beat, [with] [n]ewspapers describ[ing] the hit in cinematic detail.''

A recent article in The New York Times similarly noted:

> David Axelrod, the president's closest political adviser, began showing up at the 'Terror Tuesday' meetings [by the way, during which drone targeting was discussed], his unspeaking presence a visible reminder of what everyone understood: a successful attack would overwhelm the president's other aspirations and achievements.

And, in his recent book, Mr. Sanger notes:

> [O]ver the course of 2009, more and more people inside the Obama White House were being 'read into' the cyber program, even those not directly involved. As the reports from the latest iteration of the [cyber-]bug arrived, meetings were held to assess what kind of damage had been done, and the room got more and more crowded.

Let's look at another anecdote in Mr. Sanger's book that provides another powerful example of what I am talking about. In this excerpt, Mr. Sanger depicts a curious meeting that occurred in the fall of 2009 in Pittsburgh at the G–20 economic summit. He writes:

> As often happens when the president travels, there was a dinner organized with a number of other reporters and several of Obama's political aides, including David Axelrod and Rahm Emanuel. The talk was mostly politics and the economic downturn. But just as coffee was being served, a senior official in the National Security Council tapped me on the shoulder. After dinner, he said, I should take the elevator to the floor of the hotel where the president had his suite. 'We'll talk about Iran,' he whispered.
>
> Obama was not back at the hotel when we gathered that evening outside his suite. But most of the rest of the national security staff was present and armed with the intelligence that had been collected over many years about Iran's secret site. As they laid it out on a coffee table in the hotel suite, it was clear that this new site was relatively small: it had enough room, they estimated, for three thousand centrifuges . . .
>
> Via satellite photos, the United States had mapped the construction of the building—useful if it ever had to hit it. It was clear from the details that the United States had interviewed scientists who had been inside the underground facility . . . We spent an hour reviewing the evidence. I probed them to reveal how the facility was discovered and received evasive answers . . . Then I went down to my hotel room and began writing the story.

It absolutely eludes me under what circumstances it would be appropriate for a senior national security official to provide a reporter the opportunity to review for an hour what appears to have been raw intelligence supporting the government's recent discovery of secret nuclear sites in Iran. Yet, this vignette is indicative of what appears throughout the book as a pervasive administration perspective that viewed even the Nation's most secretive military and intelligence activities in starkly political terms and was overly lax on how related intelligence should be handled. These stories provide a revealing context for the most recent leaks—leaks that everyone has conceded have compromised our national security.

I would like to believe that the Justice Department will get to the bottom of all this. But after watching senior White House advisor David Plouffe's appearance on Fox News on Sunday, I highly doubt that it will. I was particularly troubled by Mr. Plouffe's inability or refusal to answer whether the White House will cooperate fully with the investigation and whether President Obama would agree to be questioned by investigators as President Bush was during the Valerie Plame case. I was also discomforted by Mr. Plouffe's statement that the White House talked to Mr. Sanger for his book but did not leak classified information, which of course prejudges the outcome of the investigations.

As one commentator observed yesterday, Mr. Plouffe's answers:

> were so rehearsed, clumsy and full of forced distractions and faux frustration that[,] if [his] interview [on Fox News] had been conducted by law enforcement[,] Plouffe would have been told he was going for a ride downtown to the police station for further questioning.

As this commentator noted, from these sorts of appearances, it's apparent that ''[t]he administration has something to hide. Plouffe could not have been more parsed, poorly prepared or unconvincing.''

Moreover, just this past Friday, The Washington Post reported that Federal authorities have interviewed more than 100 people in the two ongoing leak investigations and, specifically citing ''officials familiar with the probes,'' described these interviews as ''the start of a process that could take months or even years.'' According to anonymous ''officials,'' the Post also noted that ''the pace of the investigations is partly driven by the large number of government officials who had access to the material that was disclosed and who now must be interviewed.'' The fact that details about these leak investigations are themselves being leaked does not inspire me with confidence that we are on the right track.

Furthermore, according to the Post, citing ''officials who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the matter,'' the two pending investigations focus on the Associated Press article about a disrupted terrorist bomb plot by al-Qaeda's affiliate in Yemen and The New York Times' report about the Obama administration's role in authorizing cyberattacks against Iran. In other words, there appears to be no probe of the leaks relating to U.S. drone operations. Apparently, ''officials'' told the Post that such an investigation had not been requested.

Why not?

With the passage of time, the need for the Attorney General to appoint an outside special counsel to independently investigate and, where appropriate, hold accountable those found responsible for these egregious violations of our national security, becomes clearer and stronger. At the end of the day, can we really expect the administration to investigate itself impartially in the midst of an election on a matter as highly sensitive and damaging as this leaks case, especially when those responsible could themselves be members of the administration? Plus, we are not talking about an isolated instance of one leak. As my colleague, the chairperson of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN rightly observed, we are talking about ''an avalanche of leaks'' on national security matters—the implications of which are severe.

To date, I have seen no evidence that suggests that the American people should rely on the direction that the White House has chosen to provide a full and timely investigation of these leaks. For these reasons, I once again call on the appointment of an outside special counsel to do so today. Just as former Senator BIDEN and former Senator Obama called for a special counsel in the case of Valerie Plame, a case far less severe as far as the implications to our national security are concerned.

As I said at the beginning of my comments, I have been around this town for quite a while. I, like the rest of my colleagues, have never seen leaks of this nature at such a high level concerning ongoing covert operations. They deserve an investigation which will have credibility with the American people. So far that has not been forthcoming from this administration.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Oklahoma.

AGRICULTURE REFORM

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I assume we are in morning business. Because we are in morning business, I am going to use that time to talk about four amendments I have to the Agriculture bill. I want to make one acute observation to the American people on what is going on in Washington.

The four amendments I will have on the Agriculture bill are a symptom of the disease that is in front of our Nation. This year we are going to run about a $1.3 trillion deficit. At the end of this fiscal year we will have 16.25 trillion dollars' worth of debt. I am 64 years of age. My children and grandchildren are going to pay back my portion of that debt. I am not going to be paying it back. The questions in front of our Nation are, No. 1, how did we get to this point, and, No. 2, what are we going to do about it.

What we are going to hear today as we begin voting on the amendments, what we are going to hear from the Senate, is why we cannot cut spending, why we cannot limit our appetites, why we cannot end subsidies to some of the richest co-ops in the world, why we cannot stop sending money to the Republican and Democratic Conventions out of the Treasury, why we cannot limit some of the conservation programs that go to millionaires—why we cannot do it. We are going to hear why we cannot.

This country cannot wait for us to continue hearing excuses about why we cannot trim our expenditures. The real problem is the Federal Government is going to take in $2.6 trillion, and it is going to spend about $3.8 trillion. That is the real problem. We ignore it politically by not making hard decisions, by not reforming the Tax Code for a progrowth, lower rates, broader base where everybody is participating in the Tax Code. People, through their well-connectedness, don't have to get out of special benefits to them, which is $30 billion a year for the very wealthy in this country in the Tax Code. We refuse to do those things. We have campaigns going on all across the country and nobody is talking about the No. 1 threat to this country, which is our debt and our deficits.

The reason there is no job creation is not because politicians don't want job creation. It is because they refuse to reform the very things that are keeping job creation from happening.

I am going to have four amendments. All of them actually save money for the American taxpayers, our kids, and our grandkids. They are all common sense. Most people outside of Washington will agree with them except the very people who are getting the benefits. They are the well-heeled, and they are the well-connected who continue to get things for themselves to the detriment of our future.

The question the American people have to start asking is when is Washington going to grow up? When are they going to start taking responsibility for their addictive behavior? Everybody who comes into my office who has lobbied me on these four amendments say: You can't take anything away from me. Do my colleagues realize what the answer is when anybody says: You can't take anything away from me? The answer is bankruptcy and a position, in terms of the economics of this country, that will be far worse than the Great Depression ever was and far worse than anything our country has ever experienced. But everybody says: What I am getting now I have to keep, regardless if someone is a multibillion-dollar conglomerate co-op and we are sending someone $100 million every 10 years to advertise their product.

The second point I will make before I outline these four amendments is the one thing we refuse to look at that can guide us on how to make these decisions is article I, section 8 of the Constitution. What is the real role for the Federal Government? I will tell my colleagues as we look at these four amendments, we are going to have trouble squaring what our Founders said was our role with what we are doing now in these four areas and then saying we are not violating the Constitution by spending money we don't have—money we are going to have to borrow to be able to spend—and spend it in areas that help the well-heeled and the well-connected.

All of these amendments are very straightforward.

I wish to make one other point. We spend $200 million a year through five separate programs of the government to promote agricultural products outside of this country—$200 million a year. That is $2 million every 10 years. Let's show how effective they have been by looking at this chart. Whether one thinks it is constitutional, what kind of a job have they done since 1997? I don't think that trend line looks very good. So if we are going to spend $200 million paying for the promotion of agricultural products outside of this country, maybe we ought to ask the question: Why are we on a declining slope, as far as percentage of the world's agricultural sales, at the same time when farm income in this country has never been higher? Why is it? Because the Federal Government is not very good at doing things the private sector is very good at.

We have five separate programs within the Department of Agriculture to do this, and the question the American people ought to be asking is: Why do we have five programs? If, in fact, it is a role for the Federal Government, which I highly doubt under the Constitution, why do we have five? So that is how well we are doing.

I will talk about the first program. The market access program is one of the five programs the Federal Government has within the Department of Agriculture to do this. The Obama administration actually agrees with this amendment. In their budget, they put a recommendation to trim this. Yet all we have heard from everybody out there who gets the soft ride on this is that we can't take any money away from this program. If we can't take $40 million a year out of a program that is ineffective, history is here. We are going to be belly up, and the consequences of that will be devastating not just for our kids but for us, because it is going to come in the very near future.

All this amendment says is out of these five programs, let's cut this one 20 percent. The Obama administration recommended doing that. The GAO says there is nothing to say that this is effective use of tax dollars. One would think we are pulling toenails, to hear the people scream. I won't go into the details on this amendment because my time is limited. It means we are still going to spend $160 million on this one program, which is one of five, to promote agricultural products when we are not being successful in spending that money anyway.

The question is, Why would we vote against it? Because there is a parochial interest somewhere that we are going to be beholden to that is greater than our interest and fidelity to the U.S. Constitution or our interest and fidelity to the future of this country. That is why people will vote against this amendment. It doesn't have anything to do with common sense. It doesn't have anything to do with the fact that we are going to run this significant deficit when we have a $16 trillion debt. It has to do with how do I make sure I am not in trouble with the parochial interests rather than doing the right, best thing for our country.

The second amendment—and I have received a lot of criticism for it—is in conjunction with Senator DURBIN. For those people with adjusted gross incomes of greater than three-quarters of a million dollars a year, all this amendment does is decrease the subsidy the middle-income, hard-working factory worker or service worker in this country pays with their taxes to subsidize a crop insurance program that guarantees a profit and yield. Instead of a 62-percent subsidy by the Federal Government when they are making more than three-quarters of a million dollars per year, we take it to 47 percent. What do we hear? Oh, we can't do that. If a person is making $750,000 a year farming, that person's capital should be in pretty good shape and they should be able to afford to take on some more of the risks.

We are going to hear: Well, this will be too hard to implement. There isn't another agriculture program that doesn't have an income payment limitation of some type associated with it, except this one. When, out of every dollar spent on crop insurance, the average, hard-working American is paying 62 percent of it, it is not too much to ask those who are on the upper income stream in the agricultural community to participate a little bit more in helping pay for that subsidy by taking a reduced subsidy. So all we are doing is taking 15 percent of it.

Under this agriculture bill that is on the floor, there are three ways to ensure profit, and every one of them the American taxpayer who is not a farmer is paying for. There is no other business in this country where they are

guaranteed that profit and revenue will be there through an insurance policy that is paid for by the rest of us.

The GAO report said we should actually limit it to $40,000 and we will save $5 billion over the next 10 years. This amendment will only save $1 billion over the next 10 years. But the way we get rid of $1 trillion deficits is to ask everybody to share a little bit. All this amendment is doing is asking the most well-off farmers—the ones we have been subsidizing for years; the ones who are taking hundreds of thousands of dollars every year from the American taxpayers—to pay 15 percent more on their crop insurance so the average individual in this country isn't taking off their table to subsidize somebody who is making three-quarters of a million dollars a year.

The third amendment is an amendment to end conservation payments to millionaires. Almost every other program we have in terms of our farm programs has some limitations on it, but the Department of Agriculture has an exception where they can exclude this limitation. All this amendment would do is say to somebody who has an adjusted gross income of $1 million a year: Wouldn't that money be better spent somewhere else in the farm conservation area, No. 1; and No. 2, if it is in the best interests of the farm or production of agricultural acreage, and somebody has that kind of income, isn't it in their best interests to do these things?

It is a very simple amendment that says: If you are making an adjusted gross income of $1 million or more a year, then we are going to put some limitations on how much money we spend on your property and then go spend it on other properties where we might, in fact, have more effective resource conservation.

The final amendment I have to the bill has nothing to do with the agricultural bill but it has everything to do with the problems in this country. In February of this year, the U.S. Treasury wrote a check to the Democratic National Convention and the Republican National Convention for $18.4 million each. When the Presidential checkoff system was created, the politicians in Washington wired it so that we thought we were giving money to a Presidential campaign when, in fact, they took a percentage of it for both parties. We don't have $18.4 million to spend on a Republican convention or a Democratic convention. The nominees of both parties are known. So what we have done, besides spending $100 million in security for both of those events—$50 million apiece—is we sent $18 million to the heads of both parties to spend any way they want to spend it. What is wrong with that? That $18.4 million we borrowed from the Chinese. So we are borrowing money from the Chinese to fund a hallelujah party in both Tampa and Charlotte this year, each one of them getting $18.4 million. It is time that kind of nonsense stop.

This amendment is going to require 60 votes. I don't know why they put it at 60 votes; maybe so a lot of people can vote for it but it still won't pass. But here is a test vote on whether the Senate gets the problems this country faces. If somebody votes against this amendment, what it says is they believe politics is above principle, that careerism trumps character, and that they can pull the wool over the eyes of the vast portion of American citizens. What could we do with $18.4 million times two? Well, there are tons we could do. The first thing is we could quit paying interest to the Chinese for it. The second thing is who could we help in terms of their health care or their housing? How many HIV patients who are waiting on ADAP who can't get the treatment they need could we help with $18.4 million?

The point is this amendment is probably going to get defeated, but I want my colleagues to look in that realm of the universe in America where all the politicians reacted with disdain over the GSA conferences spending $880,000 in what was said to be a foolish way. If they made any comment about the excesses of governmental agencies on conferences and parties, how can they not apply the same standard to their own political party?

My hope is that America will wake up. I am in the twilight years of my life. I have seen vast changes in our country, both good and bad, but we have maxed out the credit card in our country. We can't get another credit card without severe pain. We are trying to not do the right thing in the Congress of the United States. We are trying to kick the can down the road. We are trying to not make the hard decisions. And everyone who comes and lobbies says: Yes, I agree there is a problem, but please don't take anything away from me.

The answer is leadership that says we all have to sacrifice to get our country out of the depths of the problems we are facing today. This will be a great key vote on whether the Senators understand priorities and the depth of the problems we are in.

There is no way we should ever again send taxpayer funds to the Democratic Party or the Republican Party for a convention, and this amendment would eliminate that in the future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRYOR. 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. PRYOR. Mr. President, I know we are in Republican time. I would like to use some of the Republican time to talk about an important issue in the farm bill, which is catfish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, thank you for acknowledging me. I will be brief. I know we have other colleagues on the way, so I will be brief and I will yield when they get here and they are squared away.

CATFISH INSPECTION

Mr. President, let me just talk for a few minutes about catfish and something that I think is very important; that is, that catfish be inspected. This may sound like a no-brainer, something that is simple. We certainly would inspect and anticipate that all catfish that are raised in the United States would be inspected and follow all the USDA and other requirements—and it is. That is one of the good things, that we know our food supply is safe and wholesome and it is ready for consumption by Americans.

However, that is not the case for catfish that is imported from Asia. By the way, I think people in my State and other catfish-producing States would dispute whether this is actually catfish in the first place. It is actually a variety of fish that is native to Asia, and it is grown in places such as Vietnam. I am certainly for trade and for fair trade and not for protectionism. But we need to make sure fish that is coming in from overseas—we need to make sure it is properly labeled but also that it is properly inspected.

I think the way the bill is currently drafted is appropriate and proper. We should leave the language that Senator STABENOW and the Agriculture Committee have established. We should leave that language in the legislation as it currently is so the catfish will be inspected in the United States, and imported fish that is marketed as catfish will also be inspected by the same standards our domestic catfish are inspected under.

In 2011, the FDA examined about 3 percent of all seafood entries and performed laboratory analysis on less than 1 percent of these entries. We have to understand this Asian fish is raised in places that, quite honestly, run a higher risk of contamination based on the growing conditions, based on the overall sanctity of their environment compared to ours.

I think they present more health risks. I think it only makes sense once we know that one-third of these imports comes from southeastern Asia nations, places such as China and Vietnam where food safety standards are not as high as in the United States. Once we understand that, it makes sense that they would be afforded the same inspection regime that we would have here in the United States.

These foreign countries are currently flooding the U.S. market with potentially harmful products, and those products could be putting U.S. consumers at risk. There have been several news reports about some of the growing conditions over there and some of the possible harmful side effects to human health if humans consume those.

Here again, we have the safeguards in the farm bill to do the inspections as they should be done. The new inspection program would subject domestic catfish processors to daily USDA inspection, and imported catfish, much of which is raised in the unsanitary conditions I mentioned before—and it is also treated with antibiotics and other chemicals that are not deemed legal here in the United States, but that is the growing conditions they are in over there—it would require that they would receive more rigorous inspection than they are currently subject to.

Again, I do not see this as protectionist. I think this is truly to make sure that all of the food supply, whether it comes from overseas or is grown domestically, meets our U.S. standards, and our people, our American citizens, understand that when they purchase fish, they are going to get something that will not make them and their families sick when they consume it.

With that, I want to say that I appreciate all of my colleagues looking at this provision. I appreciate Senator STABENOW and her whole team and, in fact, all of the members of the Ag Committee who helped on this, and all of their staffs. They have been great on this issue. Catfish is a very small part of our agriculture picture in the United States, but it is an important part. People all over, especially all over the southern region of the United States, love to consume catfish. They need to understand when they buy catfish in the United States that it is going to be safe for them and for their families.

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. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UTILITY MACT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for S.J. Res. 37, and to express my deep and profound disapproval of the Obama administration's handling of the utility MACT rule.

Let me first address what this debate is not about. This is not about a debate between one side that supports clean air and another side that does not. We all support and understand the importance of maintaining our pristine environment, maintaining the quality of human health in the ecosystem. My State, the great State of Utah, holds some of the greatest land resources in the country, some of the most beautiful landscapes. They are a source of pride for all Americans, and especially for all Utahns. They provide a significant economic benefit for my State in the form of tourism dollars.

I would not support any legislation ever that would damage our environmental brand in Utah or that would harm our environment. What this debate does expose is this administration's vigorous, unfettered attempts to severely limit the use of coal technology and a complete and utter disregard for the economic benefits of this industry, and the economic effects of this kind of overly aggressive regulation.

If implemented fully, the utility MACT rule would give utilities nationwide 3 short years to fully complete very costly upgrades to their plants. Many industry experts believe that these standards are nearly impossible to meet in that timeframe. Utilities will need closer to 5 or 6 years to make the necessary upgrades required by this regulatory scheme.

Those who are unable to comply will have no choice but to shut down unless or until they can meet those standards. This inevitably, with absolute certainty, will result in sharp spikes to energy costs, increased power bills for all Americans, affecting the most vulnerable among us the most severely.

Higher energy costs will, in turn, have a direct impact on the family budget. The more we as Americans spend on higher energy costs, the less we have available for savings, for education, and for other priorities. Although the President campaigns around the country by trying to convince Americans that he knows how to create jobs, this rule alone has been estimated by some industry experts as likely to kill 180,000 to 215,000 jobs by 2015.

So one has to wonder why it is this administration is nonetheless imposing rules it knows cannot be met, and that if they must be met, will kill this many jobs and hurt this many Americans. Why are they ignoring the obvious economic consequences of shutting down an industry that produces about half of all of the electricity we use in the United States of America today?

It does not make any sense. We can have sensible regulations that keep our air and our water and other aspects of our environment clean. We need that. We want that as Americans. We can also have a balanced approach that considers the economic costs of new rules and restrictions on small businesses and on consumers. That is what we need.

Utility MACT is an example of a regulation that does neither. It accomplishes none of these interests. I strongly urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 37. I stand with a growing bipartisan group of Senators, private sector unions, business interests that believe we can do better as Americans than imposing those kinds of regulations on the American people, and who also believe it is vitally important that when we do put these kinds of regulations on the American people we first have the kind of robust debate and discussion Americans have came to expect from their political institutions.

Two separate provisions of the Constitution, article I, section 1, and article I, section 7, clearly place the legislative process, the power to make rules that carry the force of generally applicable binding Federal law, in the hands of Congress, not in an executive branch agency.

The American people know this. They understand it. They expect it. They rely on it. Because they know if we pass laws the people do not like, that the people cannot accept, that kill jobs, that hurt those most vulnerable among us, that we can be held politically accountable come election time, every 2 years in the case of Members of the House, every 6 years in the case of Members of this body.

When we circumvent that process, when we allow the lawmaking process to be carried out entirely within an executive branch agency consisting of people who, while perfectly well intentioned and well educated, do not stand accountable to the people, we insulate the lawmakers from those governed by those same laws.

This is exactly why we need to exercise our authority under the Congressional Review Act by passing these resolutions of disapproval from time to time. But it is all the more reason why we need more lasting, significant reform, reform that can be had through the REINS Act proposal. This is a proposal that has already passed through the House favorably and needs to be passed in this body. It is a bill that would require for any new regulation promulgated that at the administrative level, any new regulation which qualifies as a major rule because it costs American consumers and small business interests, individuals, families, and all others in America more than $100 million in a year, it would take effect if and only if it were first passed into law in the House and in the Senate and signed into law by the President.

This is how our lawmaking process is supposed to operate. This is a system that our Founding Fathers carefully put in place, assuring that those who make the laws and thereby have the capacity to affect the rights of individual Americans can and will be held accountable to the people for the very laws they pass.

I tried to get the REINS Act up for consideration in connection with the Ag bill. We were not successful in doing that. Apparently some in this body, some in control of this body, were unwilling to have a vote on the REINS Act proposal as an amendment to the Ag bill. Sooner or later we need to have a vote on the REINS Act. We need to have this debate and discussion, to assure that the laws that are passed in this country are passed by men and women chosen by the people, accountable to the people, that we may yet still have that guarantee in our country, a guarantee of government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

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. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. WEBB).

AGRICULTURE REFORM, FOOD, AND JOBS ACT OF 2012

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 3240, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3240) to reauthorize the agriculture programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid (for Stabenow/Roberts) amendment No. 2389, of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 2390 (to amendment No. 2389), to change the enactment date.

Reid motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with instructions, Reid amendment No. 2391, of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 2406 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 2391), to eliminate certain working lands conservation programs.

Reid amendment No. 2407 (to amendment No. 2406), to convert all mandatory spending to discretionary spending subject to annual appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to recommit and amendment No. 2390 are withdrawn and a Stabenow-Roberts amendment No. 2389 is agreed to.

The Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 2440

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we have 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on the first Akaka amendment, No. 2440.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in favor of amendment No. 2440 to the farm bill. This amendment would improve implementation of an existing program at USDA which provides loans to purchasers of highly fractionated Indian lands.

One unfortunate legacy of policies of the late 1800s is that many Indian lands are highly fractionated. This means that one parcel of land might have hundreds or even thousands of owners. Highly fractionated parcels make putting these Indian lands to viable use virtually impossible. This goes against any well-established Federal Indian policies encouraging the productive use of Indian lands.

As chair of the Committee on Indian Affairs, I have worked with the USDA and stakeholders to craft this amendment to improve agricultural land use for tribal governments and individual Indians. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. This is a technical amendment. I rise in support of it, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and speak in favor of amendment No. 2396, a bipartisan amendment Senator THUNE and I are offering to the farm bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, if I might take a moment, I believe we want to first dispose of the Akaka amendment No. 2440. Our ranking member has indicated no opposition, so at this point I would ask that we proceed, unless there is a reason not to do so.

On behalf of Senator AKAKA, I call up amendment No. 2440 and ask that we proceed with a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] proposes an amendment numbered 2440.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve a provision relating to loans to purchasers of highly fractionated land)

Strike section 5102 and insert the following:

SEC. 5102. LOANS TO PURCHASERS OF HIGHLY FRACTIONATED LAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first sentence of Public Law 91–229 (25 U.S.C. 488) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the first sentence, by striking ''loans from'' and all that follows through ''1929)'' and inserting ''direct loans in a manner consistent with direct loans pursuant to chapter 4 of subtitle A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by striking ''pursuant to section 205(c) of the Indian Land Consolidation Act (25 U.S.C. 2204(c))''; and

(B) by inserting ''or to intermediaries in order to establish revolving loan funds for the purchase of highly fractionated land under that section'' before the period at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) CONSULTATION REQUIRED.—In determining regulations and procedures to define eligible purchasers of highly fractionated land under this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior.''.

(b) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER AMENDMENT.—Section 6002 is amended by striking subsection (bb).

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed with a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2440) was agreed to.

The Senator from Hawaii.

AMENDMENT NO. 2396

Mr. AKAKA. I rise today to speak in favor of amendment No. 2396, a bipartisan amendment Senator THUNE and I are offering to the farm bill. This amendment would make permanent the Office of Tribal Relations at the USDA.

This office was created to ensure that the USDA upholds Federal Indian policy and maintains its government-to-government relationship with tribes. Permanently establishing this office will ensure that tribal governments can develop their programs in parity with their neighbors in rural America. It will ensure that the USDA consults with tribal governments and that tribes can participate in programs related to agricultural, infrastructure, and economic development opportunities.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment to the farm bill.

I thank the Chair, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I call up amendment No. 2396.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] proposes an amendment numbered 2396.

Mr. AKAKA. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish the Office of Tribal Relations in the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture)

On page 1009, after line 11, add the following:

SEC. 12207. OFFICE OF TRIBAL RELATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 is amended by adding after section 308 (7 U.S.C. 3125a note; Public Law 103–354) the following:

''SEC. 309. OFFICE OF TRIBAL RELATIONS.

''The Secretary shall establish in the Office of the Secretary an Office of Tribal Relations.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)) (as amended by section 12201(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) the authority of the Secretary to establish in the Office of the Secretary the Office of Tribal Relations in accordance with section 309.''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, this amendment makes permanent the current Office of Tribal Relations with the Department of Agriculture, and that is very important in terms of outreach for Native American farmers and ranchers.

We have no objection, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2396) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

AMENDMENT NO. 2192

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I call up Ayotte amendment No. 2192.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire proposes an amendment numbered 2192.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Thursday, June 7, 2012 under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, my amendment seeks to reform the value-added grant program. The USDA has awarded $240 million in grants over the lifetime of this program, but the USDA has not been transparent and has failed to adequately account for the grants and how they are awarded.

The last assessment of this program was in 2006 and indicated that more than 40 percent of the grant recipients went out of business just 3 years after having completed their grant project. My amendment would allow the program to go forward, but it would reform this program to be more accountable to taxpayers.

The program has awarded 62 grants totaling $12.1 million to ethanol facilities. It does eliminate grants to ethanol facilities. We should not be wasting further taxpayer dollars to give to ethanol producers when we have already given them so many taxpayer opportunities here.

At least 105 wine industry groups and wineries have received $10.5 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I would just say this is a good amendment for taxpayers to reform this program and make it accountable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, unfortunately, I would urge my colleagues to vote no on this amendment. It cuts in half funding for a program that helps food entrepreneurs—small businesses and farmers who want to create new kinds of products and to commercialize them and get them to the marketplace.

This is really what we are trying to do—to leverage more dollars in this bill to support not only the farmer on the farm but also to move into commercialization and to create new food products and jobs. In fact, we have created hundreds of jobs at wineries. We have done this all across the country—created jobs by helping small businesses and entrepreneurs to take a great idea and to move it to commercialization and add value to their product.

I would strongly urge a ''no'' vote, and I would ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 61, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 123 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Alexander	Enzi	Murkowski
Ayotte	Graham	Paul
Barrasso	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Brown (MA)	Hutchison	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sessions
Chambliss	Isakson	Shelby
Coats	Johnson (WI)	Snowe
Coburn	Kyl	Thune
Corker	Lee	Toomey
Cornyn	Manchin	Vitter
Crapo	McCain	Wicker
DeMint	McConnell	

NAYS—61

Akaka	Grassley	Murray
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Hoeven	Pryor
Bingaman	Inouye	Reed
Blumenthal	Johanns	Reid
Blunt	Johnson (SD)	Roberts
Boxer	Kerry	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cantwell	Kohl	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Shaheen
Carper	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Cochran	Levin	Udall (CO)
Collins	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Conrad	Lugar	Warner
Coons	McCaskill	Webb
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden
Franken	Mikulski	
Gillibrand	Moran	

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The amendment (No. 2192) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for the benefit of all Senators—if I could have the attention of the Senate—we have before us why we are here. This was very difficult, to get to the point we are now, where we have a very important bill. We do these every 5 years. Senators Stabenow and Roberts have worked very hard to get us to this point. I congratulate them both, but we have a long way to go.

First of all, everyone understand all the next votes will be 10-minute votes. That means at the end of 15 minutes we are going to cut off the vote. It doesn't matter if a Democrat is missing or Republican is missing; it does not matter. If it is a close vote, we always are careful with that, we understand, but let's understand when the time is up, we are going to turn in the vote.

Second, I have instructed all of the presiders, we are going to have 1-minute speeches—1 minute for Democrats, 1 minute for Republicans. When the time is up, the time is going to end so everyone will be treated the same. We have 73 amendments we have to work through. We have a lot to do the rest of this week, but this is important. No. 1, we are going to keep the vote. I have an important meeting at 4 o'clock. I have instructed my staff, if I am not here I will not be counted. That is what we have to do. If you have important meetings, you might have to miss a vote or two.

Second, I repeat, we will have 2 minutes equally divided before each vote, and it will be 2 minutes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2429

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2429.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. TESTER], for Mr. BAUCUS, for himself and Mr. TESTER, proposes an amendment numbered 2429.

Mr. TESTER. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the livestock forage disaster program)

On page 128, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

(iii) ANNUAL PAYMENT BASED ON DROUGHT CONDITIONS DETERMINED BY MEANS OTHER THAN THE U.S. DROUGHT MONITOR.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—An eligible livestock producer that owns grazing land or pastureland that is physically located in a county that has experienced on average, over the preceding calendar year, precipitation levels that are 50 percent or more below normal levels, according to sufficient documentation as determined by the Secretary, may be eligible, subject to a determination by the Secretary, to receive assistance under this paragraph in an amount equal to not more than 1 monthly payment using the monthly payment rate under subparagraph (B).

(II) NO DUPLICATE PAYMENT.—A producer may not receive a payment under both clause (ii) and this clause.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the Baucus-Tester amendment No. 2429. The Baucus-Tester amendment fixes a problem in the livestock forage program to make sure that ranchers who suffer losses in their herds because of drought are able to get the help they need. If you are in grass-based agriculture, folks, for those ranchers the grass is the heartbeat of your operation. If you do not have it, you cannot survive. It was critical this last year when record droughts devastated the Southwest. Wild fires burned more than 2 million acres in Texas.

This program has moved into title I of the farm bill. This amendment fixes a problem we have seen in one of those programs. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, can we proceed with a voice vote on this amendment?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I know of no objection at this point. I yield the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2429.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2190, AS MODIFIED

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, it is my understanding we are ready with the amendment of Senator SNOWE. I ask she be the next amendment in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. I call up amendment No. 2190.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows.

The Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), for herself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND, proposes an amendment numbered 2190.

Ms. SNOWE. I ask unanimous consent that amendment 2190 be modified with the changes I am sending to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows.

(Purpose: To require Federal milk marketing order reform)

At the end of part III of subtitle D of title I, insert the following:

PART IV—FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER REFORM

SEC. 1481. FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDERS.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—The Secretary shall provide an analysis on the effects of amending each Federal milk marketing order issued under section 8c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 608c), reenacted with amendments by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (in this part referred to as a ''milk marketing order''), as required by this section.

(b) USE OF END-PRODUCT PRICE FORMULAS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) consider replacing the use of end-product price formulas with other pricing alternatives; and

(2) submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the findings of the Secretary on the impact of the action considered under paragraph (1).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of this amendment I have offered along with Senator GILLIBRAND of New York on a bipartisan basis. I thank the Chair and ranking member for working with us on the modifications in support of this amendment.

The underlying bill establishes a margin insurance program that helps very large dairy producers but provides little assistance to small family-owned dairy producers who have exponentially fewer cows and do not produce the surplus amounts of milk. Without this amendment, these small dairy farmers face possible extinction due, in part, to the excessive price volatility. The prices in Europe influence the price our farmers right here at home receive from the government.

This amendment will help resolve this inequity by requiring the Department of Agriculture to provide an analysis on the effects of amending each Federal milk marketing order and deciding how best to update the system of Federal orders, which is now 12 years old. I hope we will adopt this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I support this amendment and yield the remainder of our time. It is my understanding we can proceed with a voice vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2190, as modified.

Those in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

All opposed, no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nays appear to have it.

All those in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

All those opposed, no.

(Chorus of nays.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nays appear to have it.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask for a record rollcall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 124 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Akaka	Grassley	Murkowski
Ayotte	Hagan	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Hatch	Portman
Bingaman	Inouye	Pryor
Blumenthal	Kerry	Reed
Brown (MA)	Klobuchar	Reid
Brown (OH)	Landrieu	Roberts
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Rockefeller
Cardin	Leahy	Rubio
Carper	Lee	Sanders
Casey	Levin	Schumer
Coburn	Lieberman	Sessions
Cochran	Manchin	Shaheen
Collins	McCain	Shelby
Conrad	McCaskill	Snowe
Coons	McConnell	Stabenow
Corker	Menendez	Tester
Franken	Merkley	
Gillibrand	Mikulski	
Graham	Moran	
Toomey	Vitter	Webb
Udall (NM)	Warner	Whitehouse

NAYS—33

Alexander	DeMint	Johnson (WI)
Barrasso	Durbin	Kohl
Bennet	Enzi	Kyl
Blunt	Feinstein	Lugar
Boozman	Heller	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Hoeven	Paul
Burr	Hutchison	Risch
Chambliss	Inhofe	Thune
Coats	Isakson	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Johanns	Wicker
Crapo	Johnson (SD)	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The amendment (No. 2190), as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

AMENDMENT NO. 2364 WITHDRAWN

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, let me speak for a moment with regard to amendment No. 2364 that Senator HUTCHISON and I had intended to offer. We have been in consultation with the managers of the legislation. They have agreed to some changes in the report language that accommodate our concern.

Our concern is about water conservation and ensuring that water conservation, particularly in the arid West but in any part of the country where there are underground aquifers and wherever there is depletion of water supplies that is going to make farming and agricultural activities impossible in the future. The managers have agreed to some changes in the report language that accommodate our concerns. They have agreed to a colloquy that accommodates our concerns. Accordingly, we will not proceed with the amendment.

Before I withdraw the amendment, could I ask Senator HUTCHISON to make any comments she would like to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I appreciate the sponsors of the bill working with us. Just as an example, the Ogallala Aquifer has gone down 100 feet since irrigation has been allowed from this water source. It is a source for cities such as the city of San Antonio and other cities around New Mexico and Texas. That is just one example. It is happening all over our country. So conservation has to be a part of keeping our farms and ranches alive, and that is the purpose of the amendment.

We appreciate the managers working with us and hope we can go forward and highlight the importance of conservation to keep our water resources for our farmers and ranchers.

WATER CONSERVATION IN MULTI-STATE AQUIFERS

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Ogallala Aquifer—also known the High Plains Aquifer—region, an area that is impacted on a daily basis by groundwater pumping for agriculture. In fact, that region leads the Nation in the amount of groundwater pumped for irrigation purposes, with some 17 billion gallons per day being withdrawn for irrigation. I

have for many years been concerned about the rapid groundwater depletion occurring in the southern portion of that aquifer. There are parts of the Ogallala underlying New Mexico that have seen a decline in water levels of more than 150 feet since groundwater pumping for agriculture first started.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I share the concern of the Senator from New Mexico. A large area in western Texas overlies the Ogallala Aquifer as well. We, too, have seen alarmingly high levels of groundwater depletion. Water is a precious resource in our part of the country, and the Ogallala is a major source of water for agriculture, our communities, and industrial development.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I understand that the bill before the Senate will make resources available to address the problem of the declining groundwater resources in the Ogallala. It would be helpful to my colleague from Texas and me if the chairwoman and ranking member of the Agriculture Committee could confirm our understanding on certain aspects of the bill. First, am I correct that substantial funds under the Environmental Quality Incentive Program, EQIP, will continue to be made available for practices that result in the conservation of groundwater, including the use of more efficient irrigation systems and conversion to less water-intensive crops or dryland farming, which may, within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, include long-term grassland rotation?

Ms. STABENOW. Yes, the Senator is correct.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I understand that the Regional Conservation Partnership Program is intended to address water quantity as well as water quality issues, so funding under the program could be directed to address situations where high historic levels of groundwater depletion have occurred due to agricultural use. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. BINGAMAN. With respect to the designation of critical conservation areas under section 2401 of the bill, I would encourage USDA to look to areas where they already have initiatives in place addressing the area. I understand that any funding under this program would be in addition to funding that would otherwise be available to the region under any other provision of the bill. Finally, it is my expectation and understanding that in determining whether an area would be designated as a critical conservation area and in determining the level of funding to be directed to the area, the Secretary would carefully consider areas where continued agricultural activities are threatened by groundwater depletion.

Ms. STABENOW. The Senator is correct in his understanding.

Mr. ROBERTS. I agree.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the chairwoman and ranking member.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank them as well.

Mr. President, in light of the comments we have just made, we will not call up the amendment.

The managers can go to the next amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, if I may take a moment to thank Senator BINGAMAN and Senator HUTCHISON. Both New Mexico and Texas have strong and passionate advocates. They are lucky to have them, and we are looking forward to working with them to make sure the issues they have raised are addressed.

Also, just for those following along in order, I would just indicate that Senator COLLINS, in light of the passage of the Snowe amendment, will not be proceeding with her amendment, just for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENT NO. 2167

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I call up my marketing loan amendment, amendment No. 2167.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] proposes an amendment numbered 2167.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide payment limitations for marketing loan gains and loan deficiency payments)

On page 140, strike line 1 and insert the following:

(b) LIMITATION ON MARKETING LOAN GAINS AND LOAN DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS FOR PEANUTS AND OTHER COVERED COMMODITIES.—Section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308) is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

''(d) LIMITATION ON MARKETING LOAN GAINS AND LOAN DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS FOR PEANUTS AND OTHER COVERED COMMODITIES.—The total amount of marketing loan gains and loan deficiency payments received, directly or indirectly, by a person or legal entity (except a joint venture or general partnership) for any crop year under subtitle B of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2012 (or a successor provision) for—

''(1) peanuts may not exceed $75,000; and

''(2) 1 or more other covered commodities may not exceed $75,000.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

On page 143, line 9, strike ''(c)'' and insert ''(d)''.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I tried to get this amendment adopted in the 2008 farm bill. It got 57 votes, but it was under a 60-vote rule, so obviously it did not get adopted.

This amendment would cap payments that one farmer can get on marketing loans and loan deficiency payments. We cannot have 70 percent of the farm payments going to 10 percent of the largest farmers.

I think this amendment will help add integrity to the program. We should have caps on title I commodity programs. This will add defensibility to this bill, along with the payment limit reforms we were able to put in in the committee before the bill was voted out.

Opponents will argue—I am sure you will hear this argument—that this would increase forfeitures of crop. But I believe they are overstating that issue, especially given current prices. And even if a farmer did forfeit crop——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Well, this is a commonsense amendment. I hope you will vote for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Limiting MLGs and LDPs is disruptive to orderly marketing because USDA lacks the ability in real time to track eligibility. Consequently, a producer may exceed his loan limit under this amendment and USDA have no idea he has exceeded his loan limit, so he is going to have to come back later on and obviously repay that in very difficult times.

Most farming operations secure financing for annual production costs as well as incur long-term debt for equipment and land. Introducing limits on marketing loan benefits makes this financing more difficult to obtain and more difficult to administer from a farmer's standpoint as well as a banking standpoint.

I urge opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 24, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 125 Leg.]

YEAS—75

Akaka	Cantwell	Enzi
Alexander	Cardin	Feinstein
Ayotte	Carper	Franken
Barrasso	Casey	Gillibrand
Baucus	Coats	Grassley
Begich	Coburn	Harkin
Bennet	Collins	Hatch
Bingaman	Coons	Heller
Blumenthal	Corker	Inouye
Boxer	Crapo	Johanns
Brown (MA)	DeMint	Johnson (SD)
Brown (OH)	Durbin	Kerry

Klobuchar
Kohl
Kyl
Lautenberg
Lee
Levin
Lieberman
Lugar
Manchin
McCain
McCaskill
McConnell
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murkowski
Murray
Nelson (NE)
Nelson (FL)
Paul
Portman
Reed
Reid
Risch
Roberts
Rockefeller
Rubio
Schumer
Shaheen
Snowe
Stabenow
Tester
Thune
Toomey
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Webb
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—24

Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Chambliss
Cochran
Conrad
Cornyn
Graham
Hagan
Hoeven
Hutchison
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson (WI)
Landrieu
Leahy
Moran
Pryor
Sanders
Sessions
Shelby
Vitter
Warner
Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The amendment (No. 2167) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2445

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2445.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] proposes an amendment numbered 2445.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strengthen rural communities and foster the next generation of farmers and ranchers)

On page 574, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

''(C) MANDATORY FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out this subsection $12,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2017, to remain available until expended.

On page 606, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

''(E) MANDATORY FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEARS 2013 THROUGH 2017.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out this paragraph $3,750,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2017, to remain available until expended.

On page 782, between lines 14 and 15 and insert the following:

SEC. 6203. FUNDING OF PENDING RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOAN AND GRANT APPLICATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use funds made available under subsection (b) to provide funds for applications that are pending on the date of enactment of this Act in accordance with the terms and conditions of section 6029 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1955).

(b) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning in fiscal year 2014, of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section $50,000,000, to remain available until expended.

On page 832, line 6, strike ''$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2013'' and insert ''$17,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes of debate, equally divided.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, Congress has provided an average of $400 million for farm bills in the rural development title. The bill we are considering includes no funding at all. My fiscally responsible amendment funds rural business development programs, a portion of the backlog of wastewater infrastructure projects, and will help bring a new generation of farmers into agriculture.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I know how important it is that this amendment maintain our committee's commitment to save at least $23 billion in the farm bill. I yield the rest of my time to the chairwoman, Senator STABENOW.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, let me add my strong support for the amendment. We have reformed this title on rural development. We have eliminated 16 different authorizations, tightened it up. The amendment stays within our parameters of $23 billion in deficit reduction. In effect, this benefits every small town and community across America that counts on rural development. I would strongly support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I oppose this amendment. I do so reluctantly with my colleague on the committee. But the committee bill contains no mandatory funding in the rural development title. This amendment would take savings achieved in the bill from 23.4—used to be 26.3—now we are down to 23.4. That would take it down to 23.2 and redirect $150 million mandatory spending into a few rural development programs.

Nothing against them, but if we are going to achieve savings in this bill, we have to hold the line. I reluctantly oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Akaka
Baucus
Begich
Bennet
Bingaman
Blumenthal
Boxer
Brown (MA)
Brown (OH)
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Collins
Conrad
Coons
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gillibrand
Hagan
Harkin
Heller
Inouye
Johnson (SD)
Kerry
Klobuchar
Kohl
Landrieu
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Lieberman
Manchin
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murray
Nelson (NE)
Nelson (FL)
Pryor
Reed
Reid
Rockefeller
Sanders
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Warner
Webb
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—44

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Chambliss
Coats
Coburn
Cochran
Corker
Cornyn
Crapo
DeMint
Enzi
Graham
Grassley
Hatch
Hoeven
Hutchison
Inhofe
Isakson
Johanns
Johnson (WI)
Kyl
Lee
Lugar
McCain
McCaskill
McConnell
Moran
Murkowski
Paul
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rubio
Sessions
Shelby
Snowe
Thune
Toomey
Vitter
Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The amendment (No. 2445) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

AMENDMENT NO. 2174

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2174.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SESSIONS] proposes an amendment numbered 2174.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To limit categorical eligibility for the supplemental nutrition assistance program to those who receive cash assistance)

On page 312, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 4002. LIMITATION ON CATEGORICAL ELIGIBILITY.

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

(1) in the second 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''.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, food stamp spending has quadrupled—gone up four times—since 2001, increasing twice the rate that the other major poverty program, Medicaid, has increased. It is now the second largest Federal welfare program. An individual on food stamps, with all other government programs they may be eligible for, can receive as much as $25,000 a year.

Under this bill food stamps will average $80 billion a year for 10 years; whereas, the agriculture farm programs will average $20 billion a year. It is by far the dominant factor in this entire piece of legislation.

Amendment No. 2174 deals with the problem through a system known as categorical eligibility. Forty-three States now provide benefits to individuals whose income exceeds the statutory limit—incomes and assets. Only 11 States did that in 2007.

I ask that we be able to fix this problem, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I strongly urge a ''no'' vote. We actually rejected this amendment last fall. I ask that we do it again.

It is true that food assistance has gone up as the economy has had a rough time. As unemployment goes up, food costs go up. Unemployment is coming down, and in this bill we reflect savings. As the economy is getting better, food help goes down. It is no different than crop insurance helping the farmer in a disaster. This helps families in a disaster.

Unfortunately, this amendment would completely change the structure of food help. It would dramatically affect children and families. For example, it would affect someone's ability to get to work because the value of their car would somehow be reflected in a way that would require them to possibly give up their car when they are trying to get to work in order to be able to put food on the table for their families. It makes no sense.

This bill has commonsense reforms to make sure every dollar goes where it should. I urge a ''no'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 127 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Alexander	Graham	Moran
Ayotte	Grassley	Murkowski
Barrasso	Hatch	Paul
Blunt	Hoeven	Portman
Boozman	Hutchison	Risch
Burr	Inhofe	Roberts
Chambliss	Isakson	Rubio
Coats	Johanns	Sessions
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cochran	Kyl	Thune
Corker	Lee	Toomey
Cornyn	Lugar	Vitter
Crapo	McCain	Wicker
DeMint	McCaskill	
Enzi	McConnell	

NAYS—56

Akaka	Carper	Heller
Baucus	Casey	Inouye
Begich	Collins	Johnson (SD)
Bennet	Conrad	Kerry
Bingaman	Coons	Klobuchar
Blumenthal	Durbin	Kohl
Boxer	Feinstein	Landrieu
Brown (MA)	Franken	Lautenberg
Brown (OH)	Gillibrand	Leahy
Cantwell	Hagan	Levin
Cardin	Harkin	Lieberman
Manchin	Reed	Tester
Menendez	Reid	Udall (CO)
Merkley	Rockefeller	Udall (NM)
Mikulski	Sanders	Warner
Murray	Schumer	Webb
Nelson (NE)	Shaheen	Whitehouse
Nelson (FL)	Snowe	Wyden
Pryor	Stabenow	

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The amendment (No. 2174) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 2370

Ms. CANTWELL. I call up amendment No. 2370.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2370.

Ms. CANTWELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To encourage the purchase of pulse crop products for school meals programs)

On page 361, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 4208. PULSE CROP PRODUCTS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to encourage greater awareness and interest in the number and variety of pulse crop products available to schoolchildren, as recommended by the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans published under section 301 of the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5341).

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE PULSE CROP.—The term ''eligible pulse crop'' means dry beans, dry peas, lentils, and chickpeas.

(2) PULSE CROP PRODUCT.—The term ''pulse crop product'' means a food product derived in whole or in part from an eligible pulse crop.

(c) PURCHASE OF PULSE CROPS AND PULSE CROP PRODUCTS.—In addition to the commodities delivered under section 6 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1755), the Secretary shall purchase eligible pulse crops and pulse crop products for use in—

(1) the school lunch program established under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.); and

(2) the school breakfast program established by section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773).

(d) EVALUATION.—Not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the activities conducted under subsection (c), including—

(1) an evaluation of whether children participating in the school lunch and breakfast programs described in subsection (c) increased overall consumption of eligible pulse crops as a result of the activities;

(2) an evaluation of which eligible pulse crops and pulse crop products are most acceptable for use in the school lunch and breakfast programs;

(3) any recommendations of the Secretary regarding the integration of the use of pulse crop products in carrying out the school lunch and breakfast programs;

(4) an evaluation of any change in the nutrient composition in the school lunch and breakfast programs due to the activities; and

(5) an evaluation of any other outcomes determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(e) REPORT.—As soon as practicable after the completion of the evaluation under subsection (d), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representative a report describing the results of the evaluation.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I rise in support of this amendment offered by my colleague, Senator MURRAY, and others, to include in the school lunch program a pilot program dealing with dry beans, peas, lentils, and chickpeas.

My amendment works to improve the nutritional value of school meals across America at a very economical price. With the level of obesity of children between 2 and 19, it is very important we have this program included.

I yield 30 seconds to my colleague from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I thank Senator CANTWELL, and I rise to speak in support of this amendment. I cosponsored the legislation.

This would provide that pulse crops—peas, beans, and lentils—are used in school lunch programs. It does not add additional cost. They are a high source of protein, very cost effective, and it is a growing—no pun intended—crop in our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I am supportive of this amendment.

I have been notified a record vote is being requested, so I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 128 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Akaka	Crapo	Landrieu
Baucus	Durbin	Lautenberg
Begich	Feinstein	Leahy
Bennet	Franken	Levin
Bingaman	Gillibrand	Lieberman
Blumenthal	Hagan	Lugar
Boxer	Harkin	Manchin
Brown (OH)	Hoeven	Menendez
Cantwell	Inouye	Merkley
Cardin	Johanns	Mikulski
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Murray
Casey	Kerry	Nelson (NE)
Conrad	Klobuchar	Nelson (FL)
Coons	Kohl	Pryor

Reed
Reid
Risch
Roberts
Rockefeller
Sanders
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Warner
Webb
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—41

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Brown (MA)
Burr
Chambliss
Coats
Coburn
Cochran
Collins
Corker
Cornyn
DeMint
Enzi
Graham
Grassley
Hatch
Heller
Hutchison
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson (WI)
Kyl
Lee
McCain
McCaskill
McConnell
Moran
Murkowski
Paul
Portman
Rubio
Sessions
Shelby
Snowe
Thune
Toomey
Vitter
Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The amendment (No. 2370) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2243

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Madam President, I rise to call up my amendment No. 2243.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NELSON] proposes an amendment numbered 2243.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. I ask that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that performance bonus payments are used by State agencies only to carry out the supplemental nutrition assistance program)

On page 335, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 4011. PERFORMANCE BONUS PAYMENTS.

Section 16(d) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) USE OF PERFORMANCE BONUS PAYMENTS.—A State agency may use a performance bonus payment received under this subsection only to carry out the program established under this Act, including investments in—

''(A) technology;

''(B) improvements in administration and distribution; and

''(C) actions to prevent fraud, waste, and abuse.''.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Madam President, I rise to call up this amendment addressing Federal performance payments that States receive to make sure Americans in tough times who need Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits receive them and those who don't do not get them.

It is a commonsense, good government amendment that builds on a 2002 bipartisan agreement between the States, the previous Bush administration, and Congress. In my view, Congress shouldn't eliminate incentives to improve efficiency in SNAP, as some are proposing. Congress should, though, better target these Federal performance bonus funds so States can use them only—and let me emphasize ''only''—to improve their SNAP.

My amendment ensures that the incentive payments go toward activities that improve efficiency, effectiveness, and the integrity of SNAP. These efforts have results. Since these incentives were put in place, the SNAP error rate—and overpayment and underpayment rates—has fallen nearly 43 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. That is a good investment.

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield back the remainder of our time.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I believe a voice vote is OK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2243) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2172

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I appreciate my good friend's amendment. I do not think it deals with the problem completely and appropriately. I have offered amendment No. 2172, which would end the bonus payments for increasing registration on the Food Stamp Program. States currently receive bonuses for increasing enrollment in the Food Stamp Program. This amendment would end that policy and would save a modest $480 million—if you call that modest—out of $800 billion being spent on this program over 10 years, according to the CBO.

One of the problems we have with the Food Stamp Program, if you just think about it, is that all the money comes from the Federal Government but all the administration comes from the States. They have no incentive to manage the program in a way to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse. It really helps their economy if more money comes in from out of State. For the Federal Government to have a program that rewards States on top of their natural incentives would be wrong.

I urge support of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask for the yeas and nays and call up amendment No. 2172.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SESSIONS] proposes an amendment numbered 2172.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To end the State bonus payments for administering the supplemental nutrition assistance program)

On page 335, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 4011. REPEAL OF STATE BONUS PAYMENTS.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I strongly oppose this amendment. We are talking about improvements in managing errors, reducing errors in the nutrition program. The amendment of the Senator would eliminate the error-reduction bonuses that go to State governments.

We have seen a 43-percent drop in payment errors as a result of the program Senator NELSON has now strengthened with his amendment. In his amendment, he would ensure that all of the additional funds that go to States are used only to carry out improvements in SNAP, to lower the error rates. Those savings to taxpayers dwarf the costs of this incentive to States to improve their processes. It is working well.

In addition, in this bill we eliminate any lottery winners or students living at home with their parents from receiving assistance. We crack down further on trafficking in retail establishments.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 58, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 129 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Chambliss
Coats
Coburn
Cochran
Corker
Cornyn
Crapo
DeMint
Enzi
Graham
Grassley
Hatch
Hoeven
Hutchison
Inhofe
Isakson
Johanns
Johnson (WI)
Kyl
Lee
Lugar
McCain
McConnell
Moran
Paul
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rubio
Sessions
Shelby
Thune
Toomey
Vitter
Wicker

NAYS—58

Akaka
Baucus
Begich
Bennet
Bingaman
Blumenthal
Boxer
Brown (MA)
Brown (OH)
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Collins
Conrad
Coons
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gillibrand
Hagan
Harkin
Heller
Inouye
Johnson (SD)
Kerry
Klobuchar
Kohl
Landrieu
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Lieberman
Manchin
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murkowski
Murray
Nelson (NE)
Nelson (FL)
Pryor
Reed
Reid
Rockefeller
Sanders
Schumer
Shaheen
Snowe
Stabenow
Tester
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Warner
Webb
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The amendment (No. 2172) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

AMENDMENT NO. 2238

Mr. CASEY. I call up my amendment No. 2238.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASEY] proposes an amendment numbered 2238.

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require more frequent dairy reporting)

On page 110, line 7, strike ''no less'' and insert ''more''.

On page 110, line 22, strike ''no less'' and insert ''more''.

On page 112, after line 21, add the following:

(c) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the feasibility of establishing 2 classes of milk, a fluid class and a manufacturing class, to replace the 4–class system in effect on the date of enactment of this Act in administering Federal milk marketing orders.

(2) FEDERAL MILK MARKET ORDER REVIEW COMMISSION.—The Secretary may elect to use the Federal Milk Market Order Review Commission established under section 1509(a) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1726), or documents of the Commission, to conduct all or part of the study.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the study required under this subsection, including any recommendations.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I am calling up this amendment, which is very simple. It is about two things: First of all, it would increase the frequency of so-called dairy price reporting that goes on already. The Department of Agriculture does this reporting on a rather frequent basis. We are just going to suggest that we codify, or make law, what the USDA is already doing. So, first, it would increase the frequency of reporting from ''no less than once a month'' to ''more than once a month.'' So it just puts into law what is already in practice.

Secondly, this amendment would require the USDA to study—only to study—the feasibility of having two classes of milk as opposed to four. This would help clarify whether folks who want to do that—it requires that study. But, particularly, in the first part of the amendment, we need to make sure our farmers have as much information about pricing to help the farmers themselves, dairy buyers, and dairy suppliers.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Thank you, Madam President. A recorded vote has been requested, so I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 130 Leg.]

YEAS—73

Akaka	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Alexander	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Ayotte	Harkin	Portman
Baucus	Heller	Pryor
Begich	Hutchison	Reed
Bennet	Inouye	Reid
Bingaman	Isakson	Risch
Blumenthal	Johanns	Roberts
Blunt	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boozman	Kerry	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Kohl	Shaheen
Cardin	Landrieu	Snowe
Carper	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Chambliss	Levin	Toomey
Coats	Lieberman	Udall (CO)
Collins	Lugar	Udall (NM)
Conrad	Manchin	Vitter
Coons	McCaskill	Warner
Corker	Menendez	Webb
Crapo	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Murkowski	
Gillibrand	Murray	

NAYS—26

Barrasso	Feinstein	McConnell
Boxer	Graham	Moran
Brown (MA)	Hatch	Paul
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cornyn	Kyl	Thune
DeMint	Lee	Wicker
Enzi	McCain	

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The amendment (No. 2238) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 2181

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2181.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 2181.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish an average adjusted gross income limitation of $250,000 for all payments and benefits under the Farm Bill)

Strike section 1605 and insert the following:

SEC. 1605. AVERAGE ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME LIMITATION.

Section 1001D of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person or legal entity shall not be eligible to receive any payment or other benefit under the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2012, or any amendment made by that Act, during a crop, fiscal, or program year, as appropriate, if the average adjusted gross income of the person or legal entity exceeds $250,000.''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, this amendment will limit all payments or all farm subsidies to persons with an adjusted gross income of less than $250,000.

My friends across the aisle are commonly saying: Why don't those of means pay more or receive less? This amendment would do precisely that.

Nine percent of farmers earn more than $250,000 worth of adjusted gross income. This would limit their payments. Currently, 9 percent of the farmers—who are the well-off farmers—are receiving nearly a third of the benefits.

A good question for the Senate might be: What do Scottie Pippen, Larry Flynt, and David Rockefeller have in common? The answer would be: that besides being very rich, they have all gotten farm subsidies in the past. I think this should change and that the wealthy should not be receiving farm subsidies. This amendment would get rid of this.

I yield back the remainder of my time and encourage Senators to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I would urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment. The good news is, the people who were mentioned will no longer be able to get farm subsidies under this bill because of the reforms we have already put in place. We have already lowered the adjusted gross income. We have put a $50,000-per-person cap on payments, which is less than half than what farmers currently receive.

Let me say, this would cap across the board, including conservation, and conservation of land and water is critically important to us as a country.

I yield now the remainder of my time to my ranking member.

Mr. ROBERTS. It is not only commodity programs, I say to my chairwoman. This would also affect all of our conservation programs, crop insurance, rural development programs, research, dairy, and livestock. I doubt if Larry Flynt has anything to do with any of those.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2181.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 84, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 131 Leg.]

YEAS—15

Ayotte	Johnson (WI)	Murkowski
Burr	Kohl	Paul
DeMint	Kyl	Portman
Hatch	Lee	Rubio
Heller	McCain	Toomey

NAYS—84

Akaka	Enzi	Mikulski
Alexander	Feinstein	Moran
Barrasso	Franken	Murray
Baucus	Gillibrand	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Graham	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Grassley	Pryor
Bingaman	Hagan	Reed
Blumenthal	Harkin	Reid
Blunt	Hoeven	Risch
Boozman	Hutchison	Roberts
Boxer	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Brown (MA)	Inouye	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Johanns	Sessions
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Shaheen
Carper	Kerry	Shelby
Casey	Klobuchar	Snowe
Chambliss	Landrieu	Stabenow
Coats	Lautenberg	Tester
Coburn	Leahy	Thune
Cochran	Levin	Udall (CO)
Collins	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Conrad	Lugar	Vitter
Coons	Manchin	Warner
Corker	McCaskill	Webb
Cornyn	McConnell	Whitehouse
Crapo	Menendez	Wicker
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The amendment (No. 2181) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 2426

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2426.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr COONS] proposes an amendment numbered 2426.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for studies on the feasibility of establishing a business disruption insurance policy for poultry producers and a catastrophic event insurance policy for poultry producers)

On page 970, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 11019. POULTRY BUSINESS DISRUPTION INSURANCE POLICY.

Section 522(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(c)) (as amended by sections 11016, 11017, and 11018) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(21) POULTRY BUSINESS DISRUPTION INSURANCE POLICY AND CATASTROPHIC DISEASE PROGRAM.—

''(A) DEFINITION OF POULTRY.—In this paragraph, the term 'poultry' has the meaning given the term in section 2(a) of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 182(a)).

''(B) AUTHORITY.—The Corporation shall offer to enter into 1 or more contracts with qualified entities to carry out—

''(i) a study to determine the feasibility of insuring commercial poultry production against business disruptions caused by integrator bankruptcy; and

''(ii) a study to determine the feasibility of insuring poultry producers for a catastrophic event.

''(C) BUSINESS DISRUPTION STUDY.—The study described in subparagraph (B)(i) shall—

''(i) evaluate the market place for business disruption insurance that is available to poultry producers;

''(ii) assess the feasibility of a policy to allow producers to ensure against a portion of losses from loss under contract due to business disruption from integrator bankruptcy; and

''(iii) analyze the costs to the Federal government of a Federal business disruption insurance program for poultry producers.

''(D) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of—

''(i) the study carried out under subparagraph (B)(i); and

''(ii) the study carried out under subparagraph (B)(ii).''.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I thank the leaders who have worked so hard on this bipartisan farm bill, especially Chairwoman STABENOW and Ranking Member ROBERTS.

On this bipartisan farm bill, Senator CHAMBLISS and I are grateful to have our amendment heard. Poultry is a critical industry in Delaware, Georgia, and in many States. Between the recession and the volatile cost of chickenfeed, there will be a rising number of factors that can have a catastrophic impact on local economies that are well beyond the control of our farmers and integrators. The two studies we propose in this amendment would explore whether insurance programs might make sense as a tool for helping poultry farmers and integrators continue to thrive during uncertain economic times and would specifically study protection from catastrophic loss from disease outbreaks or bankruptcy of poultry integrators.

This amendment is at no additional cost to taxpayers. I urge my colleagues to join Senator CHAMBLISS and me in supporting it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, we yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 2426.

The amendment (No. 2426) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 2422

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 2422.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], for herself, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. KYL, proposes an amendment numbered 2422.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify a provision relating to conservation innovation grants and payments)

Strike section 2207 and insert the following:

SEC. 2207. CONSERVATION INNOVATION GRANTS AND PAYMENTS.

Section 1240H of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–8) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2017''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) REPORTING.—Not later than December 31, 2013, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report on the status of projects funded under this section, including—

''(1) funding awarded;

''(2) project results; and

''(3) incorporation of project findings, such as new technology and innovative approaches, into the conservation efforts implemented by the Secretary.''.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I present this amendment on behalf of Senator KYL, Senator BOXER, and myself. It is a very simple amendment. It maintains a provision from the 2008 farm bill that sets aside $37.5 million for air quality improvement projects.

This program has been used to replace old diesel tractor engines with newer, cleaner ones. This improves efficiency for the farmer and air quality in the region. It has helped thousands of farmers comply with EPA, State, and local air quality regulations.

In California's Central Valley, we have some of the poorest air quality in the country. It is an EPA extreme nonattainment zone, and the EPA and the State have set very strict standards for emissions.

This funding has achieved the equivalent of removing more than 408,000 cars from California highways in the last 5 years. I urge its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment—the ranking member has yielded some time to me—to thank Senator FEINSTEIN. This is an excellent amendment. She has done a tremendous amount of work on it. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the amendment, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2422) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2191

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2191.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. ALEXANDER] proposes an amendment numbered 2191.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide that any cooperative organization or other entity that receives a business and industry direct or guaranteed loan for a wind energy project is ineligible for any other Federal benefit, assistance, or incentive for the project)

On page 596, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

''(12) OTHER FEDERAL BENEFITS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any cooperative organization or other entity that receives a loan or loan guarantee under this subsection for a wind energy project shall be ineligible for any other Federal benefit, assistance, or incentive for the project under any other provision of law.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, if my colleagues think it is a good idea to give rich developers of wind turbines a double dip into the Federal Treasury at a time when we are borrowing 40 cents of every $1, then this provision in the farm bill is for you. If you think a single dip into the Treasury is justified, then this amendment is for you.

The farm bill gives new loans, new loan guarantees for wind turbines. That is on top of the 14 billion Federal tax dollars we are spending over 5 years for wind turbines—$6 billion through the production tax credit and the other $8 billion through the section 603 grants. This simply says: No double-dipping. Only one dip. If you do the tax credit, you can't do the farm bill.

Vote yes if you don't like double-dipping into the Federal Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise to oppose this amendment. I appreciate the interest and concern of the Senator from Tennessee. Let me just say that this amendment would cut off access for farmers and small businesses that are looking to develop wind energy projects that will create jobs. I have to say, as someone coming from Michigan, when I look at one of those big wind turbines, I see 8,000 parts, and every single one of them can be made in Michigan or across the country—we would prefer Michigan. But the reality is this is about jobs.

We are in the middle of a global clean energy race with countries such as China, and this is about giving our businesses a leg up to be able to win that race. Frankly, it is about getting us off of foreign oil. This is one way to do that and to create jobs.

Since 2005, wind energy companies have contributed more than $60 billion to the economy, with over 400 facilities in 43 States. It is about jobs. It is about manufacturing.

I would urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. ALEXANDER. How much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 66, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 132 Leg.]

YEAS—33

Alexander	Crapo	Murkowski
Ayotte	DeMint	Paul
Barrasso	Enzi	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Chambliss	Isakson	Sessions
Coats	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Coburn	Kyl	Snowe
Cochran	Lee	Toomey
Corker	McCain	Vitter
Cornyn	McConnell	Wicker

NAYS—66

Akaka	Hagan	Mikulski
Baucus	Harkin	Moran
Begich	Heller	Murray
Bennet	Hoeven	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Hutchison	Nelson (FL)
Blumenthal	Inhofe	Pryor
Boozman	Inouye	Reed
Boxer	Johanns	Reid
Brown (MA)	Johnson (SD)	Roberts
Brown (OH)	Kerry	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cardin	Kohl	Schumer
Carper	Landrieu	Shaheen
Casey	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Tester
Conrad	Levin	Thune
Coons	Lieberman	Udall (CO)
Durbin	Lugar	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Manchin	Warner
Franken	McCaskill	Webb
Gillibrand	Menendez	Whitehouse
Grassley	Merkley	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The amendment (No. 2191) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 2199

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I call up Senator MCCAIN's and my amendment No. 2199.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], for himself and Mr. MCCAIN, proposes an amendment numbered 2199.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To repeal a duplicative program relating to inspection and grading of catfish)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 12207. REPEAL OF DUPLICATIVE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the date of enactment of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act (7 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.), section 11016 of that Act (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2130) and the amendments made by that section are repealed.

(b) APPLICATION.—The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) and the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) shall be applied and administered as if section 11016 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2130) and the amendments made by that section had not been enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of debate will be equally divided.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, Senator MCCAIN and I, along with a strong bipartisan group of our colleagues, are offering this amendment to repeal the 2008 farm bill's catfish language. Our amendment would repeal this language because it is unfair to importers, it is costly to taxpayers, and it provides no food safety benefit. It is duplicative of the other programs, and it never received consideration or debate in the House or Senate and should never have passed in the first place. It doesn't make sense to have a catfish category for the regulation of fish, and then all other fish are in a completely separate category.

The GAO concluded in its recent report:

To enhance the effectiveness of the food safety system for catfish and avoid duplication of effort and cost, Congress should consider repealing provisions of the Farm Bill that assigned USDA responsibility for examining catfish and for creating a catfish inspection program.

Five years later, they are still debating what a catfish is. This is entirely duplicative, a waste of time, and hurts consumers and processors.

I hope colleagues will support us in this effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, let me give the other side of the story here. We have a lot of fish that gets imported from important trading partners such as Vietnam and other Asian countries. It is disputed whether they meet the definition of catfish. They certainly aren't an American variety of catfish; they are probably some other type of fish. But regardless of all of the science there, it is important that we inspect these fish as they come in because they are not grown in the same sanitary conditions we have in the United States. They use different herbicides and pesticides, and they have different pollutants. In fact, we have seen documented cases where they are raised in sewage water—water contaminated with sewage.

We need to make sure these fish are inspected when they come into the United States. That is what the underlying bill provides, and that is what I support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we can proceed with a voice vote on this amendment.

The amendment (No. 2199) was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2309

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2309.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], for herself and Mr. CHAMBLISS, proposes an amendment numbered 2309.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a study into the feasibility of an insurance product that covers food safety recalls)

On page 968, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

SEC. 11017. STUDY OF FOOD SAFETY INSURANCE.

Section 522(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(c)) (as amended by section 11016) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(19) STUDY OF FOOD SAFETY INSURANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall offer to enter into a contract with 1 or more qualified entities to conduct a study to determine whether offering policies that provide coverage for specialty crops from food safety and contamination issues would benefit agricultural producers.

''(B) SUBJECT.—The study described in subparagraph (A) shall evaluate policies and plans of insurance coverage that provide protection for production or revenue impacted by food safety concerns including, at a minimum, government, retail, or national consumer group announcements of a health advisory, removal, or recall related to a contamination concern.

''(C) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the study conducted under subparagraph (A).''.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I offer this amendment on behalf of Senator CHAMBLISS and myself. This is a simple amendment. It simply authorizes a study into how we can better cover farmers affected by recalls they did not cause.

When a food safety recall occurs—such as spinach, tomatoes, cantaloupe—consumers stop purchasing the product regardless of what farm the food came from. When this happens, producers suffer major financial losses because of a recall they did not cause.

This amendment directs the USDA to conduct a study into the feasibility of a crop insurance product that would cover a producer's losses after these kinds of events.

The amendment has zero cost, it has bipartisan support, and it is endorsed by United Fresh.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I urge an ''aye'' vote. I don't believe a rollcall vote is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I strongly commend Senator FEINSTEIN and strongly support the amendment.

It is my understanding we do have those who have asked for a rollcall vote on this amendment.

I yield to my ranking member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, we have a request on our side for a recorded vote. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 133 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Akaka	Feinstein	Murkowski
Alexander	Franken	Murray
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Grassley	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Hagan	Portman
Bennet	Harkin	Pryor
Bingaman	Hutchison	Reed
Blumenthal	Inouye	Reid
Blunt	Isakson	Risch
Boozman	Johanns	Rockefeller
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Brown (MA)	Kerry	Schumer
Brown (OH)	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Burr	Kohl	Snowe
Cantwell	Landrieu	Stabenow
Cardin	Lautenberg	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Casey	Levin	Udall (NM)
Chambliss	Lieberman	Vitter
Cochran	Lugar	Warner
Collins	Manchin	Webb
Conrad	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Coons	Menendez	Wicker
Cornyn	Merkley	Wyden
Crapo	Mikulski	
Durbin	Moran	

NAYS—23

Barrasso	Heller	Paul
Coats	Hoeven	Roberts
Coburn	Inhofe	Rubio
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
DeMint	Kyl	Shelby
Enzi	Lee	Thune
Graham	McCain	Toomey
Hatch	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The amendment (No. 2309) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

AMENDMENT NO. 2217

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2217.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOOMEY] proposes an amendment numbered 2217.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To eliminate the organic certification cost share assistance program)

Beginning on page 980, strike line 13, and all that follows through page 983, line 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, the bill we are debating today has a provision called the Organic Certification Cost Share and Agricultural Management Assistance Program. This creates $115 million of mandatory spending over the next 5 years. It continues existing policy except at a much higher spending level. It is a 53-percent increase over the 2008 farm bill. Half of the funding goes to pay producers. Half of this funding goes to have taxpayers pay the cost of producers that want to certify that they grow an organic product. I have nothing against organic farming, but it is a $31 billion industry. It has had a 50-percent growth rate just since 2008, and this applies only to large producers because small producers are not required to seek this certification. This is a great market. There is a great deal of interest in organic products, but I think these large producers can pay for their own certification.

The other half goes to duplicative conservation efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. TOOMEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I strongly oppose the Toomey amendment, which would completely eliminate funding for the organic certification cost-share assistance, risk management education, and agricultural management assistance. These programs are highly effective and have helped farmers across the entire country, which is why they have widespread bipartisan support. They ensure that all producers have equal access to the organic certification process, support sustainable farm practices, and help disseminate information about the intricate crop insurance system to those who traditionally have not had access. The farm bill is about fairness, equity, job growth, and protecting farmers eliminating these vital programs runs counter to these fundamental goals.

The National Organic Certification Cost Share Program and the Agricultural Management Assistance program have proven to be highly cost-effective tools for farmers. With grants of up to $750, they allow organic producers and handlers to defray a portion of their rising organic certification costs. These small grants help the many producers who already follow organic practices complete the costly certification process. In fiscal year 2011 alone, over 9,300 operations in 49 states received assistance through these 2 programs.

Demand from the marketplace has fueled the skyrocketing production of organic food. This food frequently yields higher prices for producers and gives consumers greater choice. Many small producers who often sell their goods directly to consumers—have trouble obtaining organic certification, which is the last hurdle that must be

overcome to access these valuable markets. The National Organic Certification Cost Share Program brings equity to the system and enables producers to properly label their goods. This ensures that consumers can find American organic products and rest assured that they have been produced according to organic standards.

The Agricultural Management Assistance, AMA, program also helps producers make the conservation improvements that they would like to make—such as water quality and erosion controls. This program is completely voluntary and helps farmers in states where participation in Federal Crop Insurance has remained low. Agricultural Management Assistance helps farmers develop sustainable practices that protect their farmland and ensure the health of our shared water systems. This is the type of program that pays long-term dividends and greatly reduces future mitigation costs for our Nation's farmers.

Last year Tropical Storm Irene devastated the landscape in Vermont, eroding soil and spreading contaminants into our water system. Fertile soil was wiped away leaving only bedrock behind. To the extent we can, we should try to lessen the toll of natural disasters like Irene by implementing the conservation practices that AMA supports. Eliminating programs like AMA kicks the can down the road, increasing the size and impact of problems that our children and grandchildren will be left to fix.

I urge all Senators to stand with our farmers and oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. I rise to oppose this amendment. One of the important principles in this bill is that we support the great diversity of American agriculture. This particular amendment would go after a very small part of this bill—a provision to support the fastest growing part of agriculture, which is organic farming.

We have reformed this bill, as we have every other part of the bill. We continue what has been in the farm bills of the past.

I might add this amendment would also reduce funding available for conservation and risk management assistance for States that have been underserved by crop insurance.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2217.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 134 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Murkowski
Blunt	Hatch	Paul
Boozman	Heller	Portman
Burr	Inhofe	Risch
Chambliss	Isakson	Roberts
Coats	Johanns	Rubio
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Cochran	Kyl	Shelby
Corker	Lee	Thune
Cornyn	Lugar	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
DeMint	McCain	Wicker

NAYS—57

Akaka	Gillibrand	Murray
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Hoeven	Pryor
Bingaman	Hutchison	Reed
Blumenthal	Inouye	Reid
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Brown (MA)	Kerry	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Kohl	Shaheen
Cardin	Landrieu	Snowe
Carper	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Levin	Udall (CO)
Conrad	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Coons	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Webb
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The amendment (No. 2217) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

AMENDMENT NO. 2156

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2156.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mrs. GILLIBRAND], for herself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. REED, and Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 2156.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike a reduction in the supplemental nutrition assistance program and increase funding for the fresh fruit and vegetable program, with an offset that limits crop insurance reimbursements to providers)

Beginning on page 312, strike line 9 and all that follows through the end of page 313.

On page 361, strike lines 1 through 8 and insert the following:

SEC. 4207. PURCHASE OF COMMODITIES BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.

When the Secretary considers the purchasing of commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation or under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), in addition to other appropriate considerations, the Secretary may consider the needs of the States and the demands placed on emergency feeding organizations.

SEC. 4208. FRESH FRUIT AND VEGETABLE PROGRAM.

Section 19(i) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769a(i)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (7) as paragraphs (5) through (8), respectively; and

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

''(4) MANDATORY FUNDING.—In addition to any other amounts made available to carry out this section, on October 1, 2012, and on each October 1 thereafter through October 1, 2021, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary to carry out this section $50,000,000, to remain available until expended.''.

On page 953, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 11011. ANNUAL LIMITATION ON DELIVERY EXPENSES AND REDUCED RATE OF RETURN.

(a) ANNUAL LIMITATION ON DELIVERY EXPENSES.—Section 508(k)(4) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(G) ANNUAL LIMITATION ON DELIVERY EXPENSES.—Beginning with the 2014 reinsurance year, the amount paid by the Corporation to reimburse approved insurance providers and agents for the administrative and operating costs of the approved insurance providers and agents shall not exceed $825,000,000 per year.''.

(b) REDUCED RATE OF RETURN.—Section 508(k)(8) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(8)) (as amended by section 11010) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(G) REDUCED RATE OF RETURN.—Beginning with the 2014 reinsurance year, the Standard Reinsurance Agreement shall be adjusted to ensure a projected rate of return for the approved insurance producers not to exceed 12 percent, as determined by the Corporation.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2156, AS MODIFIED

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Beginning on page 312, strike line 9 and all that follows through the end of page 313.

On page 361, strike lines 1 through 8 and insert the following:

SEC. 4207. PURCHASE OF COMMODITIES BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.

When the Secretary considers the purchasing of commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation or under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), in addition to other appropriate considerations, the Secretary may consider the needs of the States and the demands placed on emergency feeding organizations starting in 2014.

SEC. 4208. FRESH FRUIT AND VEGETABLE PROGRAM.

Section 19(i) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769a(i)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (7) as paragraphs (5) through (8), respectively; and

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

''(4) MANDATORY FUNDING.—In addition to any other amounts made available to carry out this section, on October 1, 2014, and on

each October 1 thereafter, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary to carry out this section $50,000,000, to remain available until expended.''.

On page 953, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 11011. ANNUAL LIMITATION ON DELIVERY EXPENSES AND REDUCED RATE OF RETURN.

(a) ANNUAL LIMITATION ON DELIVERY EXPENSES.—Section 508(k)(4) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(G) ANNUAL LIMITATION ON DELIVERY EXPENSES.—Beginning with the 2014 reinsurance year, the amount paid by the Corporation to reimburse approved insurance providers and agents for the administrative and operating costs of the approved insurance providers and agents shall not exceed $825,000,000 per year.''.

(b) REDUCED RATE OF RETURN.—Section 508(k)(8) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(8)) (as amended by section 11010) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(G) REDUCED RATE OF RETURN.—Beginning with the 2014 reinsurance year, the Standard Reinsurance Agreement shall be adjusted to ensure a projected rate of return for the approved insurance producers not to exceed 12 percent, as determined by the Corporation.''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Let me be clear, Mr. President, about what this amendment does and does not do. This amendment does not extend or expand the Food Stamp Program. It provides the exact same benefits families are receiving today.

Half of the food stamp beneficiaries are children, 17 percent are seniors, and, unfortunately, now 1.5 million households are veteran households that are receiving food stamps.

This amendment does not take a penny from our farmers. These cuts are not about waste, fraud, and abuse. According to CBO, it is $90 a month from these families' kitchen tables.

We all here in this Chamber take the ability to feed our children for granted. That is not the case for too many families in America. Put yourselves for just a moment in their shoes. Imagine being a parent who cannot feed your children the food they need to grow. It is beneath this body to cut food assistance for those who are struggling the most among us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I must, regretfully, oppose this amendment. I deeply care about protecting nutrition assistance programs. I hope that is not in doubt. But here is what is going on. In a handful of States, they have found a way to increase the SNAP benefits for people in their States by sending $1 checks in heating assistance to everyone who gets food assistance. Now, it is important to consider what a family's heating bill is when determining how much help they need, which is why the two programs are linked. But sending out $1 checks to everyone is not the intent of Congress. For the small number of States that are doing that, it is undermining the integrity of the program, in my judgment.

I appreciate we have turned down those amendments that would, in fact, change this structure and lower benefits. But this is about accountability and integrity within the program, and I must oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I strongly oppose this amendment. This amendment would shield over 82 percent of farm bill spending from deficit reduction and prevent the bill from addressing a serious breach in nutrition program integrity.

Let me be clear. Tightening the LIHEAP loophole does not affect SNAP eligibility for anyone using SNAP.

To add insult to this injury, this amendment then pillages money from crop insurance——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS. Did we not have a minute apiece?

Ms. STABENOW. I would ask the Presiding Officer if there is any time remaining in the debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All debate time has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS. Well, we will stop at ''pillaging.''

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 66, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 135 Leg.]

YEAS—33

Akaka	Gillibrand	Murray
Begich	Heller	Reed
Blumenthal	Kerry	Reid
Boxer	Lautenberg	Rockefeller
Brown (MA)	Leahy	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Levin	Schumer
Cantwell	Lieberman	Shaheen
Cardin	Menendez	Snowe
Casey	Merkley	Udall (NM)
Coons	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden

NAYS—66

Alexander	Coats	Franken
Ayotte	Coburn	Graham
Barrasso	Cochran	Grassley
Baucus	Collins	Hagan
Bennet	Conrad	Harkin
Bingaman	Corker	Hatch
Blunt	Cornyn	Hoeven
Boozman	Crapo	Hutchison
Burr	DeMint	Inhofe
Carper	Durbin	Inouye
Chambliss	Enzi	Isakson
Johanns	McCaskill	Sessions
Johnson (SD)	McConnell	Shelby
Johnson (WI)	Moran	Stabenow
Klobuchar	Nelson (NE)	Tester
Kohl	Nelson (FL)	Thune
Kyl	Paul	Toomey
Landrieu	Portman	Udall (CO)
Lee	Pryor	Vitter
Lugar	Risch	Warner
Manchin	Roberts	Webb
McCain	Rubio	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The amendment (No. 2156), as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have done very well today. We have 2½ pages, and we almost have a page of our amendments finished. We are going to have 2 hours of debate of the time set forth for the resolution of disapproval. That will start at 7:50 tonight or thereabouts. One of the Senators agreed to take a voice vote, and that saved us 15 minutes. So we gave them 10 minutes off.

If everybody will look at these amendments, we have to finish this bill and flood insurance this week. We have to do that. I don't want to be crying wolf that we are going to have to be here Friday. We need to finish our work, and we can do that. People have been here, and we have finished some of our votes before the time even expired. That is difficult. The floor staff has a difficult time recapping the votes, but everybody did a good job.

I hope one of the things we can look at is that perhaps Senators BOXER and INHOFE could look at giving back an hour of their time for debate. I think virtually everybody knows how they will vote on this issue. The debate could be stunning and somebody could change, but I doubt it. If they will consider giving back an hour of their time out of the 4, it will help us.

I don't want to be here until 2 o'clock Friday morning. I don't want to do that. I hope we can work through this. We will have a limited amount of morning business tomorrow and we will start voting as soon as we can and we will move quickly like we have today. I ask everybody to look at the amendments and see if they are willing to take a voice vote. We are going to stop voting at about 7:50 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2263

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2263.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DEMINT] proposes an amendment numbered 2263.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To maintain funding at current levels for programs providing access to broadband telecommunications services in rural areas)

On page 770, strike lines 7 through 11 and insert the following:

(7) in subsection (k)(1), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2017''; and

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, on the amendment.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, the President's 2013 budget asks for about $9 million for the Rural Utility Service to expand broadband services in rural areas. The average spending over the last 10 years for that service is about $14 million. The current level of spending is at $25 million. If anything, given our $16 trillion in debt, one would think we would come in somewhat below that. But the farm bill doubles our current level from $25 million to $50 million.

My amendment keeps spending at the $25 million level. That is the least we can do, given the President has asked for $9 million. The average is $14 million, and we are now at $25 million. We at least need to keep it there.

I encourage my colleagues to have a brief moment of fiscal sanity and vote for my amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment that would cut funding for critical programs for small businesses in rural communities across the country. In the 1930s and 1940s we made a commitment to rural electrification and extended what was a fairly new technology to communities across the country. We had a boom in innovation and economic growth.

Our country no longer has a divide between urban ''haves'' and rural ''have-nots'' as a result of that. Today, the Internet is the new dividing line. Too many communities still don't have access to high-speed broadband Internet for businesses in these locations. It is a real competitive disadvantage for them, especially in a global economy.

I urge that we support what we have done to invest in small businesses and the ability to connect. We don't need the new urban ''haves'' and rural ''have-nots.'' This is about investing in rural communities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado). Are there any other Sentors in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 136 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Alexander	Barrasso	Boozman
Ayotte	Blunt	Brown (MA)
Burr	Hatch	Moran
Chambliss	Heller	Paul
Coats	Hoeven	Portman
Coburn	Hutchison	Risch
Cochran	Inhofe	Roberts
Collins	Isakson	Rubio
Corker	Johanns	Sessions
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Crapo	Kyl	Snowe
DeMint	Lee	Thune
Enzi	Lugar	Toomey
Graham	McCain	Vitter
Grassley	McConnell	Wicker

NAYS—54

Akaka	Hagan	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Inouye	Nelson (NE)
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Pryor
Bingaman	Kerry	Reed
Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Reid
Boxer	Kohl	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Landrieu	Sanders
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Lieberman	Tester
Conrad	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Coons	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Webb
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The amendment (No. 2263) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 2366

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I call up Hagan amendment No. 2366.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mrs. HAGAN] proposes an amendment numbered 2366.

Mrs. HAGAN. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Risk Management Agency and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to use plain language and a website to make crop insurance more accessible)

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 110____. GREATER ACCESSIBILITY FOR CROP INSURANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) due to changes in commodity and other agricultural programs made by the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2012, it is more important than ever that agricultural producers be able to fully understand the terms of plans and policies of crop insurance offered under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.); and

(2) proposed reductions by the Secretary in the number of State and local offices of the Farm Service Agency will reduce the services available to assist agricultural producers in understanding crop insurance.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR USE OF PLAIN LANGUAGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In issuing regulations and guidance relating to plans and policies of crop insurance, the Risk Management Agency and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation shall, to the greatest extent practicable, use plain language, as required under Executive Orders 12866 (5 U.S.C. 601 note; relating to regulatory planning and review) and 12988 (28 U.S.C. 519 note; relating to civil justice reform).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the efforts of the Secretary to accelerate compliance with the Executive Orders described in paragraph (1).

(c) WEBSITE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the approved insurance providers (as defined in section 502(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1502(b)), shall improve the existing Internet website through which agricultural producers in any State may identify crop insurance options in that State.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The website described in paragraph (1) shall—

(A) provide answers in an easily accessible format to frequently asked questions; and

(B) include published materials of the Department of Agriculture that relate to plans and policies of crop insurance offered under that Act.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Nothing in this section authorizes the Risk Management Agency to sell a crop insurance policy or plan of insurance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, as everyone knows, Federal crop insurance policies are extremely technical and complex. My amendment seeks to give farmers additional access to clear, concise information about crop insurance policies and programs approved by the USDA.

This commonsense amendment seeks to accomplish this goal in two ways:

First, it will require the Secretary of Agriculture to report back to Congress on the status of the agency's effort to comply with the President's Executive order to require the use of plain language. My hope is that this simple measure will force USDA to move quickly to provide information necessary for our farmers in North Carolina and other parts of the country to make informed decisions about signing up for the crop insurance plans that meet their specific needs.

Second, my amendment requires the Risk Management Agency to improve its existing Web site so that agriculture producers in any State can access easily understandable information on crop insurance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. HAGAN. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, on behalf of the ranking member and myself, I yield back the time.

It is my understanding that we may proceed with a voice vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2366) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2262

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2262.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DEMINT] proposes an amendment numbered 2262.

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act should manipulate prices or interfere with the free market)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act should manipulate prices or interfere with the free market.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, this amendment is a sense of the Senate that reflects what all of us talk about not just with the farm bill but with the whole U.S. economy—the importance of a free market and letting our competitive system work.

This amendment says that nothing in the farm bill would interfere with the free market by setting prices or doing anything that I think all of the proponents of the bill say it will do—that it will protect the free market.

So it is a sense of the Senate, and I agree to a voice vote on this, but I encourage my colleagues to add their voice to the free market system and support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, on behalf of the ranking member and myself, I yield back all time, and we both agree to a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2262) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2187

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2187.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] proposes an amendment numbered 2187.

(Purpose: To extend eligibility for certain emergency loans to commercial fishermen)

On page 398, line 1, insert ''(including a commercial fisherman)'' after ''farmer''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, this is an amendment on behalf of myself, Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator BROWN, and others.

In these very difficult economic times, we have also had a problem for the fishermen of the Northeast and in other parts of the country where the fishing stocks have been greatly reduced for a lot of different reasons, and a lot of fishermen are sitting there with their boats, where they are trying to get through the season in order to be able to fish in the future, with greatly restricted fishing capacity and availability. This is not unlike farmers who wind up with crops being affected by floods and other disasters, things that take place.

All we are seeking is the ability to do away with an inequity in the law that denies fishermen access to a loan under Federal emergency loan standards for when an emergency arises and they need to have some ability to stay over.

The Congressional Budget Office determined that this amendment has no score. There is no score.

We believe commercial fishermen deserve access to the same type of assistance commercial farmers and other people in this country get. We hope colleagues will do away with this anomaly that denies them the ability to simply apply, through normal standards, for a loan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, we yield back all time. I understand we can proceed with a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2187) was agreed to.

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, Senate amendment No. 2187 offered by Senator KERRY has now been voice voted onto the farm bill. It is unfortunate that this significant change of USDA policy occurred without a recorded vote.

While it may sound innocuous to add commercial fishermen to the list of those eligible for USDA emergency farm loans, it is not without its negative implications.

Support for commercial fishermen has typically been the responsibility of the Department of Commerce. Thus, USDA has little to no experience serving commercial fishermen.

Additionally, funding for farm emergency loans is limited. Amendment No. 2187 would further dilute this limited pool of funding and divert it from its core mission—assisting our farmers and ranchers.

While this amendment may have been voice voted, I would have voted nay on this amendment had there been a recorded vote. I hope this is an issue that we can revisit and rectify in conference committee.

AMENDMENT NO. 2268

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2268.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DEMINT] proposes an amendment numbered 2268.

(Purpose: To prohibit the Secretary from making loan guarantees)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON PROVISION OF LOAN GUARANTEES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, including any amendment made by this Act, no loan guarantee may be provided by the Secretary or any other Federal official or agency for any project or activity carried out by the Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, as we look at some of the loan guarantees—such as Solyndra—that have gone bad, this amendment would prohibit loan guarantees for the farm bill. There are many programs that guarantee loans that expose the American taxpayers to millions of dollars. This bill would prohibit those guarantees—not prohibit the programs themselves and the crop insurance and things farmers count on but just the liability we put on the American taxpayers. CBO has said loan guarantees do cost the taxpayers money. So I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and save the American taxpayers from this additional liability.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise to oppose this amendment. The FDA loan guarantees are critical to our farmers, our rural small businesses, and community banks in small towns across the country. The loan guarantee programs help support commercial and farm credit lending when farmers and ranchers face tough times. It is also an important program to help beginning farmers and ranchers who don't have a long history of credit but who are certainly qualified to receive loans to start their operations.

We know that the average age of an American farmer is 57 years and that one-quarter of our farmers are 65 years of age or older. If agriculture in America is going to survive, we need to have young people engaged in farming. This amendment would make it much harder. So I oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 84, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 137 Leg.]

YEAS—14

Ayotte	Graham	McCain
Burr	Inhofe	Paul
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Corker	Kyl	Toomey
DeMint	Lee	

NAYS—84

Akaka	Franken	Murkowski
Alexander	Gillibrand	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Hatch	Portman
Bennet	Heller	Pryor
Bingaman	Hoeven	Reed
Blumenthal	Hutchison	Reid
Blunt	Inouye	Risch
Boozman	Isakson	Roberts
Boxer	Johanns	Rockefeller
Brown (MA)	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Kerry	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sessions
Cardin	Kohl	Shaheen
Carper	Landrieu	Shelby
Casey	Lautenberg	Snowe
Chambliss	Leahy	Stabenow
Coats	Levin	Tester
Cochran	Lieberman	Thune
Collins	Lugar	Udall (CO)
Conrad	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Coons	McCaskill	Vitter
Cornyn	McConnell	Warner
Crapo	Menendez	Webb
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Enzi	Mikulski	Wicker
Feinstein	Moran	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Harkin	Kirk

The amendment (No. 2268) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 2321

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2321.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU] proposes an amendment numbered 2321.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To move a section from the rural development title to the credit title)

On page 508, strike lines 13 and 14 and insert the following:

"SEC. 3430. PROHIBITION ON USE OF LOANS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary may not approve a loan under this subtitle to drain, dredge, fill, level, or otherwise manipulate a wetland (as defined in section 1201(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3801(a))), or to engage in any activity that results in impairing or reducing the flow, circulation, or reach of water.

''(b) PRIOR ACTIVITY.—Subsection (a) does not apply in the case of—

''(1) an activity related to the maintenance of a previously converted wetland; or

''(2) an activity that had already commenced before November 28, 1990.

''(c) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply to a loan made or guaranteed under this subtitle for a utility line.

"SEC. 3431. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.

Beginning on page 750, strike line 14 and all that follows through page 751, line 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I don't believe there is any opposition to this amendment, but I would like a minute to explain. Under current law, any rural development project is automatically excluded from even applying for a loan under current law. That was not the intention of the farm bill, but it was put in the farm bill, the last one. I would like to remove that language so small rural communities of 20,000 or less can apply to build a hospital, fire station, et cetera.

They do not have to be given the permit. They still need to get the wetland permit from the Corps of Engineers, but this removes an automatic prohibition. The agriculture department supports it. I do not believe there is any opposition, and I thank the Chair and ranking member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, we agree to a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. STABENOW. I yield the remainder of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2321) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2276

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I believe this will be the last vote of today, DeMint amendment 2276.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DEMINT] proposes an amendment numbered 2276.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit mandatory or compulsory check off programs)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON MANDATORY OR COMPULSORY CHECK OFF PROGRAMS.

No program to promote and provide research and information for a particular agricultural commodity without reference to specific producers or brands (commonly known as a ''check-off program'') shall be mandatory or compulsory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, this amendment would give individual businesses and small farmers the freedom to refrain from joining 1 of the 19 check-off programs against their will. Right now, a lot of businesses are forced into programs they do not want to be a part of. As a lot of us know, a lot of the large corporate farmers, a lot of large businesses love to form these check-off programs to force the smaller companies to pay into them.

This just makes it strictly voluntary, so any company that wants to be a part of this, any farmer who wants to be a part of it, can. But it makes no sense to continue to force small businesses into these check-off programs against their will.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment that would prohibit the zero cost check-off programs. These programs are funded by the private industry, not taxpayers. They are incredibly beneficial to farmers and businesses who want to help market their products. For example, the ''Got Milk'' campaign came from a check-off program used by the dairy industry. The ''Incredible Edible Egg'' is another one. No single egg farmer is going to have the resources to run a national television ad encouraging folks to eat more eggs.

Let's be clear. This is a program that commodity groups vote on and agree to. The ''Got Milk'' campaign happened because dairy farmers got together, voted, and decided they wanted to go ahead and do research and a promotion program. Let's not take the ability for the industry to come together, pool their own money, and market their product.

I would urge a ''no'' vote and ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DEMINT. How much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has 10 seconds.

Mr. DEMINT. I will remind everyone that while it is not taxpayer money, we are forcing businesses to do things they don't necessarily want to do. My amendment would allow any business to join the check-off program voluntarily. That is the American way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 79, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 138 Leg.]

YEAS—20

Ayotte	Graham	McConnell
Brown (MA)	Hatch	Murkowski
Burr	Heller	Paul
Coats	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Coburn	Kyl	Sessions
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
DeMint	McCain	

NAYS—79

Akaka	Blunt	Chambliss
Alexander	Boozman	Cochran
Barrasso	Boxer	Collins
Baucus	Brown (OH)	Conrad
Begich	Cantwell	Coons
Bennet	Cardin	Corker
Bingaman	Carper	Crapo
Blumenthal	Casey	Durbin

Enzi
Feinstein
Franken
Gillibrand
Grassley
Hagan
Harkin
Hoeven
Hutchison
Inhofe
Inouye
Isakson
Johanns
Johnson (SD)
Kerry
Klobuchar
Kohl
Landrieu
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Lieberman
Lugar
Manchin
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Moran
Murray
Nelson (NE)
Nelson (FL)
Portman
Pryor
Reed
Reid
Risch
Roberts
Rockefeller
Sanders
Schumer
Shaheen
Shelby
Snowe
Stabenow
Tester
Thune
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Vitter
Warner
Webb
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The amendment (No. 2276) was rejected.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to express my deep disappointment that the Senate will not be considering amendment No. 2252, the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments of 2012.

Unanimous consent was required for this amendment to be voted on, but it is my understanding that there were objections to its consideration.

That is unfortunate because this was a bipartisan amendment cosponsored by Senators BLUMENTHAL, SCOTT BROWN, CANTWELL, COLLINS, KERRY, LIEBERMAN, MENENDEZ, MERKLEY, MURRAY, SANDERS, VITTER, and WYDEN.

The amendment was supported by the vast majority of the egg industry, and it was supported by the vast majority of animal welfare organizations.

The major opposition to this amendment came from groups wholly unaffected by it.

Without Congressional action, the egg industry in California and the rest of this Nation is very much in jeopardy. Individual State standards threaten to cripple the industry.

That is why I introduced this amendment—to give the industry a chance to survive.

The amendment would have set a national standard for the treatment of egg-laying hens and would have established standards for egg labeling.

Let me briefly explain the specifics:

The size of new and existing hen cages would have had to be increased over the next 18 years.

The practice of depriving hens of food and water to increase egg production would have been outlawed.

Minimum air quality standards would have been put in place for hen houses, protecting workers and birds.

And clear requirements for egg labeling would have been created, so consumers know whether the eggs they buy come from hens that are caged, housed in enriched cages, cage-free or free range.

As I said earlier, this bill is strongly supported by the Nation's largest egg producer organization, the United Egg Producers. And it is supported by the largest animal welfare organization, the Humane Society of the United States.

After years of disagreement, the Humane Society and the egg producers decided to work together, and they were able to agree on a reasonable and practical compromise. The text of this amendment is the product of their negotiations.

The reason for the compromise is clear: The current laws governing the treatment of egg-laying hens and the labeling of eggs vary from State to State. This makes it difficult for producers to do business in multiple States.

In 2008, California voters passed Proposition 2 with 64 percent of the vote. This initiative requires egg producers to increase cage size so that the birds can stand up and extend their wings.

Similar initiatives passed in Michigan, Arizona, Washington, Ohio and Oregon. And there may be more if Federal legislation is not enacted.

The result of the varying State laws is that producers will not be able to ship eggs freely across State lines.

The amendment would have addressed this problem by setting a single national standard that is consistent with the existing State laws. And it would have given consumers peace of mind knowing that eggs were raised humanely. It should have been a win-win and an example of what can happen when groups decide to work together.

But instead, a group of unaffected parties decided to make this amendment a rallying cry, and they spread mis-information about what this amendment would really do and who it would really impact.

I understand that many of my colleagues have heard from these other industries. Even though this amendment will not come up, I still want to set the record straight.

The first misconception is that this amendment will set precedent beyond egg producers and impact other industries such as pork, beef, or poultry.

Let me be clear. This amendment applies only to egg producers and is the result of careful negotiations between the only industry that is impacted and animal welfare groups.

Regulations governing eggs date back 30 years and have had no effect on other industries to date. For instance, the FDA has on-farm enforcement authority for egg farms but not for meat or poultry farms. This amendment will not change that.

Furthermore, the meat industry has insisted on preemption of State laws and emphasized the importance of national standards for decades. This legislation applies the same principle to the egg industry.

Another argument I hear is that this bill will hurt small producers.

But small producers—farmers with 3,000 birds or fewer—are exempt from the requirements under this amendment.

Even moderate-sized operations, with more than 3,000 birds, have built-in protections—most notably the long phase-in period—up to 18 years.

Over such a long period, many producers would have replaced existing cages due to normal wear and tear. This amendment will just require producers to purchase slightly larger cages in the coming years.

Even the smallest companies can plan for an investment 18 years out.

This amendment will have positive effects for all producers by providing certainty about the rules with which they must comply.

All producers, regardless of size, face a disadvantage when there is a complicated web of different State regulations.

A third misconception is that this amendment is not based on sound science. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

The amendment is endorsed by the American Veterinary Medical Association, the Association of Avian Veterinarians, the American Association of Avian Pathologists, the Center for Food Safety, and the Center for Science in the Public Interest.

Multiple studies demonstrate that larger, enriched colony cages result in decreased mortality, decreased contamination, and increased egg production.

One survey from Feedstuffs magazine found that hen mortality in larger, enriched cages declined by 45 percent compared to conventional battery cages.

The survey also found that the number and quality of eggs per hen improved, from an average of 399 eggs to 421 in enriched cages.

The weight-per-case of eggs also increased, from 47.93 pounds to 49.4 pounds.

I ask my colleagues to look at the data before jumping to conclusions. This amendment is good for animals and good for the industry.

Finally, I want to set the record straight with regard to consumers and egg prices. A new study released last week by the consulting firm Agralytica found that this amendment would not have a substantial effect on consumers.

Between 2013 and 2030, egg prices are expected to increase only 1 percent as a result of this amendment.

A 1-percent increase translates to about a penny and a half per dozen eggs, or one-eighth of 1 cent per egg.

The Agralytica study attributes the low impact to the long phase-in period, giving producers ample time to adjust to the new requirements.

The bill has been endorsed by the Consumer Federation of America and the National Consumers League.

And it is important to understand that this amendment captures what is already occurring with consumer demand.

Polls indicate broad support for the provisions in this amendment. The survey found that:

Consumers support this bill by a 4-to-1 margin;

Consumers prefer a Federal standard over State standards by a 2-to-1 margin; and,

92 percent of consumers support the industry transitioning to enriched cages.

It is not often that we have the opportunity to enact legislation that helps industry, reflects consumer demand, and is supported by a broad coalition of advocates on both sides of an issue. If my colleagues have any doubts about the support for this bill, take a look at the list of supporters. As of today it is 13 pages long.

We wouldn't have gotten this far if it weren't for the strong support and leadership of the United Egg Producers. Without this amendment, the livelihood of the egg producers nationwide will be compromised by the confusing tapestry of State laws.

We had the opportunity to fix this problem before more damage is done—so the fact that we are not even going to consider the amendment makes it all the more disappointing.

The egg industry was prepared to make these investments, and animal welfare advocates and consumers will approve of the end result.

This was a reasonable and widely supported solution to a costly problem.

I hope to work with my colleagues on both sides of the issue to have this legislation considered at a later date. The future of the industry is dependent on it, and I am confident we will be able to get there.

Thank you Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to engage my colleague, Senator STABENOW, in a colloquy.

I thank Senator STABENOW and the other members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry for their collective efforts in passing S. 3240, the Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act of 2012. This bill promises to save taxpayers money and concentrate funds in the areas in which they will have the greatest impact, making them work better for producers.

As the Senator knows, Long Island Sound, LIS, and its watershed contain some of the most important farm, forest, and water resources in the country. The estuary is home to a historically significant and now burgeoning aquaculture industry. The Sound provides natural habitats to more than 1,200 species of invertebrates, 170 species of fish, and hundreds of species of migratory birds. Commercial and recreational shellfishers harvest oysters, crabs, and lobsters from its waters. More than 23 million people live within 50 miles of the Sound. The estimated annual value to the local economy of LIS is $8.91 billion. Federal, State, and local partners operate together throughout its six-State watershed using formal, shared priorities that provide a strong basis for applying conservation practices to improve soil and water quality, farm and producer productivity, and to restore wetlands and wildlife habitat. The Sound and its watershed are recognized by NRCS as a multistate partnership area. The watershed's major river, the Connecticut River, was just designated as the Nation's first Blueway.

Is it the Senator's intent to provide a framework where strong partnerships between producers and conservation organizations, like exist in the Long Island Sound watershed, can succeed by putting forth projects that work to achieve locally or regionally established goals and metrics?

Ms. STABENOW. I thank Senator LIEBERMAN for his leadership on environmental issues facing his State and the Long Island Sound. Yes, that is my intent through the Regional Conservation Partnership Program.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Senator for her leadership and assistance and cooperation in ensuring that the intent of this important bill is allowed to be carried out in areas where greatest impact will result.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask unanimous consent that Bennet-Crapo amendment No. 2202, which has been cleared by both sides, be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

UNANIMOUS CONSET AGREEMENT S.J. RES. 37

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate this evening on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 37 be in order, even though the motion to proceed will not be made until Wednesday's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am going to make a unanimous consent request that Senator CARPER open this debate—and I give thanks to Senator INHOFE for allowing that—for 8 minutes, and then Senator INHOFE will use 15 minutes at his discretion. Then we will go to Senator SHAHEEN for up to 10 minutes. Then we go back to Senator INHOFE for another 15 minutes from his side, and then our side will be Senator LAUTENBERG for 10, Senator MERKLEY for 10, and Senator WHITEHOUSE for 10.

Mr. INHOFE. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. It is my understanding that we would have our three speakers after that, but not necessarily restricted to 5 minutes. It will not be much more than that. But since our speakers will be speaking in these three sessions, I would like a little latitude, maybe 6 or 7 minutes on those three.

Mrs. BOXER. Why not give us an exact time. I think it is important. So we are saying instead of 15 minutes of time—I would just say some of my people—can the Senator from Oklahoma take the first segment for 15 minutes—because I know Senator SHAHEEN is going to be waiting to speak—and then we will give you 20 minutes after that?

Mr. INHOFE. For my three who come after Senator CARPER, 6 minutes apiece.

Mrs. BOXER. So 18 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Yes.

Mrs. BOXER. OK. Then we will go to Senator SHAHEEN for 10 and back to Senator INHOFE for 18 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Yes, that would be fine.

Mrs. BOXER. All right. Then the others will have 10 minutes apiece after that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. My thanks to Senator BOXER and to Senator INHOFE.

Over the years, I have been privileged to hold a bunch of different jobs, including newspaper boy, pots-and-pan man in college, naval flight officer, and Governor of my State, just to name a few. The most cherished and important job I have ever held is that of the role of father. I am blessed with three wonderful sons who make me proud and thankful every day.

Celebrating Father's Day this past weekend, I was reminded that a major motivator in my own life has been my love for our boys and my desire to make the world a better place for them. Today, 2 days later, I am reminded of just how important this clean air fight is for my children and for children across the country.

Unbeknownst to a lot of us, our children actually listen to what we say. More importantly, they watch just about everything we do. They notice the choices we make and the company we keep. They hear us talk about playing by the rules and treating others the way we would like to be treated. They watch carefully to see if we actually practice what we preach—if we play fair, and if we do try to follow the Golden Rule as we go about our lives. They hear us talk about chores, homework, and responsibility, but they watch to see if we actually pitch in and do our fair share.

It strikes me that much of the country's ongoing efforts to clean up the air pollution is about playing fair and doing our share. My home State of Delaware has done our homework and worked hard on that front and, as a result, we have made great strides in cleaning up our own air pollution. Unfortunately, a number of the upwind States to the west of us have not made the same commitment to clean air. In fact, 90 percent of Delaware's pollution comes from our neighboring States. This pollution endangers our hearts, lungs, and brains, and it costs us a great deal in medical bills and in the quality of our lives.

Some of this air pollution, such as poisonous mercury, settles into our streams and our fish, threatening the health of this generation and generations to come. That doesn't sound like the Golden Rule to me.

Even though the First State is doing its part to protect our air and public health, some of our neighbors are not. Yet those of us who live at the end of America's tailpipe end up suffering. It just is not fair.

Fortunately, Federal clean air protections established by the Clean Air Act have been created to right that wrong. These protections were forged by both Democrats and Republicans who believe that playing fair and doing our share when it comes to cleaning up America's air is profoundly important.

The Clean Air Act, signed by President Richard Nixon in 1970 and updated in 1990 by President George Herbert Walker Bush, was approved each time by Congress with overwhelming bipartisan support. In fact, many in this Congress on both sides of the aisle supported the passing of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. Those Members include my friends, Senator BOXER and Senator INHOFE, and me.

This landmark law to protect public health and the environment has proven time and again to be a success. In fact, I am told the Clean Air Act delivers about $30 of health savings for every $1 we invest in clean air—not a bad return on our investment. Moreover, the Clean Air Act has helped create hundreds of thousands of jobs in new technologies as America develops clean air solutions that our businesses can export around the globe.

The bipartisan vision embodied in our Nation's clean air laws has been translating into healthier, longer, and more productive lives for millions of Americans.

While much of the Clean Air Act has been in place improving health for years, some key aspects of the law have never been implemented. They include requirements to reduce deadly mercury and other toxic air emissions from some of our oldest and dirtiest coal-fired plants. These toxic air pollutants are known to cause cancer, neurological damage, and other health concerns.

One example of particular concern is mercury. Up to 10 percent of childbearing women in this country have unsafe levels of mercury in their bodies. Today, all 50 States have mercury fish consumption advisories. In fact, there are more fish consumption advisories in the United States for mercury than for all other contaminants combined.

Uncontrolled coal-fired utilities are our largest source of mercury in this country. Fortunately, current control technology can dramatically reduce mercury emissions and mercury in our local environments.

This is why Senator ALEXANDER, several of our colleagues, and I have been trying for years to reduce emissions through legislation. It is also why 18 States have their own powerplant mercury standards. Yet, until recently, we lacked a Federal standard.

Last December, after years of delay, the EPA finally implemented—under court order—Clean Air Act protections to require dirty coal powerplants to clean up their mercury and air toxic emissions. The EPA did so through something called the mercury and air toxics standards rule.

By targeting our Nation's largest sources of mercury emissions, this regulation requires dirty coal plants to reduce their mercury emissions by 90 percent. This will reduce the mercury that contaminates our streams and oceans, pollutes our fish, and harms our children's health.

In implementing these long overdue regulations, the EPA has provided a reasonable and achievable schedule for our powerplants to reduce these harmful emissions. EPA's new standard gives utilities until 2016 to comply. The EPA has also made it clear it is willing to give companies 2 additional years to address reliability concerns if needed. Delaware's powerplants have already met these standards. So do half of the powerplants throughout America. Most communities will see great benefits from these rules, and I am told that nationally we will see up to $90 billion in public health benefits.

As someone who tried for years to work across the aisle to find a way to clean up our Nation's powerplants, I welcomed the EPA's decision to act to finally address these harmful emissions.

Regrettably, some of our colleagues do not share the appreciation that many of us feel for the EPA's efforts to protect public health and our environment. They want to prevent these efforts from moving forward, despite court orders requiring the EPA to do just that. I find it remarkable that some in Congress would seek to prevent the EPA from following through on a law passed overwhelmingly by Congress 22 years ago and signed by a Republican President.

The EPA is doing what Congress told them to do over two decades ago. If we let them do their job, their efforts will reduce harmful pollution and improve the health of generations of children to come.

As much as I hate to say it, given my friendship with the author of this proposal, a vote for this Congressional Review Act would delay any real hope we have of cleaning up our largest source of mercury. A vote for the Congressional Review Act signals uncertainty and a lack of commitment—a commitment to make good on the law we passed overwhelmingly 22 years ago to protect public health in this country.

We cannot afford to delay the mercury and air toxics rule. This is the time to modernize our energy fleet. This is the time to clean up our dirtiest, most inefficient plants. And this is the time to clean up our rivers, lakes, and streams so that all children can look forward to living healthier lives.

So today I rise in strong opposition to this last-ditch effort to prevent the EPA from doing its job—a job we should have done—and reducing these deadly emissions, and I hope my colleagues will join us. My decision to oppose this effort is not based solely on the fact that I am a dad—like a lot of our colleagues here—but knowing that the implementation of this rule will positively impact the lives and health of my sons weighs heavily on my mind. It should weigh heavily on the minds of all of us.

Our children really do hear us when we talk to them and to others. They are watching today to see if we really walk the walk. Whether we are Democrats, Independents, or Republicans, we are still mothers and fathers, aunts and uncles, grandfathers and grandmothers. So let's continue to lead the way by following the Golden Rule this day. Let's treat our neighbors as we would like to be treated, and let's work together across America to keep the Clean Air Act resilient and strong and to make our air cleaner. Our children and their children are counting on us.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I would ask that the Senator from Nebraska Mr. JOHANNS be recognized for 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I rise today to support S.J. Res. 37. The rule addresses emissions from powerplants. However, in my judgment, this rule goes too far, too fast, and tries to achieve too much in too little time, at too high a cost to our families.

Oftentimes, we hear concerns in my office about rules and regulations. Too often, those rules and regulations come from the EPA. And when EPA rules are the topic, sometimes I have to ask: Which EPA rule are you talking about? Because, let's face it, the list of EPA job-killing regulations is downright dizzying.

However, this resolution addresses only one, which hammers coal-fired electricity generation, especially large coal-fired plants.

In Nebraska's case, the rule would require the addition of expensive new equipment to control particulate matter and certain exhaust gases. Well, how expensive would these additions be? One of our States's largest utilities has estimated they would need to spend about $900 million to $1.3 billion over the next 3 years to get into compliance. So one might ask, where is that money going to come from? Well, in our State, every single penny of these capital expenditures comes directly from users—essentially every Nebraskan. You see, in our State, the State of Nebraska, we are 100 percent public power. That means no stockholders, no shareholder equity, no profits to draw down.

How quickly would they need to come up with that money? The compliance period is just 3 years. These are major projects, so 3 years is not an adequate timeline. Now, 3 years may sound like plenty of time to some, but the actual process that needs to occur, all in a specific sequence, makes a 3-year timeline especially challenging. Preliminary engineering comes first,

then financing, then opening the projects for bidding, and bidding, and then determining whether compliance with bidding has occurred before you could even start the project. For public power, there are rules and procedures that control each one of these steps. In other words, there is no shortcut.

Normally, our utilities try to get these projects done in the periods known as the shoulder months. In Nebraska, these are the months of early spring and early fall—before the summer heat hits the Midwest and before the winds of winter knock at our door and take temperatures down. If the compliance schedule precludes the powerplant from using these shoulder months, then the project costs go up because of the need to buy power from outside of the system. So what does that mean? It means we are faced with compliance that is nearly impossible. And the compliance dates keep changing. The cross-State air pollution rule—another rule the EPA has finalized just in the last several months—was put on hold by a Federal court after many States affected by the rule challenged the EPA. And we may hear any day now as to whether the court will tell EPA to go back to the drawing board and rewrite the rule.

But the main point is that the stream of rules coming out of EPA is huge and compliance is nearly impossible. In Fremont, NE, a Nebraska city manager described it this way:

> Smaller utilities in rural areas . . . will have difficulty in getting vendors and contractors to supply and install the equipment in this timeframe. Being Public Utilities we have to follow a public letting process and cannot just negotiate a design build contract with a contractor as an investor owned utility can.

So what happens to Fremont's 26,000 residents? Well, they will face rate increases of between 20 and 25 percent to cover the compliance costs of this rule, when combined with the requirements of two other rules. Increasing electricity bills by one-fourth is huge. It is a huge impact on Fremont families.

The city of Grand Island, NE, estimates that the Utility MACT rule will cost $35 million and require 3 to 5 years of planning and financing and construction.

For Hastings, NE, the same sobering outlook—big expense, rushed timeframe, and a worried community trying to figure out how they pay for it. For Hastings alone, the costs of compliance with this rule and the cross-State rule are estimated to be $95 million over 5 years. Now, Hastings has 25,000 residents. You do not need a degree in economics to know this is an enormous burden for the small businesses, small manufacturers, and households. They will carry the load.

So the vote for this resolution is a vote to tell EPA their approach is not achievable. It cannot work. It is a vote that means there is substantial opposition to the rule and the country does not support EPA.

It is also important to note what this vote is not. No. 1 and most significantly, this is not a vote against clean air. Everybody in my State wants clean air. Everybody wants to comply. They just want some clear, achievable rules on a timeline that is reasonable. The Agency needs to go back to the drawing board.

No. 2, this resolution does not strip EPA of its power. If the resolution passes, EPA would not be barred from trying another rule——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 7 minutes.

Mr. JOHANNS. Let me just close by saying that I hope my colleagues will support us on this resolution.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

I now ask that the Senator from Georgia be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Oklahoma, and I would ask the Chair to let me know when I have utilized 4 minutes, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will do so, gladly.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise to speak out against the EPA's mercury and air toxics standards—known as Utility MACT—and in support of the resolution disapproving this rule introduced by my colleague from Oklahoma, Senator INHOFE.

This set of standards—one of the most expensive of its kind ever issued by EPA—will cause a rise in electric bills for my constituents in Georgia and for Americans all across this country. As our economy continues to stagnate, we can hardly afford to increase the cost of electricity, which will be an economic burden for individuals and businesses and will hamper economic recovery.

Higher electric bills are especially unwarranted when the regulations that will cause the electricity cost increase are expected to provide negligible benefits for the American public. The poor and individuals on fixed incomes, such as the elderly, can hardly afford higher electricity bills. These are precisely the groups disproportionately affected by Utility MACT.

EPA estimates that compliance with this rule will cost $9.6 billion annually in 2015, which is more conservative than many industry figures. One electric company in my home State estimates that by 2014 Utility MACT could cost them up to $250 million annually to implement. This does not take into account the hundreds of millions of additional dollars the company expects to spend on complying with existing environmental statutes and regulations. Even going by EPA's own conservative $9.6 billion cost estimate, studies have shown that the costs will lead to job loss, both directly at utilities and indirectly through industries and manufacturers affected.

I hear every day from businesses of every size in my home State that say the regulatory overreach of this administration threatens the very well-being of their particular business. Utility MACT is yet another example of this overreach.

Instead of promulgating a limited rule to regulate mercury and air toxics—known as hazardous air pollutants—as the title ''Mercury and Air Toxics Standards'' implies, EPA has extended its reach by focusing a great deal of attention on particulate matter in these standards. Particulate matter emissions, not characterized as hazardous air pollutants, are already subject to other EPA regulations, so with Utility MACT, EPA is going beyond what Congress directed the Agency to do. The extra regulations tacked on to the mercury standard add significantly to the expected cost of this rule.

Furthermore, the standards for new facilities, as set forth by Utility MACT, might very well prove to be unattainable. Due to the methodology employed by EPA to gather the data used to set the standards, even certain manufacturers of the emissions control equipment say they cannot guarantee their technology will be able to achieve the standards in practice. How can we require utilities to reduce emissions to such a level that cannot even be guaranteed achievable with current technology? It makes no sense. That will spell the end of any new coal-fired plants in the United States, drastically reducing our ability to use one of our most abundant domestic energy resources, even in more environmentally friendly ways.

The cumulative impact of these EPA rules coming down the pipeline, one after another, causes further concern. Aptly called a ''train wreck'' by many, by forcing the retirement of one coal-fired plant after another, these rules will put at risk the reliability of our electric supply system.

Some state that a delay in implementation, enacted through legislation or otherwise, will be a sufficient remedy. However, a delay will not address the substantive concerns with this rule as written, including the significant issue of certain standards being unattainable.

I thank my colleague from Oklahoma for introducing this disapproval resolution and showing leadership on this issue. Over 200 companies and associations have joined the Senator from Oklahoma in calling for Utility MACT to be overturned.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution disapproving the EPA's Utility MACT rule. By doing so, we take a step toward preventing higher electricity prices and grid unreliability while preserving clean air.

The point of supporting this Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval is to force EPA to go back to the drawing board to craft a narrower rule that properly protects human health in a manner that is not outweighed by its cost, that is actually attainable, and one that will not threaten the reliability of our electrical grid.

I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I ask now that the Senator from Wyoming be recognized for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to express my support for legislation that will force a partial cease-fire in the Obama administration's war on coal.

If we move forward with Senator INHOFE's resolution of disapproval, we will end one of the most egregious rules promulgated by an administration that, in the words of President Obama, hopes to see the price of electricity necessarily skyrocket.

Coal is our Nation's most abundant energy resource. It provides approximately half our Nation with low-cost, reliable electricity. In my State of Wyoming, more than 6,800 people are employed directly by the coal industry. They make an average salary of more than $77,000 each year, which is $35,000 more than the average wage in the State. When we count those employed directly and indirectly, nearly 30,000 people in Wyoming depend on the coal mining industry for jobs.

Nationwide, the numbers are much larger. The coal industry employs 136,000 people directly, with an average salary of $73,000 per year. For every coal mining job in the United States, we see 3.5 jobs created in another part of the economy. Simply put, the coal industry puts people to work. In an economy that is struggling to recover, the coal industry provides high-paying jobs for workers in Wyoming and in other States such as West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

Coal provides low-cost electricity across the country that can power our Nation's manufacturing base. It provides high-paying jobs across the country at a time when our Nation's unemployment rate is at an unacceptable 8.2 percent, and the most recent jobs report shows no signs that the economy is recovering. With the tremendous benefits coal can provide, it is so puzzling to me that the administration seeks to end our use of this important, affordable energy source.

Since being sworn into office, President Obama's rulemaking machine released rule after rule designed to make it more expensive to use coal. The administration's greenhouse gas standard would make it impossible to build a new coal-fired powerplant in the United States. The stream buffer zone rule would make it more difficult to mine coal. Those are just 2 of the 11 regulations the President is considering that would grievously wound the coal mining industry and hurt an already ailing economy. In total, the regulations could cost up to $130 billion to retrofit existing coal-fired powerplants and could, by some estimates, lead to shutting down as much as 20 percent of the existing coal-fired powerplant fleet.

Today, we have a chance to stop one of those regulations. In February, the EPA finalized a standard that requires a strict reduction in air emissions from electric generating utilities. It is known as the Utility MACT rule. Similar to many of the rules coming from the EPA, the costs of this regulation are great and the benefits are limited. EPA estimates that the rule would create between $500,000 and $6 million in benefits related to mercury reductions, at a cost of nearly $10 billion annually for implementation of the rule. The cost-benefit ratio, assuming the EPA's best-case scenario, is 1,600 to 1.

These costs will be passed on to consumers and will result in higher electricity prices. According to the Industrial Energy Consumers of America, a nonpartisan association of manufacturing companies with more than 650,000 employees, these increased costs will lessen competitiveness, threaten U.S. manufacturing jobs, and make our electric grid less reliable. It is everything not to like in a policy—all costs, no benefits.

National Economic Research Associates has studied the Utility MACT rule and found it would cause between 180,000 and 215,000 job losses by 2015. Further, it found that the Utility MACT rule would increase electricity rates by 6.5 percent on average and by as much as 19.1 percent in some areas of the country. An average household could see their electricity bills go up by at least $400 per year—a cost that will disproportionately impact those with lower fixed incomes, such as many older Americans.

This resolution is the best opportunity to begin fighting back against President Obama's war on coal. By passing S.J. Res. 37, we can take a stand against this administration's goal of higher electricity costs. I plan to vote for Senator INHOFE's resolution and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of the time.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we have used this element of our time. The Senator from New Hampshire will be recognized for 10 minutes, after which time we will be recognized for 18 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to the efforts to nullify the Environmental Protection Agency's mercury and air toxics standards or MATS. This far-reaching resolution would severely and permanently undermine EPA's authority to protect our Nation's air from harmful and dangerous pollutants.

In New Hampshire, we have long enjoyed bipartisan cooperation when it comes to crafting policies that ensure clean air, a strong economy, and healthy citizens. We do have coal-fired powerplants in New Hampshire, but they have scrubbers on them to clean up the air. When I was Governor, we passed the pollutant bill to address mercury, and it passed with bipartisan support.

Nobody appreciates our clean air more than a woman named Lia Houk, from Henniker, NH. She has lived with cystic fibrosis for the past 40 years. In order to breathe, she must use a nebulizer three times a day and has to exercise daily to clear her lungs. When pollution poisons the air, she suffers from chest tightness and lung hemorrhaging that can lead to hospitalization. Pollution also worsens the long-term effects of cystic fibrosis, such as lung scarring, and it causes her disease to progress more rapidly.

To protect Lia and millions like her, Congress passed the Clean Air Act, and it has long been one of our most successful public health and environmental laws. Yet despite the success of the Clean Air Act, we now face efforts to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from regulating toxic air pollutants.

At issue are the new mercury and air toxics standards, which will require powerplants to control the pollution that affects Lia and others who suffer from respiratory problems. For the first time, the standards set Federal limits on the amount of mercury, arsenic, chromium, nickel, and acid gases that powerplants can release into our air. These standards will eliminate emissions of these poisonous chemicals from the powerplants by 90 percent by 2015.

The new nationwide standards are based on widely available pollution control technologies that are already in place at powerplants across the country. They represent a realistic, achievable goal. Yet opponents of MATS argue the environmental regulations will hurt the economy. That is simply not true. These standards will benefit our health, our economy, and our environment.

By removing the largest source of many of these toxins, the new standards will prevent an estimated 17,000 premature deaths and 11,000 heart attacks each year. America's children will be spared 120,000 asthma incidents and 11,000 cases of acute bronchitis. That is particularly important for us in the Northeast. The Presiding Officer, who is from Rhode Island, knows what this is because we are in the tailpipe of the Nation in New England in the Northeast. We get all the pollution coming out of the Midwest from those dirty powerplants. In New Hampshire, we have one of the highest children's asthma rates in the country because of that pollution.

Far from being job killers, these regulations will mean new work for the innovative American companies that supply the equipment needed for plants to comply with the law. In fact, a study by the Economic Policy Institute found that enactment of these standards would create a net gain of 117,000 jobs.

Of course, clean air is also vital to the tourism and outdoor recreation economy, which, in my State, is the second largest industry.

All the beautiful sights of our State, from the White Mountains to the Great Bay, can only be enjoyed if our air is free of smog and clean to breathe.

So as we consider whether to keep the Clean Air Act in place, we don't have to choose between helping people such as Lia or helping our economy. We can and we must do both.

I urge my colleagues to reject the resolution that Senator INHOFE has offered and to continue to protect the health and welfare of our citizens.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, the next speaker will be Senator HOEVEN for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Utility MACT issue.

EPA's Utility MACT rule is a clear example of how overzealous regulations and a lack of a sensible energy policy are derailing investment and costing America jobs.

I support good, responsible policies to protect human health and safeguard our environment. These rules, however, need to bear the qualities of all good rules: They need to be simple, efficient, achievable, and affordable. In short, they need to make sense from both an environmental and economic perspective.

Unfortunately, as written, the Utility MACT rule—and others similar to it that the EPA is proposing—fails to find that proper balance. To the contrary, burdensome and complex new rules for the coal industry will not only discourage responsible energy growth but will prompt the complete shutdown of dozens of powerplants.

That will increase energy costs for consumers and businesses and, sadly, force thousands of hard-working Americans onto the unemployment rolls.

Utility MACT alone will require powerplants to install costly emission controls by 2015, with a pricetag for compliance of nearly $10 billion annually.

Moreover, EPA has made it clear there will only be limited extensions to give utilities the time they need to make the changes. We now have an opportunity to vote either to retain or reject the Utility MACT rule under the Congressional Review Act.

In fact, it is exactly this kind of rule that the Congressional Review Act was designed to address, by allowing Congress to review a new regulation and overrule it if that regulation is unfair or overreaching.

So we can send the EPA back to the drawing board and insist that the Agency come up with a plan that is simpler, more affordable and, most important, that is fairer by taking into account the livelihoods of hard-working Americans and their families. That is exactly what we need to do.

In my State of North Dakota, we have a lot of coal-fired electric generation. We supply power not only to our State but to the surrounding States as well—Minnesota, South Dakota, Montana, and well beyond. The reality is that we are producing more power, more electricity, and we are doing it with better environmental stewardship because, in our State, we have created the right legal tax and regulatory climate to stimulate that private investment, which is driving the new technology. In fact, we not only produce coal-fired electricity, we convert coal into synthetic natural gas. But we are successfully doing that because we are driving the investment that is spurring the new technology that is producing more energy. And as we produce more energy, that same technology is also enabling us to do it with better environmental stewardship.

That is the win that we all seek. That is the win we all seek. Because that is not only about providing more electricity, more power, more energy for this country at a lower cost so that consumers benefit, it is also about creating high-quality, high-paying jobs for our American workers and, at the same time, providing better environmental technology through this investment, providing better environmental stewardship through this investment in new technologies. That is exactly what is happening, because we are empowering the industry to produce more electricity to develop, to grow and, again, to develop the technology that produces more technology with the better stewardship.

That is the direction we need to go, and that is why I urge my colleagues to vote for this Congressional Review Act that would require EPA to go back and redraft this rule. It is in the interest of the American workers whose jobs depend on the coal industry, and, ultimately, it is in the best interest of Americans who not only need the energy but, again, as we are able to continue to develop the technology, we produce better and better environmental stewardship.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator, and I now recognize the Senator from Alabama for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague Senator INHOFE, who has been such a leader on these issues and has contributed so much to the national discussion as we wrestle with the challenges of trying to have affordable energy for Americans to maintain our business competitiveness and improve the quality of our air and environment. And we can do those things. We have been doing those things, and we are going to continue to do those things. But this Senate Joint Resolution 37 dealing with Utility MACT provides us an opportunity to make a strong statement and reject the program the EPA has adopted that will damage this economy, will drive up the cost of energy for every American throughout this country, drive up the cost of energy for American businesses that are struggling now to hire workers and be competitive.

If we have an advantage on the world market today, every expert tells us it is because of a decline in natural gas prices, and we have competitive electricity prices from coal. So we have competitive electricity prices from our largest source—coal—and we have surprising, wonderful new finds in natural gas that are allowing our energy to be cheaper too. This helps us create jobs and growth.

Yet we have within the administration a number of people—and, I hate to say, all the way to the top—who seem to believe that cheap energy is not a goal, that cheap energy is not something that should be brought forth, I guess because that would make their alternative sources—solar and wind and other things—even less competitive than they are today. We will develop those programs. We can seek to advance those programs. But in truth, we should not be mandating these much higher costs on the American people, hammering our economy, which, in effect, is a tax increase on the American economy.

So this is a $90 billion rule—the most expensive environmental rule in our Nation's history. And $90 billion is the amount the EPA acknowledges this rule will cost. The Congressional Review Act that Senator INHOFE has triggered says we can have this vote, this review of any regulation over $100 million, and $90 billion is 900 times larger than $100 million. It is the largest rule in American history. It changes the course of our economy. It is the kind of thing that Members who are elected to answer to the American people should be voting on, not having it done within basically a bureaucratic process, without having elected individuals engaged in it.

But the Congressional Review Act has a fundamental weakness. That weakness is that if the Congress votes to overturn an act, the President can veto it. We have this odd situation where the President appoints the bureaucrats. He appoints the head of the EPA. And all the people working throughout the executive branch and for the President, directly or indirectly—directly, really—produce the regulations the President desires they produce. They do not produce regulations he does not desire they produce. So the result is that Congress has an awfully difficult time overturning it because the President can veto what we pass. We need something like the REINS Act that would actually replace this unconstitutional, nontraditional procedure of impacting our economy with monumental regulations and putting that back to the Congress so that Congress is required to vote on the regulation.

My time, I know, is running out, but I want to reiterate that the impact of the regulations, if not changed, will

drive up the cost of energy for every single American and for all businesses in America. It will achieve only a modest improvement in mercury reductions over what President Bush proposed, and it is so extreme that it hammers coal processing and energy production in America, basically making coal no longer a realistic way to produce electricity in America. That is a huge event that impacts the economy. Fundamentally, this regulation would say that, yes, we have reduced mercury emissions by 50 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes, we would reduce the emissions of mercury since 1990 by 50 percent. Yes, President Bush proposed a very effective, sophisticated plan to further reduce those emissions by 75 percent—75 percent more. But there were problems with it. The courts found a problem with it. But instead of pursuing the matter in the fashion President Bush did, the new regulations call for this dramatic 90-percent reduction of mercury emissions, far more than we are able to do technologically and financially, I believe. That is why I salute Senator INHOFE for this resolution and I will support him.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. How much time do we have remaining, including the 40 seconds we didn't use?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes on the Senator's side.

Mr. INHOFE. First, let me comment on something I am glad the Senator from Alabama brought up because it is very significant. The frailty in the CRA, for a lot of our fellow Members who are not familiar with the history of that, is that the President can veto it. I am a little hopeful in this case, if we are successful, because I wonder if the President wants to veto, a few months before the election, a bill that is going to cost the American people over 200,000 jobs this year, along with all of the other costs they admit.

The EPA itself says it will cost $10 billion, but it is going to be considerably more than that in nearly everyone else's view. So I hold that out as a hope, that even though he would love to veto it, if we are successful, I don't think he will do it because he wants to get reelected more than he wants to veto this.

I would also comment that I think it is worth bringing up that the other side had an opportunity to do something about real pollution—and we are talking about NO_X, SO_X, and mercury, not CO_2. Remember the Clear Skies Act that was such a successful operation? That was back during the Bush administration. That would have mandated the 75-percent reduction the Senator from Alabama talked about in SO_X, NO_X, and mercury. Those are real pollutants. But it was held hostage because it didn't include CO_2. At that time that was the crown jewel of their efforts.

So all I can say in this remaining time we have is that everything has been said, although it hasn't been said by everybody, and I am not going to repeat that and be redundant. But I think the points were made by all the Senators who spoke, looking at the economy of this and how devastating this would be in terms of jobs in America. But if you look at Utility MACT, it is not about public health, it is about killing coal. And everybody knows that. Everybody knows that. People from coal States are trying to act as if that is not the case, but it is the case. I think we are all very much aware of that.

According to EPA's own analysis, Utility MACT will cost $10 billion, though others have it up higher than that. However, if $10 billion a year to implement it is correct, then it will only yield $6 million in projected benefits—health benefits. This is the EPA talking, not me. And that is at 1600-to-1 ratio. That is not a very good ratio to depend on.

I wish to address the myth that top EPA officials are perpetrating, and that is the idea coal is not being killed by the EPA regulations but by the cheaper price of natural gas. EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson said recently it is simply a coincidence that EPA's rules are coming out at the same time natural gas prices are low, so utilities are naturally moving toward natural gas. So her message was, don't blame the EPA. The truth is the EPA itself has admitted the agency deliberately and consciously made a decision to kill coal.

EPA Region 1 Administrator Curt Spalding was caught on tape saying:

> Lisa Jackson has put forth a very powerful message to the country. Just two days ago, the decision on greenhouse gas performance standard and saying basically gas plants are the performance standard which means if you want to build a coal plant you got a big problem.

He also went on to say the decision by the EPA to kill coal was ''painful every step of the way'' because you have got to remember if you go to West Virginia, you go to Pennsylvania—and he could have included other States in there too, such as Ohio, Illinois and Missouri—but he said ''and all those places, you have coal communities who depend on coal.'' And they are going to put those people out. This is a very serious attack that is taking place right now, I think, when we saw the attack on fossil fuels, as presented by Region 6 Administrator Armendariz, when he said the truth is EPA's ''general philosophy'' is to ''crucify'' and ''make examples'' of oil companies and gas companies.

I only bring that up because many people think this is just about coal. No, it is very clear about fossil fuels. This has been a relentless war of this President on fossil fuels; that is, coal, gas, and oil, ever since he has been in office. It was the president of the Sierra Club who said a short while ago, yes, Utility MACT is about killing coal. Fine, we can kill coal, but that doesn't mean we want to change and start using natural gas because it is also a fossil fuel.

It may be that over in the House it took NANCY PELOSI 6 months to recognize natural gas is a fossil fuel, but it is. So this is just the beginning. This is the one where they are admittedly trying to kill coal because it is an easier target. In their belief, there are fewer States that are the big producers of coal, so go after them first.

I know my time has expired. I only want to say in closing that we will have another opportunity tomorrow. There are many other people wanting to be heard who don't want to kill coal and have this dramatic negative effect on our economy, our jobs, and our ability to produce the necessary energy to run this machine called America.

If we are dependent upon just under 50 percent for our entire generation ability on coal, imagine, if they are successful, what is going to happen to the price of the remaining available fuel? And of course they would be subject next. So I would urge our people to forget for a short period of time this President's obligation to certain small groups and oppose the Utility MACT.

We went through the same thing with greenhouse gases and we fought that battle before, I say to my good friend Senator BOXER from California. At that time, there were many legislative efforts to kill greenhouse gases, and yet every time there was a vote, the people who were answerable to the American people were the ones who voted it down. Now there might be, at most, 25 left in the Senate in favor of greenhouse gas emissions.

I urge Members to pass my CRA and let the President decide what he is going to do about vetoing this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I would like to take 3 minutes now, then yield up to 15 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey. I would then ask my friend, the Senator from Rhode Island—who is in the chair—to take up to 15 minutes, if he would like, and I will sit in the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I just wish to say to my colleague Senator INHOFE before he leaves, that under this President we have seen more domestic energy production than we have seen probably in decades and decades—more domestic energy production and less reliance on imported oil than we have seen in decades and decades. So let's not attack President Obama for not working to ensure that we have the

domestic capacity here at home to produce energy, because we are producing it from all sources.

The other point I wish to make is that my friends on the other side are ignoring the facts. The facts are that for every $1 to $3 that will be invested in clean utilities, we get back $9 in benefits. The Presiding Officer has spoken on this quite often, and the fact is there are many benefits to doing this.

The other point I wish to make—which is very important—is that one-half of our coal-fired powerplants have already made these important technology upgrades. That is wonderful news. Why would we reward companies that haven't done what these others have done, that are continuing to spew forth the most dangerous chemicals? The list of them goes on and on. But we are talking about mercury, we are talking about arsenic, lead, and formaldehyde. I will get into that, but if we allow this congressional resolution to pass, why would we be rewarding the most recalcitrant utilities that are not cleaning up when the technology is clearly there?

There is a cost-benefit ratio. Our kids will breathe better. Later on tonight, I will spell out how many deaths will be avoided, how many asthma attacks will be avoided. We hear a little coughing in the Chamber today. That is the sound, unfortunately, we hear in classrooms all over this country. If we go into a classroom and we ask how many kids have asthma, one-third of the kids will raise their hand. If we say: How many of you know someone with asthma or have asthma yourself, half the kids will raise their hand.

So this isn't benign. What my colleague is doing is essentially pushing forward a resolution that would stop the Environmental Protection Agency from doing its job that we asked them to do 20 long years ago when we passed the Clean Air Act amendments.

It is my privilege to yield up to 15 minutes to Senator LAUTENBERG, followed by the Presiding Officer, Senator WHITEHOUSE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I thank Senator BOXER for her leadership in resisting these attempts to be able to permit companies to continue to pollute the air, a risk to our children, and marshaling the forces to say no to this.

I feel this may be a lesson I learned when I was in business school at Columbia: If we spend money here, we might save it there. But if we don't spend it, we are liable to lose something—a child, the child's ability to function. What kind of a proposition are we looking at? This isn't an accounting exercise. We are talking about the well-being of our children.

I will say, we may have disagreements between our sides, but I believe Republicans care as much about their kids on their side as we do on ours. But in this debate, they would say they have to take care of the power companies and permit them to emit poisonous ingredients into the air. So I think the sentence would be more completely said: Rather than take advantage of protecting our children, we would rather continue the profit buildup. It is preposterous when we think about it.

We have to continue the standards for powerplants that emit mercury pollution, which is brain poison for our children. We have to make sure we don't relinquish and permit this contagious material to continue to be put into the air.

Under the proposal of our friend from Oklahoma, Senator INHOFE, companies should be free to spew toxic air pollution out of their smokestacks, regardless of whether it goes into neighborhoods where our children play or in the path of their exercise and games.

This is a picture we would see. We have all seen it at different times in our lives. But we have learned something over the years. We have learned we can reduce this threat that comes out of these smokestacks.

We have a devil of a time in the State of New Jersey because it is from States to the west of us from which we get much of the pollution in our communities. Even if we had a State's option, fully, we couldn't do much about it if our neighbors to the west permit their companies to emit poisons into the air.

The standards Senator INHOFE wants to overturn—the Clean Air Act amendments—were approved by Republicans and Democrats over 20 years ago, in 1990. Most Americans would be disappointed to learn that powerplants have been free to put unlimited amounts of mercury into the air that our children breathe. After years of delay and dirty air, the new standards will finally require powerplants to cut mercury pollution. Mercury is a highly toxic brain poison. Even in low doses, mercury can cause damage to fetuses and infants that permanently affect the child's development.

Every year, 630,000 babies are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Let's be clear about what this means. Mercury is poison, and children are being born with it coarsing through their veins. These children suffer from brain damage, learning disabilities, hearing loss. The mercury they are born with can damage their kidneys, liver, and nervous systems.

The powerplants that spew mercury also emit pollutants that trigger asthma attacks. Unfortunately, I have had the ability to see a child with an asthma attack. It happens to be my grandson. When he is gasping for air, if someone said: How much would you pay to relieve your grandson of the gasping or the trauma that comes with that kind of condition, there is no cost that would be too much. Anyone who has seen an asthmatic child wheeze and struggle to breathe knows we would do anything in our power to prevent asthma attacks.

EPA standards prevent 130,000 asthma attacks from occurring each year. Imagine that. We are protecting 130,000 asthma attacks from occurring to our kids every year. So why are Republicans proposing to erase limits on mercury pollution? We already know EPA's new standards will save and improve lives.

EPA estimates this rule would prevent 130,000 asthma attacks, 4,700 heart attacks, and up to 11,000 premature deaths. What kind of a calamity is worse than that? There isn't any. Heaven help those families who are tortured by learning that the problems they have for their children's school accomplishments could have been avoided and for every $1 we spend to reduce pollution, we get $3 to $9 in health benefits. A child with pollution in her body is set back from day one and is going to carry that disability for her full life.

The polluters ignore the cost to American families. These companies think their right to pollute is more important than our kids' right to breathe. I can't believe they are willing to risk the health of a baby in their home or their grandchildren's home.

They say that cleaning up their act will cut into their profits, but we know clean air isn't just good for our health; it can be good for business. For proof, we look no further than in my State of New Jersey and our largest utility, Public Service Electric & Gas. They invested $1.5 billion to upgrade their powerplants. PSE&G cut emissions of mercury and acid gases by 90 percent or more, and they created more than 1,600 new jobs in the process. That is the real picture. That is what happens. It is clear what this resolution, as proposed, would do. It would effectively kill any EPA action to reduce mercury now or in the future. It is unacceptable.

I say to those people who come from coal States: Clean up the air. Spend the money. You are going to spend it one way or another. Wouldn't you rather spend it on doing something that is positive for the environment rather than risking your child's health? I think there is no comparison.

We had an unfortunate incident in my family. I had a sister who was asthmatic. When she traveled, she always carried a respirator that she could plug into a cigarette lighter, and if she started to feel uncomfortable from beginning to wheeze, she could put this on and her breathing would clear up. She had been elected to the school board.

She was at a school board meeting and she felt an attack coming on. She got up to go to her car in the parking lot to get some relief from her inability to breathe. She collapsed in the parking lot and 3 days later she expired. She was 53 years old.

What is the price of a life? This was an adult. What about the life of a child, and we compare it to the costs? That is all we have heard about. The other side sounds like a bunch of accountants

when they talk about how much will this cost. How much does it cost for a child who can't learn? How much does it cost to live life with a child whose body is impaired and they can't function? What is the cost?

The cost can't be explained in dollars. The cost is: What is right in our society? Do we have the obligation to try and protect the children who live in our country? I think so. Let the companies figure out ways to improve the quality of their air emissions. It is pretty simple. If they do, the problem can be solved. But to say no, no, this will cost too much—I think of a schoolyard full of little kids and I say I would like to ask them: What is it worth to see these little kids sing ring-around-the-rosie, and be happy compared to saying to the company, no, your job is to clean up your act. You have time to do it but you must do it. You cannot avoid it any longer.

It is clear what this resolution would do. It would effectively kill any EPA action to reduce mercury now or in the future. That is unacceptable. I say to my colleagues: Defeat this measure. Look at your children, look at your grandchildren, and say to yourself: What will I do to protect her; to protect him; to hear their voices nice and clear; to see them learning; to see them growing?

What is more important, to protect the powerplant that wants to emit more poisonous air and refuses to do its share? They are going to do it one way or the other. Look at your children. Look at your grandchildren. I urge my colleagues to defeat this measure.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOXER). Under the previous order, Senator WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island is recognized for up to 15 minutes.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, it is one thing to say things and it is another to say things that are true. Let us review some of the things that have been said on the floor of the Senate today in the context of this discussion.

One of my colleagues said that this rule, which will for the first time require our powerplants to meet mercury emission standards that other industries have had to meet, and have successfully met for years, is now coming on, to use his words, ''too far and too fast.''

The Clean Air Act was passed 30 years ago and, specific to this, in the year 2000 EPA began the process that has culminated in this rule determining that it would be appropriate and necessary to have a rule on this kind of hazardous air pollution being emitted by powerplants. Here we are in 2012 and we are being told that it is too fast that utilities are obliged to comply with a program that was first announced as appropriate and necessary in the year 2000. It would seem to me that a dozen years' notice is enough, particularly where other industries have already met these standards.

On that note, the same colleague said that compliance with these standards is ''nearly impossible.'' It is obviously not nearly impossible if other industries have already complied with the standard with which the electric utility industry is being asked to comply. More specifically, this rule sets the mark at a level where the highest performing 12 percent of emitters already are. They are already there. So it is not a question of compliance being nearly impossible. Compliance is actually already achieved by the good-behaving and responsible utilities that have put the technology to work to clean up their exhausts.

I have a letter that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. In this letter, 16 of my colleagues, led by myself and the distinguished Chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee, BARBARA BOXER, wrote to the President supporting this rule. We described, for one thing, a utility called Constellation, which has invested to add environmental controls and a new scrubber to its Brandon Shores facility in Maryland, cutting mercury emissions by 90 percent. Also, in addition, it created 1,385 jobs at peak construction, not counting the many more jobs manufacturing those clean air technologies. So this is not ''nearly impossible,'' this is being done regularly.

The other remark that was made by this colleague is that the country does not support EPA on this. To the contrary, actually, public health groups and officials across the country support this: the Academy of Pediatrics, the Association of Respiratory Care, the Heart Association, the Lung Association, the American Nurses Association, the Public Health Association, the March of Dimes—it is a considerable number of public health supporters.

If you want to go beyond the public health community, it is interesting to note that the faith community is very actively supporting our position, everything from the Evangelical Environmental Network to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, to the General Baptist Convention of Texas, to the National Council of Churches USA, to the Jewish Council on Public Affairs, to the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, and the United Methodist Church. To say that America does not support the EPA I think is to take a very constricted view of America. Perhaps the occupants of the electric utility boardrooms in America would be more precise.

Some of the folks who support this, interestingly, are not just health groups, but they are the electric utilities themselves. Half of the fossil fuel electric generation in the country is controlled by electric utilities that support the EPA rule. Let me read some examples from this same letter.

The chairman, president and CEO of Wisconsin Energy said, ''We really see very little impact on customer electric rates or our capital plan between now and 2015 as a result of all the new EPA regulations that have been proposed . . . . '' Very little impact.

The Senior Vice President of Energy Policy at Seminole Electric Cooperative indicated, ''If the EPA adopts a mercury role as currently proposed, Seminole would already be meeting that standard.'' So much for it being almost impossible.

Duke Energy's CEO noted, ''I think 3 years is doable,'' not too fast, doable as a compliance timeline. And the CEO of PSEG stated, ''We are also well-positioned to meet the anticipated requirements under EPA's . . . regulation.'' ''We believe these regulations are long overdue.'' Not coming too fast, ''long overdue.''

''Our experience shows that it is possible to clean the air, create jobs and power the economy, all at the same time.''

Another one of my colleagues said that higher electric bills should be measured, on the one hand, against the negligible benefits on the other hand. That was a theme that a number of colleagues adopted.

Another one said this was all costs, no benefits.

A third said this bill fails to find the proper balance between cost and benefit. And a fourth said this rule would be ''hammering our economy, in effect a tax increase.''

What are the facts? The facts are that although the rule will cost $9.6 billion to implement, because there is better health, because there are beneficial effects of not polluting our country with all of these dangerous chemicals, the benefits are between $37 and $90 billion; $9 billion in costs, $37 to $90 billion every year in savings, in benefit to our economy. On the whole, this is a huge economic win for the country. The only place where it is a problem is, again, in the boardrooms of the electric utility companies that have not been good citizens, that have not put the scrubbers on, that are trailing the rest of the industry and do not want to be forced to catch up to where other industries, and half of their industry, now is.

If you want to move off, as Senator LAUTENBERG so movingly did, the accounting of this $9 billion in cost versus $37 billion to $90 billion in benefits, there are the 11,000 lives that will be saved every year. You cannot put a price on a human life. This will save them.

The last point is that the distinguished ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Committee described a relentless war, and what he was referring to is an imagined war by the Obama administration against the

coal industry. I think if there is a relentless war out here, and I am speaking now as a Senator from Rhode Island, it is a relentless war of these polluting coal plants against the northeastern States in particular, my State in particular, that carries the burden of all the fallout of that exhaust and that pollution that they do not bother to treat at the source so it lands in our State.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the resolution in support of the EPA mercury and air toxic standards for powerplants that was adopted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I will not read the whole thing. Let's just read the concluding paragraph:

> Now, therefore, be it resolved that the U.S. Conference of Mayors strongly supports the EPA's issued Mercury and Air Toxics Standards for Power Plants.

There were no Federal standards for mercury until now for our powerplants. You would think we should have done this by now but—yes, we should have done it by now but at least we are here. At least we will achieve the benefits of $1 in cost for $3 to $9 in savings and in benefits to Americans. We should be celebrating this sensible and yet significant public health achievement.

Instead, we are engaged in a debate that I think is confounded, on their side—their arguments are confounded by the actual facts.

The benefits are staggering, in addition to the 11,000 lives saved, 4,700 fewer heart attacks, 130,000 fewer cases of children suffering asthma attacks, 5,700 fewer emergency visits each year.

Let me close by mentioning one specific. Mercury is a neurotoxin. The reason that people use the phrase ''mad as a hatter'' is because hatters, making hats, used mercury and mercury poisoned them, made them mad, affected their brains. It is a neurotoxin.

That affects Rhode Island quite considerably. First of all, we are a State that is downwind. Every Rhode Islander has heard, as we drive into work on a bright summer weekday morning, the radio warning: Today is a bad air day in Rhode Island; children, people with breathing difficulties, seniors should stay indoors today in their air conditioning.

It is a beautiful day. People have a right to be out of doors on a beautiful day. They should be celebrating, playing, picnics, going to the beach. But, no, stay indoors because there is ozone pollution settling on us from the powerplants.

In addition, the mercury comes in and that creates a different set of harms in Rhode Island. One harm is that small children should not eat any freshwater fish in Rhode Island, according to our health department. Here is a wonderful Norman Rockwell picture, sort of an emblematic American scene, grandfather is taking his grandson fishing. The excitement as the fish comes up out of the pond—that image in Rhode Island is shattered by the fact that this small child would not be allowed to eat any freshwater fish that he caught with his grandfather because of this mercury pollution that has bombarded us by these out-of-State powerplants that did not clean up their act.

Furthermore, no one in Rhode Island should eat more than one serving of freshwater fish caught in our State each month, so if the grandfather caught two fish, he could eat one, for a month, but he should not eat the other because of the health effects of the mercury that has piled up in the bodies of the fish.

There are some bodies of water that seem to be more in the gunsights of these polluting dirty Midwestern powerplants than others for reasons that nobody can explain. But Quidnick Reservoir, Wincheck Pond, and Yawgoog Pond in Rhode Island—no one should ever eat any of the fish caught in those three bodies of water because of the mercury poisoning. So when we talk about every dollar a utility will spend to clean up its pollution being offset by $3 to $9 in benefits, that figure doesn't take into account these intangible benefits. It doesn't take into account the intangible benefit of being able to enjoy the emblematic American pastime of taking your grandson or going with your grandfather to go fishing in a pond, to be able to catch something, bring it home, fry it up, and have it for supper. The utility polluters get to wreck that for free in this equation, but we should not forget it in this Chamber.

There are many aspects of the American way of life that should not yield to the bottom line of those polluters that are not willing to meet the same rules that so many of their colleagues already do and that so many industries already do.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,
WASHINGTON, DC,
December 16, 2011.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Respectfully, we urge the Administration to finalize the Utility Air Toxics Rule as scheduled on December 16, 2011, and to adhere to the compliance schedule set forth in Section 112 of the Clean Air Act. Our nation has waited far too long for a federal limit on mercury and other hazardous air pollution emitted by power plants.

The electric utility industry has been on notice for a decade that the EPA intended to limit its hazardous air pollution. In 2000, the EPA determined it was ''appropriate and necessary'' to set hazardous air pollution standards for power plants, based on the serious health effects of this pollution. Power plants are the biggest emitters of mercury, a neurotoxin that can stunt cognitive development in children and infants. Power plants are also significant emitters of toxic metals—for instance, they emit 62% of all such arsenic pollution in the air we breathe—and acid gases such as hydrochloric acid which can cause respiratory tract ailments and fluid buildup in the lungs. The rule is expected to save up to 17,000 lives per year by cutting this pollution.

Plants in 17 states have begun to control for mercury pollution. These projects protect public health, and demonstrate that updating our energy infrastructure triggers investment in new technologies and the creation of tens of thousands of jobs. Consider: Constellation invested $885 million to add environmental controls and a new scrubber to its Brandon Shores facility in Maryland, cutting mercury emissions by 90 percent. This investment created 1,385 jobs at peak construction, and many more jobs manufacturing the clean air technologies; PSEG retrofitted two of its coal facilities and installed scrubbers, creating 1,600 construction-related jobs over two years, and 24 permanent jobs; and AEP retrofitted one of its coal facilities and created more than 1,000 construction-related jobs building a scrubber, and 40 permanent jobs in operations.

AEP CEO Michael Morris said this year that when a utility retrofits a plant to comply with the Clean Air Act, ''jobs are created in the process—no question about that.'' Good environmental policy is good economic policy, as the jobs numbers—and the United States' $11 billion trade surplus in environmental technologies—demonstrate.

Most electric utilities in this country are ready for this rule. Indeed, operators of half of the fossil fuel electric generation in this country have gone on record on this point. For instance:

The Chair, President and CEO of Wisconsin Energy noted that, ''We really see very little impact on customer electric rates or our capital plan between now and 2015 as a result of all the new EPA regulations that have been proposed. . . .''

The Senior Vice President of Energy Policy at Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc., indicated that ''If the EPA adopts a mercury rule as currently proposed, Seminole would already be meeting the standard.''

Duke Energy's CEO noted that ''I think three years is doable'' as a compliance timeline for the Utility Air Toxics Rule.

The CEO of PSEG stated that, ''We are also well-positioned to meet the anticipated requirements under EPA's HAPs/MACT regulation, which is scheduled to be issued on December 16. We believe these regulations are long overdue. Our experience shows that it is possible to clean the air, create jobs and power the economy, all at the same time.''

Some utilities, however, are arguing that this rule will compromise their ability to provide reliable service. We do not believe the facts support this argument. Earlier this month, your Department of Energy released a report finding that even under the most conservative assumptions, utilities could comply with both the Transport Rule and the Utility Air Toxics Rule while providing adequate electric power in each region of the country.

Meanwhile, new generation capacity is being built. Over the next four years, utilities are constructing nearly 78 GW of new capacity, including about 38 GW of natural gas. Natural gas prices are dropping rapidly, driving both the construction of new gas-fired plants and the utilization of existing gas capacity. These gas plants are starting to outcompete inefficient coal units on price alone, separate and apart from any Clean Air Act rules.

If localized reliability issues emerge, or if a unit needs more time to comply with the Utility Air Toxics Rule, current law and long-standing practice provide off-ramps on a case-by-case basis. Upon request, EPA and

the states may grant a unit a fourth year to comply. If the unit needs more time to install controls, or if it plans to retire but needs to stay online to ensure reliability, EPA may enter into legally binding agreements with the utility to provide that necessary time.

Given that so many utilities are well-positioned to comply with the Utility Air Toxics Rule, and the flexibility afforded particular units, there is no reason for an across-the-board delay of this important public health measure. We applaud the work that EPA has undertaken to limit dangerous air pollution from power plants, and urge the Administration's approval of a final rule to be in place by December 16, 2011.

Sincerely,

SHELDON WHITEHOUSE.
PATRICK J. LEAHY.
JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN.
PATTY MURRAY.
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG.
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN.
JEANNE SHAHEEN.
KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND.
BARBARA BOXER.
JOHN F. KERRY.
DANIEL K. AKAKA.
MARIA CANTWELL.
ROBERT MENENDEZ.
BERNARD SANDERS.
JEFF MERKLEY.
RICHARD BLUMENTHAL.

EXHIBIT 2

IN SUPPORT OF EPA MERCURY AND AIR TOXICS STANDARDS FOR POWER PLANTS

Whereas, mayors recognize that mercury pollution, the majority of it coming from coal-fired power plants, represents a particularly widespread threat to families nationwide; and

Whereas, in 1990, 3 industry sectors made up ⅔ of the total mercury emissions in the nation including Medical Waste Incinerators, Municipal Waste Combustors (Waste-to-Energy); and Power Plants; and

Whereas, The first two sectors have already had to comply with mercury and air toxics rules and have reduced their mercury emission by 95%; and

Whereas, the technology to retrofit these facilities already exists and is being utilized in the other two industries; and

Whereas, because of local mercury contamination, all 50 states have fish consumption advisories in place to warn residents of the potential health effects of eating fish caught from area waters; and

Whereas, mercury poses a particular threat to vulnerable populations such as pregnant women and small children; and

Whereas, mercury is a potent neurotoxin that affects a developing child's ability to talk, walk, read and write, and in addition to learning disabilities, in utero exposure can result in severe birth defects such as blindness, deafness and cerebral palsy; and

Whereas, EPA's analysis projects that the annual cost to the regulated industry for the year 2016 (the first year in which EPA expects the standards to be fully implemented), would be $9.6 billion and the aggregate benefits for that year would be between $37–$90 billion; and

Whereas, for every dollar spent to reduce this pollution, Americans get 3–9 dollars in health benefits; and

Whereas, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) projects that the new Clean Air Act protections from reduced mercury and air toxics will save citizens as much as $90 billion annually when fully implemented through lower health care costs. Each year, this translates into as many as 11,000 lives saved, 4,700 heart attacks and 130,000 asthma attacks prevented, and 5,700 hospital visits avoided; and

Whereas, the benefits are widely distributed and are especially important to minority and low income populations who are disproportionately impacted by asthma and other debilitating health conditions; and

Whereas, clean, healthy air and water are fundamental American rights,

Now, therefore, be it Resolved that the U.S. Conference of Mayors strongly supports the EPA's issued Mercury and Air Toxics Standards for Power Plants (MATS).

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I yield the floor. 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.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. I wish to thank the Presiding Officer very much for taking the Chair again and for his beautiful statement. I thought the Senator definitely debated the issue and took apart the argument that my Republican friends made against a rule that is widely supported by the American people. The Senator cited some of the amazing organizations. I will do that again tomorrow in the debate.

Just for the sake of the folks who are still working here tonight, I don't plan to go much more than 5 minutes. It has been a very long day for everyone who works here and I respect that.

It is not only these amazing groups that are with us that want us to defeat this very dangerous resolution—my colleague named some of them—the American Nurses are among those who understand what health care is about. They see people struggling to find a breath when they come in with these attacks. Also, religious organizations recognize we are only as good as the weakest among us. As Senator LAUTENBERG pointed out so eloquently, it is our kids who get the real impact of this many times as well as adults.

What I wish to do in closing out the debate tonight—and we will have another hour of debate tomorrow—is just run through a few charts that tell the tale. The first one is: What does this resolution do? Because I know people may be following us and saying: What exactly do Senator INHOFE and his colleagues want to do? They want to repeal the rule that is about to go into place and block the Environmental Protection Agency from implementing the first-ever national mercury and air toxics standards for powerplants. These powerplants are giving off these poisons, and these poisons are going into the air.

In the case of mercury, we wind up poisoning fish, which was such a great part of my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE's presentation. So poisons are being spewed into the air from these powerplants.

In 1990, by a vote of 89 to 10 and in the House 401 to 25, we passed the Clean Air Act. Those were the amendments. It was signed by George Herbert Walker Bush. More than 20 years later, we have a court order because we didn't do what we were supposed to do. Now President Obama is doing the right thing to protect the people by moving forward with this first-ever national standard. We have to defeat this push to stop the Obama administration from doing what we wanted done since 1990 and what we wanted the then-EPA to do and it has taken this much time to get it done. Just as we are on the brink of getting this protective rule, which is so cost-efficient—for every $1 to $3, we save $9—they want to turn it around.

What is at stake? There are 4,200 to 11,000 additional premature deaths. So when people say what we do doesn't matter, I say look at this. If this rule is repealed, more people will die prematurely. We will have 4,700 heart attacks, 130,000 cases of childhood asthma symptoms, 6,300 cases of acute bronchitis, 5,700 emergency room visits and hospital admissions, 540,000 days of missed work due to respiratory illness. Again, it is $3 to $9 in benefits for every $1 invested in the powerplants, one-half of which have already done the right thing. Half the coal powerplants have done this already. So we are talking about ensuring that the rest of them do the same.

Many companies have addressed their mercury and air toxic emissions. We should thank the coal companies that have already cleaned up their act, not reward those that have delayed in installing the pollution-control equipment. Anyone on the other side who says there is no pollution-control equipment that is available and this can't be done and it is going to result in increased electric utility rates should listen to the facts. They should talk to the people who already installed these important mechanisms. They created jobs doing it, and as far as electricity prices, there was no impact.

I talked about the jobs that are provided. When we clean up these utilities, there will be 8,000 long-term jobs and 46,000 short-term jobs. It is actually a jobs bill when we clean up to current standards.

What poisonous emissions does the clean air rule address? I think this is basically where I am going to end it. I am going to mention these things, and they sound scary because they are. Mercury and lead, this is what we are asking them to clean up, and my colleagues say, no, keep on polluting. Mercury and lead damages the nervous system of children and harms the brains of infants. Arsenic sound scary? It is. It causes cancer and damages the nervous system, kidneys, and the liver. My Republican friends say: Oh, it is OK. Who cares? We should all care. How about selenium? It harms the reproductive system of wildlife. Other heavy metals such as cadmium and chromium cause cancer and harm vital organs. Benzene causes cancer and

damages immune and reproductive systems. How about this one, formaldehyde. It sounds scary. It is scary. It is a carcinogen, and that means it causes cancer—no question about that. Acid gases sound scary? They are scary. They damage the heart, the lungs, and the nervous system. Imagine breathing in acid gases and what that does to our pulmonary system. Toxic soot pollution causes respiratory illness, including asthma attacks, chronic bronchitis, heart attacks, and premature death.

Tomorrow I will go into these in greater detail. It is just a rhetorical question, but why would anyone in their right mind stand in the way of cleaning up these poisons. They say it costs too much. No, it doesn't because the companies that already did it say it is working. For every $1 we invest, we save $3 to $9. So it doesn't cost too much. Is it just about doing business as usual? That is fine if all we are doing is something that is benign. This is not benign.

My colleague Senator INHOFE attacked the President and said our President is stymieing domestic energy production when we have the opposite truth. We have seen a tremendous increase in domestic energy production under this President, more than we have seen for decades. So don't blame this President and say he is trying to stymie domestic energy production. He has embraced an all-of-the-above strategy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a paper entitled ''Develop and Secure America's Energy Supplies.''

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVELOP AND SECURE AMERICA'S ENERGY SUPPLIES—EXPAND SAFE AND RESPONSIBLE DOMESTIC OIL AND NATURAL GAS DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION

''All these actions can increase domestic oil production in the short and medium term. But let's be clear—it is not a long-term solution''—President Obama, March 11, 2010.

THE CHALLENGE

America's oil and natural gas supplies are critical components of our Nation's energy portfolio. Their development enhances our energy security and fuels our Nation's economy. Recognizing that America's oil supplies are limited, we must develop our domestic resources safely, responsibly, and efficiently, while taking steps that will ultimately lessen our reliance on oil and help us move towards a clean energy economy.

Over the last two years, domestic oil and natural gas production has increased. In 2010, American oil production reached its highest level since 2003, and total U.S. natural gas production reached its highest level in more than 30 years. Much of this increase has been the result of growing natural gas and oil production from shale formations as a result of recent technological advances. These resources, when developed with appropriate safeguards to protect public health, will play a critical role in domestic energy production in the coming decades.

America's public lands and Federal waters provide resources that are critical to the nation's energy security. To encourage robust exploration and development of the nation's resources, the Administration has offered millions of acres of public land and Federal waters for oil and gas leasing over the last two years. Oil production from the Outer Continental Shelf increased more than a third—from 446 million barrels in 2008 to more than 600 million barrels of estimated production in 2010. Responsible oil production from onshore public lands also increased over the past year—from 109 million barrels in 2009 to 114 million barrels in 2010. These increases are occurring at the same time that oil imports are decreasing; for the first time in a decade, imports accounted for less than half of what we consumed.

Mrs. BOXER. It shows how U.S. crude oil production is way up under President Obama. It is way up. Over the last 2 years domestic oil and natural gas production has increased. In 2010, American oil production reached its highest level since 2003 and total U.S. natural gas production has reached its highest level in more than 30 years. How can my colleagues stand and say this President doesn't like the coal companies and is trying to push them out of business so we will have less energy production? Wrong. What he is trying to do and we are trying to do—those of us who are going to oppose the Inhofe resolution—is say we want to see coal continue, but we don't want it to spew forth—mercury, arsenic, selenium, other heavy metals, benzene, formaldehyde, acid gases, and toxic soot. It is pretty straightforward. Clean it up.

When I was a kid, my mother said: Clean your room. She said: You made a mess so clean it. I see some of the pages are smiling because their mothers say the same to them. What I found as I matured over the years is that we need to come back to some of those basics. Clean up your mess. They are making a mess. But it is not the benign mess that is in some of the bedrooms of our kids, with toys, papers, and clothes scattered around; it is dangerous toxins, and it has to be cleaned up.

Tomorrow is an important vote. I hope tonight people will think about this debate because a lot of the things we do here maybe don't have such a direct impact on people's lives. This has a direct impact. What we breathe and the fish we eat are all related to what is going to happen tomorrow. I hope we will vote no on the Inhofe resolution and allow the EPA to do its work which 75 percent of the American people support. They want clean air, they want clean water, and we want to make sure they get it without interference. Let's vote down the Inhofe resolution and move forward with clean air. I think we will all be proud tomorrow if we can defeat that resolution.

I note the absence of a quorum and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERAN CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASE AWARENESS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I would like to take a moment to recognize the Department of Veterans Affairs and the American Heart Association for their work to raise awareness about the dangers of cardiovascular disease amongst our Nation's women veterans and service members.

VA's dedicated work on cardiovascular disease has successfully decreased the gaps between men and women veterans in heart disease prevention outcomes. However, as cardiovascular disease remains the No. 1 killer of women, I applaud VA and the American Heart Association's ''Go Red for Women'' campaign for partnering under the First Lady's Joining Forces Initiative to raise awareness and promote prevention amongst our Nation's female veterans. I am pleased to see VA focus its efforts on educating women veterans through an online fitness and nutrition program and an online support network to connect women with other women who share similar experiences.

Today, women serve in every branch of the military. Women represent 15 percent of our Nation's Active-Duty military, and they are the fastest growing population within the veteran community. The number of women veterans is expected to increase to 2 million in 2020 and with this projected increase it is critical that VA remain responsive to the unique needs of women.

Nearly one in two women, 44.4 percent, will die of heart disease and stroke. We must ensure that women receive equal access to VA health care benefits and services. This partnership between VA and the American Heart Association is a great step toward ensuring that women are educated on the dangers of cardiovascular disease and provided with the resources necessary to prevent it.

Mr. President, I applaud the collaboration between VA and the American Heart Association to raise awareness and increase prevention efforts on an issue that affects so many of our Nation's women veterans and civilian women throughout our country.

OBSERVING WORLD REFUGEE DAY

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President. Abraham Lincoln once spoke of our Nation as the last best hope on earth. On this World Refugee Day—the 11th of its kind and the 61st anniversary of the

United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees—it is fitting that we give careful pause to remember that the responsibility attached to Lincoln's words does not end at our shores.

Across the world, refugees need our assistance and our support. They look to America's voice and leadership to champion their plight—from the dusty plains of northern Kenya to the mountainous confines of Burma, Nepal and Southwest Asia.

As we look around the world, there are, sadly, numerous refugee crises. In many cases, refugees exchange one set of dangerous conditions for overcrowded, unsanitary and even violent camps. Instability in Somalia is swelling the ranks of the world's largest refugee complex in Dadaab, Kenya, home to nearly 500,000 people. In the Sahel, more than 150,000 Malians have fled the conflict to neighboring countries, joining host communities that are already suffering from drought and hunger. To them, daily survival is a gamble.

We also know that refugees and displaced populations can be the spark for large-scale violence, and today we face that very threat from the millions displaced from homes across the Middle East. Unspeakable violence in Syria has uprooted an estimated 500,000 people inside the country and driven tens of thousands more to Jordan, Turkey, Lebanon and Iraq. Human security in Iraq continues to be a pressing concern, as our partners support hundreds of thousands of Iraqi refugees in neighboring countries and over one million internally displaced persons.

Of course, there are glimmers of hope. As Burma slowly and steadily opens its political system, we will look to the government to provide space for humanitarian action to assist those displaced by years of conflict. Have a thought for the Burmese refugee in limbo along the border with Thailand or the young ethnic Rohingya who is denied even the basic identity papers that connote official personhood. They, too, deserve our attention, compassion and support.

In South Asia, more than 5.7 million Afghan refugees have returned home in the past decade, one of the UN's most successful voluntary repatriation operations. We must celebrate this achievement, even as we renew efforts to find durable solutions for the nearly 3 million Afghan refugees scattered across the region. In Colombia, where conflict has displaced an estimated 4 million people, our partners are helping the government to provide reparations and land restitution to affected individuals and families. We also continue to support the UN Relief and Works Agency in its efforts to provide assistance to millions of Palestinian refugees in the Palestinian territories and throughout the region.

Above all, we must remember that these aren't just statistics. The plight of the world's refugee and displaced populations is a challenge to the humanity of every single one of us. Children who need proper nutrients and access to education, women who are at great risk of falling victim to gender-based violence, individuals with psycho-social needs after witnessing devastation—these realities prick our conscience from half a world away.

Mr. President: Lincoln used to say that he ''tried to pluck a thistle and plant a flower wherever the flower would grow . . . '' Despite our trying times, we should remember all those who have planted the seeds of hope and opportunity where thistles would otherwise grow, from the State Department's Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration and its partners in the UN to international, faith-based and non-governmental organizations in the field. Let us also recognize the efforts of the organizations that provide guidance and services to give refugees resettled in the United States the opportunity to rebuild their lives here—and thank the communities across the country, including in my State of Massachusetts, who welcome them to their adoptive homes. Their legacy is ours, too. And the next chapter is waiting to be written.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING JOSEPH A. LESNIEWSKI

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments to commemorate a great Pennsylvanian who passed away on May 23, 2012. Those who worked alongside this high-spirited citizen of Erie, PA knew him as a hard worker, those who served alongside him in World War II knew him as a selfless soldier, while others who worked with him at the United States Post Office knew him as a devoted civil servant; still, many more around the world knew this great Pennsylvanian as World War II veteran Private Lesniewski, of the 101st Airborne Division, immortalized in the book and HBO series ''Band of Brothers.'' Today I would like to commemorate and take stock of this remarkable life: Joseph A. Lesniewski, an influential and inspirational citizen of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Joseph A. Lesniewski passed away at a Veterans Affairs Medical Center at the age of 91; he was survived by his wife of 38 years, Phyllis Schindley Lesniewski; and his four daughters, two sons, two sisters, six grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren. From Mr. Lesniewki's work with General Electric, to his service in World War II, to his 37 years serving our country at the Erie Post Office, Mr. Lesniewski embodied the American spirit of dedication to country and unyielding resolve during several of our country's most trying times.

After graduating from Erie Technical High School in 1940 and faced with a battered world economy, Mr. Lesniewski joined the Civilian Conservation Corps, a New Deal Program that helped weather the Great Depression and achieve the skills necessary for a position as a tool and die maker in General Electric's Erie, PA factory. Following the bombing of Pearl Harbor, Mr. Lesniewski enlisted in the United States Army in 1942, where he served in the storied 101st Airborne Division during the momentous Battle of Normandy, Operation Market Garden, and the Battle of the Bulge. Mr. Lesniewski and his comrades were later immortalized in historian Stephen E. Ambrose's book, Band of Brothers, which illustrated the common acts of heroism displayed in World War II by our soldiers. Ambrose wrote that Lesniewski took German-grenade shrapnel to his neck while alerting his fellow comrades to take cover after he discovered a machine gun nest and an entire company of SS soldiers just yards away. Lesniewki's selfless actions led to the capture of both the machine gun nest and the company of SS soldiers. In another incident, Private Lesniewski disregarded his own safety during a German artillery barrage and marked the spot where an unexploded German shell had burrowed itself into the ground. This action helped to ensure the safety of his fellow soldiers.

After helping to keep others alive on numerous occasions, and serving as a source of strength and inspiration to the soldiers around him, Mr. Lesniewski re-entered the civilian workforce in 1945 and served for 37 years at the United States Post Office in Erie, PA. A historian and close friend of Mr. Lesniewski once said:

> Over the years I saw a thousand acts of random kindness come from him. He had a heart of gold. He never stopped giving, as he was proudly involved in numerous charitable causes in his community.

As a testament to his heroism, Senator JOHN KERRY invited Mr. Lesniewski to join him at the 2004 dedication of the World War II Memorial in Washington, DC.

As we commemorate the valiant life of Joseph Lesniewski, we should not forget that our country has survived seemingly insurmountable challenges in our history. We survived these dire times due to the dedication to country and unyielding resolve found uniquely in our citizenry, symbolized so clearly through the life of Joseph A. Lesniewski. Let us not forget the words of Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg, ''It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced.'' So then, with reflection on the life of Mr. Lesniewski, who so nobly advanced our country in both military and civilian roles, let us continue our dedication to the unfinished work before us: the work of building a better country and ensuring that the lives of our children can and will be better than that of our own.•

REMEMBERING PATRICIA RAE McCOY ROHLEDER

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life of Patricia Rae McCoy Rohleder. An Idaho native, Pat has been an integral part of the Idaho agriculture community for many years.

Pat had a remarkable 40-year career as a newspaper reporter that included many years of covering agricultural issues through the Capital Press. The value she placed on agricultural production was evident in her activity in this field. She was involved in many related efforts, including the Julia Davis Ag Pavilion project, Idaho Food Producers legislative meetings, and work on the Ag Pavilion Committee. The long list of awards and honors she received for her work includes three Conservation Writer of the Year honors from the Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts; two media awards from the Idaho Grain Producers Association; an Idaho Farm Bureau award for outstanding reporting of agriculture; an honorary life membership received in 2009 from the Owyhee Cattlemen's Association; and a special award for dedication and service to Idaho's agricultural industry received at the 2010 A. Larry Branen Idaho Ag Summit.

In addition to her writing, Pat had many other talents and interests including sewing, needle arts, playing the piano, and genealogy, and I understand her favorite title was ''Grandma.'' She was also an active member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Pat's action reflected her values. She always lived her life the way a person ought to and served as a great example to many. I extend my condolences to Pat's husband, Erwin Ralph Rohleder, her mother, Edna L. McCoy, and her many other family members and friends. Pat will be greatly missed.•

REMEMBERING PERRY SWISHER

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life and legacy of Joseph ''Perry'' Swisher. A third-generation Idahoan, Perry committed much of his life to service to our State and Idahoans.

Perry was born in Bruneau, IA, and educated at Pocatello High School, University of Idaho Southern Branch and Idaho State University. He had an extensive career as a journalist and in elected office. This included his work as the Pocatello News Bureau manager for the Salt Lake Tribune, editor and publisher of the Intermountain, and assistant managing editor for the Lewiston Morning Tribune. In the late 1960s through mid 1970s, Perry owned The Book Arcade in Pocatello. For 7 years, he served as director of special services at Idaho State University and was involved in helping low-income and minority students succeed in college. He also served as a member and president of the Idaho Public Utilities Commission, as Idaho State representative of Bannock County, Idaho State senator for Bannock County, and as a member of the Pocatello City Council. Perry received many awards and honors for his work and served on a number of boards and commissions.

His immense experience in many aspects of the communities he lived in and the State contributed to his deep understanding of Idaho and Idahoans. Perry was known for his ability to simplify complex issues and make them understandable. He was sharp and inquisitive and had a propensity for debate and thought-provoking discussions. Perry had a comprehensive knowledge and sense of Idaho history, which he was willing to share if asked. Although his political partisan affiliations were famously known to shift according to the cyclical vagaries of political thought, his own view of the world remained consistent. His view of current events, always stated in the context of Idaho history, was of enormous value to many, including to those in my office. He also had an innate kindness and fabulous sense of humor that made the lessons he delivered particularly enjoyable.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to Perry's wife of 64 years, Nicky Swisher, his children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and many other family members and friends. Perry was truly exceptional. His steadfast determination and efforts in support of and to better our state will always be remembered.•

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL D. LEE

• Mr. LEE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the career of Police Chief Michael D. Lee, who is retiring after 34 years with the Kaysville Police Department.

Chief Lee was the eighth officer hired by Kaysville City in 1977. He started as the first school resource officer for Kaysville and rose through the ranks becoming a detective sergeant in 1988. He was subsequently promoted to lieutenant over the Patrol Services Division, and in 2007 he became the captain of the Investigative Services Division. In 2008, he was named chief of police for Kaysville City and has served the citizens honorably.

During his time at the Kaysville Police Department, Lee has helped to oversee the force's evolution into the 21st century. As new technologies have become available, Lee has pushed the department to continue to modernize, acquiring equipment ranging from advanced speed radar systems to laptops for patrol cars.

Passing the tradition of public service from one generation to another, Lee's son, Jason, has entered into his own law enforcement career. He protects the public as a patrol sergeant for the Morgan County Sheriff's office.

I join Kaysville Mayor Steve Hiatt and the local community in congratulating Michael D. Lee for his many years of dedicated service. I want to personally thank him for protecting and serving so many Utahns and bringing honor to a name that we share. His career is a testament to the accomplishments of hardworking police officers everywhere, and I congratulate him on his many achievements and 34 years of excellence.•

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a withdrawal which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The nomination received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:23 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 404. An act to modify a land grant patent issued by the Secretary of the Interior.

S. 684. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of land to the town of Alta, Utah.

S. 997. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to extend a water contract between the United States and the East Bench Irrigation District.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1272. An act to provide for the use and distribution of the funds awarded to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, et al., by the United States Court of Federal Claims in Docket Numbers 19 and 188, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1556. An act to amend the Omnibus Indian Advancement Act to allow certain land to be used to generate income to provide funding for academic programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3668. An act to prevent trafficking in counterfeit drugs.

H.R. 4027. An act to clarify authority granted under the Act entitled ''An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes''.

At 2:33 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4310. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe

military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1272. An act to provide for the use and distribution of the funds awarded to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, et al. by the United States Court of Federal Claims in Docket Numbers 19 and 188, and for otner purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 1556. An act to amend the Omnibus Indian Advancement Act to allow certain land to be used to generate income to provide funding for academic programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 3668. An act to prevent trafficking in counterfeit drugs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4027. An act to clarify authority granted under the Act entitled ''An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4310. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following joint resolution was discharged pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 802(c), and placed on the calendar:

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to disapprove a rule promulgated by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency relating to emission standards for certain steam generating units.

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–6528. A communication from the Inspector General of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the audit of the financial statements of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6529. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Award Fee for Service and End-Item Contracts'' (RIN2700–AD70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6530. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the Department of Transportation, Research and Innovative Technology Administration in the position of Administrator, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6531. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration in the position of Administrator, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6532. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Llano, Texas)'' (MB Docket No. 11–168, RM–11642) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6533. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures'' (RIN0648–BB85 and RIN0648–BB27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6534. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Snapper Grouper Management Measures'' (RIN0648–BB10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6535. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Deep-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XC001) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6536. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Recreational Management Measures for the Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Fishing Year 2012'' (RIN0648–BC07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6537. A communication from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of two violations of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–6538. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Methyl bromide; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9352–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6539. A communication from the Acting Director of the Legislative Affairs Division, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Appeal Procedures'' (RIN0578–AA59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6540. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Chronic Wasting Disease Herd Certification Program and Interstate Movement of Farmed or Captive Deer, Elk, and Moose'' ((RIN0579–AC35) (Docket No. 00–108–8)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6541. A communication from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Atlanta, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's management reports and statements on system of internal controls for fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6542. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, with respect to Belarus; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6543. A communication from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Departmental Offices, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Assessment of Fees on Large Bank Holding Companies and Nonbank Financial Companies Supervised by the Federal Reserve Board To Cover the Expenses of the Financial Research Fund'' (RIN1505–AC42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6544. 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; Revisions to the Georgia State Implementation Plan'' (FRL No. 9686–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6545. 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; Massachusetts; Determination of Attainment of the 1997 Ozone Standard for the Western Massachusetts Nonattainment Area'' (FRL No. 9688–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6546. 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; Texas; Determination of Failure to Attain the 1-Hour Ozone Standard'' (FRL No. 9688–3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6547. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval, Disapproval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plan; Utah; Maintenance Plan for the 1-Hour Ozone Standard for Salt Lake and Davis Counties'' (FRL No. 9683–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6548. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''TSCA Inventory Update Reporting Modifications; Chemical Data Reporting; 2012 Submission Period Extension'' (FRL No. 9353–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6549. A communication from the Chief of the Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Dusky Gopher Frog (Previously Mississippi Gopher Frog)'' (RIN1018–AW89) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6550. A communication from the Chief of the Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revised Designation of Critical Habitat for the Pacific Coast Population of the Western Snowy Plover'' (RIN1018–AX10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6551. 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 ''Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates'' (Notice 2012–43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2012; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6552. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 12–061); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6553. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 12–041); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6554. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 12–026); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6555. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Health, United States, 2011''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6556. A communication from the Surgeon General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the National Prevention, Health Promotion and Public Health Council's 2012 annual status report; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6557. 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 ''Irradiation in the Production, Processing, and Handling of Food'' (Docket No. FDA–2007–F–0390) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6558. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''Review of HIV Program Effectiveness''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6559. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6560. A communication from the Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6561. A communication from the Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of the Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6562. A communication from the Program Manager, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Residency Requirements for Aliens Acquiring Firearms'' (RIN1140–AA44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2012; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–6563. A communication from the Program Manager, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Firearms Disabilities for Certain Nonimmigrant Aliens'' (RIN1140–AA08) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2012; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–6564. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Hart-Scott-Rodino Annual Report: Fiscal Year 2011''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. KERRY for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Edward M. Alford, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of The Gambia.

Nominee: Edward M. Alford.

Post: Banjul, The Gambia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: 0.
2. Spouse: 0.
3. Children and Spouses: Angela Alford/Pablo Conga: 0. Sylvia Alford: 0. James C. Alford: 0.
4. Parents: William L. Alford, Sr.: 0. Eleanor G. Alford: 0.
5. Grandparents: Deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Dr. William L. Alford, Jr.: 0. Byron P. Alford/Ginny Alford: 0.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Martha Morfit: 0.

---

*Peter William Bodde, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal.

Nominee: Peter William Bodde.

Post: Nepal.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.
2. Spouse: none.
3. Children and Spouses: Son—Christopher Bodde, $200, Fall 2008, Obama for America.
4. Parents: William Bodde, Jr., $200, 9/22/08, Obama for America.
5. Grandparents: none.
6. Brothers and spouses: none.
7. Sisters and spouses: none.

---

*Piper Anne Wind Campbell, of the district of Columbia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mongolia.

Nominee: Piper Anne Wind Campbell.

Post: Ambassador to Mongolia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $1,000, 8/13/2008, Obama for America.
2. Spouse: none.
3. Children and spouses: none.
4. Parents: Gay Campbell, none; David Campbell, $1,000, 10/13/2010, DNC Services Corp; $2,500, 5/14/2011, Kathy Hocul for Congress; $1,000, 12/02/2009, Citizens for Alen Khazei; $1,000, 11/02/2008, Obama for America.
5. Grandparents: Neil Campbell—deceased; Gertrude Campbell—deceased; Ed Wind—deceased; Amelta Wind—deceased.
6. Brothers and spouses: Todd Campbell, none; Alicia Campbell, none; Skip Campbell, none; Christina Campbell, none.
7. Sisters and spouses: April Cyr, none; Kris Cyr, none.

---

*Dorothea-Maria Rosen, of California, 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 Federated States of Micronesia.

Nominee: Dorothea-Maria Rosen.

Post: Micronesia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.
2. Spouse: none.
3. Children and spouses: Dory Schachner (daughter-in-law), $20, 2010, DNC.
4. Parents: none.
5. Grandparents: none.
6. Brothers and spouses: none.
7. Sisters and spouses: none.

---

*Mark L. Asquino, of the District of Columbia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to

be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Equatorial Guinea.

Nominee: Mark Asquino.

Post: Equatorial Guinea.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $75, 6–30–11, DNC.

3. Children and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: None.

---

*Michele Jeanne Sison, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Maldives.

Nominee: Michele J. Sison.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka and the Republic of Maldives.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: Michele J. Sison: 0.

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Alexandra K. Knight: 0; Jessica K. Knight: 0.

4. Parents: Pastor B. Sison: 0; Veronica T. Sison: 0.

5. Grandparents: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: No brothers.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Victoria Sison Morimoto and Miles Morimoto: Miles Morimoto: $100, 2008, ''Organizing for America'' Democratic Party website; Cynthia Sison Morrissey and Patrick Morrissey: Cynthia Sison Morrissey for National Democratic Party: 2008–$150, 2009–$50, 2010–$50, 2011–$50.

---

*Douglas M. Griffiths, of Texas, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Mozambique.

Nominee: Douglas Griffiths.

Post: Mozambique.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self—Douglas Griffiths: None.

2. Spouse—Alicia Griffiths: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Helen Griffiths: None, Claire Griffiths: None.

4. Parents: Richard R. Griffiths: $50, 2/5/11, National Republican Congressional Committee; $50, 2/5/11, Republican National Committee (RNC); $50, 1/29/10, RNC; $50, 3/8/09, RNC; $50, 2008, RNC; $50, 2007, RNC. Alma Griffiths: Joint account with spouse Richard Griffiths.

5. Grandparents: Helen Mackin—Deceased, James Mackin—Deceased, Louise Griffiths—Deceased, Richard Griffiths—Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Richard R. Griffiths, Jr.: None; Louise Tharrett (spouse): None; Gregory Griffiths: None; Sarah Griffiths (spouse): None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: None.

---

*Jay Nicholas Anania, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Suriname.

Nominee: Jay Nicholas Anania.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Suriname.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: Lourdes Bernal Anania: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Nicholas E. Anania (19): None. Michael A. Anania (16): None.

4. Parents: Joan Marilyn Anania: None. Edward Patrick Anania: None.

5. Grandparents: All deceased more than twenty years. I have no knowledge of any political activity by any of them.

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Jill Francesca Anania: None. Dale Alison Anania: $50 (estimated), 2008, Obama for America.

---

*Susan Marsh Elliott, of Florida, 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 Tajikistan.

Nominee: Susan Marsh Elliott.

Post: Tajikistan.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount:

1. Self: 0.

2. Spouse: 0.

3. Children and Spouses: 0

4. Parents: 0.

5. Grandparents: 0.

6. Brothers and Spouses: 0.

7. Sisters and Spouses: 0.

---

*Timothy M. Broas, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

Nominee Timothy M. Broas

Post U.S. Ambassador to the Kingdom of the Netherlands

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:

1. Self: $1000, 1/4/08, NH Democratic Party; $700, 2/14/08, Democratic Party of Virginia; $2,300, 4/15/08, Becerra for Congress; $2,300, 4/23/08, Joe Garcia for Congress; $500, 6/18/08, Friends of Jay Rockefeller; $250, 6/18/08, Musgrove for U.S. Senate; $1,000, 6/18/08, Patrick Murphy for Congress; $1,000, 6/25/08, Kissell for Congress; $1,000, 6/26/08, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; $1,300, 6/30/08, Patrick Murphy for Congress; $5,000, 7/1/08, Campaign for Our Country; $28,500, 7/25/08, Obama Victory Fund; $28,500, 7/25/08, DNC via Obama Victory Fund; $2,400, 3/2/09, Friends of Byron Dorgan; $2,400, 3/31/09, Patrick Murphy for Congress; $500, 9/17/09, Friends of Patrick Kennedy Inc; $500, 10/27/09, Campaign for Our Country; $15,200, 2/3/10, Democratic National Committee; $1,000, 2/28/10, John Kerry for Senate; $1,000, 6/22/10, John Kerry for Senate; $500, 6/22/10, Friends of Schumer; $15,200, 7/30/10, Democratic National Committee; $2,400, 8/9/10, Bennet for Colorado; −$25, 8/16/10, Democratic National Committee; $1,000, 9/30/10, Alexi for Illinois; $1,000, 9/30,10, Perriello for Congress; $2,400, 10/25/10, Patrick Murphy for Congress; $2,800, 12/22/10, John Kerry for Senate; $35,800, 4/8/11, Obama Victory Fund; $30,800, 4/8/11, Democratic National Committee, via The Obama Victory Fund; $5,000, 4/8/11, Obama for America; $2,500, 5/2/11, Kaine for Virginia; $1,000, 5/14/11, Campaign for Our Country 2012; $2,500, 5/12/11, Klobuchar for Minnesota; $1,500, 5/25/11, Montanans for Tester; $2,500, 6/17/11, Setti Warren for Senate; $2,500, 11/30/11, Kaine for Virginia; $1,000, 3/6/12, Friends of John Delaney; $2,500, 3/27/12, Andrei for Arizona; $1,000, 3/28/12, Elizabeth for MA Inc.; $1,000, 3/29/12, Hoyer's Majority Fund; $2,500, 3/28/12, Joseph Kennedy III for Congress; $30,800, 3/31/12, Obama Victory Fund; $30,800, 3/31/12, Democratic National Committee, via The Obama Victory Fund;

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children: Emily Broas $2,300, 1/31/08, Obama for America; $2,500, 10/12/11, Obama for America, via Obama Victory Fund 2012;

4. Parents: None.

5. Grandparents: None.

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Robert Emmett: $28,500, 9/30/08, Obama Victory Fund; $1,930, 9/30/08, Obama for America Via Obama Victory Fund; $26,569, 9/30/08, Democratic National Committee via Obama Victory Fund; −$28,500, 10/7/08, Democratic National Committee; Pauline Emmett: $250, 4/10/08, Democratic Party of Virginia; $28,500, 12/4/08, Obama Victory Fund.

---

*Richard L. Morningstar, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Azerbaijan.

Nominee: Richard Louis Morningstar.

Post: Azerbaijan.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $1,000.00, 5/20/2008, Bobby Scott for Congress; $5,000.00, 7/31/2008, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; $4,600.00, 7/31/2008, Obama Victory Fund; $2,300.00, 8/28/2008, Friends of Hillary; $500.00, 10/08/2008, Friends of Scott Harper; $250.00, 10/24/2008, Paul Hodes for Congress; $250.00, 10/24/2008, Wulsin for Congress; $2,300.00, 11/04/2008, Barney Frank for Congress Committee; $2,400.00, 3/24/2010, Barney Frank for Congress Committee.

2. Spouse: Faith P. Morningstar: $33,100.00, 7/31/2008, Obama Victory Fund; $2,400.00, 1/17/2010, Martha Coakley for Senate Committee; $30,400.00, 4/6/2010, Democratic National Committee; $2,300.00, 8/28/2008, Friends of Hillary; $2,400.00, 10/13/2010, Barney Frank for Congress Committee; $35,800.00, 4/7/2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012; $1,000.00, 5/19/2011, Kaine for Virginia; $1,000.00, 6/25/2011, The Niki Tsongas Committee; $2,500.00, 9/30/2011, Elizabeth for MA INC.

3. Peter Morningstar (son): None. Jill Morningstar (daughter): $250.00, 10/25/2008, Al Franken For Senate; $600.00, 10/24/2008, Obama for America; $250.00, 9/29/2010, Ed Potosnak for Congress. Timothy Morningstar (son): $2,300.00, 1/12/2008, Hillary Clinton for President; $2,300.00, 8/28/2008,

Friends of Hillary Clinton. Emily Morningstar (daughter): None. Elizabeth Morningstar (daughter-in-law): $2,300.00, 1/8/2008, Obama for America; $2,300.00, 7/31/2008, Hillary Clinton for President; $500.00, 4/14/2010, MA Democratic State Committee; $250.00, 6/2/2011, MA Democratic State Committee. Bridget Morningstar (daughter-in-law): None. Alistair Fitzpayne (son-in-law): None.

4. Otto and Jane Morningstar (parents): Deceased.

5. Edward and Ida Nathanson (grandparents): Deceased. Monya and Louis Morningstar: Deceased,

6. David Morningstar (brother): Deceased.

7. Betty Morningstar (sister): $10,000.00, 6/30/2009, Democratic National Committee; $500.00, 2/24/2010, Democratic National Committee; $500.00, 4/09/2010, Democratic National Committee; $5,000.00, 10/18/2010, Gay and Lesbian Victory Fund Federal PAC; $10,000.00, 10/21/2010, Massachusetts Democratic State Committee; $3,000.00, 9/16/2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012. Jeanette Knieger: None.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORD on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with William M. Zarit and ending with Michael J. Richardson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 2, 2012

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Jeffrey B. Justice and ending with Enrique G. Ortiz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 18, 2012.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Michael C. Aho and ending with Michael L. Yoder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 26, 2012.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Alboino Lungobardo Deulus and ending with Bradley Alan Freden, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 15, 2012.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. LUGAR:

S. 3310. A bill to direct the President, in consultation with the Department of State, United States Agency for International Development, Millennium Challenge Corporation, and the Department of Defense, to establish guidelines for United States foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BAUCUS:

S. 3311. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 2601 2nd Avenue North, Billings, Montana, as the ''James F. Battin United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

S. 3312. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 3313. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, to improve health care furnished by the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

S. 3314. A bill to specifically authorize certain funds for an intelligence or intelligence-related activity and for other purposes; considered and passed.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WEBB, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. AKAKA):

S.J. Res. 45. A joint resolution amending title 36, United States Code, to designate June 19 as ''Juneteenth Independence Day''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WEBB, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 496. A resolution observing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. Res. 497. A resolution congratulating the Los Angeles Kings on winning the 2012 Stanley Cup Championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. COONS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CORKER, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. Res. 498. A resolution designating June 20, 2012, as ''American Eagle Day'', and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. Res. 499. A resolution recognizing the tenth anniversary of the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 227

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 227, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN) 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 name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor 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. 1670

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1670, a bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1935

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1935, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the March of Dimes Foundation.

S. 1990

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1990, a bill to require the Transportation Security Administration to comply with the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act.

S. 2060

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2060, a bill to provide for the payment of a benefit to members eligible for participation in the Post-Deployment/Mobilization Respite Absence program for days of nonparticipation due to Government error.

S. 2077

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2077, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize Federal assistance to State adult protective services programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2124

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2124, a bill to amend title

III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize and support the creation of cardiomyopathy education, awareness, and risk assessment materials and resources by the Secretary of Health and Human Services through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the dissemination of such materials and resources by State educational agencies to identify more at-risk families.

S. 2165

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2165, a bill to enhance strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2213

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2213, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 2258

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2258, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the rule providing 5-year amortization of expenses incurred in creating or acquiring music or music copyrights.

S. 2374

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2374, a bill 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, and for other purposes.

S. 3178

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3178, a bill to amend section 1951 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the Hobbs Act), and for other purposes.

S. 3225

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3225, a bill to require the United States Trade Representative to provide documents relating to trade negotiations to Members of Congress and their staff upon request, and for other purposes.

S. 3257

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3257, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the use of public funds for political party conventions, and to provide for the return of previously distributed funds for deficit reduction.

S. 3280

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3280, a bill to preserve the companionship services exemption for minimum wage and overtime pay under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

S. 3286

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3286, a bill to enhance security, increase accountability, and improve the contracting of the Federal Government for overseas contingency operations, and for other purposes.

S. 3290

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3290, a bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex or gender, and for other purposes.

S. 3308

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3308, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the furnishing of benefits for homeless veterans who are women or who have dependents, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 41

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 41, a joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the nuclear program of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

S. CON. RES. 46

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 46, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that an appropriate site at the former Navy Dive School at the Washington Navy Yard should be provided for the Man in the Sea Memorial Monument to honor the members of the Armed Forces who have served as divers and whose service in defense of the United States has been carried out beneath the waters of the world.

S. CON. RES. 47

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 47, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the sovereignty of the Republic of Cyprus over all of the territory of the island of Cypress.

S. RES. 473

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 473, a resolution commending Rotary International and others for their efforts to prevent and eradicate polio.

S. RES. 489

At the request of Mr. THUNE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 489, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the appointment by the Attorney General of an outside special counsel to investigate certain recent leaks of apparently classified and highly sensitive information on United States military and intelligence plans, programs, and operations.

AMENDMENT NO. 2156

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2156 proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2195

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2195 intended to be proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2199

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2199 proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2204

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2204 intended to be proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2214

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2214 intended to be proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2306

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2306 intended to be proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2364

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2364 intended to be proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2382

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2382 intended to be proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2426

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2426 proposed to S.

3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2454

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2454 intended to be proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2457

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2457 intended to be proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 3310. A bill to direct the President, in consultation with the Department of State, United States Agency for International Development, Millennium Challenge Corporation, and the Department of Defense, to establish guidelines for United States foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, last week heads of state, key policymakers, and foreign aid implementers met in Washington to examine ''Frontiers in Development.'' It was my pleasure to provide the conference keynote address Monday in which I pressed for greater transparency in global financial transactions and investments. This includes both U.S. foreign assistance funding and payments that companies make to foreign governments for oil, natural gas and mineral developments. Fuller disclosure improves accountability to citizens of both our country and the recipient country and would set an important example for other countries to provide more clarity about their own foreign assistance programs. Transparency in energy and mineral payments is already required for U.S.-listed companies by law in the Cardin-Lugar provision of the Dodd-Frank Act, and thanks to American leadership, the European Union is preparing similar legislation. Now, it is timely to enact legislation requiring the U.S. to disclose where and for what purpose it provides foreign assistance dollars across the globe. Further, taxpayers and foreign aid recipients have a right to know the impacts of these funds.

That is why I am introducing The Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act, which will require the President to disclose this information through a publicly accessible website in a timely manner.

The U.S. provides assistance through a host of federal agencies including the Departments of State, Defense and Agriculture, as well as agencies including the U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, MCC. While our Federal budget is available for public review, there is currently no single source required by law where one can review in what amount and for what purpose U.S. dollars flow to individual countries and programs. President Obama early in his administration promised to bring more transparency to our international development programs. But so far, the efforts by the State Department, USAID, the MCC and others to display this information through the Foreign Assistance Dashboard have been inadequate. There is a meager amount of data on the Dashboard, and it is often woefully out of date.

My legislation is the identical version to that introduced earlier in this Congress by Congressman TED POE of Texas, which now has more than 50 House co-sponsors. I compliment Representative POE on the bill and appreciate the bipartisan support he has already garnered for it in the House. I look forward to working to enact the legislation in this Congress, bringing greater transparency and accountability to taxpayer funding of foreign assistance programs in a timely manner.

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. 3310

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 ''Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act of 2012''.

SEC. 2. GUIDELINES FOR UNITED STATES FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to evaluate the performance of United States foreign assistance programs and their contribution to policy, strategies, projects, program goals, and priorities undertaken by the Federal Government, to foster and promote innovative programs to improve the effectiveness of such programs, and to coordinate the monitoring and evaluation processes of Federal departments and agencies that administer such programs.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF GUIDELINES.—The President, in consultation with the Department of State, United States Agency for International Development, Millennium Challenge Corporation, and the Department of Defense, shall establish guidelines regarding the establishment of measurable goals, performance metrics, and monitoring and evaluation plans that can be applied on a uniform basis to United States foreign assistance programs, country assistance plans, and international and multilateral assistance programs receiving financial assistance from the United States. Such guidelines shall be established according to best practices of monitoring and evaluation studies and analyses.

(c) OBJECTIVES OF GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Such guidelines shall provide direction to Federal departments and agencies that administer United States foreign assistance programs on how to develop the complete range of activities relating to the monitoring of resources, the evaluation of projects, the evaluation of program impacts, and analysis that is necessary for the identification of findings, generalizations that can be derived from those findings, and their applicability to proposed project and program design.

(2) OBJECTIVES.—Specifically, the guidelines shall provide direction on how to achieve the following objectives for monitoring and evaluation programs:

(A) Building measurable goals, performance metrics and monitoring and evaluation into program design at the outset, including the provision of sufficient program resources to conduct monitoring and evaluation.

(B) Disseminating guidelines for the development and implementation of monitoring and evaluation programs to all personnel, especially in the field, who are responsible for the design, implementation and management of foreign assistance programs.

(C) Developing a clearinghouse capacity for the dissemination of knowledge and lessons learned to United States development professionals, implementing partners, the international aid community, and aid recipient governments, and as a repository of knowledge on lessons learned.

(D) Distributing evaluation reports internally and making this material available online to the public. Furthermore, providing a summary including a description of methods, key findings and recommendations to the public on-line in a fully searchable form within 90 days after the completion of the evaluation. Principled exceptions will be made in cases of classified or proprietary material.

(E) Establishing annual monitoring and evaluation agendas and objectives that are responsive to policy and programmatic priorities.

(F) Applying rigorous monitoring and evaluation methodologies, choosing from among a wide variety of qualitative and quantitative methods common in the field of social scientific inquiry.

(G) Partnering with the academic community, implementing partners, and national and international institutions that have expertise in monitoring and evaluation and analysis when such partnerships will provide needed expertise or will significantly improve the evaluation and analysis.

(H) Developing and implementing a training plan for aid personnel on the proper conduct of monitoring and evaluation programs.

(d) ROLE OF OTHER FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—The President shall carry out this section in conjunction with the heads of Federal departments and agencies that administer United States foreign assistance programs.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report that contains a detailed description of the guidelines that have been developed on measurable goals, performance metrics, and monitoring and evaluation plans for United States foreign assistance programs established under this section.

(f) EVALUATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''evaluation'' means, with respect to a United States foreign assistance program, the systematic collection and analysis of information about the characteristics and outcomes of the program and projects under the program as a basis for judgments, to improve effectiveness, and to inform decisions about current and future programming.

SEC. 3. INTERNET WEB SITE TO MAKE PUBLICLY AVAILABLE COMPREHENSIVE, TIMELY, COMPARABLE, AND ACCESSIBLE INFORMATION ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT; PUBLICATION AND UPDATES.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall establish and maintain an Internet Web site to make publicly available comprehensive, timely, comparable, and accessible information on United States foreign assistance programs. The head of each Federal department or agency that administers such programs shall on a regular basis publish and update on the Web site such information with respect to the programs of the department or agency.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Such information shall be published on a detailed program-by-program basis and country-by-country basis.

(2) TYPES OF INFORMATION.—To ensure transparency, accountability, and effectiveness of United States foreign assistance programs, the information shall include country assistance strategies, annual budget documents, congressional budget justifications, actual expenditures, and reports and evaluations for such programs and projects under such programs. Each type of information described in this paragraph shall be published on the Web site not later than 30 days after the date of issuance of the information and shall be continuously updated.

(3) REPORT IN LIEU OF INCLUSION.—If the head of a Federal department or agency makes a determination that the inclusion of a required item of information on the Web site would jeopardize the health or security of an implementing partner or program beneficiary or would be detrimental to the national interests of the United States, such item of information may be submitted to Congress in a written report in lieu of including it on the Web site, along with the reasons for not including it in the database required under subsection (c)(2).

(c) SCOPE OF INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Web site shall contain such information relating to the current fiscal year and the immediately preceding 5 fiscal years.

(2) DATABASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Web site shall also contain a link to a searchable database available to the public containing such information relating to fiscal years prior to the current fiscal year and the immediately preceding 5 fiscal years.

(B) LIMITATION.—The database shall not contain such information relating to fiscal years prior to fiscal year 2006.

(d) FORM.—Such information shall be published on the Web site in unclassified form. Any information determined to be classified information may be submitted to Congress in classified form and an unclassified summary of such information shall be published on the Web site.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 3313. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, to improve health care furnished by the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President today, as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I introduce the Women Veterans and Other Health Care Improvement Act of 2012. I am incredibly proud of the women and men who have served or are serving our nation in uniform, and I strongly believe we must do all that we can to honor them.

That is why I introduced legislation, which was signed into law as part of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010, which helped to transform the way that the Department of Veterans Affairs, VA, addresses the needs of women veterans. Among other things, this law required the VA to provide neonatal care, train mental health professionals to provide mental health services for sexual trauma, and develop a child care pilot program. VA has an obligation to provide veterans with quality care and we have an obligation to make sure that VA does so. The legislation I am introducing today builds upon that effort to make additional improvements to VA's services for women veterans and veterans with families.

The nature of the current conflict and increasing use of improvised explosive devices leaves servicemembers, both male and female, at increased risk for blast injuries including spinal cord injury and trauma to the reproductive and urinary tracts. Army data shows that between 2003 and 2011 more than 600 women and men experienced these life-changing battle injuries while serving in Iraq or Afghanistan.

As they return from the battlefield, the VA system must be equipped to help injured veterans step back into their lives as parents, spouses, and citizens. These veterans have served honorably and have made the ultimate sacrifice for our great nation. They deserve the opportunity to pursue their goals and dreams, whether that includes pursuing higher education, finding gainful employment, purchasing their first house, or starting their own family. VA has many programs that help veterans pursue the educational, career, or homeownership dreams and goals that they deferred in service to this country, yet it falls short when it comes to helping severely wounded veterans who want to start a family. These veterans often need far more advanced services in order to conceive a child.

The Department of Defense and the Tricare program are already able to provide advanced fertility treatments, including assisted reproductive technology, to servicemembers with complex injuries. However; not all injured servicemembers are well situated to have a child at the time they are eligible for that coverage, and some are no longer eligible for Tricare by the time they are ready.

VA's fertility counseling and treatment options are limited and do not meet the complex needs of severely injured veterans. I have heard from severely injured veterans whose injuries have made it impossible for them to conceive children naturally. While the details of these stories vary, the common thread that runs through them all is that these veterans were unable to obtain the type of assistance they need. Some have spent tens of thousands of dollars in the private sector to get the advanced reproductive treatments they need to start a family. Others have watched their marriage dissolve because the stress of infertility, in combination with the stresses of readjusting to life after severe injury, drove their relationship to a breaking point. Any servicemember who sustains this type of serious injury deserves so much more. It is our responsibility to give VA the tools it needs to serve them, and the Women Veterans and Other Health Care Improvement Act is a start at doing that.

This legislation also requires VA to build upon existing research framework to gain a better understanding of the long-term reproductive health care needs of veterans, from those who experience severe reproductive and urinary tract trauma to those who experience gender-specific infections in the battlefield. A recent Army Task Force Report found that women in the battlefield experience high rates of urinary tract infections and other women's health conditions. After a decade at war, many women servicemembers are still at increased risk for women's health difficulties due to deployment conditions and a lack of predeployment women's health information, compounded by privacy and safety concerns. Little is known about the impact that these issues and injuries have on the long-term health care needs of veterans. Additional research will provide critical information to help VA improve services for veterans.

VA has come a long way in addressing the unique health needs and challenges that women face. Yet for all of its recent progress, VA can and must do more to ensure that women veterans are receiving the care that they need and deserve. Work remains to make VA a friendly environment for women veterans and veterans with families. Many women veterans are single mothers, making it difficult for them to take full advantage of the services that VA offers. The Women Veterans and Other Health Care Improvement Act creates a pilot program that provides child care to veterans seeking readjustment counseling at VA's Vet Centers. It also helps VA ensure that women veterans can get the information that they need in order to access VA health care and benefits.

This is not a section by section review of all the provisions within this legislation. However, I have provided an appropriate overview of the major benefits of this legislation and how it would improve the lives of our veterans and their families. The promise that we make to our veterans is sacred and knows no gender. To honor our veterans, we must honor this promise for each and every one of them.

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. 3313

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Women Veterans and Other Health Care Improvements Act of 2012''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Facilitation of reproduction and infertility research.
Sec. 3. Clarification that fertility counseling and treatment are medical services which the Secretary may furnish to veterans like other medical services.
Sec. 4. Reproductive treatment and care delivery for spouses and surrogates of veterans.
Sec. 5. Requirement to improve Department of Veterans Affairs women veterans call center.
Sec. 6. Modification of pilot program on counseling in retreat settings for women veterans newly separated from service in the Armed Forces.
Sec. 7. Pilot programs on assistance for child care for certain veterans.

SEC. 2. FACILITATION OF REPRODUCTION AND INFERTILITY RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 7330B. Facilitation of reproduction and infertility research

''(a) FACILITATION OF RESEARCH REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall facilitate research conducted collaboratively by the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the National Institutes of Health to improve the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs to meet the long-term reproductive health care needs of veterans who have a service-connected genitourinary disability or a condition that was incurred or aggravated in line of duty in the active military, naval, or air service, such as spinal cord injury, that affects the veterans' ability to reproduce.

''(b) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that information produced by the research facilitated under this section that may be useful for other activities of the Veterans Health Administration is disseminated throughout the Veterans Health Administration.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 73 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7330A the following new item:

''7330B. Facilitation of reproduction and infertility research.''.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a report on the research activities conducted by the Secretary under section 7330B of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION THAT FERTILITY COUNSELING AND TREATMENT ARE MEDICAL SERVICES WHICH THE SECRETARY MAY FURNISH TO VETERANS LIKE OTHER MEDICAL SERVICES.

Section 1701(6) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(H) Fertility counseling and treatment, including treatment using assisted reproductive technology.''.

SEC. 4. REPRODUCTIVE TREATMENT AND CARE DELIVERY FOR SPOUSES AND SURROGATES OF VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter VIII of chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 1787. Reproductive treatment and care for spouses and surrogates of veterans

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall furnish fertility counseling and treatment, including through the use of assisted reproductive technology, to a spouse or surrogate of a severely wounded veteran who has an infertility condition incurred or aggravated in line of duty in the active military, naval, or air service and who is enrolled in the health care system established under section 1705(a) of this title if the spouse and the veteran apply jointly for such counseling and treatment through a process prescribed by the Secretary.

''(b) COORDINATION OF CARE FOR OTHER SPOUSES AND SURROGATES.—In the case of a spouse or surrogate of a veteran not described in subsection (a) who is seeking fertility counseling and treatment, the Secretary may coordinate fertility counseling and treatment for such spouse or surrogate.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 17 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1786 the following new section:

''1787. Reproductive treatment and care for spouses and surrogates of veterans.''.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall prescribe regulations to carry out section 1787 of title 38, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1).

SEC. 5. REQUIREMENT TO IMPROVE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS WOMEN VETERANS CALL CENTER.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall enhance the capabilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs women veterans call center—

(1) to respond to requests by women veterans for assistance with accessing health care and benefits furnished under laws administered by the Secretary; and

(2) for referral of such veterans to community resources to obtain assistance with services not furnished by the Department.

SEC. 6. MODIFICATION OF PILOT PROGRAM ON COUNSELING IN RETREAT SETTINGS FOR WOMEN VETERANS NEWLY SEPARATED FROM SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) INCREASE IN NUMBER OF LOCATIONS.—Subsection (c) of section 203 of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–163; 38 U.S.C. 1712A note) is amended by striking ''three locations'' and inserting ''14 locations''.

(b) EXTENSION OF DURATION.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended by striking ''2-year'' and inserting ''four-year''.

SEC. 7. PILOT PROGRAMS ON ASSISTANCE FOR CHILD CARE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS.

(a) MODIFICATION OF DURATION OF PILOT PROGRAM ON ASSISTANCE FOR CHILD CARE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS RECEIVING HEALTH CARE.—Subsection (e) of section 205 of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–163; 38 U.S.C. 1710 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) DURATION.—A child care center that is established as part of the pilot program may operate until the date that is two years after the date on which the pilot program is established in the third Veterans Integrated Service Network required by subsection (d).''.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR PILOT PROGRAM ON ASSISTANCE FOR CHILD CARE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS RECEIVING READJUSTMENT COUNSELING AND RELATED MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES.—

(1) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of providing, subject to paragraph (2), assistance to qualified veterans described in paragraph (3) to obtain child care so that such veterans can receive readjustment counseling and related mental health services.

(2) LIMITATION ON PERIOD OF PAYMENTS.—Assistance may only be provided to a qualified veteran under the pilot program required by paragraph (1) for receipt of child care during the period that the qualified veteran receives readjustment counseling and related health care services at a Vet Center.

(3) QUALIFIED VETERANS.—For purposes of this subsection, a qualified veteran is a veteran who is—

(A) the primary caretaker of a child or children; and

(B)(i) receiving from the Department regular readjustment counseling and related mental health services; or

(ii) in need of readjustment counseling and related mental health services from the Department, and but for lack of child care services, would receive such counseling and services from the Department.

(4) LOCATIONS.—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program under this subsection in no fewer than three Readjustment Counseling Service Regions selected by the Secretary for purposes of the pilot program.

(5) DURATION.—The pilot program under this subsection shall be carried out until the end of the two-year period beginning on the day on which the Secretary begins carrying out the pilot program at the last Readjustment Counseling Service Region selected under paragraph (4) at which the Secretary begins carrying out the pilot program.

(6) FORMS OF CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Child care assistance under this subsection may include the following:

(i) Stipends for the payment of child care offered by licensed child care centers (either directly or through a voucher program) which shall be, to the extent practicable, modeled after the Department of Veterans Affairs Child Care Subsidy Program established pursuant to section 630 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2002 (Public Law 107–67; 115 Stat. 552).

(ii) Payments to private child care agencies.

(iii) Collaboration with facilities or programs of other Federal departments or agencies.

(iv) Such other forms of assistance as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(B) AMOUNTS OF STIPENDS.—In the case that child care assistance under this subsection is provided as a stipend under subparagraph (A)(i), such stipend shall cover the full cost of such child care.

(7) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the completion of the pilot program required by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the pilot program. The report shall include the findings and conclusions of the Secretary as a result of the pilot program, and shall include such recommendations for the continuation or expansion of the pilot program as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(8) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the pilot program required by paragraph (1)

$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 and 2015.

(9) VET CENTER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Vet Center'' means a center for readjustment counseling and related mental health services for veterans under section 1712A of title 38, United States Code.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WEBB, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. AKAKA):

S.J. Res. 45. A joint resolution amending title 36, United States Code, to designate June 19 as ''Juneteenth Independence Day''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers led by Major General Gordon Granger reached Galveston, Texas to announce that the Civil War had ended and that slaves had been emancipated.

It was a bittersweet day; the news traveled slowly, reaching Galveston nearly 2½ years after President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. But it was a joyous occasion, a triumph of freedom that has been remembered since. In commemoration of that historic day, I am delighted to introduce a Joint Resolution designating June 19 as ''Juneteenth Independence Day,'' a National Day of Observance.

It is a day to reflect on history and to celebrate freedom. To remember, in the words of W. E. B. Du Bois, that ''The cost of liberty is less than the price of repression.''

This resolution offers recognition of the role that Juneteenth Independence Day has played in African-American culture in Texas and throughout the Southwest. Enshrining Juneteenth in our national consciousness will confer the recognition it merits and serve as inspiration for all Americans. I am proud to be part of this bipartisan joint resolution to commemorate this day that reminds us that in America, we are all blessed to live in freedom.

United States law provides for the declaration of selected public observances by the President of the United States as designated by Congress or at the discretion of the President. I believe that marking Juneteenth Independence Day as a National Day of Observance will honor freedom and liberty, something that Americans of all races, creeds, and ethnic backgrounds can celebrate.

This legislation is an important reminder of that extraordinary day in 1865, a day that carried liberty across America. My fellow Texan Barbara Jordan once said, ''A nation is formed by the willingness of each of us to share in the responsibility for upholding the common good.'' There is no plainer common good than commemorating American freedom. I encourage all of my colleagues to join in cosponsoring this resolution.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 496—OBSERVING THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WEBB, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 496

Whereas news of the end of slavery did not reach frontier areas of the United States, and in particular the Southwestern States, for more than 2½ years after President Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, which was issued on January 1, 1863, and months after the conclusion of the Civil War;

Whereas, on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers led by Major General Gordon Granger arrived in Galveston, Texas, with news that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were free;

Whereas African Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest celebrated June 19, commonly known as ''Juneteenth Independence Day'', as the anniversary of their emancipation;

Whereas African Americans from the Southwest continue the tradition of celebrating Juneteenth Independence Day as inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas, for more than 145 years, Juneteenth Independence Day celebrations have been held to honor African-American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures; and

Whereas the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves remain an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background, religion, or race: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate—

(A) recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the Nation;

(B) supports the continued celebration of Juneteenth Independence Day to provide an opportunity for the people of the United States to learn more about the past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped the Nation; and

(C) encourages the people of the United States to observe Juneteenth Independence Day with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs; and

(2) it is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) the celebration of the end of slavery is an important and enriching part of the history and heritage of the United States; and

(B) history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future.

SENATE RESOLUTION 497—CONGRATULATING THE LOS ANGELES KINGS ON WINNING THE 2012 STANLEY CUP CHAMPIONSHIP

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 497

Whereas, on June 11, 2012, the Los Angeles Kings were crowned National Hockey League champions after defeating the New Jersey Devils by a score of 6-1 in Game 6 of the 2012 Stanley Cup Finals;

Whereas this is the first Stanley Cup title that the Los Angeles Kings have won since the team entered the National Hockey League in 1967;

Whereas the Los Angeles Kings are the first 8th seeded playoff team to win the Stanley Cup;

Whereas the Los Angeles Kings never allowed an opposing team with a higher seed or home-ice advantage to intimidate them;

Whereas, en route to their first Stanley Cup appearance since 1993, the Los Angeles Kings quickly dispatched the defending Western Conference Champions, the Vancouver Canucks, dominated the upstart St. Louis Blues, and defeated the Phoenix Coyotes, who were the Pacific Division Champions;

Whereas Los Angeles Kings forward Dustin Brown is the first American team captain of a Stanley Cup champion since 1999;

Whereas Los Angeles Kings goalie Jonathan Quick performed admirably in each playoff game, totaling 125 saves and maintaining a .946 save percentage during the Stanley Cup Finals, and winning the Conn Smythe Trophy, which is awarded to the player considered most valuable to his team during the Stanley Cup Playoffs;

Whereas each of the 26 players on the Los Angeles Kings playoff roster should receive recognition, including Most Valuable Player of the Stanley Cup Playoffs Jonathan Quick, team captain Dustin Brown, Jonathan Bernier, Jeff Carter, Kyle Clifford, Drew Doughty, David Drewiske, Colin Fraser, Simon Gagne, Matt Greene, Dwight King, Anze Kopitar, Trevor Lewis, Andrei Loktionov, Alec Martinez, Willie Mitchell, Jordan Nolan, Scott Parse, Dustin Penner, Mike Richards, Brad Richardson, Rob Scuderi, Jarret Stoll, Slava Voynov, Kevin Westgarth, and Justin Williams; and

Whereas team owners Philip Anschutz and Edward Roski, General Manager Dean Lombardi, and head coach Darryl Sutter admirably assembled the team that comprised the 2012 Los Angeles Kings and led them through one dominant performance after another in the 2012 Stanley Cup Playoffs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Los Angeles Kings on winning the 2012 Stanley Cup Championship; and

(2) commends the Los Angeles Kings fans in California and across the Nation for showing the team support throughout its 45-year history.

SENATE RESOLUTION 498—DESIGNATING JUNE 20, 2012, AS ''AMERICAN EAGLE DAY'', AND CELEBRATING THE RECOVERY AND RESTORATION OF THE BALD EAGLE, THE NATIONAL SYMBOL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. COONS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CORKER, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. SESSIONS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 498

Whereas on June 20, 1782, the bald eagle was officially designated as the national emblem of the United States by the founding fathers in the Congress of the Confederation;

Whereas the bald eagle is the central image of the Great Seal of the United States;

Whereas the image of the bald eagle is displayed in the official seal of many branches and departments of the Federal Government, including—

(1) the Office of the President;

(2) the Office of the Vice President;

(3) Congress;

(4) the Supreme Court;

(5) the Department of the Treasury;

(6) the Department of Defense;

(7) the Department of Justice;

(8) the Department of State;

(9) the Department of Commerce;

(10) the Department of Homeland Security;

(11) the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(12) the Department of Labor;

(13) the Department of Health and Human Services;

(14) the Department of Energy;

(15) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;

(16) the Central Intelligence Agency; and

(17) the Postal Service;

Whereas the bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of—

(1) the spirit of freedom; and

(2) the sovereignty of the United States;

Whereas since the founding of the Nation, the image, meaning, and symbolism of the bald eagle have played a significant role in the art, music, history, commerce, literature, architecture, and culture of the United States;

Whereas the bald eagle is prominently featured on the stamps, currency, and coinage of the United States;

Whereas the habitat of bald eagles exists only in North America;

Whereas by 1963, the population of bald eagles that nested in the lower 48 States had declined to approximately 417 nesting pairs;

Whereas due to the dramatic decline in the population of bald eagles in the lower 48 States, the Secretary of the Interior listed the bald eagle as an endangered species on the list of endangered species published under section 4(c)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(1));

Whereas caring and concerned individuals from the Federal, State, and private sectors banded together to save, and help ensure the recovery and protection of, bald eagles;

Whereas on July 20, 1969, the first manned lunar landing occurred in the Apollo 11 Lunar Excursion Module, which was named ''Eagle'';

Whereas the ''Eagle'' played an integral role in achieving the goal of the United States of landing a man on the Moon and returning that man safely to Earth;

Whereas in 1995, as a result of the efforts of those caring and concerned individuals, the Secretary of the Interior listed the bald eagle as a threatened species on the list of threatened species published under section 4(c)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(1));

Whereas by 2007, the population of bald eagles that nested in the lower 48 States had increased to approximately 10,000 nesting pairs, an increase of approximately 2,500 percent from the preceding 40 years;

Whereas in 2007, the population of bald eagles that nested in the State of Alaska was approximately 50,000 to 70,000;

Whereas on June 28, 2007, the Secretary of the Interior removed the bald eagle from the list of threatened species published under section 4(c)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(1));

Whereas bald eagles remain protected in accordance with—

(1) the Act entitled ''An Act for the protection of the bald eagle'', approved June 8, 1940 (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.) (commonly known as the ''Bald Eagle Protection Act of 1940''); and

(2) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

Whereas on January 15, 2008, the Secretary of the Treasury issued 3 limited edition bald eagle commemorative coins under the American Bald Eagle Recovery and National Emblem Commemorative Coin Act (Public Law 108–486; 118 Stat. 3934);

Whereas the sale of the limited edition bald eagle commemorative coins issued by the Secretary of the Treasury has raised approximately $7,800,000 for the nonprofit American Eagle Foundation of Pigeon Forge, Tennessee to support efforts to protect the bald eagle;

Whereas if not for the vigilant conservation efforts of concerned Americans and the enactment of conservation laws (including regulations), the bald eagle would face extinction;

Whereas the American Eagle Foundation has brought substantial public attention to the cause of the protection and care of the bald eagle nationally;

Whereas November 4, 2010, marked the 25th anniversary of the American Eagle Foundation;

Whereas facilities around the United States, such as the Southeastern Raptor Center at Auburn University in the State of Alabama, rehabilitate injured eagles for release into the wild;

Whereas the dramatic recovery of the population of bald eagles—

(1) is an endangered species success story; and

(2) an inspirational example for other wildlife and natural resource conservation efforts around the world;

Whereas the initial recovery of the population of bald eagles was accomplished by the concerted efforts of numerous government agencies, corporations, organizations, and individuals; and

Whereas the continuation of recovery, management, and public awareness programs for bald eagles will be necessary to ensure—

(1) the continued progress of the recovery of bald eagles; and

(2) that the population and habitat of bald eagles will remain healthy and secure for future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 20, 2012, as ''American Eagle Day'';

(2) applauds the issuance of bald eagle commemorative coins by the Secretary of the Treasury as a means by which to generate critical funds for the protection of bald eagles; and

(3) encourages—

(A) educational entities, organizations, businesses, conservation groups, and government agencies with a shared interest in conserving endangered species to collaborate and develop educational tools for use in the public schools of the United States; and

(B) the people of the United States to observe American Eagle Day with appropriate ceremonies and other activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 499—RECOGNIZING THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BIOMEDICAL IMAGING AND BIOENGINEERING

Mr. BURR (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 499

Whereas the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering Establishment Act (Public Law 106–580; 114 Stat. 3088) was signed into law on December 29, 2000;

Whereas the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering (referred to in this preamble as the ''Institute'') awarded its first research grants in April 2002;

Whereas the purpose of the Institute, a component of the National Institutes of Health, is to conduct and support research, training, dissemination of health information, and other programs relating to biomedical imaging, biomedical engineering, and associated technologies and modalities with biomedical applications;

Whereas the Institute was established to—

(1) accelerate the development of new technologies with clinical and research applications;

(2) improve coordination and efficiency at the National Institutes of Health and throughout the Federal Government;

(3) lay the foundation for a new medical information age;

(4) promote economic development; and

(5) provide a structure for training current and future researchers based on the most recent innovative discoveries;

Whereas the Institute and the biomedical imaging and bioengineering research communities encourage the integration of the physical and life sciences to advance human health by improving quality of life and reducing the burden of disease through research and discoveries;

Whereas, since its establishment, the Institute has supported research to develop scientific advances in biotechnology, imaging, and biomedical engineering, and to advance the application of biomedical technology to improve detection, treatment, and prevention of disease by assembling diverse teams of scientists and engineers to pursue innovative medical therapies and technologies to better meet the health care needs of patients; and

Whereas the Institute has helped to support scientific breakthroughs in areas such as regenerative medicine, cancer treatments, and nanotechnology, which are helping health care providers to better target care and meet the individual health care needs of patients: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering for its leadership in research and its role in advancing technologies that improve patient health;

(2) recognizes the remarkable impact that biomedical research supported by the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering has had on patients; and

(3) recognizes the importance of maintaining a strong commitment to pursuing the next generation of life-saving treatments and technologies for patients.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2459. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3240, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2460. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3240, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2459. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3240, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4208. ENCOURAGING LOCALLY AND REGIONALLY PRODUCED FOOD.

(a) COMMODITY PURCHASE STREAMLINING.—The Secretary may allow a school food authority with low annual commodity entitlement values, as determined by the Secretary, to substitute for the allotment of the school food authority for commodities commonly referred to as ''USDA Foods'' if—

(1) the option is requested by the eligible school food authority;

(2) the Secretary determines that the option will reduce Federal and State administrative costs; and

(3) the option will provide the eligible school food authority with greater flexibility to purchase locally and regionally produced foods.

(b) FARM-TO-SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish not less than 10 farm-to-school demonstration programs under which school food authorities, agricultural producers producing for local and regional markets, and other farm-to-school stakeholders collaborate with the Agricultural Marketing Service to obtain food for school meals from local agricultural producers rather than through other agricultural and food programs of the Secretary.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A demonstration program under this subsection shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

(i) facilitate and increase the purchase of unprocessed and minimally processed locally and regionally produced agricultural commodities and products to be served in school meal programs;

(ii) test methods to improve procurement, transportation, and meal preparation processes;

(iii) assess whether administrative costs can be saved through increased school authority flexibility to source locally and regionally produced agricultural commodities and foods; and

(iv) undertake rigorous evaluation and share information about results, including cost savings, with the Department of Agriculture, school food authorities, agricultural producers producing for local and regional markets, and the general public.

(B) PLANS.—The Secretary shall require demonstration project participants to provide plans that detail compliance with this subsection.

(3) DURATION.—The Secretary shall determine the appropriate period of time for each demonstration program.

(4) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate among relevant agencies of the Department of Agriculture and nongovernmental organizations with appropriate expertise to facilitate the provision of training and technical assistance necessary to the successful implementation of demonstration programs under this subsection.

(5) DIVERSITY AND BALANCE.—In establishing the demonstration programs under this subsection, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure—

(A) geographical diversity;

(B) that at least ½ of the demonstration programs are completed in collaboration with school food authorities with relatively small annual commodity entitlements, as determined by the Secretary;

(C) at least ½ of demonstration programs are completed in rural or tribal communities; and

(D) equitable treatment of school food authorities with a high percentage of students participating in the free or reduced price lunch program under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.).

SA 2460. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3240, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 11001, after subsection (b) insert the following:

(c) SUPPLEMENTAL, WEATHER INDEX-BASED INSURANCE.—Section 508(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(11) SUPPLEMENTAL, WEATHER INDEX-BASED INSURANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may consider and approve applications, consistent with procedures for products submitted under subsection (h), submitted by private companies to provide supplemental, weather index-based insurance products that are not reinsured under this subtitle to producers as an alternative to the coverage provided under this section to determine whether the products can provide enhanced coverage for producers than is otherwise available under this section.

''(B) PAYMENT OF PORTION OF PREMIUM BY CORPORATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (F), if the Corporation determines that supplemental, weather index-based insurance products offered by private companies meet the conditions described in subparagraph (A), the Corporation may pay a portion of the premium for a producer to purchase a product that is not reinsured under this subtitle from a private company for an equivalent level of coverage under this section.

''(ii) ADMINISTRATION.—Any premium assistance under clause (i)—

''(I) shall be determined by the Corporation; and

''(II) may be based on, as determined by the Corporation—

''(aa) a percentage of premium;

''(bb) a percentage of expected loss determined pursuant to a reasonable actuarial methodology; or

''(cc) a fixed dollar amount per acre.

''(C) ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS.—Before providing premium assistance to producers to purchase supplemental, index-based coverage from a private company under this paragraph, the Corporation shall verify that the private company—

''(i) has adequate experience developing and managing similar index-based products for crop producers (including adequate resources, experience, and assets) or sufficient reinsurance, to meet the obligations of the private company under this paragraph;

''(ii) has adequate experience to sell and administer index-based or similar products;

''(iii) possesses a sufficient insurance credit rating from an appropriate credit rating bureau; and

''(iv) has approval from each State in which the company intends to make the supplemental insurance products of the company available.

''(D) OVERSIGHT.—The Corporation shall develop and publish procedures to administer a supplemental, index-based insurance option for producers under this paragraph that—

''(i) require each applicable private company to report sales, acreage and claim data, and any other data the Corporation determines to be appropriate, to allow the Corporation to evaluate product pricing and performance;

''(ii) allow each participating private company exclusive rights, ownership of intellectual property, and protection of confidential information with respect to the insurance offered under this paragraph; and

''(iii) contain such other requirements as the Corporation determines necessary to ensure that—

''(I) the interests of producers are protected; and

''(II) the program operates in an actuarially sound manner.

''(E) SELECTION LIMITATION.—A producer shall be allowed to select supplemental coverage annually and may not select both weather index-based coverage under this paragraph and any other supplemental coverage offered under other provisions of this section.

''(F) BASELINE SAVINGS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may not offer premium assistance for producers to purchase private company weather index-based supplemental coverage under this paragraph unless the Corporation determines that offering private company coverage will result in savings against baseline spending estimates for the supplemental coverage option provided by the Office of Management and Budget.

''(ii) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In addition to any other available funds, the Corporation shall use savings derived from offering supplemental coverage from private companies to cover administrative costs associated with evaluating and approving private company coverage under this subsection.''.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public an addition to a previously announced hearing before the Subcommittee on National Parks. The hearing will be held on Wednesday, June 27, 2012, at 3 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

In addition to the other measures previously announced, the Committee will also consider:

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.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 304 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510 6150, or by email to Jake_Mccook@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Sara Tucker (202) 224–6224 or Jake McCook (202) 224–9313.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 19, 2012, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. KERRY. 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 June 19, 2012, at 10 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. KERRY. 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 ''Forty Years and Counting: The Triumphs of Title IX'' on June 19, 2012, at 10 a.m., in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 19, 2012, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Confronting the Looming Fiscal Crisis.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 19, 2012, at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 19, 2012, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 19, 2012, at 10 a.m. in Dirksen 406 to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Review of Recent Environmental Protection Agency's Air Standards for Hydraulically Fractured Natural Gas Wells and Oil and Natural Gas Storage.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION, CIVIL RIGHTS, AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Human Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on June 19, 2012, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Reassessing Solitary Confinement: The Human Rights, Fiscal and Public Safety Consequences.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the following members of Senator BINGAMAN's office be granted the privilege of the floor for the pendency of S. 3240, the farm bill: Bijan Peters, Eugenia Woods, James Anderson, Aurora Trujillo, Carl Slater.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent our USDA detailee, Patricia Lawrence, be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of debate and consideration of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN FUNDS FOR AN INTELLIGENCE OR INTELLIGENCE-RELATED ACTIVITY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3314 introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3314) to specifically authorize certain funds for an intelligence or intelligence-related activity, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, Vice Chairman CHAMBLISS and I are introducing a bill today to authorize funds included in the fiscal year 2012 Defense Appropriations Act that were not previously authorized.

Last year, the classified annex to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2012, division A of the conference report on H.R. 2055, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012, added three funding lines for two separate intelligence programs. While those programs are part of the National Intelligence Program, these additional funds were placed in a separate budgetary account, the Military Intelligence Program.

The additional funds for these items included in the defense appropriations conference annex were not included in the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012, Public Law 112–87, which authorized the National Intelligence Program budget. Neither were the additional funds for these items included in the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012, Public Law 112–81, which authorized the Military Intelligence Program budget.

This created a situation in which funds for an intelligence program were appropriated but not authorized in statute. Section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act states that funds may be obligated or expended for an intelligence or intelligence-related activity only if those funds were specifically authorized by the Congress for such activities.

As a result, the additional funds appropriated for these items have not been specifically authorized as required by section 504 and, therefore, may not be obligated or expended for these intelligence activities.

Vice Chairman CHAMBLISS and I have no substantive objections to expending the appropriated funds for these specific programs. However, we hold strongly to the principle that intelligence funds must be authorized if they are to be spent—this is one of the major purposes of the annual intelligence authorization bills.

We have discussed this matter with the Director of National Intelligence James Clapper and the Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, and have agreed to seek passage of this legislation to permit them to spend these funds for the purposes identified in the 2012 Defense Appropriations Act.

The bill we are introducing today is very simple and quite short. It specifically authorizes the increased funding for these specific items to the extent that they are in excess to the amounts authorized in the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012.

For reasons of classification, I can't describe the nature of these intelligence programs on the Floor. Any Member, however, is welcome to come to the Intelligence Committee office and receive a briefing on the programs and why the funding is important.

I believe this legislation is necessary as a technical correction to permit funds already appropriated to be obligated and expended. I appreciate the work and cooperation of my Vice Chairman Senator CHAMBLISS on this matter and hope this legislation will move quickly to enactment.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I further ask that the bill be read three times, and the Senate proceed to a voice vote on passage of the measure.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further debate?

If not, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 3314) was passed, as follows:

S. 3314

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS FOR INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

Funds appropriated for an intelligence or intelligence-related activity of the United States Government as described on the last three lines in the table entitled Military Intelligence Program, Fiscal Year 2012 Recommendation, Summary on the third page after page 69 of the funding tables in the classified annex to the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference to accompany the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74; 125 Stat. 786), in excess of the amount specified for such activity in the tables in the classified annex prepared to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–87; 125 Stat. 1876) shall be specifically authorized by Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414).

Mrs. BOXER. I further ask that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the measure be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration en bloc of the following resolutions which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 496, S. Res. 497, S. Res. 498, and S. Res. 499.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measures en bloc?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

The resolutions, with their preambles, read as follows:

S. RES. 496

(Observing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day)

Whereas news of the end of slavery did not reach frontier areas of the United States, and in particular the Southwestern States, for more than 2½ years after President Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, which was issued on January 1, 1863, and months after the conclusion of the Civil War;

Whereas, on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers led by Major General Gordon Granger arrived in Galveston, Texas, with news that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were free;

Whereas African Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest celebrated June 19, commonly known as ''Juneteenth Independence Day'', as the anniversary of their emancipation;

Whereas African Americans from the Southwest continue the tradition of celebrating Juneteenth Independence Day as inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas, for more than 145 years, Juneteenth Independence Day celebrations have been held to honor African-American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures; and

Whereas the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves remain an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background, religion, or race: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate—

(A) recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the Nation;

(B) supports the continued celebration of Juneteenth Independence Day to provide an opportunity for the people of the United States to learn more about the past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped the Nation; and

(C) encourages the people of the United States to observe Juneteenth Independence Day with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs; and

(2) it is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) the celebration of the end of slavery is an important and enriching part of the history and heritage of the United States; and

(B) history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this week people all across our Nation are engaging in the oldest known observance of the ending of slavery—''Juneteenth Independence Day.'' Although passage of the 13th Amendment, in January 1863, legally abolished slavery, many African Americans remained in servitude due to the delayed dissemination of this news across the country.

It was in June of 1865, that the Union soldiers landed in Galveston, TX, with the news that the war had ended and that slavery finally had come to an end in the United States. This was 2½ years after President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, which was issued on January 1, 1863, and months after the conclusion of the Civil War.

This week and specifically on June 19, when slaves in the Southwest finally learned of the end of slavery, the descendants of slaves have observed this anniversary of emancipation as a remembrance of one of the most tragic periods of our Nation's history. The suffering, degradation and brutality of slavery cannot be repaired, but the memory can serve to ensure that no such inhumanity is ever perpetrated again on American soil.

Today, I am very pleased that the Senate has unanimously adopted a resolution, S. Res. 496, recognizing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the Nation. The resolution, which I sponsored along with Senators HUTCHISON, CARDIN, LANDRIEU, CORNYN, SHERROD BROWN, BOXER, STABENOW, HARKIN, BEGICH, DURBIN, WICKER, LEAHY, BILL NELSON, CASEY, WARNER, AKAKA, WEBB, and LAUTENBERG, expresses support for the observance of Juneteenth Independence Day, and recognizes the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves, that remains an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background or race.

All across America we also celebrate the many important achievements of former slaves and their descendants. We do so because in 1926, Dr. Carter G. Woodson, son of former slaves, proposed such a recognition as a way of preserving the history of African Americans and recognizing the enormous contributions of a people of great strength, dignity, faith, and conviction—a people who rendered their achievements for the betterment and advancement of a Nation once lacking in humanity towards them. Every February, nationwide, we celebrate African American History Month. And, every year on June 19, we celebrate Juneteenth Independence Day.

Lerone Bennett, Jr., writer, scholar, lecturer, and acclaimed executive editor for several decades at Ebony magazine, has reflected on the life and times of Dr. Woodson. Bennett tells us that one of the most inspiring and instructive stories in African American history is the story of Woodson's struggle and rise from the coal mines of West Virginia to the summit of academic achievement:

> At 17, the young man who was called by history to reveal Black history was an untutored coal miner. At 19, after teaching himself the fundamentals of English and arithmetic, he entered high school and mastered the four-year curriculum in less than two years. At 22, after two-thirds of a year at Berea College [in Kentucky], he returned to the coal mines and studied Latin and Greek between trips to the mine shafts. He then went on to the University of Chicago, where he received his bachelor's and master's degrees, and Harvard University, where he became the second Black to receive a doctorate in history. The rest is history—Black history.

In keeping with the spirit and the vision of Dr. Carter G. Woodson, I would like to pay tribute to two courageous women, claimed by my home State of Michigan, who played significant roles in addressing American injustice and inequality. These are two women of different times who would change the course of history.

The contributions of Sojourner Truth, who helped lead our country out of the dark days of slavery, and Rosa Parks whose dignified leadership sparked the Montgomery Bus Boycott and the start of the civil rights movement, are indelibly etched in the chronicle of the history of this Nation. Moreover, they are viewed with distinction and admiration throughout the world.

Sojourner Truth, though unable to read or write, was considered one of the most eloquent and noted spokespersons of her day on the inhumanity and immorality of slavery. She was a leader in the abolitionist movement, and a groundbreaking speaker on behalf of equality for women. Michigan has honored her with the dedication of the Sojourner Truth Memorial monument, which was unveiled in Battle Creek, MI, on September 25, 1999. In April 2009,

Sojourner Truth became the first African American woman to be memorialized with a bust in the U.S. Capitol. The ceremony to unveil Truth's likeness was appropriately held in Emancipation Hall at the Capitol Visitor's Center. I was pleased to cosponsor the legislation to make this fitting tribute possible. Sojourner Truth lived in Washington, DC for several years, helping slaves who had fled from the South and appearing at women's suffrage gatherings. She returned to Battle Creek in 1875, and remained there until her death in 1883. Sojourner Truth spoke from her heart about the most troubling issues of her time. A testament to Truth's convictions is that her words continue to speak to us today.

On May 4, 1999, legislation was enacted which authorized the President of the United States to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Rosa Parks. I was pleased to coauthor this tribute to Rosa Parks—the gentle warrior who decided that she would no longer tolerate the humiliation and demoralization of racial segregation on a bus. I was also pleased to be a part of the effort to direct the Architect of the Capitol to commission a statue of Rosa Parks, which will soon be placed in the U.S. Capitol, making her the second African American woman to receive such an honor.

Her personal bravery and self-sacrifice are remembered with reverence and respect by us all. Over 55 years ago, in Montgomery, AL, the modern civil rights movement began when Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat and move to the back of the bus. The strength and spirit of this courageous woman captured the consciousness of not only the American people, but the entire world. The boycott which Rosa Parks began was the start of an American revolution that elevated the status of African Americans nationwide and introduced to the world a young leader who would one day have a national holiday declared in his honor, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. In addition, the overwhelming majority of my colleagues in the Senate joined me in sponsoring legislation authorizing the Congressional Gold Medal to be presented to Dr. King, posthumously, and Coretta Scott King in recognition of their contributions to the Nation. Companion legislation was led in the House by Representative JOHN LEWIS.

We have come a long way toward achieving justice and equality for all. We still however have work to do. In the names of Rosa Parks, Sojourner Truth, Dr. Carter G. Woodson, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and many others, let us rededicate ourselves to continuing the struggle of civil rights and human rights.

I am also pleased to join Senator HUTCHISON and other members of the Senate in sponsoring another measure introduced today in recognition of Juneteenth Independence Day, which will require further action in the Senate. It is a Joint Resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation each year designating Juneteenth Independence Day as a National Day of Observance, encouraging Americans of all races, creeds, and ethnic backgrounds to celebrate freedom and the end of slavery in the United States.

In closing, I would like to pay tribute to the Juneteenth directors and event coordinators throughout my State of Michigan. They have worked tirelessly in the planning of intergenerational activities in observance of Juneteenth, heading up a wide range of activities over several days in Detroit, Flint, Holland, Lansing, Saginaw, and other areas around the State.

S. RES. 497

(Congratulating the Los Angeles Kings on winning the 2012 Stanley Cup Championship)

Whereas, on June 11, 2012, the Los Angeles Kings were crowned National Hockey League champions after defeating the New Jersey Devils by a score of 6-1 in Game 6 of the 2012 Stanley Cup Finals;

Whereas this is the first Stanley Cup title that the Los Angeles Kings have won since the team entered the National Hockey League in 1967;

Whereas the Los Angeles Kings are the first 8th seeded playoff team to win the Stanley Cup;

Whereas the Los Angeles Kings never allowed an opposing team with a higher seed or home-ice advantage to intimidate them;

Whereas, en route to their first Stanley Cup appearance since 1993, the Los Angeles Kings quickly dispatched the defending Western Conference Champions, the Vancouver Canucks, dominated the upstart St. Louis Blues, and defeated the Phoenix Coyotes, who were the Pacific Division Champions;

Whereas Los Angeles Kings forward Dustin Brown is the first American team captain of a Stanley Cup champion since 1999;

Whereas Los Angeles Kings goalie Jonathan Quick performed admirably in each playoff game, totaling 125 saves and maintaining a .946 save percentage during the Stanley Cup Finals, and winning the Conn Smythe Trophy, which is awarded to the player considered most valuable to his team during the Stanley Cup Playoffs;

Whereas each of the 26 players on the Los Angeles Kings playoff roster should receive recognition, including Most Valuable Player of the Stanley Cup Playoffs Jonathan Quick, team captain Dustin Brown, Jonathan Bernier, Jeff Carter, Kyle Clifford, Drew Doughty, David Drewiske, Colin Fraser, Simon Gagne, Matt Greene, Dwight King, Anze Kopitar, Trevor Lewis, Andrei Loktionov, Alec Martinez, Willie Mitchell, Jordan Nolan, Scott Parse, Dustin Penner, Mike Richards, Brad Richardson, Rob Scuderi, Jarret Stoll, Slava Voynov, Kevin Westgarth, and Justin Williams; and

Whereas team owners Philip Anschutz and Edward Roski, General Manager Dean Lombardi, and head coach Darryl Sutter admirably assembled the team that comprised the 2012 Los Angeles Kings and led them through one dominant performance after another in the 2012 Stanley Cup Playoffs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Los Angeles Kings on winning the 2012 Stanley Cup Championship; and

(2) commends the Los Angeles Kings fans in California and across the Nation for showing the team support throughout its 45-year history.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am in support of this resolution with Senator BOXER congratulating the Los Angeles Kings on their 2012 Stanley Cup Championship. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the players, staff, and fans for obtaining professional hockey's ultimate prize.

The Los Angeles Kings have won the Stanley Cup for the first time in the 45-year history of their franchise. Since 1967 the Kings have proudly represented the Los Angeles community with unwavering commitment. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I stand today to congratulate the 2011–2012 National Hockey League champions, the Los Angeles Kings. This past season the Kings demonstrated remarkable skill, teamwork, and determination in capturing the franchise's first Stanley Cup.

Thanks to an outstanding roster of seasoned veterans and promising young players, the Kings hoisted the Stanley Cup for the first time in the 45-year history of the franchise. On their historic run, the Kings became the first No. 8 seed to win the NHL championship. On their way to the finals, the Kings knocked off the first seed Vancouver Canucks, the No. 2 seed St. Louis Blues, and the No. 3 seed Phoenix Coyotes before capturing the Western Conference title. Despite their low seed, the Kings were dominant in each of their series, taking a 3-to-0 lead in each and never facing an elimination game.

The Kings continued their dominance in the finals against the New Jersey Devils by once again taking a three-games-to-none lead in the series. The Devils were able to stay alive in games 4 and 5 to force the series to go to six games. However, in game six the Kings once again showed their prowess winning by a score of 6 to 1 and cementing their first championship.

Throughout the season, the Kings were a model of hard work, dedication, and consistency. It is my pleasure to congratulate all members of the Kings organization who worked tirelessly to bring this hard fought victory to Los Angeles. As the Los Angeles Kings and their fans celebrate their first Stanley Cup victory, I commend them on a truly remarkable and memorable season and wish them more success in future seasons.

S. RES. 498

(Designating June 20, 2012, as ''American Eagle Day'', and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States)

Whereas on June 20, 1782, the bald eagle was officially designated as the national emblem of the United States by the founding fathers in the Congress of the Confederation;

Whereas the bald eagle is the central image of the Great Seal of the United States;

Whereas the image of the bald eagle is displayed in the official seal of many branches and departments of the Federal Government, including—

(1) the Office of the President;

(2) the Office of the Vice President;
(3) Congress;
(4) the Supreme Court;
(5) the Department of the Treasury;
(6) the Department of Defense;
(7) the Department of Justice;
(8) the Department of State;
(9) the Department of Commerce;
(10) the Department of Homeland Security;
(11) the Department of Veterans Affairs;
(12) the Department of Labor;
(13) the Department of Health and Human Services;
(14) the Department of Energy;
(15) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;
(16) the Central Intelligence Agency; and
(17) the Postal Service;

Whereas the bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of—
(1) the spirit of freedom; and
(2) the sovereignty of the United States;

Whereas since the founding of the Nation, the image, meaning, and symbolism of the bald eagle have played a significant role in the art, music, history, commerce, literature, architecture, and culture of the United States;

Whereas the bald eagle is prominently featured on the stamps, currency, and coinage of the United States;

Whereas the habitat of bald eagles exists only in North America;

Whereas by 1963, the population of bald eagles that nested in the lower 48 States had declined to approximately 417 nesting pairs;

Whereas due to the dramatic decline in the population of bald eagles in the lower 48 States, the Secretary of the Interior listed the bald eagle as an endangered species on the list of endangered species published under section 4(c)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(1));

Whereas caring and concerned individuals from the Federal, State, and private sectors banded together to save, and help ensure the recovery and protection of, bald eagles;

Whereas on July 20, 1969, the first manned lunar landing occurred in the Apollo 11 Lunar Excursion Module, which was named ''Eagle'';

Whereas the ''Eagle'' played an integral role in achieving the goal of the United States of landing a man on the Moon and returning that man safely to Earth;

Whereas in 1995, as a result of the efforts of those caring and concerned individuals, the Secretary of the Interior listed the bald eagle as a threatened species on the list of threatened species published under section 4(c)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(1));

Whereas by 2007, the population of bald eagles that nested in the lower 48 States had increased to approximately 10,000 nesting pairs, an increase of approximately 2,500 percent from the preceding 40 years;

Whereas in 2007, the population of bald eagles that nested in the State of Alaska was approximately 50,000 to 70,000;

Whereas on June 28, 2007, the Secretary of the Interior removed the bald eagle from the list of threatened species published under section 4(c)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(1));

Whereas bald eagles remain protected in accordance with—
(1) the Act entitled ''An Act for the protection of the bald eagle'', approved June 8, 1940 (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.) (commonly known as the ''Bald Eagle Protection Act of 1940''); and
(2) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

Whereas on January 15, 2008, the Secretary of the Treasury issued 3 limited edition bald eagle commemorative coins under the American Bald Eagle Recovery and National Emblem Commemorative Coin Act (Public Law 108–486; 118 Stat. 3934);

Whereas the sale of the limited edition bald eagle commemorative coins issued by the Secretary of the Treasury has raised approximately $7,800,000 for the nonprofit American Eagle Foundation of Pigeon Forge, Tennessee to support efforts to protect the bald eagle;

Whereas if not for the vigilant conservation efforts of concerned Americans and the enactment of conservation laws (including regulations), the bald eagle would face extinction;

Whereas the American Eagle Foundation has brought substantial public attention to the cause of the protection and care of the bald eagle nationally;

Whereas November 4, 2010, marked the 25th anniversary of the American Eagle Foundation;

Whereas facilities around the United States, such as the Southeastern Raptor Center at Auburn University in the State of Alabama, rehabilitate injured eagles for release into the wild;

Whereas the dramatic recovery of the population of bald eagles—
(1) is an endangered species success story; and
(2) an inspirational example for other wildlife and natural resource conservation efforts around the world;

Whereas the initial recovery of the population of bald eagles was accomplished by the concerted efforts of numerous government agencies, corporations, organizations, and individuals; and

Whereas the continuation of recovery, management, and public awareness programs for bald eagles will be necessary to ensure—
(1) the continued progress of the recovery of bald eagles; and
(2) that the population and habitat of bald eagles will remain healthy and secure for future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) designates June 20, 2012, as ''American Eagle Day'';
(2) applauds the issuance of bald eagle commemorative coins by the Secretary of the Treasury as a means by which to generate critical funds for the protection of bald eagles; and
(3) encourages—
(A) educational entities, organizations, businesses, conservation groups, and government agencies with a shared interest in conserving endangered species to collaborate and develop educational tools for use in the public schools of the United States; and
(B) the people of the United States to observe American Eagle Day with appropriate ceremonies and other activities.

S. RES. 499

(Recognizing the tenth anniversary of the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering)

Whereas the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering Establishment Act (Public Law 106–580; 114 Stat. 3088) was signed into law on December 29, 2000;

Whereas the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering (referred to in this preamble as the ''Institute'') awarded its first research grants in April 2002;

Whereas the purpose of the Institute, a component of the National Institutes of Health, is to conduct and support research, training, dissemination of health information, and other programs relating to biomedical imaging, biomedical engineering, and associated technologies and modalities with biomedical applications;

Whereas the Institute was established to—
(1) accelerate the development of new technologies with clinical and research applications;
(2) improve coordination and efficiency at the National Institutes of Health and throughout the Federal Government;
(3) lay the foundation for a new medical information age;
(4) promote economic development; and
(5) provide a structure for training current and future researchers based on the most recent innovative discoveries;

Whereas the Institute and the biomedical imaging and bioengineering research communities encourage the integration of the physical and life sciences to advance human health by improving quality of life and reducing the burden of disease through research and discoveries;

Whereas, since its establishment, the Institute has supported research to develop scientific advances in biotechnology, imaging, and biomedical engineering, and to advance the application of biomedical technology to improve detection, treatment, and prevention of disease by assembling diverse teams of scientists and engineers to pursue innovative medical therapies and technologies to better meet the health care needs of patients; and

Whereas the Institute has helped to support scientific breakthroughs in areas such as regenerative medicine, cancer treatments, and nanotechnology, which are helping health care providers to better target care and meet the individual health care needs of patients: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) commends the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering for its leadership in research and its role in advancing technologies that improve patient health;
(2) recognizes the remarkable impact that biomedical research supported by the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering has had on patients; and
(3) recognizes the importance of maintaining a strong commitment to pursuing the next generation of life-saving treatments and technologies for patients.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 2012

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 20; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that the majority leader be recognized; and that following the remarks of the leaders, the Republican leader be recognized to make a motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 37; further, that the time until 11:30 a.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first 15 minutes and the majority controlling the second 15 minutes; and finally, that at 11:30 a.m., the Senate proceed to vote on the adoption of the motion to proceed; that if the motion to proceed is agreed to, all other provisions of the previous order with respect to S.J. Res. 37 remain in effect, and that if the motion to proceed is not agreed to, the Senate resume consideration of S. 3240 and the votes in relation to the amendments remaining in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, there will be several rollcall votes beginning at approximately 11:30 a.m. tomorrow. The first vote will be on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 37, a resolution of disapproval regarding the EPA's mercury and air toxics standards. The additional votes will be on amendments to the farm bill in order to complete action on the bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mrs. BOXER. 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 9:49 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 20, 2012, at 9:30 a.m.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on June 19, 2012 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

BRETT H. MCGURK, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF IRAQ, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MARCH 27, 2012.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF JUNE 20, 2012 AS AMERICAN EAGLE DAY

HON. DAVID P. ROE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of designating June 20, 2012 as American Eagle Day and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States. On June 20, 1782, the eagle was designated as the national emblem of the U.S. by the Founding Fathers at the Second Continental Congress.

The bald eagle is the central image of the Great Seal of the United States and is displayed in the official seal of many branches and departments of the Federal Government.

The bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of the spirit of freedom and the democracy of the United States. Since the founding of the Nation, the image, meaning and symbolism of the eagle have played a significant role in art, music, history, commerce, literature, architecture and culture of the United States. The bald eagle's habitat only exists in North America.

Over the years, several members of Congress have introduced and passed resolutions in support of the designation of American Eagle Day. My friend and colleague, Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER has introduced the same resolution for this year and I support his efforts.

I hope my colleagues will join in celebrating tomorrow, June 20, 2012 as American Eagle Day, which marks the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle.

CONGRATULATING KENT STATE UNIVERSITY'S BASEBALL TEAM

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the tremendous accomplishment of Kent State University's advancement to the semifinals of the College World Series. I wish to extend my sincerest congratulations and offer them the best of luck as they continue their extraordinary journey in Omaha, Nebraska.

The 13th nationally ranked Golden Flashes punched their ticket to Omaha after winning an exciting series in the Eugene Super Regional against Oregon. In the bottom of the 9th inning with the series tied at one game apiece, Jimmy Rider became a hero by hitting the game winning RBI and sending KSU to the College World Series. Kent State is the first Ohio team since 1980 to participate in the heralded 8-team double elimination bracket. They are also the first team since Eastern Michigan in 1976 to represent the Mid-American Conference in the College World Series.

Last evening, June 18th, the Golden Flashes advanced to the College World Series semifinals by defeating the University of Florida. Kent State opened up an early 5 run lead that they never gave up, defeating Florida 5 to 4. The Golden Flashes will go on to play the South Carolina Gamecocks, last year's champions, on June 20th.

It is an incredible honor for them to have made it this far and I am proud to offer my full support to Kent State as their Cinderella story continues in the College World Series.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROSARY HALL

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Rosary Hall, on the occasion of its 60 year anniversary of providing important services to individuals struggling with the destructive disease of addiction.

Founded by Sister Ignatia in 1952, Rosary Hall has remained at the forefront of effective and innovative behavioral therapy programs, developing shortly after the founding of the first Alcoholics Anonymous in nearby Akron. In affiliation with St. Vincent Charity Medical Center, Rosary Hall works with families, friends, and co-workers of patients in a supportive and compassionate environment. Since the Hall's founding it has helped to save over 50,000 people from the debilitating and deadly grips of addiction.

Rosary Hall's success is facilitated by a process which spans the entire road to recovery: from inpatient detoxification programs in a hospital setting, to outpatient rehabilitation and finally to community-centered support networks. Rosary Hall is staffed by a team of dedicated professionals who constantly seek to develop skills in order to ensure that each patient receives the personalized care and strategies which will leave them equipped to handle this difficult disease. Rosary Hall continues to be a pioneer in the field of addiction treatment research.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, join me in honoring Rosary Hall as it enters its 60th year of saving lives, families, and providing people the freedom to live healthy and happy lives.

EXPRESSING REGRET FOR PASSAGE OF LAWS ADVERSELY AFFECTING THE CHINESE IN THE UNITED STATES

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 2012

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 683. This resolution expresses the regret of the House of Representatives for the passage of laws that adversely affected the Chinese in the United States, including the Chinese Exclusion Act. These laws discriminated against people of Chinese descent and blatantly contradicted our belief that all people are created equal.

Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882. The bill imposed a ten-year moratorium on immigration and naturalization of Chinese settlers. The law was expanded several times to apply to all persons of Chinese descent and each expansion imposed increasingly tougher restrictions on Chinese immigration and naturalization. As the resolution before us today states, the Chinese exclusion laws "enshrined in law the exclusion of the Chinese from the democratic process and the promise of American freedom."

The United States Senate passed a similar resolution in October 2011. I believe passage of H. Res. 683 will be a historic acknowledgment by Congress of the injustice of the Chinese exclusion laws.

I am proud to cosponsor this resolution and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 307 I was absent due to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

CONGRATULATING NANCY BARBOUR ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Nancy Barbour on the occasion of her retirement on June 30th after 21 years at Dykema, where she was a founding member of its government relations practice. During her tenure at Dykema, she advocated for many worthy causes, including support for the city of Detroit and the University of Michigan Medical System, where her efforts resulted in the addition of both a new veterans' hospital and a new children's hospital. The Detroit Free Press, Crain's Business Week, and Detroit News have recognized Mrs. Barbour's many endeavors.

Prior to her private sector advocacy, Mrs. Barbour dedicated nearly twenty years to working on Capitol Hill, spanning both chambers. She worked for Senator Phil Hart from Michigan, Congressman Bob Traxler from Michigan, Congressman Jim O'Hara from Michigan, Congressman Herb Harris from Virginia, and Congressman Bill Ford from Michigan, who was Chairman of the Committee on

Education and Labor. Mrs. Barbour served for many years as Chairman Ford's Legislative Director. She worked on a host of issues during her congressional tenure, including a humanitarian initiative helping to relocate a number of Soviet Jews facing persecution in the USSR to the United States. Mrs. Barbour's mastery of congressional issues and the federal assisted her success in the private sector.

Having realized personal success in both the public and private sectors, Mrs. Barbour understands the importance of education, and tirelessly gives back to her community. For many years she has tutored adults in Fairfax County, Virginia, helping them earn a high school equivalency degree and further their own career opportunities and realize their personal potential. Despite her retirement, Mrs. Barbour will continue as a pillar of her community and continue to help those striving to help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking Nancy Barbour for her decades of service to Congress and her community, and to congratulate her on her retirement and wish her well in all of her future endeavors.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF GIL NOBLE, PRODUCER AND HOST OF WABC–TV'S ''LIKE IT IS''

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my dear longtime friend and Harlem native, Gil Noble, who made his transition on Holy Thursday, April 5, 2012 at the age of eighty. Born to Jamaican immigrants Gilbert and Iris Noble in Harlem on February 22, 1932, Gil Noble was a pioneering anchorman and journalist who spent his career giving voice to Black Power and the African Diasporic experience. For over forty years he was perhaps the nation's most important black journalist, bringing the struggle for civil rights and equality into the homes of millions of Americans in black and white and in color.

Growing up influenced by jazz pianist Erroll Garner, a young Gil Noble took up the piano and decided as a teen to pursue a career in music. He formed the Gil Noble Trio, playing in New York clubs while attending City College. Later in life his love of jazz would later lead him to become a strong supporter of the Jazz Foundation of America and join its board of directors. After graduating, he went on to work for Union Carbide and modeled part time, where he met his wife, Jean, also a model at that time.

Gil Noble began his fifty years career in television and programming, when he got his first break in broadcast media in 1962, as a part-time announcer for Harlem's radio station WLIB. Gil began reporting and reading newscasts as well as servicing the Associated Press teletype machine and tracking interview tapes. In 1967, he joined WABC–TV as a reporter and served as anchor for the station's Saturday and Sunday night newscast in 1968. Gil's career surged when he was named host of WABC–TV's ''Like It Is.'' During his numerous decades hosting his iconic television program, Like It Is, Gil acquainted the country with the story and the culture of Black America.

The show was truly groundbreaking. It engaged black leaders in sports, journalism, film, education, civil rights, politics and business, like Bill Cosby, Harry Belafonte, Lena Horne, Sarah Vaughan, Sammy Davis, Jr., Dizzy Gillespie, Oscar Peterson, Erroll Garner, Carmen McRae, Aretha Franklin, Dr. Billy Taylor, Nancy Wilson, Sidney Poitier, Imhotep Gary Byrd, (Dr. Ben) Yosef Ben-Jochannan, Muhammad Ali, Arthur Ashe, Reverend Jesse Louis Jackson and Minister Louis Farrakhan to name a few.

Gil told it like it is and interviewed national and international historic figures like President Nelson Mandela of South Africa and President Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe. He interviewed controversial and uncontroversial with profound discussions of the world's most important issues. I was greatly honored to appear on Like It Is, with Reverend Dr. Calvin A. Butts of the historic Abyssinian Baptist Church, where we gather to say farewell to our dear friend and legend.

The program also featured insightful documentaries that delved into the lives of Paul Robeson, Martin Luther King, Jr., W.E.B. DuBois, Malcolm X, Charlie Parker, Jack Johnson, Fannie Lou Hamer, Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., Stokely Carmichael (Kwame Ture), Justice Bruce Wright and countless other prominent figures of the African and Urban Diaspora. Perhaps most importantly, it provided an intelligent and progressive forum for black Americans that changed the way the nation viewed its black citizens. Gil's legacy will continue as a trailblazer for African Americans in journalism.

Mr. Speaker, you would be hard pressed to find anyone in Harlem who does not have memories of gathering with friends and family to watch Gil Noble eloquently discuss the issues of the day. The death of Gil, a son of Harlem, is especially saddening for the Village of Harlem, but also our nation and the world. We will all miss this intellectually passionate man and the inspiration he gave to our nation.

On Thursday, April 12, hundreds of Harlemites, New Yorkers and world visitors convened at Harlem's historic Abyssinian Baptist Church to pay final tribute, respect and honor to a man who was larger than height. May our spirit be filled with light and progress and may the light guide us through the fear and ignorance of our times in remembrance of my dear beloved Gil Noble.

TRIBUTE TO SETH ALEXANDER KLEINWORT

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Seth Kleinwort of Madrid, Iowa for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout.

The Eagle Scout rank is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Only about 5 percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based achievement with high standards that have been well-maintained over the past century.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, as well as completing an Eagle Project to benefit the community. Seth's project involved funding and erecting 21 flags on Memorial Day Weekend along Highway 17 to pay tribute to our nation's heroes. Seth completed this project while going above and beyond the required merit badges, earning a staggering total of 50 badges. The work ethic Seth has shown in his Eagle Project, and every other project leading up to his Eagle Scout rank, speaks volumes of his commitment to serving a cause greater than himself and assisting his community.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I am honored to represent Seth and his family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating him in obtaining the Eagle Scout ranking, and will wish him continued success in his future education and career.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SCOTTISH RITE CATHEDRAL IN NEW MEXICO

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Scottish Rite Masons of New Mexico on the occasion of the Centennial Celebration of the Scottish Rite Cathedral in Santa Fe, New Mexico. On this occasion they also celebrate New Mexico's 100th year as a State of the Union.

The celebration at the Scottish Rite Temple includes tours, outdoor activities, a parade, a private reception, a brunch, a public exemplification of a Scottish Rite Degree and a Period Dress Ball in the evening.

Though the exact time of the beginning of Freemasonry is unknown, many of the symbols and language come from the Middle Ages. It has become a worldwide fraternity which focuses on self-improvement and social betterment. Freemasons partake in philanthropy, service, funding of research, and spreading ideals in which they believe.

Currently, there are four million Masons worldwide. Notable Masons throughout time are George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Paul Revere, John Hancock, John Paul Jones and Chief Justice John Marshall to name a few. Notable actions of the Masons include spreading the ideals of the Enlightenment, the formation of the democratic government and supporting the first public schools in both Europe and America.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring the Scottish Rite and all Freemasons on the joyous occasion of the Centennial Celebration of the Scottish Rite Cathedral in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

RON NEWTON, MANCHESTER VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTER

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the incredible public service of one of my constituents, Ron Newton of Manchester, Maine.

Mr. Newton has been a member of the Manchester Volunteer Fire Department now for 50 years. In that time, he has served as deputy to three different chiefs, and has put thousands of hours into training, fire calls, and meetings.

In Maine, our small towns often depend on volunteers to staff our fire departments. With their radios always close by, they routinely drop what they're doing to report to an emergency, whether they have to leave work or their families to do so. Just like full-time firefighters, they risk their lives for others, are passionate about their work, and are heroes.

Mr. Newton's five decades as a firefighter is an incredible statement of commitment to his community and its residents—he has something to teach us all about public service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 308, I was absent due to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 2012 VIENNA-TYSONS REGIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BUSINESS AND SERVICE AWARDS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the honorees of the 2012 Vienna Tysons Regional Chamber of Commerce (VTRCC) Business and Service Awards. Each year, the VTRCC recognizes companies, nonprofits, and individuals in the Vienna-Tysons area who demonstrate exceptional commitment to business and the community.

Since the 1940's, the VTRCC has provided a strategic link between local businesses and the region through participation in community activities, networking opportunities, marketing, support and education. This region has witnessed extraordinary growth, and the VTRCC has been a consistent, guiding voice for business. Fairfax County is considered by many to be one of the best communities in the country in which to live, work and raise a family. A significant factor in that distinction is the thriving partnership between the public and private sectors. Corporations, non-profit organizations, and educational institutions work hand-in-hand with their counterparts in local, State and Federal government agencies. A thriving business community is essential to maintaining a high quality of life for all residents, just as ensuring strong community institutions and educational opportunities are available for all residents is essential to fostering continued economic growth.

I join the Vienna-Tysons Regional Chamber of Commerce in congratulating the following recipients of the 2012 Business and Service Awards:

Business of the Year (Large Company): Transurban.

Business of the Year (Small Company): Washington Landscapes.

Business Executive of the Year (Large Company): Kevin Reynolds—Cardinal Bank.

Business Executive of the Year (Small Company): Diana Carlin—Damon Galleries, Ltd.

Entrepreneur of the Year: Mark Rogoff—Title One Settlement Group, LLC.

Citizen of the Year: Delegate Mark Keam.

Nonprofit of the Year: Shepherd's Center of Oakton-Vienna.

Educator of the Year: David Reynolds—Vienna Elementary School.

Lifetime Service Award: Richard Irons—First Citizens Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the recipients of the 2012 Vienna-Tysons Regional Chamber of Commerce Business and Service Awards and in thanking them for their many contributions not only to our businesses but also our community.

IN HONOR OF DR. LINDA HENKE

HON. RUSS CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Linda Henke, for her years of service to the people of the St. Louis area.

Dr. Henke is retiring as Superintendent of the Maplewood Richmond Heights School District, MRH, where she demonstrated a true passion for excellence during her years of service. When she first joined MRH, the district was one point away from losing its accreditation from the state of Missouri. After a decade under Dr. Henke's guidance, the school district now operates with Missouri's top Annual Performance Report Score; a true testament to Dr. Henke's hard work, dedication, and leadership.

Her personal approach towards the staff and the students has been a hallmark of her tenure. She made a point to know the staff and the students by name, and she attended nearly all sporting events, school plays, and concerts her students took part in. She actively sought to include her students in the development of successful school policies by regularly meeting with an advisory team of middle and high school students to openly discuss problems and possible solutions.

Dr. Henke not only cares about her students' academic success, but also about their health and well-being. I have had the pleasure of working with Dr. Henke as she has endeavored to provide locally produced, healthy food choices to her students in the cafeteria. She has worked hard to engage students in learning about our food system and teaching them that good eating habits are connected to excellence in education.

Her life has been defined by remarkable service to others. Dr. Henke has an exceptional ability to identify needs and works to fulfill them, as she has demonstrated many times while leading the MRH school district. A great example of this was when she saw that some students and families had lost their homes and had trouble finding regular meals. She addressed this by developing Joe's Place, where teenage boys can go to find affection, support, a home, and regular meals. In previous years, each of the boys who lived at Joe's Place not only graduated from MRH High School, but also went on to attend college. In many cases, they were the first members of their families to accomplish this feat.

Without Dr. Henke's passion for her students and determination to provide them with every opportunity for success, MRH would not be the model school district it is today. Educators from across the country visit MRH schools to understand how she has transformed the district, and how they can replicate her successful programs in their own districts.

I congratulate Dr. Linda Henke on her retirement, and I thank her for her service to our community.

IN HONOR OF MR. STUART J. GREENBERG

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. Stuart J. Greenberg on the occasion of his retirement as executive director of Environmental Health Watch (EHW).

As an EHW founding board member, staff member for 28 years, and chief executive for 19 years, Stu became a pioneer in the field of healthy housing leaving a rich legacy and a number of accomplishments which have led to healthier children and families both in and around the Cleveland area and across the country. Stu was instrumental in establishing the first national conference on healthy homes and, with a small group of peer experts, literally coined the term ''healthy home.''

Stu's work with EHW was not limited to the inside of the home. As part of his work with EHW, Stu helped to develop Local Emergency Planning Committees, or LEPCs, which facilitate collaboration and information sharing among partners in emergency response. Stu helped to get provisions for LEPCs in the 1986 ''Right-to-Know'' amendments to the federal Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act, better known as ''Superfund.'' Stu's participation and leadership in Cuyahoga County's LEPC over the last 25 years has contributed to the safety of local communities in Northeast Ohio.

EHW, formerly the Council on Hazardous Materials, was not the first organization which Stu took from concept to reality. Stu was a cofounder and first executive director of Spectrum of Supportive Services, formerly Panta Rhei, Inc., a rehabilitation agency now affiliated with Recovery Resources, Inc., for people re-entering the community following long-term mental health-related hospitalizations.

Stu began his college education at Western Reserve University, where he graduated cum laude in 1966 with a Bachelor's degree in Psychology and Sociology. Then, in 1970, Stu

graduated from the Case Institute of Technology, earning a Master of Science degree in Organizational Behavior.

Stu has served on many councils, committees, and boards and has received numerous awards and distinctions for his expertise, activism, and dedication to social justice, such as the 2005 Howard Metzenbaum Citizen Action Award by Ohio Citizen Action.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in congratulating Stu Greenberg on his pathforging and inspiring career and service to the Greater Cleveland community.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GIRL SCOUTS

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, When Juliette ''Daisy'' Gordon Low gathered 18 girls together in Savannah, GA, on March 12, 1912, she aimed to offer a hand to the youngsters by helping them to develop physically, mentally, and spiritually. Since that first meeting of what would become known as the Girl Scouts, millions of girls and young women have grown in courage, confidence, and character and made countless contributions to the world.

The Girl Scout leadership program exists to help girls learn more about themselves, their values, and people. Those who have made extraordinary contributions as Girl Scouts receive the Gold Award for making a difference in their communities.

Through leadership in the scouting tradition, Girls Scouts are changing our country and the world. The organization continues to operate on a strong foundation of volunteers who dedicate themselves to offering their time and talents in the interest of guiding tomorrow's leaders. Thanks to them, over 10,000 girls from kindergarten through grade 12 across 36 counties in western Virginia are enjoying the Girl Scouts program. They are among over 3 million girls and volunteers who are active members along with 50 million women in the United States who are Girl Scouts alumnae.

As the Girl Scouts celebrate their centennial with a special event in Roanoke, VA, on June 30, I applaud the organization for its long history of leadership as the voice for its many devoted members, past and present. Let us all commend the special women whose experience in Girl Scouts is influencing our communities. We look forward to today's Girl Scouts becoming our next generation of leaders.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on June 18, 2012. If I were present, I would have voted on the following:

S. 684, To provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of land to the town of Alta, Utah—rollcall No. 379: ''yea.''

S. 404, To modify a land grant patent issued by the Secretary of the Interior—rollcall No. 380: ''yea.''

HONORING REV. JANE ADAMS SPAHR

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the leadership of the Rev. Jane Adams Spahr, whose work on behalf of justice for the LGBT community is an inspiration in Northern California and across the country.

Rev. Spahr began her ministry as a proud progressive and feminist, and as one of few willing to work publicly for the cause of equality for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people. In 1980, Rev. Spahr served as Minister of Pastoral Care for the Metropolitan Community Church in San Francisco's Castro District. And in 1982, Rev. Spahr founded what would become the Spectrum LGBT Center, Mann County's premiere LGBT service provider and advocacy organization.

In 1991, Rev. Spahr was called to serve as co-pastor of the Downtown United Presbyterian Church of Rochester, New York, making her the first openly gay person called to such a position of leadership within the Presbyterian tradition. Unfortunately, Rev. Spahr's pastorship was challenged and ultimately revoked by Church leadership. The Reverend was instead invited to serve the Presbyterian congregation in Tiburon, California, with a focus on working within the denomination to end discrimination and foster inclusiveness and social justice.

More recently, after the Supreme Court of California struck down the State's ban on same-sex marriage, Rev. Spahr became known for officiating at the marriages of several gay and lesbian couples. The Reverend was again challenged for refusing to comply with the anti-gay marriage policies of Church leadership and earlier this year Rev. Spahr received a formal censure for her actions. However, as in the past, the congregation has rallied behind her, and the local presbytery voted overwhelmingly to refuse the censure. Although Rev. Spahr's battle continues, I am proud to support her mission to see the dignity and humanity of every individual respected.

In 2007, I honored Rev. Spahr in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD upon her retirement from Spectrum, emphasizing that her courageous passion for justice and inclusion for LGBT people has left a legacy that is paving the way to a better future. Clearly, she has advanced the cause of same-sex marriage and other rights during this time and will continue to be an inspiration and role model to all of us who care about human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I invite you to join me in thanking the Rev. Jane Adams Spahr for her many contributions to a stronger and more inclusive community, and to the ongoing fight for full LGBT equality. We wish her every success, and we look forward to the day—closer now than ever—when the last vestiges of anti-gay discrimination are erased from our laws and from our society.

CONGRATULATING MARTHA BROWN MIDDLE SCHOOL

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my esteemed honor to congratulate Martha Brown Middle School for being designated as a New York State and National ''School to Watch.'' It is a pleasure to acknowledge Martha Brown's Principal David Dunn, the Fairport School Board, the administration, teachers, faculty and students upon receiving this award as one of only seven newly designated schools in New York State to be honored with this distinction.

The recognition as a national School to Watch means that Martha Brown excels in each of the seven Essential Elements of Standards—Focused Middle Level Schools and Programs. Those seven Essential Elements are: a philosophy and mission that reflect the intellectual and developmental needs and characteristics of young adolescents; an educational program that is comprehensive, challenging, purposeful, integrated, relevant, and standards-based; an organization and structure that support both academic excellence and personal development; classroom instruction appropriate to the needs and characteristics of young adolescents provided by skilled and knowledgeable teachers; strong educational leadership and administration that encourage, facilitate, and sustain involvement, participation, and leadership; a network of academic and personal support available for all students; and professional learning and staff development for all staff that are ongoing, planned, purposeful, and collaboratively developed.

It is especially meaningful for me to know that a school within New York State's 28th Congressional District and my hometown of Fairport has achieved this prestigious honor. It is a true testament to the hard work of the teachers, administrators, and students. The fact that Martha Brown Middle School has been selected from among many qualified middle schools speaks volumes about the school's character and dedication to academic excellence.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Martha Brown Middle School of Fairport Central School District on this well-earned honor. As a ''School to Watch,'' Martha Brown serves as a shining example for other middle schools throughout our entire nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 309, I was absent due to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

RECOGNIZING THE RECIPIENTS OF THE 2012 SHELTER HOUSE, INC. VOLUNTEER AWARDS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the remarkable efforts of Shelter House, Inc., and to congratulate the recipients of the 2012 Volunteer Awards. Shelter House is a community-based, non-profit organization that works to break the cycle of homelessness by offering support to those most in need in the Northern Virginia community. Shelter House provides crisis intervention, temporary housing, training, counseling, and programs to support self-sufficiency. Of course, none of this would be possible without the hard work of its dedicated volunteers.

Shelter House was founded in 1981 by several ecumenical groups, which came together to better serve low-income individuals and families. Shelter House operates three shelters: The Katherine K. Hanley and the Patrick Henry family shelters, which provide temporary housing for local families who become homeless, and Artemis House, Fairfax County's domestic violence shelter. Shelter House also has transitional housing programs, and it provides services for families that have found permanent housing. This assistance is vital to breaking the cycle of homelessness.

Volunteers and community partners are essential to the success of Shelter House, as they provide the tools necessary to combat homelessness. Their time, money, and effort compose the foundation of Shelter House's commendable work. This year, Shelter House has chosen several such individuals and partners to recognize for their outstanding commitment to ending homelessness in our community.

I join Shelter House in commending the following individuals and organizations being honored with 2012 Volunteer Awards:

Community Champion—Cooper Ginsberg Gray, PLLC;

Community Champion—Virginia Tire and Auto;

Community Partner—Reading Connection;

Community Partner—Southview Community Church;

Community Partner—Keller Williams, Fairfax Gateway Office;

Friend of Shelter House—Chantelle Tait;

Friend of Shelter House—Mike Katounis & Homeworks Painting;

Friend of Shelter House—Great Falls Womens Club;

Public Service Award—Captain Willie Bailey & Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department;

Public Service Award—Kathi Sheffel & Homeless Liaison Office Tutors of Fairfax County Public Schools;

Public Service Award—Lorraine McLean & the Fairfax County Health Department;

Building Bridges Building Hope Award—Lord of Life Lutheran Church;

Building Bridges Building Hope Award—Diane Jenkins;

Building Bridges Building Hope Award—The Quilt Patch;

Youth Volunteer Award—Men On a Mission;

Youth Volunteer Award—Russ Soper; and

Youth Volunteer Award—Alec Powell.

The aforementioned individuals and organizations certainly deserve special recognition for their dedication to Shelter House. However, one also must acknowledge the importance of all Shelter House volunteers, who constantly strive to better our community through efforts to provide secure, structured environments, as well as indispensable support, for families in need. These volunteers and partners allow Shelter House to effectively battle homelessness by empowering families to achieve self sufficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our sincere appreciation to Shelter House and its many volunteers and partners. Their selfless work benefits the entire Northern Virginia community and improves the lives of many of our neighbors.

COMMENDING HOWARD BERMAN FOR HIS HELP PASSING H. RES. 683

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend HOWARD BERMAN for his help passing H. Res. 683, an expression of regret for the House passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. Due to a clerical error, Mr. BERMAN was added as a cosponsor when he should be listed as an original cosponsor.

HOWARD was a key ally in the passage of this legislation. Because of his positive relationships with Members across the aisle, he successfully convinced key Republican lawmakers to support this effort. He was very influential in getting this bill through the House Judiciary Committee, and was with me every step of the way as we pushed to get a vote on the floor. This effort required a great deal of negotiation with the Republican leaders in the House. And who was by my side? HOWARD BERMAN! The community couldn't ask for a better or more dedicated champion to their cause.

Representative BERMAN has been a dedicated supporter since the introduction of the original resolution H. Res. 282, which he also cosponsored. Without HOWARD's support, we would not have made history when the House unanimously passed an expression of regret for the discriminatory Chinese Exclusion Act on June 18, 2012.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF THOMAS GREGORY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Thomas "Tommy" Gregory, a man who devoted himself to the well-being of his family, friends, community and nation.

Born on October 1, 1949 in Lubbock, Texas, Mr. Gregory dedicated 35 years of his life to public service with the United States Department of Agriculture. He was Director and Head Statistician of the National Agricultural Statistics Service Mississippi Field Office for 18 years. He developed programs, systems and publications of great use to the agricultural community. One of his priorities was to enlist, encourage, and mentor new employees to secure the future effectiveness of the Agency.

Mr. Gregory was highly respected in the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), and was known for making special efforts with colleges in his area to encourage minority students to apply for work there. He recently received recognition for being the first white man in Mississippi to join the Black Employees of NASS Organization.

Additionally, Mr. Gregory was an active and courageous supporter of reforming our nation's broken monetary system. This year the Board of Trustees of the American Monetary Institute bestowed the Courage of Conviction Award to him, in honor and lasting memory of his active support in promoting monetary reform for the benefit of all Americans. He is survived by his wife Lanet, his three children Kelsey, Britny, and Garrett, and four grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor and remembrance of Tommy Gregory, a man of unwavering faith and vision who had the courage to live by his convictions and make a difference. He will be remembered for his outstanding and enduring service for the greater good.

RECOGNIZING NATCA'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the National Air Traffic Controllers Association (NATCA).

I would like to take this opportunity to thank NATCA's 20,000 controllers, engineers and other safety-related professionals for their tireless commitment to keeping America's skies safe. In particular, I would like to express my gratitude to New York's NATCA legislative representative and members. The New York Center has over 90% of its members in NATCA, which speaks to the strength and solidarity of the organization.

Every day, the men and women who work at control towers, control centers, TRACON facilities and flight service stations make it possible for 750,000 flyers to travel. Last year, these individuals staffed a staggering 134 million flight operations. Most importantly, they operate under a commitment to their motto, "Safety Above All."

NATCA's unparalleled dedication to its members and the flying public has made the National Airspace System the best air traffic system in the world. Once again, I thank NATCA and congratulate its membership on the group's 25th anniversary.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MS. CHARLOTTE LANDRETH-MELVILLE ON HER 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish Ms. Charlotte Landreth-Melville, a resident of historic Bristol Borough in my home of Bucks County, Pennsylvania a Happy Birthday as she turns 90 on June 25th.

During her 90 years, Charlotte has seen sixteen U.S. presidents take the oath of office, has honorably served her country in World War II as a member of the Women Marines, has traveled the world, and has started her own small business. Charlotte has enjoyed quite a healthy, exciting life.

Over the course of her life, she has climbed to the peak of Mount Kilimanjaro, trekked through the Sahara Desert, lived on a houseboat in India and bicycled all across Europe. One way or another, she still managed to find time to remain active in her local community as a contributor to the Bristol Pilot Newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to speak on Charlotte's behalf today, and I wish her the very best on this momentous occasion. Charlotte's free spirit and dedication to her country and community make her a perfect role model in today's society. I wish her many more years of good health, success and happiness.

HONORING THE OUTSTANDING CAREER OF RETIRING RED CROSS OFFICIAL ARMOND MASCELLI

HON. MARK S. CRITZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. CRITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a son of southwestern Pennsylvania and a tremendous public servant.

In 1971, a young man named Armond Mascelli took the advice of his Scranton college professor and went to work for the American Red Cross. Four decades later, after a distinguished career of philanthropic work that has taken him to many different parts of the world, Armond is set to retire from the Red Cross as Vice President for Disaster Operations.

Over the last 41 years, Armond has served on and directed numerous disaster relief operations throughout the United States, Puerto Rico, Central America and the U.S. Virgin Islands. He has also served on Red Cross assignments in South Vietnam, Thailand, Japan, Canada, Mexico, Turkey and Guam.

Over his long career, there have been many significant disasters and Armond remembers them all, particularly the Johnstown, PA, flood of 1977.

Any school child from my district can tell you about the Great Johnstown Flood of 1889 caused by a dam failure which resulted in the release of 20 million tons of water into Johnstown. The flood killed more than 2,200 people and was the first major disaster relief effort handled by the American Red Cross, led by Clara Barton.

But on July 20, 1977, a line of severe thunderstorms moved slowly over Johnstown, dropping a foot of rain on the city in only 12 hours. Small streams overflowed and several dams failed, causing history to repeat itself. Water tore through highways, homes, factories and stores.

The death toll would eventually reach 85 as a result of the flood. Property damage reached about $300 million. Hundreds were left homeless. Our town was once again reminded of its tragic history, opening old wounds and inflicting new ones. But not all of the stories from this flood were sad.

The Red Cross and many other non-profit agencies, State and Federal Governments, and private individuals rushed to help with the relief efforts. Armond Mascelli was a young Red Cross disaster worker who had been assigned to the Johnstown relief operation for more than a month when he met a young and attractive Johnstown girl who was volunteering for the Red Cross in the operations. Armond and Kathy Lenzi were married 2 years later.

Armond was also assigned to the Three Mile Island nuclear disaster near Harrisburg, PA, in 1979, and was part of the task force at Indiantown Gap near Lebanon, PA, helping the more than 19,000 refugees brought there during the Cuban Boat Lift in 1980 and 1981.

Armond has been part of the Red Cross response to a number of major national and international disasters over the past four decades, including hurricanes Hugo, Andrew, Mitch and Katrina, the Loma Prieta and North Ridge earthquakes and the 1993 flooding in the Midwest. When the floods from Irene ravaged our State last year, Armond was in the Red Cross Disaster Operations Center coordinating the response.

When asked if it was ever difficult to stay in a field that witnesses so much devastation and sadness, he said the good work the Red Cross does was motivation to stay in the job.

"Disaster is unfair, heartbreaking," he said. "Working for the Red Cross is an opportunity to provide assistance to those in need. I've met a ton of real interesting people—good people—through my years with Red Cross.

"The people I work with really believe in the principles of the Red Cross, the mission," he said. "And our volunteers—they amaze me. It's neighbor helping neighbor. People in this country want to help when something happens, it's part of their makeup.

"Part of being with the Red Cross is to make it better. I'm passing this to someone else for them to make improvements," Mascelli said. "The Red Cross is always looking to the future, to change, to improve. We're an old organization, but we're still relevant. I attribute that to our mission, our volunteers and adapting to meet the changing needs of those we serve."

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Armond on his upcoming retirement and salute his great service to our Nation and to the American Red Cross. He and his wife Kathy have my best wishes as they transition into a new phase of their life together.

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF "TAPS"

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 150th anniversary of the writing of "Taps," a song I have worked tirelessly here in Congress to recognize as the National Song of Remembrance for those who have served our country.

Much like "The Star-Spangled Banner" and "The Stars and Stripes Forever," which were born from the winds of war, "Taps" shares a similar history. In July 1862, following the Seven Days battles, Union General Daniel Butterfield and bugler Oliver Willcox Norton created "Taps" at Berkley Plantation, Virginia, as a way to signal the end of daily military activities. Since that time, "Taps" has become known throughout the United States as part of the military honors accorded at funerals, memorial services, and wreath ceremonies held for members of the uniformed services and veterans who have faithfully served our nation during times of war and peace.

The designation of "Taps" as the National Song of Remembrance is timely because the 150th anniversary of the writing of "Taps" will be observed with events culminating this month, June 2012, with a rededication of the Taps Monument at Berkley Plantation, Virginia. I am proud that the House of Representatives passed this language as a tribute to honor those that have fallen in service of our country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on the following amendments to H.R. 5325 because I was attending an official event in my home state of Minnesota with President Obama.

On rollcall vote 306, I would have voted "no" on the Scalise Amendment.

On rollcall vote 307, I would have voted "no" on the King Amendment.

On rollcall vote 308, I would have voted "yes" on the Moran Amendment.

On rollcall vote 309, I would have voted "no" on the Hultgren Amendment.

On rollcall vote 310, I would have voted "no" on the Chaffetz Amendment.

On rollcall vote 311, I would have voted "no" on the McClintock Amendment.

On rollcall vote 312, I would have voted "yes" on the Kaptur Amendment.

On rollcall vote 313, I would have voted "yes" on the Tonko Amendment.

On rollcall vote 314, I would have voted "yes" on the Hahn Amendment.

RECOGNIZING THE ADRIAN CITY BAND ON THEIR 175TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Adrian City Band as they celebrate their 175th year of providing musical entertainment to the community of Adrian, Michigan.

The Adrian City Band is one of the oldest continuously organized city bands in the

United States, tracing their roots back to 1838. Under the leadership of director Jim Rice, the band of nearly 80 members recently kicked off their weekly summer concert series, which will feature eight performances with historical themes.

In spite of the down economy and tight city finances, the band members and leadership have continued the tradition without pay, while the community has supported the band through financial donations.

Community bands are an American tradition, and for decades, the Adrian City Band has offered a fine example of this civic pastime. The Adrian City Band will continue to entertain and impress with a series of eight concerts this summer at the Trestle Park bandshell, and they deserve recognition for their dedication and sacrifice in bringing entertainment to Southeast Michigan.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 18, 2012, I was unable to vote due to a conflicting obligation in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: on rollcall No. 379, ''yea''; on rollcall No. 380, ''yea.''

IN RECOGNITION OF THE VISITING NURSE ASSOCIATION HEALTH GROUP'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Visiting Nurse Association (VNA) Health Group as its employees gather to celebrate its 100th anniversary. VNA Health Group members continue to exemplify outstanding dedication to the promotion and restoration of the health status of community individuals. Their service is truly worthy of this body's recognition.

The Visiting Nurse Association Health Group was established in 1912 in Lincroft, New Jersey. Within its first decade, the organization completed a study of mentally handicapped children in public schools, launched child welfare programs and established a mobile health clinic to assist constituents throughout Monmouth County, New Jersey. The organization adopted the name Monmouth County Organization for Social Services (MCOSS) in 1918 and maintained their focus on improving healthcare needs for women and children. The agency acquired the Visiting Nurses Association in Middlesex County in 1988 and expanded their services to include the constituents of Middlesex County; later that year, the New Jersey hospice care program was certified by Medicaid and served more than 1,500 patients and their families.

In December 1993, the organization adopted the name Visiting Nurse Association of Central New Jersey; the new name allowed for the establishment of a governing board and the ability to raise funds on behalf of the organization. VNA of Central New Jersey later joined with other organizations, including the Visiting Nurse and Hospice Services and Essex Valley Visiting Nurse Association, and partnered with Robert Wood Johnson University Hospital to continue expanding their service area. In 2011, VNA of Central New Jersey affiliates and partners unified under the title Visiting Nurse Association Health Group to better reflect the organization's growth. Today, the organization and its employees continue to personify compassionate, caring and patient-centered services to constituents throughout New Jersey.

VNA Health Group is New Jersey's largest non-profit community health provider of home health, hospice and community services. Today, the VNA remains a volunteer organization that assists over 100,000 individuals throughout New Jersey each year. VNA Health Group is accredited by the Community Health Accreditation Program, Inc. and continues to provide outstanding in-home services including certified home health aide services, pediatric care, rehabilitative therapy, palliative care, tele-health monitoring, geriatric care management, companion homemaker services, and nutritional counseling. As a result of their outstanding efforts, VNA Health Group is the proud recipient of the New York Times Tribute to Nurses Award and the New Jersey Hospice and Palliative Care Association Award, among others.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in celebrating the Visiting Nurse Association Health Group's 100th Anniversary. The organization has provided exquisite services to constituents throughout Monmouth County and New Jersey.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 2012, I was unable to vote on rollcall vote 380. Had I been present I would have voted ''yea'' on passage of S. 404.

TRIBUTE TO FRANCES PRESTON

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am joined by my colleagues Congressmen STEVE COHEN, JIM COOPER, MARSHA BLACKBURN, JERROLD NADLER, HOWARD COBLE, LAMAR SMITH, BARNEY FRANK, and JOHN CONYERS to honor the life and memory of one of the First Ladies of American music, Frances W. Preston, the former president and Chief Executive Officer of Broadcast Music Inc. (BMI).

Frances Preston was a trailblazer who opened up doors of opportunity for a new generation of female executives in the music and entertainment industries. No barriers stopped Frances in advocating for songwriters' rights, and on Capitol Hill, her tireless advocacy was critical in protecting the music industry. Her counsel was indispensible and we sought it often.

The business acumen of Frances Preston was exceeded only by her charisma and charm, and by the respect, affection and admiration her colleagues and peers had for her. She was lauded for her empathy and for the gracious manner in which she treated every person, from the hottest star to the humblest worker. She was an exceptional executive, leader, role model and friend.

With Frances at its head, BMI grew to represent over 300,000 American and foreign songwriters, composers and music publishers in licensing music, and collecting and distributing royalties from play on radio and in television, films, ads and other media. Its artists represent all types of music and its catalog contains 4.5 million works. During her 18 years as president, its revenue grew more than three times to more than $625 million.

BMI has become an internationally respected leader and a unique success story as the entertainment industry has been transformed by digital technology and globalization. Sensitive to the changing world of music, Frances focused on domestic licensing, foreign performing rights, legislation for fair compensation for writers and publishers, and copyright protection.

Frances joined BMI in 1958 after working in music and broadcasting in Nashville. She opened BMI's regional office there, and led her company to preeminence in the South, signing writers and publishers with roots in both country and other types of music.

In 1964, the year the Nashville BMI building opened on Music Row, Frances became a vice president of BMI—reportedly, the first woman corporate executive in Tennessee.

She has often been called a trailblazer in the music business but Frances was also a trailblazer among women. She was the first woman Rotarian in the State of Tennessee. She was the first woman to work with the National Chamber of Commerce. She was one of the first four women—and the first businesswoman—to be invited to join the Friars Club in New York and the first woman to serve on their board of governors.

Frances was an industry pioneer and a compassionate humanitarian who touched the lives of many people, and she will be sorely missed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker on rollcall No. 310, I was absent due to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

EXPRESSING REGRET FOR PASSAGE OF LAWS ADVERSELY AFFECTING THE CHINESE IN THE UNITED STATES

SPEECH OF

HON. JUDY BIGGERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 2012

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 683. This

resolution expresses the regret of the House of Representatives for laws that unfairly targeted the Chinese community in the United States, specifically the Chinese Exclusion Act.

I want to thank my good friend from California, Ms. CHU, for her hard work and determination in bringing this important resolution to the floor, and I am proud to join her as the lead cosponsor of this historic effort.

America's strength has always been derived from our commitment to the principles of our founders. And although we do not always succeed in living up to those ideals, we continually strive to do so, and we become stronger in the process.

Today, we have the opportunity to take another important step by recognizing one of the great—yet often overlooked—injustices in our shared history.

One-hundred and thirty years ago, just thirteen years after the last spike was driven into the first transcontinental railroad, the Congress of the United States strayed from the path laid by our founders and implemented the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882.

This ten-year ban on Chinese immigration and naturalization targeted Chinese immigrants for physical and political exclusion, and its passage was driven by an unfortunate mix of racism, jingoism, and intolerance.

In subsequent years, Congress expanded and hardened these laws, making it impossible for legal Chinese workers to reenter America, apply for citizenship, and reunite with their families. And it wasn't until the U.S.-Chinese alliance of World War Two that Congress finally repealed these laws and restored the rights of Chinese-Americans.

Since that time, this body has passed many reforms. Yet, over 100 years later, this chamber has yet to acknowledge its own misguided actions. Today, we have the opportunity to do just that and reaffirm our shared commitment to equality.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to thank Linda Yang, the Director of the Xilin [SI-LIN] Asian Community Center in Naperville, Illinois, whose advice and input has helped to drive this resolution to the floor.

It was she who told me about the individuals in our own community whose parents and grandparents were impacted by the Chinese Exclusion Act.

Unfortunately, many of these victims are no longer with us. But for those who remain, it is critical to address this issue now, before the opportunity is lost forever.

With that in mind, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important resolution. Through it, let us acknowledge the past, express our regret, and promote a greater appreciation for the challenges that past generations of Chinese Americans have bravely overcome.

IN HONOR OF THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker I rise today to recognize and celebrate the 90th anniversary of St. Thomas Aquinas Roman Catholic Church in Bristol, Pennsylvania.

St. Thomas Aquinas Church was built in 1922 as a place for working men and women of Southeast Pennsylvania to gather to pray. Funded by the generosity of the local community and the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Fr. Nolan founded this parish to unify the communities of Croydon, Bristol, and Bensalem.

St. Thomas Aquinas Church was named after the 13th century Sicilian theologian. A prominent member of the Dominican Order, St. Thomas Aquinas revolutionized philosophy, modern political theory, and ethical morality. Many consider his most notable work, Summa Theologica, to be one of the foundations of the Catholic faith and modern theology. His contributions to intellectual thought have allowed him to become the patron saint of academics and Catholic schools.

Although St. Thomas Aquinas Church has struggled through some setbacks in the past few years, the current pastor, Fr. Mike Davis, has made it his mission to unify the community. By recommitting his church to its original mission, Fr. Mike has rallied his parishioners to persevere through the recent closing of their elementary school, and unveil a major renovation effort to improve their facilities. Completed solely by the parishioners themselves, the new refurbishments not only update the facility's technology, but also display beautiful religious paintings and depictions from history.

As we look back on the past 90 years of commitment and service to the communities of Bristol and Croydon, I only hope that the future continues to bring more prosperity to St. Thomas Aquinas Church. I am proud to stand with Fr. Mike, his parishioners, and the members of my district in celebrating the 90th anniversary of St. Thomas Aquinas Roman Catholic Church.

HONORING MRS. LUCILE JOHNSON'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DAVID SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Lucile Johnson on her remarkable 100th birthday, June 19, 2012. Lucile has lived in Atlanta for all 100 years of her wonderful life—she was blessed with 65 years of marriage to her late husband Earl Johnson, and she is the proud and loving mother of 6 children, grandmother of 15, great grandmother of 20, and last but certainly not least: great great grandmother of 1.

Lucile has been a driven and caring person her entire life and worked diligently at the Biltmore Hotel in Atlanta for many years to provide for her family. As a passionate member of her community, Lucile graciously chose to volunteer with her church missionary group in feeding the homeless of Atlanta for decades. Lucile is the matriarch of her ever-growing family and has helped to raise many of her grand children and great grandchildren. The comfort and advice she provides to her family is truly treasured and matchless.

Mr. Speaker, Lucile Johnson is an outstanding member of the community in my District and has served as an exceptional role model for her family and many others. I am delighted to join her family, friends and many admirers in wishing her a very happy 100th birthday and continued good health and happiness for years to come.

RECOGNITION OF THE D.C. DIVAS FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the D.C. Divas Football team for their eleventh season and on returning to the Women's Football Association for the 2012 season. This year marks the 40th Anniversary of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which protects people from discrimination based on gender. Passage of Title IX has helped to make it possible for teams like the D.C. Divas to accomplish great success and serve as a role model for young girls.

The D.C. Divas were established in 2000, with the first season beginning in the spring of 2001. They have been a strong team with nine winning seasons and eight division titles. The D.C. Divas are currently celebrating as the 2012 Division Champions. The team won the NWFA Championship in 2006 after completing a perfect season.

Not only have they been strong on the field, but they are actively involved within the D.C. and Maryland communities. Members of the team have participated in Recess by the River since the program began, helping educate kids on active living to prevent child obesity with kids from Ward 8. The team has also supported the Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence, the Northern Virginia Ronald McDonald House, and the Special Olympics of Northern Virginia. These are only some of the many organizations in which the D.C. Divas are actively involved.

I congratulate the D.C. Divas for their accomplishments on and off the field over the past twelve years. This is a great team that provides an athletic outlet for the people of Washington, D.C. and the surrounding areas. I wish them the best during the rest of their season and the many seasons to come.

TO RECOGNIZE THE 2012 LORDS AND LADIES FAIRFAX

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a dedicated group of men and women in Northern Virginia. For the past 28 years, each member of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors has selected two people from his or her district who have demonstrated an exceptional commitment to our community. Since the program's inception in 1984, nearly 500 individuals have been recognized as a Lord or Lady Fairfax by their representative on the Board of Supervisors. I was pleased to take part in this annual ritual and recognize many outstanding community volunteers during my 14 years on the Board.

Individuals recognized as Lords and Ladies of Fairfax have made significant contributions

in their communities. This year, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors recognized outstanding individuals who have made tremendous impacts through their support of our public schools, parks, youth sports leagues, arts community, public safety providers, and human service programs. It is nearly impossible to fully describe the diversity of accomplishments by the honorees. Their efforts contribute greatly to the quality of life for the residents of Fairfax County and should be commended.

The following individuals have been recognized as Lord and Lady Fairfax honorees for 2012. Each of these individuals was selected as a result of his or her outstanding volunteer service, heroism, or other special achievements. These individuals have earned our praise and appreciation.

At Large: Lady Kathy Albarado and Lord Delbert Sheads.

Braddock District: Lady Tessie Wilson and Lord Doug Brammer.

Dranesville District: Lady Jacqueline D. Taylor and Lord Robert H. Jackson.

Hunter Mill District: Lady Jenifer Joy Madden and Lord Frank de la Fe.

Lee District: Lady Martha Lloyd and Lord Don Hinman.

Mason District: Lady Sue Hotto and Lord Ben Hester.

Mt. Vernon District: Lady Diana York and Lord James C. Rees.

Providence District: Lady Vivian Morgan-Mendez and Lord Mark D. Meana.

Springfield District: Lady Breeana G. Bomhorst and Lord Robert Scott Brown.

Sully District: Lady Jennifer Campbell and Lord John R. Cleveland.

I also commend the following recipients of two additional awards; the James M. Scott Community Spirit Award and the Celebrate Fairfax! Festival Volunteer of the Year Award. The James M. Scott Community Spirit Award recognizes a sponsor, organization or individual who has exemplified strong advocacy and commitment to Celebrate Fairfax, Inc. and its efforts to develop community through events, and the Celebrate Fairfax! Festival Volunteer of the Year Award selects one volunteer out of 1500 to be recognized for extraordinary efforts to ensure that the festival, which will be held this weekend at the county government center, and affiliated CFI programs are successful.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE LIFE OF OUR BELOVED FREEDOM FIGHTER AND FREEDOM SISTER DR. ANNIE B. MARTIN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to mourn the loss of our National Association for the Advancement of Colored People's life-long freedom fighter and freedom sister, Dr. Annie B. Martin. Dr. Martin served an unprecedented sixteen terms as President of the historic NAACP New York Branch, also known as the Harlem Branch; the first chartered Branch of NAACP's National Association, which celebrated its Centennial Anniversary in 2011. Under her leadership, the New York Branch became the largest NAACP branch in the Eastern region, with more than 6,000 members, and has received annual national awards for program activity.

Affectionately known to many of us as Chief or simply Annie B, Dr. Martin was a devoted and dedicated member of the NAACP National Board of Directors. With her soft, but outspoken voice she led by example and with dignity. Annie B was my very dear friend and ally, and on behalf of my wife Alma, my sister Hazel Dukes and our beloved Village of Harlem, our nation has lost another soldier and angel of the civil rights and labor movement that dedicated her entire life fighting and speaking out against injustices and inequality. Dr. Martin committed her 91 years plus life to making our world an equal playing field for all to inspire and attain, and I will deeply miss my beloved friend and freedom sister.

Annie B. Martin was a native of Eastover, South Carolina and was the seventh of eight children, which were born to Jacob and Queenie Martin. She was a graduate of Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina and earned a Master's Degree in both social work and guidance counseling from New York University. Dr. Martin was an important and dominant voice in the American labor movement, including service as executive board member of the New York City Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO, and first vice president of the Black Trade Unionists Leadership Committee of the New York City Central Labor Council. Dr. Martin served as New York assistant commissioner of labor under former Governors Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller, Charles Malcolm Wilson and Hugh Carey.

She also served as senior extension associate of Cornell University's School of Industrial and Labor Relations; secretary-treasurer of Local 8–138, Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers Union; and adjunct professor at Columbia, Fordham and New York Universities.

As director of labor participation for the American Red Cross in Greater New York, at the age of 81, Dr. Martin was on duty seven days a week after the terrorist attack on America on September 11, 2001, serving as liaison between labor, the Red Cross and the NYFD and NYPD departments. This remarkable woman coordinated survival and job-placement issues for hundreds of members of organized labor and personally processed 290 claims for American Red Cross Emergency Family Gifts to families' beneficiaries who lost members at "Ground Zero." Dr. Martin, freedom's mother of labor, was always there to serve her community and our great country.

Dr. Annie B. Martin now takes her place in history alongside Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Medgar Evers, Dr. Benjamin L. Hooks, Percy Ellis Sutton and Freedom Sisters Harriet Tubman, Ida B. Wells-Barnett, Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Louise McCauley Parks, Ella Jo Baker, Dorothy Irene Height, Shirley Chisholm, Barbara Charline Jordan, Betty Shabazz, Coretta Scott King and the countless of extraordinary African American Women and Men who have given so much of their entire lives and lifework to preserving freedom and equality for all of us and our nation's children.

Mr. Speaker, as I stand before you today, I ask you to join me and my colleagues in remembering the life of our beloved Freedom Fighter, Dr. Annie B. Martin. Her compassion and dedication to her community serves as a model for all Americans, our nation and the world.

TRIBUTE TO BRANDON A. THEISEN

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Brandon Theisen of Granger, Iowa for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout.

The Eagle Scout rank is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Only about 5 percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based achievement with high standards that have been well-maintained over the past century.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, as well as completing an Eagle Project to benefit the community. Brandon's project involved a complete reinstallation of a retaining wall at Jester Park, which included removing an existing wall and constructing a new one. The work ethic Brandon has shown in his Eagle Project, and every other project leading up to his Eagle Scout rank, speaks volumes of his commitment to serving a cause greater than himself and assisting his community.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I am honored to represent Brandon and his family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating him in obtaining the Eagle Scout ranking, and will wish him continued success in his future education and career.

SANFORD COMMUNITY ADULT EDUCATION

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate this year's graduates of Sanford Community Adult Education programs in Sanford, Maine. These men and women have worked incredibly hard to earn their GEDs, high school diplomas, and work skills certificates, and I am thrilled to see their efforts come to fruition.

I commend these graduates for having the courage to recommit to their education after months or even years since last stepping in a classroom. Doing so, they have had to deal with a unique set of challenges, including balancing school work with careers and families.

With their education comes opportunity. I am excited about the new doors that will open for these graduates with their diplomas and certificates in hand. I wish them the best of luck as they pursue their goals, whether that is starting a business, getting a promotion, or simply setting a good example for their children.

I also want to thank the teachers and administrators of the program, and all the family members and friends who supported these students. This accomplishment is theirs as well.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 311, I was absent due to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

TO RECOGNIZE JIM HINKLE FOR SERVICE AS THE PRESIDENT OF THE MANTUA CITIZEN'S ASSOCIATION

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mr. Jim Hinkle and to congratulate him as he completes his tenure as the President of the Mantua Citizens' Association, MCA.

Like other home owners associations, the MCA responds to the needs of its residents, circulates local news, and coordinates volunteer services and community projects. As a former president of the MCA myself, I know firsthand the time and effort Mr. Hinkle has devoted to helping improve our community and maintain its rich quality of life.

During his tenure, Mr. Hinkle has tackled local environmental, safety, and road maintenance challenges. The nearby fuel tanker farm continues to be a perennial concern, particularly given recent spills and accidents. Mr. Hinkle has demonstrated effective leadership, collaborating with local, state and federal authorities, including the Environmental Protection Agency and my office. Thanks to our coordinated efforts, improved safety measures are being implemented.

Whether it's projects large or small, Mr. Hinkle has demonstrated a passion for community service. After the severe winter storms of 2010, he proposed a community service project for a local Boy Scout troop. The Scouts identified deficiencies in the neighborhood roads and made a presentation to the Virginia Department of Transportation, VDOT, which organized the necessary repairs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Mr. Hinkle for his tremendous service to the Mantua community. Though his tenure as president has come to a close, I am confident we will continue to benefit from his contributions.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No.: 371, "no;" 372, "no;" 373, "no;" 374, "no;" 375, "no;" 376, "yes;" 377, "yes;" 378, "no." Had I been present, I would have voted as indicated.

HONORING JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Juneteenth Independence Day Celebration. Juneteenth, celebrated on the 19th of June, is a holiday that celebrates the emancipation of African Americans from slavery but has come to signify much more. It is celebrated in June, the month that the last African Americans were informed of their Emancipation.

During the Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation on September 22, 1862, which came into effect on January 1, 1863. Critically, following the conclusion of the Civil War, U.S. Government officials traversed through the South to enforce the Proclamation. It was not until June 19th, 1865, in Galveston, TX, that Union General Gordon Granger declared freedom for the last major vestige of slavery in the United States, marking one of the proudest days in all of African American history.

Mr. Speaker, Juneteenth Independence Day is a holiday that should not go without note. This date represents a crucial milestone in African American history and demonstrates the evolution of our Nation over the last century and a half. Today, Juneteenth commemorates African American freedom and emphasizes education and achievement. I encourage all of my constituents to take part in the day's festivities and also to reflect on the values of self-improvement, assessment, and future-planning which are consistent with the spirit of Juneteenth.

RECOGNIZING THE FIFTEENTH ANNUAL PLATTSBURGH RELAY FOR LIFE

HON. WILLIAM L. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the fifteenth annual Plattsburgh Relay for Life.

This event has not only strived for years to raise money and awareness in an effort to eradicate cancer, but it serves as a tribute to all those who have bravely fought this tragic disease.

This annual event honors the courageous efforts these individuals have demonstrated in their fight for life and remembers those that have lost the battle. Tonight we especially remember our dear friend, Marie Guay, who lost her brave fight with cancer last year. As the former Relay for Life Survivor Chair, Marie devoted countless hours ensuring that cancer survivors were honored and celebrated. So tonight we remember all of her efforts and together honor her memory.

With gratitude, we acknowledge the work of the entire Relay for Life committee and its participants. I commend each and every one of you for keeping the valiant struggle of these individuals in all our memories and working to ensure that more people survive cancer and are able to celebrate another birthday.

THE HUMAN COST OF THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with deep sadness and regret: we have reached 2,000 American troop deaths in the War in Afghanistan—a war we needlessly continue to fight. My sincerest condolences go out to the families, friends, and communities who have lost loved ones to a war I have ardently opposed for the past 11 years.

Americans are not alone in our loss. As of summer 2011, conservative estimates indicate that anywhere between 30,000 and 45,000 Afghan civilians have lost their lives to this war. I will never understand why we continually squander lives and money to achieve tactical or strategic military goals. The cost is simply too great; the ends do not justify the means.

Seventy percent of Americans want a complete and early withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan, according to a recent Rasmussen poll. Yet we do not listen, so more lives are lost in this nonsensical war. I hope that someday soon we will finally bring home our troops and help restore peace to the nation of Afghanistan.

CONGRATULATING HUNTER WRIGHT

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Fresno resident Hunter Wright upon being named a recipient of Pacific Gas & Electric Company's (PG&E) 2012 Bright Minds Scholarship, a prestigious academic scholarship awarded to a small number of California high school students each year.

Miss Wright is one of 8,060 students from PG&E's Northern and Central California service area to apply for the $30,000 Bright Minds Scholarship this year. The scholarship is renewable for up to four additional years. As one of eight winners, Miss Wright joins a highly select group of students participating in the utility company's largest scholarship program.

Miss Wright was informed of her scholarship award while sitting in her Advanced Placement English class, when Edison High School administrators and representatives from PG&E bearing a banner, balloons, cupcakes, and an oversize check surprised her. Her parents, Doreen and Dave Wright, were also present for the announcement.

Miss Wright graduated from Edison High School on June 12, 2012. In addition to excelling in academics, she actively participated in cross-country, lacrosse, tennis, and regularly volunteered for various community causes. Miss Wright will attend the University of Miami this fall, where she plans to study English. She aspires to be an English professor.

In addition to her academic and career goals, Miss Wright hopes to continue traveling the world to do volunteer work.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Miss Hunter Wright of Fresno, California, for

her impressive academic accomplishments. I congratulate her upon being named a recipient of PG&E's 2012 Bright Minds Scholarship and wish her the best of success in her future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 312, I was absent due to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

RECOGNIZING THE 2012 HIDDEN POND ENVIROTHON TEAM

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 2012 Hidden Pond Envirothon Team and congratulate them on achieving Second Place in the Virginia State Envirothon Competition.

The Envirothon Competition promotes problem-solving among high school students in the areas of forestry, wildlife, soils, aquatics, and other current environmental issues. What is most unique about the competition is the opportunity to work in the field with access to actual natural resource professionals. The competition aims to foster stewardship, improve management concepts and communication skills, and promote critical thinking, decision making, and team building.

This year's members of the Hidden Pond Envirothon Team are Liam Berigan (Robinson HS), Matt Baker (W. T. Woodson HS), Murjan Hammad (home-schooled), Owan Mulvey-McFerron (W. T. Woodson HS), and Peter MacDonald (West Springfield HS), with Coach Neal MacDonald. The team won first place in the local Fairfax County Envirothon Competition as well as at the Area II Regional Competition. This allowed the team to move on to competition at the state level at James Madison University in Harrisonburg. While competing against the top 15 teams from across Virginia, the Hidden Pond Envirothon Team placed second for the second year in a row. This year's oral presentation focus was titled "Low Impact Development and Nonpoint Source Pollution," for which the team placed first. Hidden Pond also placed first in the wildlife category, second place in the aquatics category, and third place in the forestry category.

I would like to offer special thanks to Mike McCaffrey and Jim Pomeroy. Mr. McCaffrey has coordinated the Envirothon Program at the Hidden Pond Nature Center for many years. His efforts have enabled the team to compete at the state level as Hidden Pond is typically the only team not sponsored by a high school. Mr. Pomeroy has served as Hidden Pond's Site Manager, supporting the Envirothon Team with great enthusiasm. Through their commitment and encouragement to this program, many of the students have gone on to become local volunteers or work in careers focused on protecting the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues join me in congratulating the 2012 Hidden Pond Envirothon Team for their performance in the Virginia State Envirothon Competition.

CONGRATULATING THE NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS ASSOCIATION ON ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the National Air Traffic Controllers Association on the 25th anniversary of the Union's founding.

NATCA represents more than 20,000 air traffic controllers and other aviation safety professionals who run the safest, most efficient air traffic control system in the world. These men and women are dedicated aviation professionals who come to work every day knowing that they have to perform their jobs with 100 percent accuracy 100 percent of the time. The American people entrust their lives and the lives of their loved ones to NATCA members each and every time they step on an airplane. This is a responsibility that NATCA takes seriously. Since NATCA's founding in 1987, the United States National Airspace System has maintained its record as the safest airspace in the world.

Mr. Speaker, NATCA's 20,000 FAA aviation safety professionals are dedicated federal employees. Our nation's incredible aviation safety record is due in part to the fact that these men and women are federal employees whose number one priority is to ensure the safety of the flying public. I applaud NATCA on this remarkable achievement and congratulate them on their 25th anniversary.

CONGRATULATING THE DEER PARK HIGH SCHOOL SOFTBALL TEAM

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Deer Park High School Softball Team for becoming the 2012 5A State Champions. Winning the state championship is a great accomplishment that takes an incredible amount of effort, dedication and teamwork from every player. This win is Deer Park High School's first state championship title since 1955. Our entire community is proud of the Deer Park Lady Deer's success and hard work to bring home the state trophy.

In addition to winning the state championship, the Deer Park Lady Deer had an impressive season record of 31–8, with a district record of 8–2. In the state semi-final game, the team set a state tournament record for the most runs scored in a single inning by scoring ten runs in the fifth inning of the game.

The talent that exists on this team is exceptional. Out of ten eligible spots, Deer Park players were selected for seven spots on the state 5A all tournament team. Those players include Kristen Davenport, Jo Rivera, Caitlin Plocheck, Lexi Fryar, Alexis Garcia, Haley Harrison, and Alana Tinker. Kristen Davenport was named the championship's Most Valuable Player, MVP, and also the Houston Chronicle's Girl Athlete of the Week for June 3, 2012. Caitlin Plocheck was also nominated for the Houston Chronicle's Girl Athlete of the Week.

Congratulations to the Lady Deer Softball Team from Deer Park High School for winning the 2012 State Championship in Texas. We are all very proud of your outstanding achievement!

HONORING SGT JOSEPH ANGEL CAPOCCIAMA

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sergeant Joseph Angel Capocciama. Sergeant Capocciama passed away on Sunday, May 20, 2012, from complications of injuries sustained in service to his country in Iraq.

The son of Alan and Maria Capocciama, Joseph Angel Capocciama was born on May 29, 1987, and raised in Grove City, Ohio. He graduated from Grove City High School in 2005. A true patriot, Sergeant Capocciama joined the United States Army on May 23, 2006, just one week before his 19th birthday.

While proudly serving his country in Iraq, Sergeant Capocciama received the Army Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal, Valorous Unit Award, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal with Campaign Star, Army Service Ribbon, and Overseas Service Ribbon. He retired from the Army on April 7, 2010.

It is because of the sacrifices of men like Joseph Capocciama that we continue to enjoy the freedoms that we do today. I am deeply thankful for all that Sergeant Capocciama endured to preserve our freedom and for his heroism. He is survived by his wife, Kayla, and his children, Joseph Angel Capocciama, Jr. and Cheyenne Faith Capocciama, for whom he set an inspiring example of service and patriotism.

On behalf of the citizens of Ohio's 15th Congressional District I would like to honor the service and memory of SGT Joseph Angel Capocciama.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. STEVEN LADENHEIM

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Steven Ladenheim. For the past 34 years, Dr. Ladenheim has served the city of Philadelphia with his extensive knowledge of otolaryngology.

A graduate of the Medical College of Pennsylvania, now known as Drexel University College of Medicine, he has won multiple awards

in his field. He is an accomplished surgeon, a clinical assistant professor at the University of Pennsylvania, and an entrepreneur with a highly successful private practice. Dr. Ladenheim recently retired as medical director for Blue Cross, and spent 20 years in practice at Presbyterian Hospital, as well as Nazareth Hospital and Hahnemann Hospital.

Dr. Ladenheim succeeded through hard work and sacrifice. In order to become a doctor he served in the military during the Vietnam War to pay his way through medical school. Throughout his career, he has created programs of outreach to the underserved community of Philadelphia, donating medical services and medicine to families and children who are denied access to health care. Taking the Hippocratic Oath to heart, Dr. Ladenheim is renowned for treating patients regardless of ability to pay, and to help those in need without any thought to his own benefit.

In addition to all of his accomplishments in the field of medicine, he has maintained a strong family life with his wife and three daughters, as well as a notable presence within the community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in recognizing Dr. Steven Ladenheim for his contributions to the city of Philadelphia and to the medical community.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 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 $15,776,139,241,010.39. We've added $5,149,262,192,097.31 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.

Forty-eight years ago today, the Civil Rights Act was approved. This act provided for a brighter future for all Americans. We must not eclipse the hope included in this legislation with the grim future of debt repayment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 313, I was absent due to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

TO COMMEND COLONEL JOHN J. STRYCULA

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague, Congressman JAMES MORAN (VA–8th), to recognize COL John J. Strycula for his service to our Nation and his extraordinary leadership as Commander, U.S. Army Garrison, Fort Belvoir.

On July 7, 2010, COL Strycula assumed command of Fort Belvoir, which is located in the shadow of the Nation's capital and one of the most diverse and complex installations in the United States. In addition to the monumental responsibilities of providing support, services, and a high level quality of life to service members, their families, and related support providers of more than 200,000 people, he was immediately immersed into the most complicated Base Realignment and Closure mission within the Department of Defense.

COL Strycula assumed personal stewardship of all aspects of realignment under BRAC 2005. To accomplish the many aspects of this mission, he oversaw the activities of 150 mission partners on more than $4 billion in construction and infrastructure improvement projects needed to accommodate the increase of installation population from 30,000 to 48,000 military and civilian personnel. Belvoir North, Fort Belvoir Community Hospital, the Wounded Warrior Complex, the USO Family Support Center, expansion of housing units including state of the art handicapped-accessible housing, child care centers, roads, bridges, fire stations, office buildings, and parking structures are examples of projects completed under the careful watch of COL Strycula.

The "brick and mortar" component of BRAC 2005 tells only part of the story; as impressive as these accomplishments are, the manner in which COL Strycula led the men and women under his command and the mission partners demonstrate the depth of his professionalism and commitment. His open and engaging command climate encouraged initiative and innovation. He has been fully involved in addressing and resolving community issues, both in the neighboring community and in the military community. COL Strycula successfully formed consensus among the various stakeholders on contentious issues, and he established strong relationships of mutual respect with elected and executive leaders in the local, State, and Federal Governments.

The first and most important priority for COL Strycula consistently has been the care and wellbeing of our soldiers and their families. Through his outstanding leadership, vision, and total dedication to soldiers, families, and civilians, he has profoundly impacted and Unproved the quality of life for all at Fort Belvoir. Serving our country in uniform, at home or in harm's way on foreign soil, is the highest of callings, and it is our sacred obligation to ensure that our military and their families receive the support, protections, respect, and services that they have earned.

Prior to his assignment as Commander of Fort Belvoir, he served in numerous capacities including several tours of duty in Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm. COL Strycula stood up and trained the Army's first Military Intelligence Interrogation Battalion, which he then led in Operation Iraqi Freedom. COL Strycula is a highly decorated officer; his awards include the Bronze Star with two oak leaf clusters, the Meritorious Service Medal with three oak leaf clusters, the Joint Service Achievement Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, and the Parachutist and Air Assault Badges.

Mr. Speaker, we ask our colleagues to join us in commending COL John J. Strycula for his exceptional leadership of Fort Belvoir through the BRAC process, and in thanking him for his years of service to our country. COL Strycula's accomplishments and expertise have contributed immeasurably to our national defense and security, and he has rightfully earned the admiration, respect, and gratitude of all. We also extend our sincere appreciation to COL Strycula's wife, Wendy, and their 5 children for their support and sacrifices, which have enabled COL Strycula to serve with such distinction. COL Strycula will soon be deploying to Afghanistan, and our thoughts and prayers are with him and his family for his safe return home.

IN HONOR OF GEDLU METAFERIA

HON. RUSS CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Gedlu Metaferia, for his decades of service to the people of the St. Louis, Missouri.

Mr. Metaferia started the African Mutual Assistance Association of Missouri, AMAAM, on April 10, 1983 and for nearly 30 years has helped over 30,000 African immigrants and refugees settle into the St. Louis metropolitan area. Today St. Louis is home to almost 6,400 African immigrants and refugees.

As Executive Director, Mr. Metaferia skillfully managed the day-to-day operations of his organization, and he successfully led it toward the fulfillment of its mission to provide culturally and linguistically appropriate social services to African refugees and immigrants. The work of this organization includes: assistance with applications and insurance forms, mediation, education about civic participation, interpretation during medical visits, transportation, and locating housing. Sadly, we are all aware of the plight of refugees and other displaced communities; therefore, I am eternally grateful for the adjustment assistance provided by Mr. Metaferia and his organization.

Mr. Metaferia's efforts have fostered a greater appreciation of diversity, and have advanced ethnic inclusion in the St. Louis community. Moreover, he remains active in the community as a poet, freelance writer, human rights activist, advocate for refugee and immigrant rights, and a member on several nonprofit boards. Mr. Metaferia has led by example and demonstrates resilience as a pillar of strength, sound judgment, and compassion.

Mr. Metaferia has dedicated his life to serving and promoting the welfare of others, and he has exemplified extraordinary commitment and selfless dedication. I congratulate Mr. Gedlu Metaferia on his many accomplishments, and I thank him for his continued service to our community.

EXPRESSING REGRET FOR PASSAGE OF LAWS ADVERSELY AFFECTING THE CHINESE IN THE UNITED STATES

SPEECH OF

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 2012

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support passage of H. Res. 683, an overdue and needed resolution that expresses the regret of the House for passing laws that targeted Chinese in the United States, including the Chinese Exclusion Act. A previous commitment has prevented me from being present to vote in support of H. Res. 683 today, but had been present, I most certainly would have voted for the Resolution, adding my voice to the Sense of the House of Representatives in expressing regret for the unconscionable Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882.

That Act stands as an example of the intolerance against which Americans must constantly fight to achieve the ideals on which our nation was founded. We can't ignore our country's history of exclusion and discrimination based on identity and country of origin. But today, the House's expression of regret for the past and apology to Chinese Americans is an important milestone in our nation's ongoing moral journey. This resolution, insufficient to repair the historical harm caused by such laws, does serve to recognize past wrongs and to remind us of our continuing work ensuring inclusion and equality for all.

While I could not be present to add my solemn support to the votes in favor of the resolution, I wish to express my regret for this historical legislation. I join my fellow members of the House of Representatives in recognition of the immense contribution of Chinese-Americans to the success of the United States historically and today, and affirm my commitment to securing the rights of all who call America home.

HONORING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS ASSOCIATION

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 25th anniversary of the National Air Traffic Controllers Association. Since their establishment in 1987, NATCA's 20,000 air traffic controllers and aviation safety professionals have ensured that our nation has the safest, most efficient air traffic control system in the world. This is a record that makes both the Union and our country proud.

Aviation creates more than 10 million good-paying U.S. jobs and drives more than $1 trillion in annual economic activity. The services that NATCA members provide enable American businesses to connect on a local, regional, national, and global level.

Aviation safety is not a partisan issue. As Members of Congress, we are all frequent users of the National Airspace System and are reassured to know that when we board a plane, NATCA's membership will safely guide us home.

Again, I want to commend the National Air Traffic Controllers Association and their leadership on a job well done.

RECOGNIZING THE 147TH ANNIVERSARY OF JUNETEENTH AND THE 19TH ANNUAL CELEBRATION OF THE JUNETEENTH FREEDOM AND HERITAGE FESTIVAL IN MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 147th anniversary of Juneteenth and the 19th annual celebration of the Juneteenth Freedom and Heritage Festival in Memphis, Tennessee. This past weekend, we celebrated Juneteenth, which is the oldest known celebration of the ending of slavery. Juneteenth commemorates African-American freedom and emphasizes education and achievement.

On June 19, 1865, Major General Gordon Granger arrived in Galveston, Texas, and announced in the town square that all slaves were free. Although this came nearly 3 years after the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation, the newly freed men and women rejoiced in the streets with jubilant celebrations, and thus, the Juneteenth holiday was born. The theme of this year's Memphis Juneteenth festival is ''Saluting Black Educators.''

Memphis has a long history of excellent black educators. During the Civil Rights Movement Memphis needed a powerful voice to stand up and push for equality in the Memphis City schools. After being denied admission to Memphis State University because of her race, Maxine A. Smith joined the local chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and soon became an agent for change as she was instrumental in desegregating Memphis schools. In 2003, alongside President Clinton, Maxine Smith received the Freedom Award from the National Civil Rights Museum.

Memphis has had its fair share of outstanding black educators in recent years as well. In 2009, the White House honored Melissa Collins with the Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching. Melissa Collins is a second grade teacher in Memphis, and during a time in this country where math and science teachers are scarce, Melissa Collins exhibits the teaching skills necessary to inspire our children to learn. In February of this year, Velma Lois Jones received the Drum Majors for Service Award from the White House. Velma Lois Jones was the first black classroom teacher ever elected as president of the Tennessee Education Association and she was also a board member of the National Education Association.

Mr. Speaker, it is in the spirit of these great individuals that I ask my colleagues to join me in observing our nation's 147th anniversary of Juneteenth and the celebrations in Memphis. This is a time to celebrate the end of slavery in America and to recognize the many contributions of African-American citizens.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE OF RICHARD W. LYMAN

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the rich and accomplished life of Richard W. Lyman, Stanford University's seventh president, who died on May 27, 2012, at his home in Palo Alto at the age of 88.

The eloquent words of Stanford University President John Hennessy bear quoting: ''Dick Lyman was a man of great strength, integrity, common sense and good humor. It was a privilege to know him, and I am deeply saddened by his death. His impact on Stanford was profound. He guided the university through some of the most turbulent years in its history, and under his leadership, Stanford not only survived, it flourished. He had an unswerving belief in academic freedom and universities, and he inspired that commitment in others. We are very fortunate—and certainly the better—for having known him and for having his courageous, committed leadership and service to Stanford.''

Richard Lyman was born in 1923 in Pennsylvania and was raised in New Haven, Connecticut. His father was an attorney and his mother a French teacher. His education at Swarthmore College was interrupted by three years of service in the Army Air Forces Weather Service, and after college he began graduate studies leading to a Ph.D. in history at Harvard. He spent two years as a Fulbright Fellow at the London School of Economics, and two summers writing for The Economist. He also taught history at Washington University in St. Louis from 1954 to 1958.

Richard Lyman came to Stanford in 1958, with the great love of his life, Jing, whom he married in 1947. He became a full professor in 1962, and rose through the ranks, becoming Stanford's president in 1970, a post he held until 1980. He served in some of the most turbulent years in our Nation's history, and in the opinion of many, he saved Stanford from collapse and greatly enhanced its prestige.

After leaving Stanford, he held many important posts, including President of the Rockefeller Foundation and Vice Chair of the National Council on the Humanities. He returned to Stanford in 1988 and developed a forum for interdisciplinary research on key international issues, and retired in 1991.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring the life of one of the most distinguished and extraordinarily accomplished leaders of our country, and to extend our deepest condolences to his devoted wife Jing, and his four children Jennifer Lyman, Rev. Holly Antolini, Christopher Lyman, Timothy Lyman, and his four grandchildren.

Richard Lyman's leadership brought great distinction to our community and strengthened our Nation. I am blessed to have known him, and our country was blessed by his high sense of citizenship and patriotism.

COMMEMORATING JUNETEENTH

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Juneteenth, commemorated on June 19 each year, marks the date of the reading of the Emancipation Proclamation by U.S. Army Major Gordon Granger in Galveston, Texas to slaves unaware of the original issuance two years prior.

The date carries significance as the official end of one era in American history that led to the freedom-filled chapter of the next for the millions who were liberated by the Proclamation.

As our Nation evolves toward legally recognizing a more inclusive citizenry of all ethnicities and backgrounds, let us remain ever mindful of the courageous and brave individuals who fought tirelessly, but were not granted freedom and liberty under American law.

Mr. Speaker, we must not take our civil rights for granted, but rather use them to continuously propel our great country forward. History is not meant for mere storytelling, but instead serves as a blueprint from which we learn and expand upon the discoveries we encounter each day.

May we take away from the events of Juneteenth the spirit of resolve and unified commitment of liberty and justice for all.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ALAMEDA COUNTY FAIR

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the 100th anniversary of the Alameda County Fair. The annual 17-day Alameda County Fair, which takes place in Pleasanton, California, is the largest single event in Alameda County and draws close to one half million patrons each year.

In 1912, the first Alameda County Fair was held at a local racetrack in the Hamlet of Alisal, which is now Pleasanton. The owner of the track, Rodney MacKenzie, organized a group of local business leaders to form a nonprofit organization and pledge their personal assets as collateral to fund the Annual Fair & Race Meet.

This new organization, The Alameda Fair Association, was formed on June 29, 1912 and consisted of fifteen businessmen, agriculturalists and livestock raisers from Pleasanton, Livermore, Dublin, Hayward, San Ramon and Irvington. The first fair opened in 1912 on Wednesday, October 23 and ran through Sunday, October 27.

In 1941 the non-profit Fair Association purchased the first 100 acres of what is now the 268-acre Fairgrounds. The 10-day Fair & Race Meet of 1941 was touted by the Oaldand Tribune as "Northern California's Largest County Fair."

The Fair Association subsequently donated the property to the people of Alameda County to guarantee that the residents of this region would have a County Fair & Race Track. Alameda County still contracts with the nonprofit Fair Association to manage and improve the Fairgrounds. The Fair Association continues to provide a significant public benefit without receiving any tax support. The Association has an annual operating budget of roughly $19 million.

On the 100th anniversary of the Alameda County Fair, the Fair Association will dedicate an Alameda County Historical Monument, on the Fairgrounds, that represents a slice of the rich history of Alameda County. The Historical Monument represents the many people, businesses and leaders that settled, developed and call Alameda County home.

I join the community in applauding the 100th anniversary of the Alameda County Fair. I also pay tribute to the Fair Association for creating and dedicating a Historical Monument on the Fairgrounds to honor the rich history of Alameda County.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 314 I was absent due to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted: "no."

TO RECOGNIZE THE RECIPIENTS OF THE 2012 FAIRFAX COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OUTSTANDING CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP AWARDS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the recipients of the 2012 Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce Outstanding Corporate Citizenship Awards.

For more than 85 years, the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce has provided a strategic link between local businesses and the region through participation in community activities, networking opportunities, marketing, support and education. Fairfax County has witnessed extraordinary growth, and the Chamber of Commerce has been a consistent, guiding voice for business. Fairfax County is considered by many to be one of the best communities in the country in which to live, work and raise a family. A significant factor in that distinction is the thriving partnership between the public and private sectors. Corporations, non-profit organizations, and educational institutions work hand-in-hand with their counterparts in local, state and federal government agencies. A thriving business community is essential to maintaining a high quality of life for all residents, just as ensuring strong community institutions and educational opportunities for all residents are essential to fostering continued economic growth.

The Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce annually recognizes individuals and businesses that have demonstrated exceptional leadership and have excelled in their efforts to better our community through social responsibility. More than 65 nominees were considered for the 2012 awards, and each is deserving of recognition and appreciation. It is my honor to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of the following recipients of the 2012 Fairfax Chamber of Commerce Outstanding Corporate Citizenship Awards:

Emerging Influential of the Year: Amanda Andere, Executive Director, FACETS.

Non-Profit of the Year: Good Shepherd Housing and Family Service.

Executive of the Year: Michael Cardaci, CEO, Global Network Services, Inc.

Woman Owned Business of the Year: Halfaker and Associates LLC.

Outstanding Corporate Citizen of the Year—Large Business: Deloitte LLP.

Outstanding Corporate Citizen of the Year—Mid Size Company: Apple Federal Credit Union.

Outstanding Corporate Citizen of the Year—Small Company: Karin's Florist.

In addition to the Corporate Citizenship Awards, the Fairfax Chamber of Commerce also bestows awards in three unique categories; the Chairman's Awards which recognize extraordinary leadership by companies and individuals within the Fairfax Chamber, the James M. Rees Awards which recognize lifelong leadership and service to the Northern Virginia business community, and the NOVAForward Award which is presented to an individual for extraordinary efforts to move Virginia forward. This year's honorees are:

Chairman's Awards: Julie Simmons, Human Capital Strategic Consulting, Jorge Scientific Corporation, and Northrup Grumman.

James M. Rees Award: Sidney O. Dewberry, Chairman Emeritus, Dewberry, and John Toups, Former CEO, PRC.

NOVAForward Award: Terrence D. Jones, President and CEO, Wolf Trap Foundation for the Performing Arts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the recipients of the 2012 Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce Outstanding Corporate Citizenship Awards and in thanking them for their many contributions that have supported not only our high quality of life but also the robust business community we have in Fairfax County.

H.R. 5855, THE DHS APPROPRIATIONS ACT

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5855, the FY13 Homeland Security Appropriations bill. I regret that this bill, especially during the amendment process on the floor of the House, became a political football. I hope that when the final bill emerges from negotiations with the Senate and the White House, it will reflect the will and priorities of the American people.

Funding appropriated by H.R. 5855 is intended to support and address the vital needs of our men and women working to ensure the country's homeland security. The bill appropriates a total of $46 billion for the Department

in FY 2013—including $39.1 billion in discretionary spending, $1.4 billion in mandatory spending, and $5.5 billion for emergency disaster relief. The measure significantly increases funding for FEMA state and local grants and for Homeland cyber-security activities.

Despite these benefits, I have concerns about how the bill disregards the mandates of the Budget Control Act, how it treats civilian employees at DHS and how the bill delves into unprecedented territory regarding the reproductive rights of women.

The spending caps set by the bi-partisan Budget Control Act ensured that prioritized programs could be funded adequately even as discretionary reductions were achieved. The harmful discretionary top-line set by the House Republican budget, and facilitated by this bill, threatens funding for other equally vital programs, threatens American jobs, and threatens the services relied upon by our seniors and our veterans.

Further, I am concerned that the bill does not fund the .5 percent cost of living adjustment provided as part of the president's FY13 budget request. Federal employees have already sacrificed $60 billion of salary over ten years as part of the two-year pay freeze. Starting in January 2013, new federal employees will contribute more to their pensions to offset the $15 billion cost of Unemployment Insurance Extension legislation. And with this bill, federal employees are asked to give up what was already a small .5% partial COLA. This provision essentially extends for another year the 2-year pay freeze currently covering DHS employees.

Finally, I am disappointed by the passage and inclusion in the bill of an amendment offered by STEVE KING of Iowa, which I opposed and which prohibits the use of the funds in the bill from being used to implement the so called "Morton Memos." The memos, written by ICE Director Morton, provide a plan to deploy ICE resources in the most cost effective manner. Specifically, they provide guidance to ensure that limited enforcement resources are focused primarily on criminals or other individuals who pose a threat to national security or public safety. The King amendment will prohibit the department from exercising this common sense prosecutorial discretion. It would force the Department to treat young people who were brought to the United States as kids and who have graduated from American schools the same as individuals who knowingly broke immigration laws and who have committed crimes in the United States. That makes no sense.

Bringing a bill to the floor that cuts the resources available to the men and women responsible for protecting the homeland security of the Nation and then tying their hands with unnecessary and ill-informed amendments is counterproductive and undercuts the bill's intended purpose.

CONGRATULATING THE DAVE THOMAS FOUNDATION FOR ADOPTION ON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Dave Thomas Foundation for Adoption on the occasion of its 20th anniversary.

This foundation, established in 1992 by Dave Thomas, has continuously strived to help every child in foster care find a loving, permanent family. It has dramatically increased the number of adoptions, including finding families for 3,000 children in the United States foster care system, and for that I commend them.

The Foundation shows its commitment to the foster care system by awarding grants to public and private adoption agencies all across the country. As a founding member of National Adoption Day, it has helped brighten the lives of countless children.

Last year's awarded grants totaled more than $8 million and focused on supporting adoption professionals who assist the longest-waiting children from foster care into adoptive families. This genuine program, Wendy's Wonderful Kids, has increased children's likely hood of being adopted by up to three times.

As an accredited charity of the Better Business Bureau Wise Giving Alliance, Standards for Excellence certified, the Foundation has received the highest possible rating on Charity Navigator, an exceptional honor.

For these reasons, I am proud to applaud the Dave Thomas Foundation for Adoption for representing Central Ohio through its extraordinary contributions to the United States foster care system.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF THE HMONG PILOTS OF THE SECRET WAR IN LAOS

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, during the Vietnam War another "secret war" was taking place in Laos with thousands of Hmong fighters assisting the U.S. The Hmong who risked their lives for the freedom of their country and in the aid of the U.S. suffered tremendously as they served with great courage.

This weekend in Maplewood, Minnesota, a little known group of Hmong pilot veterans of the secret war gathered and were recognized by the U.S. Air Force in appreciation of their heroism. Supported by the U.S., some 38 Hmong pilots were trained to fly counterinsurgency missions between 1967 and 1975. Seventeen of those pilots are alive today and were honored, along with posthumous awards for 21 deceased colleagues, by Air Force Chief of Staff, General Norton Schwartz.

I, too, would like to recognize and honor those brave Hmong pilots who are living examples of courage, along with the pilots who sacrificed their lives. The secret war was a difficult and painful time for the Hmong people. Today, decades later, Minnesota is the home to many who lived through those years of war and suffering. As Hmong Americans of all generations contribute to making Minnesota and the U.S. a stronger and more prosperous land, we must never forget the service, sacrifice, and courage of the Hmong warriors who fought on land and in the sky for freedom during the secret war.

Again, I join in the recognition and remembrance of 38 Hmong pilots who risked their lives for freedom.

RECOGNIZING ROCKWELL MUSEUM OF WESTERN ART

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Rockwell Museum of Western Art as the 29th District of New York's most recently accredited museum. The Rockwell Museum was just awarded accreditation by the American Association of Museums, the highest national recognition a museum can receive for their commitment to public service and excellence in education.

The American Association of Museums states that there are over 17,500 museums in the United States and less than 800 are accredited. These numbers would place the Rockwell Museum of Western Art in a very elite category and I am proud to represent this museum.

The Rockwell Museum of Western Art inspires and educates people of all ages. Its vision inspires the staff to strive towards making the museum a resource for study, knowledge, and entertainment by local and national audiences. I encourage everyone to stop in and visit the Rockwell Museum next time you are in Corning, New York.

CONGRATULATING JAMES FARR

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. James Farr of Rochester, New York for his three-year appointment to the Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor Commission. The Commission was established by P.L. 106–554 to assist in the preservation, maintenance and interpretation of the historical, natural, cultural, scenic and recreational resources of the Erie Canalway in ways that reflect its national significance. I nominated Jim for the Corridor's Commission on August 25, 2011, and am delighted to have a dedicated member of the Rochester community represented on the Commission.

As an employee of the City of Rochester for over 34 years, Jim's passion for improving this great area of New York will serve as an integral asset to the Commission. He has represented the city as a committee member on both of the World Canal Conferences held in Rochester and has also assisted with and attended a number of the Canal Society of New

York Conferences and events. Currently serving as Assistant Director for Recreation, Jim is responsible for the City's environmental and horticultural education programs and parks stewardship, as well as the oversight of the Rochester Public Market. Jim truly embodies the spirit of this region.

An example of Jim's creativity and dedication to the area is his close work with Parks and Trails New York to coordinate the annual ''Cycle the Erie'' bike tour, which showcases the Canalway's heritage. In addition, Jim is currently a Board member of the Genesee WaterWays Center. He is the former President and a current Foundation member of Monroe County Cooperative Extension. Jim serves as a member of many other related boards and organizations, including the Monroe County Parks Advisory Committee, the Ontario Beach Park Program Committee, the Farmers Market Federation of New York, and the National Association of Produce Market Managers. He is also the secretary and one of the founding board members of the Tony Jordan Youth Sports Foundation, which provides supplemental funding to enhance the quality and integrity of youth sports in the City of Rochester.

The Erie Canalway Corridor is a symbol of American ingenuity and perseverance, and I am grateful for Jim Farr's continued commitment to promoting its national significance by serving on the Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor Commission. I ask my colleagues to join with me in commending Jim Farr for his long record of public service.

HONORING EDDIE WONG

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Eddie Wong, a man who has played a significant role in the ongoing restoration and development of the Angel Island Immigration Station in Marin County, CA. On June 30, 2012, Mr. Wong is retiring after four productive years as Executive Director of the Angel Island Immigration Station Foundation (AIISF).

Located off the coast of Tiburon, California, in Angel Island State Park, the Immigration Station is the site of the detention of 175,000 Chinese immigrants from 1910 to 1940. Because of the Chinese Exclusion Act, many of them were held for weeks, months or years in a prison-like barracks where life was difficult and humiliating.

The restoration of this Station and related educational projects recognize the struggle of these immigrants and our nation's challenge to honor our history of immigration. AIISF, with the hard work of its many supporters and partners, including the California State Parks and the National Park Service, has led these rehabilitation efforts. During Mr. Wong's tenure, the Immigration Station Museum opened, the Immigrant Heritage Wall was created, and the hospital at the site was stabilized.

The Angel Island Immigration Station now hosts more than 50,000 visitors, including 30,000 schoolchildren, every year. I have had the privilege of participating in this effort by securing federal funding, and I share Eddie Wong's belief that with the partnership we have, we can complete the remaining work on this important testament to our rich and complex history.

Mr. Wong came to the Executive Director position with a strong background in the cultural social issues at stake. He graduated from UCLA with a BA and MFA from School of Fine Arts Motion Picture and Television Program. Before joining AIISF, he co-founded Visual Communications, the nation's first Asian American film production company, served as the Strategy and Investment Principal for Media and the Advisor on Social Justice for the Democracy Alliance, and was Executive Director of the National Asian American Telecommunications Association (now known as the Center for Asian American Media).

Understanding that the Angel Island Immigration Station site resonates personally with many immigrants, Mr. Wong says, ''I think that my father, who was deported from Angel Island as a 15-year old and came back a year later determined to better his life, would be proud that a place of shame has now become a site of conscience ''

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Eddie Wong and in wishing him well in his retirement.

IN HONOR OF TEAMSTERS LOCAL UNION NO. 600

HON. RUSS CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Teamsters Local Union No. 600, in celebration of their 100th anniversary and service to the members of the St. Louis Metropolitan Area.

Teamsters Local Union No. 600 is deserving of special public recognition for its many accomplishments. It has distinguished record of service to working men and women, as well as to their families. Its immeasurable contributions to the advancement of the union labor movement in the St. Louis Metropolitan Area have made our community a better place.

Teamsters Local Union No. 600 has worked to improve the working conditions, benefits, and wages for the men and women of the St. Louis Metropolitan Area. In addition, their influence was appreciated and felt by those who drove freight trucks, worked in warehouses, made milk deliveries, and worked at the Anheuser Busch beer distributorships.

But there work has not only been limited to St. Louis. As a Member the US House of Representatives' Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the Teamsters Local Union No. 600 advice and counsel has been invaluable to me when working on local, regional, and national transportation issues.

Teamsters Local Union No. 600 has also lead the way in providing employers in the transportation industry with the best trained employees, making it possible for the goods and services that millions of Americans rely on to be delivered safely, on time and in good condition. This kind of commitment by the Teamsters makes our US economy work, grow, and prosper for all us.

Again, I congratulate Teamsters Local Union No. 600 on their 100th Anniversary, and wish them more success in the future.

IN RECOGNITION AND CELEBRATION OF ISRAEL SOTO PRINCIPAL OF JAMES WELDON JOHNSON LEADERSHIP ACADEMY PUBLIC SCHOOL 57

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize a dear friend and great force in the education of our children, Israel Soto, principal of James Weldon Johnson Leadership Academy Public School 57, who is retiring after a long career in public education service. Israel, a Puerto Rican immigrant, began his career in education in my congressional district as a school bilingual coordinator and as an assistant director of bilingual education in Washington Heights.

In 1999, Israel ascended to principal of James Weldon Johnson Leadership Academy Public School 57, a pre-K–8 school in East Harlem/El Barrio, which is also a part of my district. Mr. Soto's expertise in bilingual education and the fact that his second language was English, like many of the school's students, made him an ideal choice for principal. His talents extend to all facets of education, and under his leadership, James Weldon Johnson Leadership Academy has gone from a near-failing school to one that received a grade of ''A'' in its latest Progress Report and is ranked in the 93rd percentile of all New York City K–8 schools.

Principal Soto has deservedly received numerous awards during his tenure. In 2001, he was named ''Principal of the Month'' in his school district and in 2004 was recognized as the ''Educator of the Week'' by Univision 41 Nueva York. Israel has also been inducted into the ''Cahn Fellows Program for Distinguished Principals'' at Columbia University as well as being honored by Children 4 Children, the YMCA of New York, the New York Post, and El Diario La Prensa.

Principal Soto's work at James Weldon Johnson Leadership Academy serves as a model for current and future educators. He has built strong partnerships with teachers, parents, community organizations, and the private sector while keeping his focus internal, on his students. This outreach has significantly increased the academic resources available to his students and demonstrates the supreme importance of an active and charismatic principal and leader.

On Thursday, May 31, 2012 at the elegant Marina del Rey, the Soto Retirement Committee joined the East Harlem/El Barrio community of leaders, children, parents, families, friends, and education advocates to pay tribute to our Dream Maker Principal Israel Soto.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in honoring a great man and an impassioned educator who, first and foremost, believes in all of our extraordinary children.

OGUNQUIT PLAYHOUSE 80TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to congratulate the Ogunquit Playhouse—America's Foremost Summer Theatre in Ogunquit, Maine—as they celebrate their 80th Anniversary Season.

Since 1933, the Ogunquit Playhouse has given generations of theatergoers the opportunity to enjoy the finest plays and brightest stars and professional actors, bringing Broadway to the Beach. Their acclaim has continued over the decades. Most recently, they were recently recognized with prestigious Moss Hart Awards for Best Professional Production and Outstanding Achievement as a Theater Company. In addition, the New England Theatre Conference has recognized the Ogunquit Playhouse with their Award for Outstanding Achievement in American Theatre, acknowledging the Playhouse as one of the most important cultural landmarks in New England.

I am proud of the Playhouse's commitment to developing and expanding theater activity in New England on the educational, community and professional levels. They have created an extensive school performance and outreach program as well as partnerships with dozens of social service agencies throughout the region to bring underserved children and families to the Playhouse to enjoy live theater.

They believe—and I believe—that the arts are essential to the quality of life for everyone. As Maine's creative economy grows and receives national attention, America's Foremost Summer Theatre serves as a shining example of success.

TRIBUTE TO ZACHARY DAVID BENJAMIN

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Zachary Benjamin of Fort Dodge, Iowa for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout.

The Eagle Scout rank is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Only about 5 percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based achievement with high standards that have been well-maintained over the past century.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, as well as completing an Eagle Project to benefit the community. Zachary's project involved creating a rock and rain garden at Kennedy Park in Webster County. Zachary completed this project while going above and beyond the required merit badges. The work ethic Zachary has shown in his Eagle Project, and every other project leading up to his Eagle Scout rank, speaks volumes of his commitment to serving a cause greater than himself and assisting his community.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent Zachary and his family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating him in obtaining the Eagle Scout ranking, and will wish him continued success in his future education and career.

A TRIBUTE TO DAVID SHELBORNE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and honor Mr. David Shelborne.

Mr. Shelborne's passion for electronics led him to become a technician for the Savin Corporation in Manhattan. His many awards during his tenure there led to his recruitment to Alco Standards Corporation, a Fortune 500 company, in a Senior Specialist position. There he was responsible for managing the entire New York and New Jersey Regions of the company.

Mr. Shelborne has been a dedicated member of the African American Benevolent Society since 1990, has held many esteemed positions in the organization, and now serves as its president.

Mr.Shelborne currently works for the Department of Sanitation where he is currently assigned to the Supervised Sick Leave Unit—Medical Division, having been a dedicated member of the department since 1990.

Mr. Shelborne is a child of God and an active member of the St. John Baptist Church, in Arverne, NY. He currently resides in Far Rockaway, New York with his wife, Lisa. Together, they have five children.

Mr. Shelbourne is currently looking forward to being a volunteer for the United States Civil Air Patrol (Parent in Partnership) with his youngest son, Tahj.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize David Shelborne for his loyalty and dedication to civic duty in his professional and private life.

IN RECOGNITION OF LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER PRIDE MONTH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor and pride that I rise today to recognize the significance of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Pride Month. The purpose of this honorable month is to recognize the vast influence lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender men and women have had not only on our nation's history, but on local and international levels as well.

Today, we regard LGBT Pride Month as an opportunity to pay tribute to the 1969 Stonewall riots, a major tipping point for the Gay Liberation Movement in the U.S. Over 40 years ago a group of New Yorkers took a stand against a discriminatory police raid at The Stonewall Inn, a popular gay bar in Manhattan.

The spontaneous demonstrations that composed the Stonewall riots are commonly referred to as the first instance in American history when people of the LGBT community fought back against a government system of persecution which targeted sexual minorities. It united the gay community in New York in the fight against discrimination.

Six months after the riots, three newspapers dedicated to promoting LGBT rights were formed: Gay, Gay Power and Come Out! Additionally, two gay activist organizations were founded right here in New York—the Gay Liberation Front and the Gay Activists Alliance. Within a few years, gay rights organizations were founded in several cities across the nation and the world. June 28, 1970 marked the first Gay Pride marches in Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York, established to commemorate the anniversary of the riots.

In honor of Stonewall, many gay pride events and celebrations are now held annually during the month of June throughout the world, including New York City's Gay Pride Week. These celebrations include pride parades, picnics, concerts and parties; and attract millions of global participants. Memorials for those LGBT members who have lost their lives to hate crimes or HIV/AIDS are also held during this month.

While the fight for justice regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity continues to be a crucial one, we have indeed made significant strides. Let this month remind us of the society we all strive for, one in which lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people enjoy the constitutional rights of equality, personal autonomy, and freedom of expression. No LGBT person should experience discrimination in housing, employment, or public spaces. We need to continue fighting until everyone has the equal opportunity to participate fully in civil society.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in commemorating the anniversary of the Stonewall riots, supporting the ongoing fight for gay liberation, and celebrating the legacy of LGBT community members whose place in our Nation's history cannot be overlooked. LGBT Americans have strengthened our country, helped create awareness and garner support for equality.

A TRIBUTE TO TREMAINE ANTOINE PRICE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and to honor Tremaine Antoine Price, an artist, minister, and man of community. Tremaine Price is currently a Community Relations Coordinator at Success Academy Charter Schools serving the Harlem community in several ways including Family Academic Events, tutoring for scholars, parent counseling, and fundraising initiatives.

Tremaine Price, born and raised in Brooklyn, was a burgeoning young artist, performing in plays, music groups, glee clubs, choirs, and praise groups. He received The Brooklyn Old Timers, the Brooklyn Links, the Congressional

Black Caucus, and the Posse Foundation Merit Leadership scholarships to pave the way for his collegiate studies at Vanderbilt University. There he participated in and led several student organizations and honed his theatrical skills, highlighted by directing a student version of Ntozake Shange's play, ''for colored girls who have considered suicide when the rainbow is enuf'' and founding The Black Arts Series at Vanderbilt University.

Tremaine Price is a drama minister and playwright, his original play is titled ''For Christian Girls'' and it debuted in August 2011. He strives to incorporate performance art into worship, which not only means acting out skits, but also revealing the truths of our triumphs, fears, suffering, and joys through the Christian faith. He is a member of the Young Adult Ministry (Praise Team), the Berean Brotherhood, and the servant leader for the Spiritual Expressions Drama Ministry. He intends on pursuing higher education degrees in Theatre Education and hopes to one day grace the Broadway stage.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Tremaine Antoine Price for his leadership in the religious word and in his community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent yesterday for votes in the House Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall votes 379 and 380.

A TRIBUTE TO MATTHEW OKEBIYI

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Mr. Matthew Okebiyi. Born in Lagos, Nigeria, Matthew Okebiyi spent most of his youth and formal schooling being shuttled between various parts of Africa, Europe, and the Middle East. It was during those formative years that he witnessed firsthand the effects of poverty, hunger, homelessness, and human rights violations. Those incidents would later have a profound impact upon his life.

Mr. Okebiyi immigrated to the United States in the early 1980s and settled in Brooklyn, New York, where he attended college on a full-time basis while working two jobs. He earned a Bachelor's degree in Communication Arts, pursued advanced studies and earned two Master's degrees: one in Urban Planning and the other in Political Science. He completed his Mental Health training at Hunter College School of Social Work in New York City.

Mr. Okebiyi is the founder of the African American Planning Commission, a New York City-based not-for-profit organization and currently serves as the Executive Director. He also worked to build the Serenity House Family Residence, a 40 unit, $5.5 million transitional homeless shelter for survivors of domestic violence. The mission of Serenity House is to offer survivors and their minor children, who have exceeded their maximum length of stay in an emergency shelter, a safe but temporary refuge from domestic violence.

Mr. Okebiyi, in addition to his accomplishments, has volunteered with Food Bank and Children's Literacy programs. He maintains a volunteer teaching schedule; tutoring several undergraduate and post-graduate students in his free time, one hundred percent of whom have gone on to receive their Bachelor's and/or Master's degrees.

Mr. Okebiyi has been the recipient of many awards for public service. Most recently was in 2011, when he was the recipient of the prestigious ''Man of the Year'' award presented by the Brooklyn Branch of Key Women of America, Inc. at its annual gala.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Matthew Okebiyi for his drive to succeed and dedication to social justice. His unceasing commitment to the welfare of others is an inspiration to us all.

HONORING ABCD AND ITS FOUNDER, BOB COARD

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 21, 2012, ABCD will celebrate and honor its late founder, Bob Coard, by renaming its Boston headquarters in honor of this titan in the effort to enable upward mobility and a higher quality of life for all people, regardless of income or situation in life. I rise today to commemorate and congratulate this incredible community action program the nation's leading anti-poverty organization, and to salute my great friend, the late, Bob Coard. From Beacon Hill to Capitol Hill, Bob was a consistent, persistent and insistent force, working tirelessly to direct critical resources toward the fight to eradicate poverty.

Bob was an early, highly-effective general in the War on Poverty. He began his unmatched service even before President Johnson urged communities to organize around the vision of a creating a Great Society free of poverty and abundant in opportunity for all Americans regardless of race, creed or income. And Bob was still on the job when an extraordinary community organizer, President Obama, was sworn in as our 44th president. For all those years, ''ABCD'' didn't just stand for ''Action for Boston Community Development.'' It also stood for ''Anything Bob Coard Desired.''

When Bob called, it was because he needed action for Boston's most vulnerable residents—more money for home heating assistance, help with Medicaid funding, support for Head Start.

And we knew Bob was right because Bob recognized that our great challenge here in the United States is to bestow the world's blessings on all of God's children—to ensure, as President Kennedy said in his Inaugural address, that ''God's work on earth must truly be our own.''

The son of a civil servant from Grenada, Bob Coard immigrated to this country to pursue the American Dream. Once here, he dedicated his own life to helping others pursue that same dream.

When Bob started work at ABCD in 1964, the organization was only two years old and it had a tiny staff. Today, it has 1,000 employees and carries out a wide array of programs focused on meeting the needs of the poor and disadvantaged in the City of Boston.

Recognizing that education provides the best way for young people to, in his words, ''make it in this world,'' Bob started two high schools for at-risk youth at ABCD, in collaboration with the Boston Public Schools.

ABCD has been called the unsung hero of Boston. For 50 years ABCD has saved lives and made dreams come true, and while ABCD is at the heart of Boston's communities, it was the heart of Bob Coard that pushed ABCD to the national model it is today, and John Drew's amazing leadership that keeps that heart beating strong.

From providing heating assistance for those in need during New England's long, cold winters to delivering job training to those who need work, ABCD is the bridge from poverty to self-sufficiency. The opportunities ABCD provides for low-income Boston residents to get back on their feet, live with dignity and achieve their full potential are building blocks for the continued success of these communities.

Today, ABCD's assistance to people and communities has grown to all sectors of poverty relief.

ABCD organizes Head Start programs for over 2,400 low-income children and families every year.

ABCD supplies fuel assistance to more than 22,000 families a year.

ABCD provides services for thousands of at-risk youth through SummerWorks, career development and two alternative high schools, and health services and family planning for more than 30,000 people every year through its Health Services Department.

From the ABCD Foster Grandparents bringing love and security to disadvantaged children, to programs that offer assistance in asset development, tax assistance and financial education, ABCD offers stability, a sense of community and economic security to low-income families.

In President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's second inaugural address, he famously declared that ''The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.''

That was Bob Coard's definition of progress, that is John Drew's definition of progress, that is ABCD's mission everyday.

It is with great pride that I congratulate ABCD for its 50 years of vital service to the community, and that I commemorate my friend Bob Coard as ABCD dedicates its Tremont Street headquarters in his honor this Thursday on Boston Common.

It is fitting that Bob Coard's building gazes out on the Common, a lush landscape where Americans from every walk of life enjoy the same open space, on equal footing. And just as the Common is part of the Emerald Necklace of parks and parkways that extend out to Franklin Park in Roxbury, Bob Coard and ABCD stitched together an array of programs that, taken together, provide a safety net for lifting Bay State residents out of poverty and into a new life of self-sufficiency.

Bob Coard and ABCD are American icons, and I congratulate Bob's wife Donna, John

Drew and the entire ABCD team for the incredible work that makes such a difference in the lives of so many Massachusetts residents.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. HEROLD SIMON

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and honor Dr. Herold Simon.

Dr. Herold Simon is the Medical Director of the East New York Diagnostic and Treatment Center (ENYDTC). His responsibilities include policy-making, facility-wide planning, staff supervision and quality management; however, he sees his most important role as a clinician and an advocate for the medically-underserved and the financially-challenged communities he serves.

In 2002, Dr. Simon was instrumental in the creation of a kidney clinic at Kings County Hospital Center, where, initially, he was the sole attendant, providing patient care and education to nephrologists in training. Dr. Simon holds an appointment as Assistant Professor of Medicine at SUNY/University of Brooklyn at Downstate. In addition to his post as Vice President for Downstate Enterprises, Inc. Dr. Simon has steadily maintained a private practice in the Flatbush community since 1996, providing care in Nephrology and Internal Medicine.

Dr. Simon had also served as a member of the ADAP Clinical Subcommittee of the Advisory Council for the AIDS Institute and advisor to the Collegiate Science and Technology Program for the Borough of Manhattan Community College. In spite of his busy schedule, Dr. Simon continues to lecture on the molecular basis of hypertension and kidney disease as well as the promises and dilemmas of preventive health care.

In 2008, Dr. Simon was able to pilot the current New York City Health and Hospital Corporation (HHC) Diabetes Guidelines and revealed that a treatment algorithm coupled with nurse care-management can rapidly improve diabetes care. As a result the HHC leadership mandated the use of the guidelines by all HHC facilities. Dr. Simon was a leading figure in the implementation of Managed Care and Rapid HIV Testing within HHC.

Following the January 12, 2010 earthquake in Haiti, he traveled there to provide medical care to the General Hospital in Port-au-Prince. He continues to be very active in planning for the immediate and long-term medical needs of Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Dr. Simon for his extraordinary contributions to our Brooklyn community.

IN RECOGNITION AND CELEBRATION OF THE LIFE OF YOLANDA SANCHEZ

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to mourn the loss of Yolanda Sanchez, a fierce advocate for Puerto Rican youth and women in my district. It is with a heavy heart that I stand here today to memorialize her.

Ms. Sanchez was a pioneer in El Barrio and I am honored to have partnered with her over the years to improve the lives of Puerto Rican youth and women. She dedicated herself for over 50 years to the community, a community she was born and raised in. Ms. Sanchez began her career as a community organizer and advocate in 1962, when she was asked to join the staff of Aspira; a non-profit organization focused on educational advancement and further development of Puerto Rican and Hispanic youth. Ms. Sanchez never stopped working for children, women and the Puerto Rican community; she never took a day off from her goals.

A graduate of City College and the Columbia University School of Social Work, Ms. Sanchez continually sought out and worked in positions that maximized her positive impact on the community. These positions ranged from Executive Director of the Puerto Rican Association for Community Affairs, to founding member and later president of the National Latina Caucus, to president of the East Harlem Council for Human Services, to Director of CUNY's office of Puerto Rican programs.

Ms. Sanchez was successful in playing a key role in the creation of three critical institutions for the underserved in El Barrio. The Taino Towers (section 8 housing), Boriken Health Center (primary care) and Casabe Houses (elderly housing) owe their existence partially to the tireless efforts of Ms. Sanchez.

This year Ms. Sanchez received the first Social Work Trailblazer Award from the Silberman School of Social Work in honor and recognition of her invaluable and tireless efforts made in the community. This award is an acknowledgment of a true heroine, feminist and champion of the downtrodden.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to please join me in celebrating and remembering the life of a fierce advocate for children, women and the disadvantaged. In her life, she truly made our community and thus the world a better place than how she found it. She will be missed by her loved ones, she will be missed by the community, but her spirit will carry on through philanthropy and in the spirit of others just like her.

A TRIBUTE TO SWAMY NAIDU SUNKARA

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and honor Dr. Swamy Naidu Sunkara.

Dr. Swamy Naidu Sunkara served as a surgeon, and then trained as an anesthesiologist in Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago. He completed a post graduate diploma in anesthesiology from the University of West Indies. He served as a Social Worker at St. James Infirmary in Montego Bay, Jamaica from 1979 to 1981. He also served at the Prince Elizabeth Hospital for destitute children in Port of Spain, Trinidad from 1981 to 1987. He gave free anesthesia for surgeries to children with cleft palates and club-feet, and other congenital abnormalities. He has worked as a volunteer physician at Trinidad and Tobago Sports Medicine. Dr. Swamy Naidu Sunkara received letters of commendation in Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago.

Dr. Swamy Naidu Sunkara migrated to the United States in 1988. He successfully completed the Diploma in Tropical Medicine and Health, and a Master's in Public Health with double majors in International Health and Emergency Medicine. He served as a published Researcher, and volunteer in the Children's Cancer Study Group in New York Medical College, and Westchester Medical Center at Valhalla, New York. He worked as a volunteer Emergency Medical Technician in the Ossining Volunteer Ambulance Corps and the Pleasantville Volunteer Ambulance Corps. He received the Best Volunteer Award from Westchester County Executive and Best Volunteer Award from the University of Medicine and Dentistry of Newark, New Jersey in 1989.

He has also faithfully served as one of the Uncles for Foster Children of the Richard Allen Center on Life in New York City.

As a young student leader, he volunteered in various natural disasters including one in Divi Andhra Predesh for several weeks directly under Mother Theresa. She always had kind words about him when she visited that area.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Dr. Swamy Naidu Sunkara for his extraordinary contributions to New York City's medical community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEOFF DAVIS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 18, 2012, I was not present for the evening vote series. Had I been present, I would have voted:

On rollcall No. 379—"yes"—S. 684, A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of land to the town of Alta, Utah.

On rollcall No. 380—"yes"—S. 404, A bill to modify a land grant patent issued by the Secretary of the Interior.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. MISBA ABDIN

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Mr. Misba Abdin.

A second-generation Bangladeshi-American, Misba Abdin came to the United States in 1982. He was born in 1969 in Beani Bazar of the Sylhet District in Bangladesh. His family led the way for others who migrated to the United States of America very early from the Sylhet region. Currently a businessman by profession, he is the product of the New York City Public School system where he went from P.S. 214K to M.S./I.S. 171 and graduated from Frank K. Lane High School. He went on to study Business Management at Hunter College of the City University of New York. He is well read and can tell you the history of almost

any book that has been on the best seller list over the last 20 years.

In 1984, Mr. Abdin, along with his three brothers and five cousins, and the support of the people of the neighborhood, started the first soccer tournament in Ozone Park, Queens, for Bangladeshi youth. The tournament became very popular as it was the first in the Bengali community and, was an example followed by Bangladeshi youth living in the other cities. In the early 1990s Mr. Abdin spearheaded the formation of the Bangladesh Football Federation, mainly with the view to provide the Bengali Community in New York with an opportunity to gather and celebrate through soccer games. Following the success of this organization, many Bangladeshi-American socio-cultural organizations were later formed by others. The Bangladesh Football Federation was renamed as Bangladesh Sports Council in 2001. And, in 2005, Mr. Abdin was appointed General Secretary of the Sports Council, a position he still holds today.

As a Pioneer Community Activist in the Bengali Community, Mr. Abdin's main focus is developing Bangladeshi youth and sports through his organizing skills and vibrant youth programs. As President and CEO of the Bangladeshi American Community Development and Youth Sports, BACDYS, his main objective is to focus exclusively on low income housing, education, youth programs and family entertainment. He is a Board member of the Highland Park Local Development Corp., the 75th Precinct Community Council and a member of the program committee of the North Brooklyn YMCA, to name a few.

Mr. Abdin is a product of a retail family. His father was a successful retail businessman and growing up he worked in his father's store after school and on weekends. After spending a couple of years in Bangladesh he returned to the United States to manage the family Key Food Supermarket, which to this day, he still manages.

Mr. Abdin is married to Farida Yeasmin, and they are blessed with two daughters and two sons. He attends the Al-Aman Mosque that was founded by his father, Abdul Sattar, on Forbell Street in Brooklyn.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleges to join me in recognizing the important achievements and dedication to community of Mr. Misba Abdin.

A TRIBUTE TO TOMMY MERRIWEATHER

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and honor Tommy Merriweather. Mr. Merriweather is a public servant that has dedicated his life to protecting the community.

Tommy enlisted in the U.S Army after high school where from 1982 to 1988 he served in the Infantry division. During his eight year military career he traveled the world and he earned many awards.

On July 5, 1989, he joined the New York City Police Department. He was a committed employee and enjoyed working for the NYPD for twenty years. In December 1992, Officer Merriweather was promoted to the rank of Detective.

Detective Merriweather was a dedicated and effective undercover detective, performing dangerous work on a daily basis. On numerous occasions, Detective Merriweather cancelled scheduled vacation days so that he could make undercover buys crucial to the progress of ongoing cases. Detective Merriweather's life and safety have been placed in jeopardy on numerous occasions by the unpredictability of the undercover work he did. On July 9, 2009, he completed 20 years with the NYPD and retired as a Detective 1st grade.

Tommy has worked with the Boy Scouts since 2009 and is the first African-American Scoutmaster of Boy Scout Troop 43 and of the Sagitokos District. He enjoys volunteering his time to work with the Scouts and helping them advance to become Eagle Scouts or be a part of the Order of Arrow. His troop enjoys outdoor camping. Tommy is always preparing for upcoming events and makes sure that everyone he talks to knows the good work being done by the Troop and Suffolk County Council of Boy Scouts.

Mr. Speaker I would like to recognize Tommy Merriweather for his extraordinary contributions to the Brooklyn community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID P. ROE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for votes on June 18, 2012 because I was attending a funeral. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes No. 379 and No. 380.

A TRIBUTE TO LEO A. MORRIS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and to honor Leo A. Morris for his track record in public service and his commitment to charity.

Leo Morris was born in Colon, Panama to Louise and Irving Morris and is now a resident of Brooklyn. He is the only son in his family and has four sisters. He migrated to the United States in 1959. Leo was educated at Eastern District High School, Staten Island Community College (AA, 1975), and Barnard College (BBA, 1978). He began his career in the housing sector with the United States Trust Company after completing his studies. He went on to serve the City of New York's Department of Housing Preservation and Development in various offices within the agency for 30 years. During his tenure, he was a Real Property Manager in the Tenant Interim Lease Program, a Community Coordinator/Unit Chief in the Division of Relocation, and Deputy Director for Field Operations in the Emergency Housing Services Bureau. Leo was recognized as a dedicated and loyal employee, retiring in 2010.

Leo is a dedicated volunteer and finds time to enjoy life. He is Vice Chair of Tashia's L.I.F.E., Inc., a charitable organization founded with the purpose of aiding, educating and assisting individuals citywide, who are experiencing difficulties while living with Lupus. Leo enjoys travelling, jazz, and trying out the diverse cuisines available all over Brooklyn. He is married to Leora Marie Morris, and is the proud father of three children, Michelle, Leah, and Natasha and a proud grandfather to Raphael, Damiere, Morgan, and Ryann.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mr. Leo A. Morris for his successful career and continued work in community service.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. RAMANATHAN RAJU

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and to honor Ramanathan (Ram) Raju, MD, MBA, FACS, FACHE. He is the Chief Executive Officer for the Cook County Health & Hospital System (CCHHS) in Chicago, Illinois. CCHHS is the 3rd largest public health system in the country which oversees a comprehensive, integrated system with several parts; an acute care hospital with a Level 1 Trauma Center and a Community Hospital; a Regional Outpatient Center; a Correctional Healthcare Facility; an Outpatient Infectious Disease Center specializing in the treatment of HIV/AIDS; 16 community clinics and a public health department.

Prior to accepting the role of CEO of Cook County Health & Hospital System (CCHHS), Dr. Raju served as the New York City Health and Hospital Corporation's (HHC) Executive Vice President, Corporate Chief Operating Officer and Chief Medical Officer since 2006. During his tenure in health care spanning over 30 years, Dr. Raju served in various leadership positions in not for profit and public hospital systems in New York. He served as the Chief Operating Officer and Chief Medical officer at Coney Island Hospital and Senior Vice President and Director of Medical Education at Lutheran Health System.

Dr. Raju began his professional career in India. He attended Madras Medical College to earn his medical diploma and subsequently did a residency in Surgery culminating in a Master of Surgery degree. He underwent further training in England and was elected as a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons. He served in various capacities in England and subsequently underwent surgical training in the United States. Dr. Raju also did a fellowship in Vascular Surgery. He is Board Certified in Surgery and is a fellow of the American College of Surgeons. He has held the position of Clinical Professor in multiple Medical Schools. He has been actively involved in teaching residents and medical students for many years, and won the Best Teacher award many times throughout his career. He is an avid researcher and has published many articles in peer review journals. Dr. Raju is also a physician executive, having obtained an MBA from the University of Tennessee and CPE from the American College of Physician Executives. He currently serves as an adjunct professor in Business Management at the University of Tennessee. He has held many positions in Healthcare Organizations, including

Director of Surgery, Director of Trauma, Director of Surgical Research, and Director of Medical Education. He has also served on various local and state wide committees including the American Hospital Association Region 2 Governance Board and on the President's Forum: The Acute Post Acute Hospital Continuum, a Member of the National Quality Forum steering Committee ''National Voluntary Consensus Standards for emergency Care—Phase II Hospital based Emergency and Research Committee. Dr. Raju's professional society memberships include the American College of Physician Executives and the American College of Surgeons. He was recently selected as one of the top 25 minority health care executives in the country by Modern Health care Magazine.

Dr. Raju married a fellow resident he met at Madras Medical College, urologist Samanthi Raju. They have a son and a daughter. Dr. Raju lives in Chicago's South Loop.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dr. Raju for his successful career and his dedication to community health.

HONORING THE 125TH UNITED WAY ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of United Way as they proudly celebrate their 125th anniversary serving our communities both here at home and abroad.

In 1887, three visionaries saw the need to help their community and to address the welfare issues their city faced. Thus, the first United Way campaign was born, collecting over $21,700 for local charitable organizations. Today, United Way exists in 1,800 communities and 41 countries, raising nearly $5 billion every year to increase opportunities for a better life worldwide.

Forty million Americans are working in low-income jobs with little or no health benefits. In 2008, United Way began a 10-year initiative to cut these staggering statistics in half. United Way continues to look into the future, searching diligently for solutions that will benefit these families in the long-term.

United Way has impacted our community in New York's 15th congressional district in profound ways. For as long as I can remember, its New York City chapter has been dedicated to helping low-income families in terms of their health, education, and financial stability. From restoring child care and after-school funding, to helping over 3 million people make healthier choices by making fresh fruits and vegetables more affordable and available. United Way sees no issue as unimportant and continues to display altruism at the highest level.

In these tough economic times, when many people are facing daily struggles that push them to the brink of pure exhaustion, the work United Way does serves as a beacon of hope for those in need. We are truly blessed to have such an amazing and crucial organization within our community. I would like to personally praise the leadership of United Way Worldwide President & CEO Brian Gallagher, New York's United Way CEO Gordon Campbell, and every staffer and volunteer who diligently works behind the scenes. Their work does not go unnoticed. Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to congratulate United Way on their 125th anniversary and I wish them the best in their future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO MONICA THOMAS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and to honor Monica Thomas, a model servant of the needs of the public, a person dedicated to the importance of family, and native New Yorker. She is Division Director of Homeless Services at Volunteers of America and currently enrolled at Bernard Baruch College to obtain her second Master's Degree in Public Administration.

Monica Thomas was called to action. After realizing the devastating impacts of drug addiction she sought a career in Addiction Counseling. In her first job she counseled homeless men, who also suffered from addiction problems and mental illness, and eventually rising to Assistant Program Director. She sought to learn more about the populations she served and received a ''JFK Jr. Fellowship'' scholarship to pursue undergraduate studies at Empire State College in 1996 where she focused in Social Administration and Addiction Studies and received New York State Certification in Alcohol and Substance Abuse Treatment.

In 1999, Monica Thomas attended Hunter College School of Social Work for a Master's in Social Work with a Specialty in Aging Health. She developed and implemented a substance abuse treatment model specifically for the elderly population and was promoted to Program Director of the Elder Care Unit at Odyssey House. Additionally, she was nominated and received the New York State CASAC of the Year Award, the highest award bestowed upon individuals who hold a New York State Alcohol and Substance Abuse Certification. Monica received her New York State Social Work Certification immediately completing her graduate studies in 2003.

Monica then worked in an executive management position overseeing residential services for an agency that focused on assisting pregnant women recover from addiction, and subsequently was appointed Vice President of Clinical Operations for a drug treatment organization in Fairfield, Connecticut. In her various roles, she designed and developed systems and policies that met the growing needs of the population while simultaneously engaging with the community to gain support for the programs under her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Ms. Monica Thomas for her efforts advocating for the well-being of our disenfranchised fellow citizens.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4253–S4311

Measures Introduced: Five bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3310–3314, S.J. Res. 45, and S. Res. 496–499. **Page S4299**

Measures Passed:

Intelligence or Intelligence-Related Activity Funds: Senate passed S. 3314, to specifically authorize certain funds for an intelligence or intelligence-related activity. **Pages S4307–08**

Juneteenth Independence Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 496, observing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day. **Pages S4308–10**

Congratulating the Los Angeles Kings: Senate agreed to S. Res. 497, congratulating the Los Angeles Kings on winning the 2012 Stanley Cup Championship. **Page S4309**

American Eagle Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 498, designating June 20, 2012, as ''American Eagle Day'', and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States. **Pages S4309–10**

National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering 10th Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 499, recognizing the tenth anniversary of the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering. **Page S4310**

Measures Considered:

Flood Insurance Reform And Modernization Act: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1940, to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund. **Pages S4253–66**

Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of S. 3240, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S4266–83**

Adopted:

Reid (for Stabenow/Roberts) Amendment No. 2389, of a perfecting nature. **Page S4266**

Akaka Amendment No. 2440, to improve a provision relating to loans to purchasers of highly fractionated land. **Page S4266**

Akaka Amendment No. 2396, to establish the Office of Tribal Relations in the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture. **Pages S4266–67**

Baucus/Tester Amendment No. 2429, to improve the livestock forage disaster program. **Pages S4267–68**

By 66 yeas to 33 nays (Vote No. 124), Snowe/Gillibrand Modified Amendment No. 2190, to require Federal milk marketing order reform. **Page S4268**

By 75 yeas to 24 nays (Vote No. 125), Grassley Amendment No. 2167, to provide payment limitations for marketing loan gains and loan deficiency payments. **Pages S4269–70**

By 55 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 126), Brown (OH) Amendment No. 2445, to strengthen rural communities and foster the next generation of farmers and ranchers. **Page S4270**

By 58 yeas to 41 nays (Vote No. 128), Cantwell Amendment No. 2370, to encourage the purchase of pulse crop products for school meals programs. **Pages S4271–72**

Nelson (NE) Amendment No. 2243, to ensure that performance bonus payments are used by State agencies only to carry out the supplemental nutrition assistance program. **Page S4272**

By 73 yeas to 26 nays (Vote No. 130), Casey Amendment No. 2238, to require more frequent dairy reporting. **Page S4273**

Coons/Chambliss Amendment No. 2426, to provide for studies on the feasibility of establishing a business disruption insurance policy for poultry producers and a catastrophic event insurance policy for poultry producers. **Page S4274**

Feinstein Amendment No. 2422, to modify a provision relating to conservation innovation grants and payments. **Page S4274**

Kerry (for McCain) Amendment No. 2199, to repeal a duplicative program relating to inspection and grading of catfish. **Page S4275**

By 76 yeas to 23 nays (Vote No. 133), Feinstein/Chambliss Amendment No. 2309, to require a study into the feasibility of an insurance product that covers food safety recalls. **Page S4376**

Hagan Amendment No. 2366, to require the Risk Management Agency and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to use plain language and a website to make crop insurance more accessible. **Page S4279**

DeMint Amendment No. 2262, to express the sense of the Senate that nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act should manipulate prices or interfere with the free market. **Pages S4279–80**

Kerry Amendment No. 2187, to extend eligibility for certain emergency loans to commercial fishermen. **Page S4280**

Landrieu Amendment No. 2321, to move a section from the rural development title to the credit title. **Page S4281**

Rejected:

By 38 yeas to 61 nays (Vote No. 123), Ayotte/Coburn Amendment No. 2192, to improve the program of value-added agricultural producer grants. **Page S4267**

By 43 yeas to 56 nays (Vote No. 127), Sessions Amendment No. 2174, to limit categorical eligibility for the supplemental nutrition assistance program to those who receive cash assistance. **Pages S4270–71**

By 41 yeas to 58 nays (Vote No. 129), Sessions Amendment No. 2172, to end the State bonus payments for administering the supplemental nutrition assistance program. **Pages S4272–73**

By 15 yeas to 84 nays (Vote No. 131), Paul Amendment No. 2181, to establish an average adjusted gross income limitation of $250,000 for all payments and benefits under the Farm Bill. **Pages S4273–74**

By 33 yeas to 66 nays (Vote No. 132), Alexander Amendment No. 2191, to provide that any cooperative organization or other entity that receives a business and industry direct or guaranteed loan for a wind energy project is ineligible for any other Federal benefit, assistance, or incentive for the project. **Pages S4274–75**

By 42 yeas to 57 nays (Vote No. 134), Toomey Amendment No. 2217, to eliminate the organic certification cost share assistance program. **Pages S4276–77**

By 33 yeas to 66 nays (Vote No. 135), Gillibrand Modified Amendment No. 2156, to strike a reduction in the supplemental nutrition assistance program and increase funding for the fresh fruit and vegetable program, with an offset that limits crop insurance reimbursements to providers. **Pages S4277–78**

By 45 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 136), DeMint Amendment No. 2263, to maintain funding at current levels for programs providing access to broadband telecommunications services in rural areas. **Pages S4278–79**

By 14 yeas to 84 nays (Vote No. 137), DeMint Amendment No. 2268, to prohibit the Secretary from making loan guarantees. **Pages S4280–81**

By 20 yeas to 79 nays (Vote No. 138), DeMint Amendment No. 2276, to prohibit mandatory or compulsory check off programs. **Pages S4281–82**

Withdrawn:

Reid Motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 2391, of a perfecting nature. **Page S4266**

Reid Amendment No. 2390 (to Amendment No. 2389), to change the enactment date. **Page S4266**

During consideration of this measure today, the Senate also took the following action:

Reid Amendment No. 2406 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 2391), to eliminate certain working lands conservation programs fell, when Reid Motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 2391, was withdrawn. **Page S4266**

Reid Amendment No. 2407 (to Amendment No. 2406), to convert all mandatory spending to discretionary spending subject to annual appropriations fell, when Reid Amendment No. 2406 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 2391) fell. **Page S4266**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Bennet/Crapo Amendment No. 2202, which has been cleared by both sides, be in order. **Page S4283**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that if the motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res, 37, to disapprove a rule promulgated by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency relating to emission standards for certain steam generating units, is not agreed to, Senate continue consideration of the bill and the votes on or in relation to the amendments remaining in the order. **Page S4311**

Boiler MACT/EPA—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, June 20, 2012, the Republican Leader be recognized to make a motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 37, to disapprove a rule promulgated by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency relating to emission standards for certain steam generating units; that the time until 11:30 a.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders, or their designees, with the Republicans controlling

the first 15 minutes, and the Majority controlling the second 15 minutes; and that at 11:30 a.m., Senate vote on the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution; that if the motion to proceed is agreed to, all other provisions of the previous order with respects to the joint resolution remain in effect, and that if the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution is not agreed to, Senate continue consideration of S. 3240, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and the votes on or in relation to the amendments remaining in order. **Pages S4283–93**

Nomination Withdrawn: Senate received notification of withdrawal of the following nomination:

Brett H. McGurk, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Iraq, which was sent to the Senate on March 27, 2012. **Page S4311**

Messages from the House: **Pages S4295–96**

Measures Referred: **Page S4296**

Executive Communications: **Pages S4296–97**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S4297–99**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4299–S4301**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4301–05**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4294–95**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4305–06**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S4306**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S4307**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S4307**

Record Votes: Sixteen record votes were taken today. (Total—138) **Pages S4267–79, S4281–82**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:49 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 20, 2012. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4310.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the potential for induced seismicity from energy technologies, including carbon capture and storage, enhance geothermal systems, production from gas shales, and enhanced oil recovery, after receiving testimony from William Leith, Senior Science Advisor for Earthquake and Geologic Hazards, U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior; Murray W. Hitzman, Colorado School of Mines Department of Geology and Geological Engineering, Golden; Susan Petty, AltaRock Energy, Inc., Seattle, Washington; and Mark D. Zoback, Stanford University Department of Geophysics, Stanford, California.

EPA AIR STANDARDS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety concluded a hearing to examine a review of recent Environmental Protection Agency's air standards for hydraulically fractured natural gas wells and oil and natural gas storage, after receiving testimony from Regina McCarthy, Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation, Environmental Protection Agency; John V. Corra, Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality Director, Cheyenne; William C. Allison, Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment Air Pollution Control Division Director, and Tisha Schuller, Colorado Oil and Gas Association, both of Denver; Fred Krupp, Environmental Defense Fund, New York, New York; and Darren Smith, Devon Energy Corporation, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

FISCAL CRISIS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine confronting the looming fiscal crisis, after receiving testimony from former Senator Pete V. Domenici, and Alice Rivlin, both a Co-Chair, Bipartisan Policy Center Debt Reduction Task Force, Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 641, to provide 100,000,000 people with first-time access to safe drinking water and sanitation on a sustainable basis within six years by improving the capacity of the United States Government to fully implement the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005;

S. 2165, to enhance strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 4240, to reauthorize the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004;

S. Res. 402, 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, with amendments;

S. Res. 429, supporting the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day;

S. Res. 473, commending Rotary International and others for their efforts to prevent and eradicate polio;

S. Res. 385, condemning the Government of Iran for its continued persecution, imprisonment, and sentencing of Youcef Nadarkhani on the charge of apostasy, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Piper Anne Wind Campbell, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to Mongolia, Peter William Bodde, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal, Dorothea-Maria Rosen, of California, to be Ambassador to the Federated States of Micronesia, Edward M. Alford, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of The Gambia, Mark L. Asquino, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Equatorial Guinea, Douglas M. Griffiths, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mozambique, Michele Jeanne Sison, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Maldives, Susan Marsh Elliott, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Tajikistan, Richard L. Morningstar, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Azerbaijan, Timothy M. Broas, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Jay Nicholas Anania, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Suriname, all of the Department of State, and lists in the Foreign Service.

TITLE IX

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Title IX, focusing on forty years and counting, after receiving testimony from Rear Admiral Sandra L. Stosz, Superintendant, Coast Guard Academy, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security; Nancy Hogshead-Makar, Florida Coastal School of Law, Jacksonville; Mae C. Jemison, Houston, Texas; and Billie Jean King, New York, New York.

SOLITARY CONFINEMENT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights concluded a hearing to examine reassessing solitary confinement, focusing on the human rights, fiscal and public safety consequences, after receiving testimony from Charles E. Samuels, Jr., Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice; Christopher Epps, Mississippi Commissioner of Corrections, Jackson; Stuart M. Andrews, Jr., Protection and Advocacy for People with Disabilities, Inc., Columbia, South Carolina; Anthony C. Graves, Anthony Believes, Houston, Texas; and Craig Haney, University of California, Santa Cruz.

TREATING SUBSTANCE ABUSE DISORDER

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control: Caucus received a briefing on treating substance abuse disorder and expanding access to and resources for community-based treatment providers in the United States, after receiving testimony from Benjamin B. Tucker, Deputy Director of State, Local and Tribal Affairs, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President; Gary Tennis, Pennsylvania Department of Drug and Alcohol Programs Incoming-Secretary, Harrisburg: Kathryn Icenhower, SHIELDS for Families, Inc., Los Angeles, California; and Sushma Taylor, Treatment Communities of America, San Rafael, California.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 13 public bills, H.R. 5959–5971; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 690, 692–693 were introduced. **Pages H3806–07**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3807–08**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 691, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4480) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in response to a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (H. Rept. 112–540). **Page H3806**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Webster to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3735**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:02 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H3742**

Oath of Office—Eighth Congressional District of Arizona: Representative-elect Ron Barber presented

himself in the well of the House and was administered the Oath of Office by the Speaker. Earlier, the Clerk of the House transmitted a facsimile copy of a letter from Ms. Amy B. Chan, State Election Director, Office of the Secretary of State, State of Arizona, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held June 12, 2012, the Honorable Ron Barber was elected Representative to Congress for the Eighth Congressional District, State of Arizona. **Page H3753**

Whole Number of the House: The Speaker announced to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Barber, the whole number of the House is 433. **Page H3754**

Motion to Instruct Conferees: Representative McKinley announced his intent to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4348. **Page H3755**

Amending the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act related to a segment of the Lower Merced River in California: The House passed H.R. 2578, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act related to a segment of the Lower Merced River in California, by a yea-and-nay vote of 232 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 387. **Pages H3744–53, H3754–87**

Rejected the Perlmutter motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 234 noes, Roll No. 386. **Pages H3785–86**

Pursuant to the rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112–25 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. **Page H3765**

Agreed to:

Hastings (WA) amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 112–539) that makes technical and clarifying changes; reduces the size of the land conveyance in Title IV; conforms the text of Title VI to the House-passed version of the bill from the 111th Congress; and reduces the authorization of Title VIII to conform with Leadership protocols and **Page H3776**

Bishop (UT) amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 112–539) that clarifies the intent of the legislation and narrows the list of laws which may be waived for border security activities. It also adds provisions protecting private property and tribal sovereignty. **Pages H3779–81**

Rejected:

DeFazio amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 112–539) that sought to ensure that if the SEAlaska Native Corporation is allowed to clear-cut new areas of the Tongass National Forest in Alaska, it is subject to the same limitation on the export of unprocessed timber that applies to other national forests in the lower 48 (by a recorded vote of 184 ayes to 236 noes, Roll No. 383); **Pages H3776–78, H3782–83**

Markey amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 112–539) that sought to authorize a pilot project to test a small increase in federal grazing fees (by a recorded vote of 156 ayes to 268 noes, Roll No. 384); and **Pages H3778–79, H3783–84**

Grijalva amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 112–539) that sought to strike Title XIV which creates a 100-mile operation control zone for the Department of Homeland Security along the Northern and Southern borders of the United States (by a recorded vote of 177 ayes to 247 noes, Roll No. 385). **Pages H3781–82, H3784–85**

Withdrawn:

Hanabusa amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 112–539) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have excluded the state of Hawaii from the provisions of the bill that exempt the Department of Homeland Security from dozens of conservation laws within 100 miles of the nation's borders. **Page H3782**

H. Res. 688, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a recorded vote of 240 ayes to 175 noes, Roll No. 382, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 238 yeas to 178 nays, Roll No. 381. **Pages H3444–53, H3754–55**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated yesterday, June 18th:

Gila Bend Indian Reservation Lands Replacement Clarification Act: H.R. 2938, amended, to prohibit certain gaming activities on certain Indian lands in Arizona, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 343 yeas to 78 nays with 2 answering "present", Roll No. 388. **Page H3787**

Motion to Instruct Conferees: The House debated the Walz (MN) motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4348. Further proceedings were postponed. **Pages H3788–94**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3752–53, H3754–55, H3782–83, H3783–84, H3784, H3786, H3786–87, H3787. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a markup of Agriculture Appropriations Bill, FY 2013; and the Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development Appropriations Bill, FY 2013. The bills were ordered reported, as amended.

ACTIVITIES AND SUMMARY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a markup of Activities and Summary Report of the Committee on the Budget. The Activities and Summary Report of the Committee on the Budget was passed.

AMERICAN ENERGY INITIATIVE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing entitled ''The American Energy Initiative''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FEDERAL GREEN JOBS AGENDA

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''The Federal Green Jobs Agenda''. Testimony was heard from Molly F. Sherlock, Specialist in Public Finance Government and Finance Division, Congressional Research Service; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee began markup of H.R. 5859, to repeal an obsolete provision in title 49, United States Code, requiring motor vehicle insurance cost reporting; H.R. 5865, the ''American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2012''; H.R. 4273, the ''Resolving Environmental and Grid Reliability Conflicts Act of 2012''; H.R. 5892, the ''Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2012''; H. Con. Res. 127, providing for the acceptance of a statue of Gerald R. Ford from the people of Michigan for placement in the United States Capitol; and Semi-Annual Committee Activity Report.

JPMORGAN CHASE'S TRADING LOSS

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Examining Bank Supervision and Risk Management in Light of JPMorgan Chase's Trading Loss''. Testimony was heard from Thomas J. Curry, Comptroller of the Currency, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency; Mary Schapiro, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission; Gary Gensler, Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission; Martin J. Gruenberg, Acting Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Scott Alvarez, General Counsel, Federal Reserve Board of Governors; and a public witness.

BORDER SECURITY THREATS TO THE HOMELAND: DHS' RESPONSE TO INNOVATIVE TACTICS AND TECHNIQUES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security held a hearing ''Border Security Threats to the Homeland: DHS' Response to Innovative Tactics and Techniques''. Testimony was heard from Donna A. Bucella, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Intelligence and Investigative Liaison, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; James A. Dinkins, Executive Associate Director, Homeland Security Investigations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security; Rear Admiral William D. Lee, Deputy for Operations Policy and Capabilities, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security; and Rear Admiral Charles D. Michel Director, Joint Interagency Task Force South.

TSA'S PLANNED PURCHASE OF CAT/BPSS

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation Security held a hearing entitled ''Is TSA's Planned Purchase of CAT/BPSS a Wise Use of Taxpayer Dollars?''. Testimony was heard from Kelly Hoggan, Assistant Administrator for the Office of Security Capabilities, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security; and Stephen M. Lord, Director of Homeland Security and Justice Issues, Government Accountability Office.

NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND INNOVATIONS IN THE MOBILE AND ONLINE SPACE, AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC POLICY

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition, and the Internet held a hearing entitled ''New Technologies and Innovations in the Mobile and Online space, and the Implications for Public Policy''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup of H.R. 5949, the ''FISA Amendments Act Reauthorization Act of 2012''. The bill was ordered reported, without amendment.

TAXPAYER-FUNDED LITIGATION: BENEFITTING LAWYERS AND HARMING SPECIES, JOBS AND SCHOOLS

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Taxpayer-Funded Litigation: Benefitting Lawyers and Harming Species, Jobs and Schools''. Testimony was heard from Senator Sessions and Representative Lummis; Jerry Patterson, Commissioner, Texas General Land Office, Austin, Texas;

John Stokes, Facilities Development Project Coordinator, San Diego Unified School District, San Diego, California; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 2706, the ''Billfish Conservation Act of 2011''; H.R. 3472, the ''Pirate Fishing Vessel Disposal Act of 2011''; and H.R. 4100, the ''Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing Enforcement Act of 2011''. Testimony was heard from Eric Schwaab, Assistant Administrator for Fisheries National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; John Graves, Chair, International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, Advisory Committee; and public witnesses.

OBAMA ADMINISTRATION'S GREEN ENERGY GAMBLE PART II

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, Stimulus Oversight and Government Spending held a hearing entitled ''The Obama Administration's Green Energy Gamble Part II: Were All the Taxpayer Subsidies Necessary?''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

STRATEGIC ENERGY PRODUCTION ACT OF 2012

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 4480, the ''Strategic Energy Production Act of 2012''. The Committee granted, by a record vote, a structured rule providing two hours of general debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for purpose of amendment the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112–24 and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Gardner, Rush, Gene Green (TX), Lamborn, Markey, Hanabusa, Hastings (FL), Polis, Jackson Lee (TX), Langevin, and Ellison.

BEST PRACTICES IN TRANSFORMING RESEARCH INTO INNOVATION: CREATIVE APPROACHES TO THE BAYH-DOLE ACT

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation held a hearing entitled ''Best Practices in Transforming Research into Innovation: Creative Approaches to the Bayh-Dole Act''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SCIENCE OF HOW HUNTING ASSISTS SPECIES CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Investigation and Oversight held a hearing entitled ''The Science of How Hunting Assists Species Conservation and Management''. Testimony was heard from Daniel Ashe, Director, Fish and Wildlife Service; Nick Wiley, Executive Director, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission; and public witnesses.

VBA CLAIMS TRANSFORMATION PLAN AS A MEANS TO EFFECTIVELY SERVE OUR VETERANS; AND ACTIVITIES REPORT FOR THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Reclaiming the Process: Examining the VBA Claims Transformation Plan as a Means to Effectively Serve our Veterans''; and Approval of the Activities Report for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Testimony was heard from William J. Bosanko, Executive for Agency Services, National Archives and Records Administration; Linda Halliday, Assistant Inspector General for Audits and Evaluations, Office of the Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs; General Allison Hickey, Under Secretary for Benefits, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses. The Activities Report for The Committee on Veterans' Affairs was agreed to.

MEDPAC'S JUNE 2012 REPORT TO CONGRESS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''MedPAC's June 2012 Report to Congress''. Testimony was heard from Glen M. Hackbarth, Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission.

Joint Meetings

GOVERNMENT STATISTICS FUNDING

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the economic impact of ending or reducing funding for the American Community Survey and other government statistics, after receiving testimony from Kenneth D. Simonson, Associated General Contractors of America, Andrew Reamer, George Washington University Institute of Public Policy, and Grant D. Aldonas, Split Rock International, Inc., all of Washington, D.C.; and Keith Hall, George Mason University Mercatus Center, Arlington, Virginia.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D601)*

S. 292, to resolve the claims of the Bering Straits Native Corporation and the State of Alaska to land adjacent to Salmon Lake in the State of Alaska and to provide for the conveyance to the Bering Straits Native Corporation of certain other public land in partial satisfaction of the land entitlement of the Corporation under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. Signed on June 15, 2012. (Public Law 112–133)

S. 363, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey property of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to the City of Pascagoula, Mississippi. Signed on June 15, 2012. (Public Law 112–134)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 2012

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel, to hold hearings to examine Department of Defense programs and policies to support military families with special needs in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2013 and the Future Years Defense Program, 2:30 p.m., SH–216.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance and Investment, to hold hearings to examine the initial public offering (IPO) process, focusing on ordinary investors, 9:30 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Science and Space, to hold hearings to examine risks, opportunities, and oversight of commercial space, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on the Judiciary: To hold an oversight hearing to examine the United States Patent and Trademark Office, focusing on implementation of the Leahy-Smith "America Invents Act" and international harmonizing efforts, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine Holocaust-era claims in the 21st century, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Full Committee, markup of Financial Services Appropriations Bill, FY 2013, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, markup of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2013, 1 p.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing on Addressing the Iranian Nuclear Challenge: Understanding the Military Options, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Afghan National Security Forces: Resources, Strategy, and Timetable for Security Lead Transitions, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, hearing entitled "Assessing the Challenges Facing Multiemployer Pension Plans", 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, continued markup of H.R. 5859, to repeal an obsolete provision in title 49, United States Code, requiring motor vehicle insurance cost reporting; H.R. 5865, the "American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2012"; H.R. 4273, the "Resolving Environmental and Grid Reliability Conflicts Act of 2012"; H.R. 5892, the "Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2012"; H. Con. Res. 127, providing for the acceptance of a statue of Gerald R. Ford from the people of Michigan for placement in the United States Capitol; and Semi-Annual Committee Activity Report, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled "Market Structure: Ensuring Orderly, Efficient, Innovative and Competitive Markets for Issuers and Investors", 9 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity, "Mortgage Disclosures: How Do We Cut Red Tape for Consumers and Small Businesses?", 1:30 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, hearing entitled "Reflections on the Revolution in Egypt, Part II", 1:30 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, and Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights, joint subcommittee hearing entitled "The African Growth and Opportunity Act: Ensuring Success", 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The American Muslim Response to Hearings on Radicalization within their Community", 10:15 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing entitled "The

Drug Enforcement Administration'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement, hearing on H.R. 2899, the ''Chinese Media Reciprocity Act of 2011'', 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, markup to consider a report holding Attorney General Eric Holder in contempt of Congress for his failure to produce documents specified in the Committee's October 12, 2011, subpoena, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Examining Priorities and Effectiveness of the Nation's Science Policies'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on the following measures: H.R. 2985, the ''Veteran's I.D. Card Act''; H.R. 3730, the ''Veterans Data Breach Timely Notification Act''; H.R. 4481, the ''Veterans Affairs Employee Accountability Act''; and H.R. 5948 the, ''Veterans Fiduciary Reform Act of 2012'', 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Russia's Accession to the World Trade Organization and Granting Russia Permanent Normal Trade Relations'', 9:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 20

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: The Majority Leader will be recognized. Following the remarks of the Majority Leader, the Republican Leader will be recognized to make a motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 37, Boiler MACT/EPA, and at 11:30 a.m., Senate will vote on the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution. If the motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 37, Boiler MACT/EPA is not agreed to, Senate will continue consideration of S. 3420, Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act, and the votes on or in relation to the remaining amendments.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, June 20

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Begin consideration of H.R. 4480—Strategic Energy Production Act of 2012 (Subject to a Rule)

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Andrews, Robert E., N.J., E1076
Berman, Howard L., Calif., E1073
Biggert, Judy, Ill., E1073
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E1079
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E1077
Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E1080
Carnahan, Russ, Mo., E1069, E1078, E1082
Chu, Judy, Calif., E1071
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1078
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E1079
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E1067, E1069, E1071, E1074, E1076, E1077, E1078, E1080
Critz, Mark S., Pa., E1072
Davis, Geoff, Ky., E1085
Denham, Jeff, Calif., E1076
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1079
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E1072, E1074
Goodlatte, Bob, Va., E1070
Gutierrez, Luis V., Ill., E1084
Hartzler, Vicky, Mo., E1073
Hirono, Mazie K., Hawaii, E1076
Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E1067, E1069, E1070, E1073, E1076, E1077, E1078, E1080
King, Peter T., N.Y., E1071
Kingston, Jack, Ga., E1074
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E1067, E1068, E1069, E1071
Larson, John B., Conn., E1079
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E1068, E1075, E1083
McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E1070
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E1072, E1081
Markey, Edward J., Mass., E1084
Olson, Pete, Tex., E1077
Owens, William L., N.Y., E1076
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E1073
Pingree, Chellie, Me., E1069, E1075, E1083
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1068, E1075, E1082, E1083, E1085, E1087
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E1072, E1081
Roe, David P., Tenn., E1067, E1086
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E1067
Scott, David, Ga., E1074
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E1070, E1081
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E1076, E1080
Stivers, Steve, Ohio, E1077, E1081
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E1083, E1083, E1084, E1085, E1085, E1085, E1086, E1086, E1086, E1087
Turner, Michael R., Ohio, E1073
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1067, E1077, E1080
Walberg, Tim, Mich., E1072
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E1070, E1082

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.