

SENATE—Wednesday, July 20, 2011*(Legislative day of Tuesday, July 19, 2011)*

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, author of liberty, to You we lift our hearts in prayer. Long may our land be bright with freedom's holy light; protect us by Your might, great God our King.

Give to our lawmakers the wisdom to know the role they should play in keeping freedom's holy light bright. As they seek to be responsible stewards of their calling, keep them from the paths that lead to ruin. May the words of their mouths and the meditations of their hearts be acceptable to You.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND 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. INOUE).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 20, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUE,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour. The majority will control the first half and the Republicans the final half. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the military construction appropriations bill. There will be a rollcall vote at noon on that matter in relation to the Vitter amendment. There are four other amendments pending. We hope to complete action on this bill today. We will notify all Senators when the votes will occur.

DEBT DEFAULT

Mr. REID. Madam President, there is a fundamental principle we have to focus on in the Senate, and I think we have focused on it; that is, we cannot default on our debt. We have 11 or 12 days until that crucial time comes. We have a number of plans that are being talked about here. We have a path forward in the Senate, we believe. There is the Gang of 6, which reported some encouraging news yesterday. We have President Obama's grand plan that has been talked about a lot.

So now we return to the roots of what this country is all about; that is, our constitutional form of government. The Founding Fathers uniquely—when they finally figured out a way to do the Constitution, the breakthrough was in June of 1787, the so-called Grand Compromise, when a member of the Constitutional Convention from Connecticut came up with the idea of a bicameral legislature. No one had ever thought about that before, that we would have a system of government with three branches—executive, judicial, and legislative. No one had ever considered having anything other than a parliamentary form of government.

But our Founding Fathers came up with a new idea, and that new idea was to have within the legislative branch of government two Houses; one based strictly on population and one based on the same number of Senators from each State. That took care of the big problem they had with New York—big, massive New York, with a lot of area and lots of people—and little, tiny Rhode Island—not much area and not many people.

The reason I say we return to our roots is we are not going to be able to do the fundamental principle that guides this country in the last 11 or 12

days of this legislative session; that is, we cannot default on our debt. We in the Senate can have the greatest ideas in the world, but if they are not accepted in the House we cannot extend the debt ceiling, which we have to do.

So now we await the House of Representatives. With our bicameral form of legislature, that is what we must do. We know they know time is of the essence. We know all of the partisanship that has been shown in the House of Representatives, including their spending so much time on this plan they call cap, cut, and balance—which others have called cut, cap, and destroy Medicare, and all the other names this program has been given—and we have to get now where we work on something that is important and has an opportunity to pass.

Everyone knew, the Republican leadership knew that did not stand a chance over here. That is why, with this most important issue we are facing; that is, not defaulting on our debt, they have to become real and send something over to us or we will send something to them or agree in the interim to something that will extend the debt.

As most know, I have worked hard in trying to figure a way through all this. Others have worked just as hard as I have. Right now, I am at a point where I am saying we need to hear from the House of Representatives. We have a plan to go forward over here. But until we hear from the House of Representatives, all of our work here would be for naught.

So I await the word from the Speaker. He indicated that he thought it would be appropriate they get this other matter out of the way first. I look forward to working on this.

I had a terrific conversation with the President last night. He understands the issue as well as anyone in the country, if not more so, because the buck does stop at his desk. So I tell all Senators to be calm and deliberate. I am confident we will be able to work our way through this very difficult time. But we are at this stage depending on the House of Representatives to help us find a path forward.

ORDER FOR MEASURE TO BE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 2560

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives H.R. 2560, it be ordered to be read twice and placed on the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Would the Chair announce morning business, please.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEBT CEILING

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, our Nation is less than 2 weeks away from potentially facing what Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has called a "calamitous outcome."

Unless we act, the United States of America, for the first time in our history, may face the prospect of defaulting on our loans, and not making good on the promises we have made to millions of our citizens.

This outcome is unthinkable, and we should be doing everything we can to avoid it. That is why I am so disappointed that instead of working with us to tackle this issue seriously, the Republican-led House of Representatives has chosen to put politics ahead of everything else, and has sent us a bill they call cut, cap, and balance.

First of all, this is a colossal waste of time. The Republican House has sent us a bill that may appeal to their extreme base, but right now the American people are looking for results, not more rhetoric.

The Washington Post reports this bill as being "a doomed plan." Even conservative columnist David Brooks said in his column yesterday that this bill has "zero chance of becoming law." And that it is "likely that Republicans will come to regret this missed opportunity."

But second of all, this bill is not just a waste of time, it's truly terrible pol-

icy. It would essentially enshrine into our Constitution the failed Republican policies that got us into this crisis in the first place.

It could bind our hands from responding to national emergencies that require quick and decisive action. Like another terrorist attack or Hurricane Katrina, payments for families who have lost their homes in tornadoes, or an infrastructure breach in states across the country like the Howard Hanson Dam in my home State of Washington.

It would force us to say "no" to families across the country who need some temporary support to help them get back on their feet, and at the same time help them contribute back to our economic strength.

This bill would have prevented us from taking any real actions after Wall Street brought us to the precipice of financial collapse in 2008, which would have led to thousands more job losses across the country at a time when we could afford it least.

And it would not allow Congress, as representatives of the American people, to make the investments we need to continue innovating, educating, and leading in the 21st century economy.

Republicans may be talking about the virtues of cutting, capping and balancing now, but their actions and votes speak much louder than these three words.

And the Republican budget this same House of Representatives just passed, a budget that slashes and burns away at the fabric of our society that cuts off millions of middle class and working families from the health care, nutrition, education, and housing support they need. Even this Republican budget would not meet the standards of cut, cap, and balance. And you know whose budgets would not meet those standards? Ronald Reagan's and George W. Bush's.

It is truly unbelievable that they are playing these games with the clock ticking down to another financial crisis. We do not need a so-called cut, cap, and balance bill to put in place sensible policies that work for the American people.

My Republican colleagues may choose to ignore this fact these days, but we did some responsible cutting and balancing of our own here in America not too long ago and we did not need a constitutional amendment to do our jobs, either. Like many of them, I was here in 2000.

I remember that when President Clinton left office we were on a course to completely pay down the \$5.6 trillion debt by 2012. I remember the projections of surpluses. I remember some of my colleagues actually being worried that the large surpluses in years ahead could be a problem. And I remember the efforts by many of us to safeguard that funding for our seniors,

for our future, and to pay down the debt.

But I also remember what Republicans chose to do with that surplus. They could not wait to get their hands on the nation's credit card. And when they did, after President Bush took office, they spent lavishly.

Throughout the Bush years, and particularly in the Bush tax cuts of 2001 and 2003, trillions of dollars in tax breaks went to the very wealthiest Americans.

There were capital gains tax roll-backs. Tax breaks designed to benefit corporate giants. And a new tax bracket that provided the very wealthiest Americans the lowest tax rates they have enjoyed since World War II.

These tax breaks were all unpaid for, all handed out to those who could most afford to pay, and all put on the Nation's credit card.

Our country was also led into two wars, and neither of them were paid for.

Now that the credit card bill has come due, now that all those tax cuts and spending need to be reckoned with, and just as our Nation is starting to recover from the Wall Street crisis that has devastated so many families, Republicans are playing political games with our future.

This is serious. If we cannot come to an agreement by August 2, the consequences will be dire.

A few weeks ago the Bipartisan Policy Center put out a report authored by a former Bush Treasury official about what would happen if Congress failed to act and the administration was forced to make desperate spending decisions in August. And the scenarios were worse than grim.

Potentially at risk are: the benefits and health care we owe our veterans, loans for struggling small businesses, food stamps for those struggling to buy groceries, Social Security checks for our seniors, unemployment benefits for the millions of workers desperately seeking jobs, and even active duty pay for our military. These risks are unacceptable.

Senior citizens in this great country are worried that the Social Security checks they depend on, and that they have been promised, may not be coming in the mail in 2 weeks. And then they read the news and hear that Republicans are still "playing games."

Mothers and fathers are sitting around their kitchen table, trying to figure out what they would do if the food stamps they count on to feed their kids got cut off. And then they turn on the television, and see reports of the House of Representatives sending us a bill that cannot pass. This is an embarrassment. And the American people deserve better.

Democrats have come to the table again and again with reasonable proposals for coming to an agreement. We

have come to the middle. We have offered up serious and deep cuts in Federal spending. But again and again, Republicans have said no.

So far, they have refused to make any deal that does not protect tax cuts and loopholes for oil companies, private jets, and millionaires and billionaires and as we see today, they seem to be more focused on offering up red meat to their base than actual solutions for the American people and more focused on negotiating tensions within their own party than on working with us to get results.

So, with 13 days to go, I urge House Republicans to get serious about this.

The so-called cut, cap, and balance bill is bad policy. It is the kind of silly politics that Americans are sick of, and it is a waste of time that we as a country simply cannot afford right now.

If all it took were slogans and gimmicks to solve this crisis, House Republicans would have this covered. But we know that is not the case. And the clock is ticking for families across America.

Democrats are going to keep working to solve this crisis. We are ready to compromise. And we need a partner at the table that is just as serious about this as we and the American people are.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska.

HEALTHCARE FAIRNESS

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Madam President, I rise today to speak about legislation that I believe is very important for the future of health care fairness in our country.

Yesterday, I introduced the Savings Through Eligibility Fairness Act, which addresses Medicaid fairness and debt reduction. My friend and colleague from Wyoming, the ranking member of the HELP Committee, Senator ENZI, has a shared interest in this issue, and I commend and appreciate his offering of similar legislation and offer to continue to work with him to deal with and find solutions to this issue.

Medicaid is an important safety net for Nebraska and our country's most vulnerable families. I am committed to making sure they will continue receiving health care coverage. Unfortunately, the health care reform law passed last year would inadvertently make some middle-class Americans eligible for Medicaid who should not be eligible for Medicaid. My bill changes the law to ensure that only the neediest Nebraskans and Americans would qualify for the Medicaid expansion and health exchange subsidies created by the health reform law.

This simple, reasonable change has a significant impact: It saves \$13 billion. Let me repeat that—\$13 billion worth

of savings. My bill commits that \$13 billion will be used to pay down the national deficit. As Washington debates various debt-reduction plans, my bill offers one concrete, commonsense way to reduce the national debt by \$13 billion. We hear a lot of different ideas but not with the same level of concrete, commonsense approach.

I regularly hear from Nebraskans who are already benefiting from the new health care law—children remaining on their parents' coverage, seniors closing the doughnut hole, and young people no longer being denied coverage because of preexisting conditions. Those are Nebraskans who are already benefiting from the new health care law. So improvements such as the one I have proposed will save money and help reduce the national debt, while still protecting health care for Nebraska and American families.

In the current debate of how best to reduce spending and reduce our Nation's deficit, I believe Congress should start with this commonsense approach. It will maintain sensible eligibility requirements for the Medicaid expansion and health exchange subsidies rather than focusing on shifting costs to States, providers, and the people who rely on this most important program.

Right now, most States do include Social Security income when deciding who will be eligible for Medicaid. So my legislation will maintain that definition for establishing eligibility for both Medicaid and health exchange subsidies. Keeping this same definition consistently will ensure Medicaid will not start down the path of covering middle-income families, which has never been the purpose of this program, nor should it be. Rather, Medicaid is part of a critical safety net for the most vulnerable and the most in need.

Let me point out an important fact. Those who would no longer qualify for the Medicaid expansion would still be eligible to receive health insurance coverage through the State health insurance exchange and subsidies where appropriate. So they will receive the health care they need. As a result, the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the savings through the Eligibility Fairness Act will have a negligible effect on the total number of individuals projected to be insured as a result of health care reform.

Let me conclude and summarize by saying that Medicaid is an important health safety net for Nebraska and America's most vulnerable citizens. I am committed to preserving this program for more than 200,000 Nebraskans out of 1.85 million who include children, seniors, pregnant mothers, and the disabled. I am committed to maintaining this coverage for these Nebraskans in this fashion.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, this weekend I was in eastern Oregon holding townhalls. At each gathering, citizens asked me: How important is August 2? Are the Members of the Senate going to be able to come together and make sure our Nation doesn't default?

I rise today to address that question. Indeed, it would be historic, the first time in the history of the United States that we will have refused to pay our bills.

Some of my colleagues have called into question the significance of such an event. One of my colleagues said:

I am a little bit cynical about the scare mongering and putting America's back up against this August 2 deadline just to get an increase in the American credit card.

I heard some of my colleagues talk about the situation in which they view paying the interest on Treasury bills as equivalent to a family holding a mortgage; and the fact that the United States has other bills, such as checks to write to our veterans and our senior citizens, as more equivalent to utility bills; and that somehow, as long as you keep paying on your mortgage, you can quit making your payments on your utilities; that is, other payments for debts and obligations we have already incurred.

I want to clarify that this is a deeply flawed analysis because we don't have our national debt locked in for 30 years in a situation where we don't have to worry about changes in interest on it as long as we keep making our payments. Indeed, every week there is an auction of Treasury bonds. Thus, even if we make our payments on our interest, if we are not making our payments on other obligations in the United States, that translates into a sense that we are in trouble, and we will have to pay higher interest on the Treasury side. So it is as if you had to refinance your family mortgage and you knew that if you didn't pay your utility bills, you weren't going to be able to get that bill refinanced or at least you would have to pay higher interest. The consequences are substantial because this would be an increase in interest that is like a tax on all Americans, on all small businesses, on

the entire economy, and a tax that buys us nothing of value.

A Representative from the House has said, referring to the possibility of losing our AAA rating:

I am not as worried as Moody's or anyone else as this economy gets worse . . . I don't take the premise that we're going to default on our obligations.

Quite frankly, to believe that we can ignore payments on our debts and not have serious consequences is way off the mark. If we don't hit August 2 with action and we don't get our act together by then, on August 3 we will fail to make payments, and there will be a severe impact on our national economy. No matter how we shuffle around the money, we will not have enough money to pay some of our obligations, whether it be our interest payments, Social Security checks, checks to veterans, military checks—you name it—and our credit rating will be downgraded. Already, the ratings agencies have stated as much. As Senator SCHUMER and others have shown very effectively, there is no way for revenues we have coming in to cover the full set of obligations we have incurred.

This cavalier attitude about the consequences of default ignores the fact that default will have an immediate impact on interest rates and could send our economy into quite a tailspin. That is the last thing families need—higher costs in the short term and perhaps a severe loss of jobs and a much deeper recession. That would put us in a hole deeper than the one we have now. It would not facilitate our path to a solution; it would hinder our path to fiscal responsibility.

I thought I would note that the impact on families is fairly direct. Most major items families buy are with loans. A three-quarters of a percentage point increase on the interest rate for Treasury bonds, which J.P. Morgan has estimated would be the minimum it would rise in default, translates into serious costs for a family.

Let me be clear. This is the best-case scenario. The consequences could be much more severe.

Let's start first with the consequences on a mortgage. The average family takes out a loan of \$172,000 to buy their home, with a monthly mortgage payment of around \$1,000. The expected increase in Treasury bond rates would translate into higher rates for mortgages, and it would cost the average family about \$1,000 more per year. This would be on new loans. Families who have adjustable-rate mortgages based on Treasury rates would also be impacted.

Let's take a second look at credit cards. Families use credit to pay for everything from food, to gas, to prescription drugs—it is especially true during hard times such as we are in now. The median balance for an American with credit card debt was \$3,300 in

2009. That means the average family with credit card debt will pay about \$250 more in interest per year.

Let's turn to some of the other family expenses.

Analysts estimate that a technical default on bonds will also diminish the trading value of the dollar, maybe causing it to fall 5 percent or so against competing currencies. This would have a direct impact, and we would feel it most directly in the cost of oil. I have been arguing that we need a plan to end our dependence on overseas oil. We send \$1 billion a day out of our country. That creates jobs overseas rather than here at home. But ending our dependence on overseas oil can't happen overnight, so all of the costs of that additional oil, at a different exchange rate, would be felt in the family budget.

Indeed, if there was a decline of 5 percent, the impact would be felt on food. It takes a lot of energy to power agriculture. The estimate is about \$318 more per year for a family. That is a J.P. Morgan estimate.

Similarly, on utilities, we have all heard horror stories throughout the recession that families have to decide which utilities to pay first. Mothers and fathers are sitting around the kitchen table thinking, Can we get by without electricity or should we postpone the water payment or perhaps the natural gas payment? Default would make the situation worse for families, adding, at that 5 percent estimate from J.P. Morgan, about \$182 more per year. Remember, this is the best-case analysis.

Gasoline at the pump is similarly affected. Taking a look at average consumption per year, families would pay about \$100 more per year on gas. Again, that is the best case.

If we total these, we can see that the overall cost for a middle-class family would be on the order of about \$1,850. We can round it off to about \$2,000 per family. I don't know about the block you live on, but on the block I live on \$2,000 is a real blow for working families.

That is just the beginning of this story because, as it unfolds, the impact on the dollar and the shock waves that would flow would very likely send us into a double-dip recession. Now, it would have an impact as of August 2 or 3 on Social Security and Medicare payments. A bipartisan committee has taken a look at it and backed up Senator SCHUMER's statement that there would not be enough revenue coming in to cover all of our obligations. The stock market would probably take a hit, and 401(k)s could be severely impacted. Other savings could be severely impacted. We all know how that felt in late 2008 and 2009 when families often saw their life savings wiped out in a few short weeks.

The bigger issue is jobs. Perhaps more than half a million jobs could be

lost. This analysis is from the Third Way. Their estimate is 640,000 jobs. Oregon has about 1 percent of the Nation's population. This would translate into about 6,000 to 7,000 jobs in my home State. We would love to have an increase of 6,000 to 7,000 jobs in Oregon, and we would hate to see a loss of 6,000 to 7,000 jobs. I know that would extend throughout our Nation. We need more jobs, not fewer jobs.

In addition, this situation will have an impact on our debt. Contrary to what some of my colleagues have said, it will make the situation worse, not better. That is because the interest payments on the debt will go up—\$1.3 trillion additional in new debt. Is that really the direction in which we want to go? Is that really good stewardship of the economy—to impose a situation in which Social Security checks might be halted and veterans might go to the mailbox and find it empty; that the bills will have to be missed, and it will put people more directly in harm's way in terms of being able to keep house payments up and avoid foreclosure in a situation where we already face a tsunami of foreclosures across this country? At a minimum, the American families will be impacted by higher costs on their homes, credit cards, essential goods—food, gas, utilities—and then with the significant possibility of hundreds of thousands of Americans losing jobs, and additional debt, not less.

It is important that we come together and have a sound deal so that we can avoid this situation. This isn't about incurring new spending, this is about paying the bills on spending decisions that were made in the past. I disagreed with a lot of those spending decisions. I disagreed that Medicare Part D should have been enacted without a way to pay for it. I disagreed with the giveaways for the best off in America, the wealthy and well-connected, when we could not afford it, which reversed the surplus into a deficit in this country. I disagreed with a strategy where we are spending \$120 billion in Afghanistan and a strategy of nation building that is not the best use of national security and of our soldiers, who are there to fight for our national security. Those decisions were made in the past, and we must pay the bill on those decisions, even though I disagreed with them.

Then we need to put together a plan that takes on our deficit and our debt. That plan has to put all of the options on the table. Some of my colleagues across the aisle said: Well, we want to protect the tax spending programs, where we have tucked in tax provisions for the wealthy and well-connected. They want to defend those, and they want to cut the programs for working Americans.

That is unacceptable. We have seen an enormous increase in the disparity between the wages and welfare of our

citizens in general and the best off becoming much wealthier proportionately. We can't continue to say that we are going to protect the well-connected while attacking working families. That is not the America we want to build. We want to build an America where families can thrive, provide a great foundation for their children to also thrive. That means all policies have to be on the table, all spending programs, whether in tax bills or in appropriations bills, have to be on the table, and we have to weigh them one against the other to say which is most important in creating a stronger economy, which is more valuable in strengthening the financial foundations of our families.

That is the process we must go through, and that is the process that will put us back on track. But let us not doubt for a moment that when the citizens of my State come to a town-hall and say, How important is it that we get this figured out by August 2, the answer is, Very important. When they ask, Will it hurt us if we fail, the answer is, Yes, it will hurt us. We will be shooting ourselves maybe—I say in the foot, maybe worse.

This is a serious issue. We must come together, not as Democrats and Republicans but as Senators working together for the best future for the United States of America.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, in my view something significant happened yesterday in the House of Representatives. I am pleased with the outcome of the passage of the cut, cap, and balance legislation. I think we have a serious responsibility here in the Congress to see that we address the economic circumstances in which we find ourselves. Certainly the way we do that is important. I am one who believes it would be irresponsible not to address the debt ceiling, but I also believe it would be irresponsible only to address the debt ceiling without adequately taking into account the economic circumstances we are in and the tremendous debt our country faces.

There is no way we can continue down the path we are on. While it is easy for us to make accusations, the reality is that this country, through its Congress and through various administrations, has overspent year after year. The fact that 42 cents of every dollar we spend is now borrowed tells us we

cannot continue down that path. In one of my townhall meetings this past weekend back in Kansas, the suggestion was we are willing to take a cut in what benefits we get from government but let's do this in a fair way and let's do an across-the-board reduction in Federal spending. The suggestion by the constituent was maybe if we all took 5 percent off of what we received, we would be fine.

I appreciate that attitude but it fails to recognize the magnitude of the problem. Reducing Federal spending by 5 percent across the board will not get us out of the financial circumstance we are in, will not restore fiscal sanity to our Nation. So while we are about, between now and August 2, seeing what we can do to raise the debt ceiling, in my view we have to come together with a plan that addresses the long-term financial condition of our Federal Government.

I am a supporter of cut, cap, and balance, and was pleased by the broad support that legislation received in the House. It is my understanding we will now consider that legislation here in the Senate this week. But I read the press reports and the political pundits who say that legislation is dead on arrival in the Senate. I encourage my colleagues not to reach that conclusion. It may be the one and only path we have to accomplish what we need to accomplish in the next 2 weeks. It may be this is one of the very few measures, if not the only one, that would pass the House of Representatives. We have now received in the Senate a message that says this is something we are willing to do. For a long time I have been told as a Senator there is nothing that will pass the House of Representatives that raises the debt ceiling. Yet we saw last night that was not the case. So let's not be so quick to say that the Senate will not address and seriously consider and potentially pass legislation based upon cut, cap, and balance.

In some circles, this concept of cut, cap, and balance is considered radical, extreme. Cutting spending is not extreme. That is what every Kansas family does when the budget gets too tight, when we have overspent, when the credit cards are maxed. We reduce our spending. It is unlikely we can go out and say I need a raise to solve our problems. Our employers are not that sympathetic. We ought not be so quick to say we need a raise. We ought to say what can we find within the government that we can reduce, that we can cut.

The idea of capping is certainly not radical. For the last 60 years, our country has averaged 18 percent of the gross national product in spending by the Federal Government. In the last couple of years that average has increased to 24, 25 percent. It would not be radical to move us back to the days in which we were living with 18 percent—what

seems to me to be a significant percentage; if we would go back to the days in which only 18 percent of our gross national product was spent by the Federal Government.

Finally, balancing the budget is not a radical idea. Amending the Constitution ought to be done rarely and with great regard for this divinely inspired document, but the Constitution allows for an amendment process. In fact, it has been utilized to solve many of our country's problems and challenges over the time of history. It is not radical. Forty-nine States have a provision that requires them to have a balanced budget in some form or another at the end of the year. So amending the U.S. Constitution to say we are not ever going to get back in the mess we are in today certainly is worth pursuing. Of the cut, cap, and balance provisions, perhaps it is the constitutional amendment that is the most controversial among my colleagues. I certainly would express an interest to work with others to find the right constitutional amendment, the right language in an amendment to the U.S. Constitution that met their concerns.

This cut, cap, and balance seems to me the path forward and the Senate should pass a version of cut, cap, and balance to not only allow the debt ceiling to be raised but to allow the debt ceiling to be raised only if we become responsible stewards of American taxpayer dollars.

I actually have a fourth component of cut, cap, and balance. I would say it is cut, cap, balance, and grow. The last time our fiscal house was in solvency—was solvent—was back at the end of President Clinton's administration. In part, Republicans and Democrats could not get along well enough in those days to spend money on big programs. There was legislation that was passed that was supported in a bipartisan way by President Clinton and Republicans in Congress to limit spending, so there was some spending restraint. But the reality is that the last time we had our fiscal house in order, that we were spending less money than we were taking in, was a time at which the economy was growing. If we want to address the issue of balancing our budget, we should focus much more attention than we have on growing the economy, putting people to work and allowing, as they work, that the taxes will be collected.

The greatest opportunity we have to improve people's lives is to create an environment in which jobs are created, in which employers feel comfortable in investing in the future, buying plant and equipment and putting people to work. So while it is cut, cap, and balance today, we need to make certain we do not forget what is in my view that fourth component: Grow the economy. In my view that means a Tax Code that is certain and fair, that does

not change, that is something a business person or a family can rely upon. It is also a regulatory environment that allows businesses to have the opportunity to grow their business.

The most common conversation I have had with a business owner in Kansas, walking through a manufacturing plant, some small business that manufactures a piece of agriculture equipment—that is pretty common in our State—the most common conversation we have is: Senator, what next is government going to do that puts me out of business? If that is the mindset, how do we ever expect that business person to reach the conclusion that they have the faith in the future to invest in their plant and equipment and in hiring new employees? We need to make certain our financial institutions, particularly our community banks, are not hamstrung by significant regulations that would discourage them from making loans and create uncertainty about the ability to do that, a tax regulatory and access-to-credit environment that says now is the time to invest in America, to put people to work.

I am here to urge my colleagues to seriously consider, not dismiss, cut, cap, and balance and upon its passage for us to immediately return to the progrowth agenda that allows people to have the faith the future of their country is bright and we return to them the opportunity for the next generation of Americans to understand the American dream can still be lived.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I appreciate the good words of my colleague from Kansas. He comes from a State where they understand that the role of the government should be limited. They understand the importance of living within your means, of not spending money you do not have. The Senator from Kansas has had a long and distinguished career in public life, but before coming to Washington, DC, to serve in Congress I suspect he also was a State legislator and my guess is that when he was a member of the State legislature in Kansas they had to balance their budget every year.

I ask my colleague if he could perhaps shed some light on what his State of Kansas does, year in and year out, in order to get their budget balanced, to make sure they are not spending more than they take in. I think, as he pointed out, that is something for most families in Kansas—I would say for most families in my State of South Dakota—those are decisions they have to grapple with all the time and we don't always have the luxury of being able to borrow. Most States don't allow it. My State of South Dakota doesn't allow that. Certainly rules in our States probably are not very conducive to saying we are going to raise taxes on peo-

ple and on small businesses, which requires then we have to make our decisions on spending.

I would, through the Chair, ask my colleague from Kansas, perhaps that might have been the way in which they went about dealing with their fiscal crisis in the past?

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota and would indicate that, yes, Kansas is one of those 49 States in our Constitution in which we are prohibited in almost all ways of living beyond our means. It has been something that the Kansas legislature and Governor have lived with throughout the history of our State, including in today's environment where an economic downturn creates the circumstance in which there are less revenues. So the solution to the problem in Kansas is not a try for more revenue, it is a recognition that spending in difficult times has to be reduced. It is the restraint that we desperately need in Washington, DC, that is so common in State capitals and families and businesses across the country. While I have always indicated to Kansans, while we have this debate every year how to balance the revenues with the expenditures—and it is not an enjoyable debate—we are fortunate in Kansas we have to reach that conclusion and it is something we need in Washington, DC.

For a long time the political talk of Washington is that we are too likely to spend and tax. There is also a problem of spending and borrowing. We are now suffering the consequence. We are not immune from what we see in Greece and Italy and Portugal and Ireland. If we do not solve this problem that we face today in a responsible way, it will be solved for us by the markets, by those from whom we borrow money, determining we are no longer credit-worthy. We don't have to worry much about that in Kansas because we have a constitutional provision that requires our legislature and Governor to reach the right conclusion, and it is why I thought this debate on the debt ceiling was the opportunity for us to force ourselves to do the things that politicians do not always like to do.

Mr. THUNE. To the point the Senator from Kansas was making, he talks about higher interest rates and the impact of not dealing with the fiscal circumstances in which the country finds itself. Look at what is happening in Europe. Three-year government bond interest rates are about 19.4 for Portugal, 28.9 for Greece, and 12.9 for Ireland.

Think about the impact in this country if we had interest rates go back to what is even a 20-year average. We would see an additional \$5 trillion, about \$5 trillion in additional borrowing costs in the next decade alone. That is if we went back to the 20-year historical average for this country, not

to mention going to what they are looking at in countries in Europe, with these 19, 20-percent rates. Think about auto loans, think about home loans, think about student loans, think about business loans—all those things we rely on in our economy and that families across this country rely on, in order to carry on with their daily lives if we were looking at those types of interest rates. That is the type of interest rate sensitivity we have. If we do not get our fiscal house in order, we could very well end up like many of these countries, and that would be devastating for our economy.

The most important work we could be doing right now—and the Senator from Kansas pointed this out—is to put policies in place that actually grow the economy and support jobs. I also will support the cut, cap, and balance proposal that is before the Senate today because I think it does important work. It cuts spending today, immediately, it caps spending in the near term, and puts in place a process by which we balance the budget in a long term, a balanced budget amendment.

It is interesting to note, if we go back historically, something President Ronald Reagan said 29 years ago this week. He led a rally of thousands of people on the Capitol steps calling for a balanced budget amendment. This is what he said: "Crisis is a much-abused word today but can we deny we face a crisis?"

That is 29 years ago at a time when the Federal debt was \$1 trillion. We face a debt 14 times as high, \$14 trillion. Under the President's budget it would literally double in the next decade. We have to get our fiscal house and our spending in order.

The Senator from Kansas also mentioned the size of government as a percentage of our entire economy. If you go back to 1800, the formation, in the early years of our country, 2 percent is what we spent on the Federal Government, 2 percent of our total economy. This year we are over 24 percent, in that 24 to 25-percent range. If you look at the 40-year historical average, about 20.6 percent is what we have spent as a percent of our entire economy. What does that mean? It means we are spending more at the Federal level and that the private economy is shrinking relative to our total economy. What we want to see is an expansion of the private economy where we put policies in place that enable our job creators to create jobs and that we get the Federal Government smaller, not larger. My view is, when you are looking at a debt crisis the way we are, you don't grow and expand the size of government, you make government smaller. You get the private economy growing and expanding and creating jobs, and that is how you ultimately get out of this situation.

We have policies in place right now that are making it more difficult, and

more expensive I would argue, for our small businesses to create jobs. Anywhere you go—in my State of South Dakota and elsewhere—you talk to small business owners, you talk to farmers and ranchers, and what they will tell you is the policies, the regulations, and the taxes that are coming out of Washington, DC, make it more expensive and more difficult for our job creators to create jobs.

If you look, the data on that it is pretty clear. Since this President took office, we have higher unemployment by 18 percent, we have 2.1 million more people unemployed than we did when he took office, and we have a 35-percent higher debt. We saw spending go up in the last 2 years alone, nondefense discretionary spending, by 24 percent. The number of people who are receiving food stamps in this country is up by 40 percent.

All the data, all the tools by which we can measure economic progress and growth demonstrate that the policies that have been put in place by this administration have been a complete failure. So what we need is a change in policies, and it starts by cutting Federal spending, capping it in the near term, and putting in place a long-term solution—a balanced budget amendment like so many States have in place, like the Senator from Kansas mentioned they have in his State of Kansas, like we have in my State of South Dakota, where our State governments have to live within their means. They cannot spend money they do not have. That is the problem we have in Washington, DC, today.

In terms of our small businesses, there was a survey done by the chamber of commerce a couple of weeks ago in which they found that 64 percent of the small businesses that responded to the survey said they are not going to hire this year. Another 12 percent actually said they are going to cut jobs. Why? Half of the small businesses listed economic uncertainty as the major reason. They are concerned about what is going to come out of Washington, DC. They don't know what policies and regulations are going to be imposed on them and what it is going to do to them and their cost of doing business, and as a consequence they are just hunkering down and trying to survive.

We need to change that. We change that by getting Federal spending under control. Cut, cap, and balance is an important step in that process, and I am pleased the House of Representatives last night passed it and sent it over here to the Senate. We will have an opportunity to vote on that in the next few days, and I would argue to my colleagues that this is fundamentally the best we can be doing to not only get our fiscal house in order and get it on a more sustainable path going forward but also to help get our economy growing again and get jobs created out

there. You can't do it by making government larger. If that was the case, the trillion-dollar stimulus bill that was passed last year would have brought unemployment down. But, as we all know, we are facing 9.2 percent unemployment today.

We continue to see an economy that is struggling, that is growing at a very slow rate. We need to unleash that economy, and the way we do that is by capping or cutting spending in Washington, DC, making the Federal Government smaller, not larger, getting that amount of spending as a percentage of our entire economy back into a more historical norm, and working to ensure that taxes and regulations stay low on our job creators in this country.

That is why I fundamentally object to what the President and many of his allies in Congress want to do with regard to the debt crisis; that is, increase revenues. You cannot create jobs, you cannot grow the economy by increasing taxes on our job creators. I can't think of a single tax that you could put on our economy that actually would help create jobs. It will have the opposite effect—it will make it more difficult for small businesses to create jobs, more difficult for us to get out of this economic downturn.

I hope my colleagues will support cut, cap, and balance and that it will get a big vote here in the Senate and get this country on a more sound fiscal footing and on a path where we can create jobs and get this economy growing.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2055, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Coburn (for McCain) amendment No. 553, to eliminate the additional amount of \$10,000,000, not included in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2012, appropriated for the Department of Defense for planning and design for the Energy Conservation Investment Program.

Johnson (SD) modified amendment No. 556, of a perfecting nature.

Vitter amendment No. 568, to provide that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this act may be obligated

or expended at a rate higher than the level of the Senate and House of Representatives concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 2012.

Wyden/Merkley amendment No. 570, to provide for the closure of Umatilla Army Chemical Depot, Oregon.

Coburn amendment No. 564, to require evidence of causal relationships for presumptions by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of service connection for diseases associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am hopeful that the Senate will be able to complete action on the MILCON-VA appropriations bill today. Members have had ample opportunity to offer amendments, staff has been working to clear them, and I believe we now have a clear path to final passage.

I would like to spend a few minutes today talking about the military construction portion of this bill, which is so important to our troops and their families. The bill includes \$13.7 billion for MILCON, which is \$1 billion below the budget request. In drafting this bill, we took a hard look at the projects submitted by the administration and made strategic reductions in order to make wise use of our MILCON dollars without sacrificing key military priorities. I believe this bill is a prudent approach to addressing our military construction needs at home and abroad.

The bill fully funds the administration's request of \$1.2 billion for Guard and Reserve projects. Typically, Congress adds funds for our Guard and Reserve components; however, given the current budget pressures, that option was not available to us this year. It is my hope the services will acknowledge and address the chronic backlog of construction requirements for the Guard and Reserve forces in future budget requests.

Of note, this bill includes \$550 million to construct or modify 15 Department of Defense schools at home and overseas. As Newsweek magazine pointed out last month, a shocking number of DOD schools are crumbling and in need of replacing. The administration has made upgrading DOD schools a priority, and the committee wholeheartedly supports that goal. DOD school funding in this bill represents a significant downpayment on the estimated \$3.1 billion requirement for DOD school recapitalization.

The administration's request included funding for the move of Marines from Japan to Guam. While the committee recognizes the need to restructure force posture in the Pacific, we remain concerned about the ballooning cost of this plan and the lack of forward progress on the part of our Japanese allies. The report accompanying this bill directs the Navy to provide Congress with detailed information on

the cost and prognosis of the Guam relocation initiative.

Additionally, the committee is concerned with the potential cost of related troop realignments in Korea and the long-term impact of troop reductions in Europe. The report accompanying this bill addresses these concerns in depth.

As I have said before, this is a sound and responsible bill. Senator KIRK and I have worked hand in hand to forge a bipartisan approach for the MILCON-VA bill, and I believe we have succeeded. I urge my colleagues to support final passage of the bill today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleague and say that Republicans unanimously supported this bill that provides appropriations for our veterans and for our military construction needs unanimously in the subcommittee. Our Republican members unanimously supported this bill in the full committee, and the reason why is because this bill is marked to the House budget. This bill cuts spending on the budget authority discretionary side about \$1.2 billion below the President's request. The bill also cuts spending \$620 million below last year's level, and it even comes in \$2.6 million below Chairman CULBERSON's bill that passed the House of Representatives under their very strict budget guidelines.

I will note that we came together on a bipartisan basis in the Senate to bring up this very first of the appropriations bills, and the cloture motion to move forward to bring this bill to the floor passed by a vote of 71 to 26, with Leader MCCONNELL and our vice chairman, the lead Republican on the committee, Mr. COCHRAN, supporting that.

This bill has been endorsed by AMVETS, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America.

I think it is very important as we look at the wider issue of deficits and debt, any danger of interrupting payments to veterans because of negotiations here on Capitol Hill, it is a very important signal that not just the House pass the appropriations bill to support our veterans but also the Senate. So my hope is we will consider the amendments this afternoon and then advise Members that we would seek to go to final passage and get this first of the appropriations bills done this year, sending a very clear message, especially to our veterans and men and women on Active Duty, that we are supporting their construction and veterans health care needs in a way that spends money according to the dictates of the House budget resolution.

I yield back and wait for our senior Member from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak up to 10 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to point out the obvious; that is, we are 13 days away from August 2, the date Secretary Geithner has indicated, if we do not raise the debt ceiling, that America runs the risk of defaulting on its debt and not paying its bills. I bring this up because this is an issue on which we never should be this close to this deadline.

It has been pointed out many times that the debt ceiling has very little to do with how much money we spend. It has nothing to do with how much money we spend because we already spent this money. The question is whether we are going to pay our bills, whether the United States is going to live up to its obligations, or whether we are going to default on our debt.

The prospect of not making that deadline is basically unthinkable, that the United States would give up its preeminent position internationally. It could jeopardize the U.S. currency being the global currency. It would have an effect on everyone in this Nation.

We already have heard from the rating houses. Last week, both Standard & Poor's, S&P, and Moody's Investors Service warned they are considering downgrading the country's credit rating if the debt ceiling is not raised. A smaller firm, Egan-Jones Ratings, has already downgraded the U.S. securities. What happens if we get the major rating houses saying we are no longer AAA bond rated? Well, it will have an immediate effect on costs for taxpayers in this country. It will cost us more to borrow. That means we will have to pay higher taxes in order to pay the interest on the national debt. It will affect all credit in this country. It is estimated that the typical homeowner will pay an extra \$1,000 a year on mortgage costs. The average credit card holder will pay an extra \$250 a year in credit card interest. In other words, the interest rates of the Federal Treasury notes affect all the interest rates in this Nation. All of us will pay more, and it will cost jobs. It will cost us in our retirement savings. It will affect each one of us.

Yesterday, the people of Maryland found out another way the failure to increase the debt ceiling will have an effect on Maryland taxpayers; that is, the rating houses have indicated that if the Federal credit is jeopardized, the State of Maryland's AAA bond rating is in jeopardy. Why? Because Maryland depends, as do most States, upon the Federal Government.

Governor O'Malley, as the Presiding Officer knows—when you were Gov-

ernor of West Virginia, you managed your State well. The credit ratings you deserved were based upon what you did in your State. That is true in Maryland. But Marylanders will find that their credit costs will go up if we don't increase the debt ceiling by August 2. We are all in this. We should never be this close. We should make sure we increase the debt ceiling by August 2.

Yes, I do hope we use this as an opportunity to get our spending and our budget in order. We need to manage our deficit. We all understand that. We have to bring our debt under proper management.

I have taken the floor before to sort of go over how we got here. I am not going to do that today, but I am here to tell you that the Democrats in the Senate, under Senator CONRAD, have come in with a proposal that we think is well-balanced, that has more deficit reduction, quite frankly, than any plan that is out there. It is comprehensive, and it will allow us to be able to continue to grow our economy because the best thing we can do for our deficit is to create more jobs. The Conrad Democratic budget does that by investing in education, by investing in innovation and in infrastructure.

It also recognizes we have to bring the deficit under control. It protects Medicare and Medicaid because we know those programs are important for our seniors and important for our economy. So we protect high-priority programs and include more deficit reduction by having a balanced approach. That is what we should do in addition to raising the debt ceiling. We should have a comprehensive approach.

Let me cite some of the numbers of what the Conrad budget does. It brings spending down to 22 percent. I heard some of my colleagues talk about the historical averages. Twenty-two percent of our economy would be the same spending amount, on average, we had when Ronald Reagan was President. I think most of us would agree the Reagan years were certainly conservative in terms of government spending. That would bring down the percentages, despite the demographic changes in this country. I think that is quite an accomplishment.

The revenues would be equal to what the revenues were as a percentage of our economy when Bill Clinton was President of the United States and when we had the strongest economic growth and the greatest job growth in modern history. So these are responsible programs.

It also, by the way, says to our government workers, who should not be used as scapegoats and who are doing incredible work under difficult circumstances and are being asked to do more with less since they have already made the sacrifice with a 2-year pay freeze—the Conrad Democratic budget says enough is enough and doesn't ask

our Federal workers to make additional sacrifices beyond the 2-year pay freeze they have already been subjected to.

I know there are other efforts and I hope we will continue those efforts. I have spoken before about the Bowles-Simpson approach, and we have the bipartisan group working. That is how we should proceed. But, quite frankly, this cut, cap, and balance is not a bipartisan effort; it is an extreme effort by Republicans to bring forward a budget that is even more severe and more radical than the Ryan budget. I call it cut, cap, and kill when it comes to Medicare.

Why do I say that? I have taken the floor regarding the Republican Ryan budget to point out the impact on the Medicare system, which would be to increase the costs, on average, to our seniors, when it is fully implemented, by an additional \$6,500 to pay for health care. I know the Presiding Officer has been through West Virginia and I have been through Maryland and I know our seniors are already paying too much for health care. They cannot afford another \$6,500 a year for their health care. We should be looking at reducing their health care costs, not increasing them.

But the cut, cap, and balance approach would go even beyond that. It is estimated there would be another \$2,500 in costs on top of the \$6,500, so \$9,000 of additional costs, when fully implemented, to our seniors for health care. That is cut, cap, and kill on Medicare, and I don't think any one of us wants to be responsible for that.

I heard my colleagues talk about job growth, and we are all for job growth. The cut, cap, and balance bill is estimated to cost us hundreds of thousands of private sector jobs.

Why do we say that? Well, the objective is not very subtle. The objective, as the Heritage Foundation has said—and this was just sent out to us—this would cut the size of the Federal Government by about half within 25 years. Are we going to tell our students they can do without half of their Pell grants? Yesterday, I joined students from around the Nation and presidents of colleges to talk about the importance of the Pell grant. At Morgan State University in Maryland and the University of Maryland Eastern Shore—both historically Black colleges and universities, in which 80 percent of their student body is made up of minority students—50 percent depend upon Pell grants. Half of that number could not be there without Pell grants. We are saying it is OK to cut the Pell grants in half? No, it is not OK.

Are we going to tell our seniors we are going to cut Social Security in half?

Are we going to tell those people who need unemployment insurance they are going to get 50 percent? It is not sustainable.

I heard my colleagues talk about predictability. Well, the cut, cap, and balance bill is not going to be sustained. It is a radical approach. We can do better.

Quite frankly, David Brooks, the conservative columnist, said it best. I will quote what he said about where the Republicans, particularly in the House, are trying to lead this Nation. David Brooks wrote:

... the Republican Party may no longer be a normal party. Over the past few years, it has been infected by a faction that is more of a psychological protest than a practical, governing alternative.

The members of this movement do not accept the logic of compromise, no matter how sweet the terms. If you ask them to raise taxes by an inch in order to cut government by a foot, they will say no. If you ask them to raise taxes by an inch to cut government by a yard, they will still say no.

That is from David Brooks, the conservative columnist.

We need to have the system work. We need Democrats and Republicans working together. We need a budget plan that is predictable, that gets our budget under control, that allows America to create the jobs we need, and that invests in education, innovation, and infrastructure so America can continue to lead the world in economic growth. That is what we need to do. It starts by raising the debt limit so America does not default on its obligations and for us to work in a bipartisan manner to develop a budget plan that gets the debt under control but allows America to live up to its commitments to our seniors, to our students, and to create the job opportunities for tomorrow.

That is what we need to do, and that is what this Senator is prepared to do.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, our country is 2 weeks away from a deadline date, and this deadline is approaching because of Washington's constant inaction. To me, this deadline has to do with our national debt. The President, on the other hand, says it has to do with our debt limit, the amount of money we are allowed by law to borrow.

I believe it has to do with the amount of money we have already bor-

rowed and the amount of money they want to continue to borrow. I believe as Americans we can do better. I believe as Americans we must do better. Our country needs for us to act.

The President has repeatedly said we have to deal with this issue now. Last week he asked the most fundamental question. He said: If not now, when? The clock is ticking.

We got a wake-up call from Medicare not too long ago when we found out that it will be bankrupt 5 years sooner than they initially thought, just over a decade from now. As a doctor who has practiced medicine a long time, I will tell you we have to strengthen Medicare. We know in 25 years the same will happen to Social Security. Unlike our debt limit which Congress can legislate away, strengthening Medicare, saving Social Security, that cannot simply be legislated away. We have to act now to prevent these programs from failing not just people on those programs today but also future generations.

The President has observed that we are in the eleventh hour when it comes to our debt ceiling, and the only clear path to raise the debt ceiling that has passed either House of Congress is the proposal that passed the House of Representatives last night, the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act. This act would only raise the debt ceiling if we put our country on the fast track back to fiscal sanity. That is where we need to be, on the track to fiscal sanity. It is an approach the American people will tell us we need now more than ever.

Our creditors are getting restive. This week Fitch credit ratings warned if the United States does not take action to avoid default, we could lose our AAA credit rating.

Standard & Poor's has already warned that unless we cut our budget, our credit rating could be at risk. Wasteful Washington spending has already saddled our children with over \$14 trillion of debt. If we default, this spending may also force them to pay punishingly high interest rates that will drain American dollars from our already sluggish economy.

I believe we will not default. We are already paying \$6,000 a second on interest alone on our debt. For those of us with children, we know what this impact is going to be on them years and years into the future. Well, the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act would put us on the path to resolving the issue by cutting spending immediately, by capping spending in the future, and by forcing—finally forcing—Washington to live within its means. This is the sort of law that the country needs and that the President should actually welcome.

What has the President done? Well, he has threatened to veto this law, he says, if it crosses his desk. The President has threatened to veto the only plan that actually solves the problem that has passed either House of Congress.

Why? Well, the administration emphasizes “public opinion” as their reason for opposing the hard choices required by our debt crisis. But yet the President said they are opposed to a balanced budget constitutional amendment. Well, in a recent Mason Dixon poll, 65 percent of Americans say they support a balanced budget constitutional amendment. Where is that respect the President talks about for public opinion?

Finally, the administration has hidden behind catch phrases rather than debate the merits of cut, cap, and balance. They refer to it by a different name. Well, when I hear the White House spokesman talk about cut, cap and balance in a different way, I say: How is that ducking the issue to confront both our spending problem and the debt ceiling head on? That is not ducking the issue; that is facing the issue.

When the President’s spokesman talks about dodging the issue, I will say: How is it a dodge to support commonsense solutions to our spending addiction, such as a balanced budget amendment?

Then he used the phrase about dismantling. I say: How does stopping our government from going bankrupt count as dismantling? The White House has even admitted that they do not have a plan. You know what, they do not think they need one. Is that astonishing? The White House—the United States, the most powerful country in the world—the White House does not think they need a plan at the eleventh hour. The White House Press Secretary just recently said: Leadership is not proposing a plan for the sake of having it voted up or down and likely voted down.

The budget that was brought to this floor—the President’s budget—failed 0 to 97. Not one Republican voted for it. Not one Democrat voted for it. No one voted for what the President had proposed, no one of either party.

Perhaps the President ought to propose something new. Holding our country hostage to irresponsible Washington spending while trying to hit the economy with tax hikes is not leadership; it is denying the reality. Refusing to put forward a plan to resolve our spending crisis is not leadership; it is deferring the consequences.

Making the economy worse the way this administration has done for the past 2 years is not leadership, and it is hurting our country. The President’s policies have made it worse—made the economy worse, made health care worse, made energy availability worse, housing worse. The policies have made it worse.

This administration can accuse cut, cap, and balance of ducking, and they can accuse it of dodging, and they can accuse it of dismantling, but the strategy coming out of the White House

seems to be duck and cover. That is what we are seeing.

Anyone who knows the math knows this strategy was never acceptable before, and it is doubly unacceptable now. The amount of debt we owe right now is so high that it is hurting employment at home. Experts tell us our debt is costing us 1 million jobs. Spending like this makes it harder for the private sector to create new jobs, and the unemployment numbers that just came out show us at 9.2 percent unemployment.

With that kind of unemployment, energy prices are high, and people are noticing it in the quality of their lives. It is harder for American families to buy gas, buy groceries, buy cars, homes, pay tuition for their kids to go to college, and it is harder to create jobs for those kids who will be graduating this year and next year and every year until we get the spending under control.

Debt is not just a disaster for the distant future. Our debt is irresponsible. Our debt is unsustainable. Even our military leaders have condemned it. ADM Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said: The biggest threat to our national security is our debt.

The debt is the threat. It is not our enemies who are defeating us, it is our spending that is hurting us so very much. It is time for America to fight back. That is why I am supporting and have cosponsored cut, cap, and balance and will vote for it on the floor of the Senate.

This piece of legislation takes commonsense steps to get our country out of debt. It will immediately reduce spending by over \$100 billion as a downpayment on our children’s future. It will place a hard cap on spending so that it never reaches the unsustainable heights of the past 2 years. It will send a balanced budget constitutional amendment to the American people for ratification, and it will prevent us from defaulting on our debt.

Passing this law is the kind of leadership that America deserves; and if the President wants to show he understands leadership, he should retract his veto threat and support this approach. I absolutely will support it when it comes to this body.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 568

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I rise to ask support, bipartisan support, for

the Vitter amendment which we will be voting on at 12 noon. This amendment is very simple. It is very straightforward. I think it is important and makes a central point.

The amendment says these funds in this bill will not be spent unless and until we have a 2012 budget, unless we start with first things first and decide what the overall budget framework is and then move forward with spending, with appropriations bills consistent with that budget. That is all it says. It is simple, straightforward, but it is an important point.

Folks around America, including in the market, are scratching their heads. They look at Washington and us and the Congress and the President and see almost complete dysfunction in the complete lack of a budget, even lack of an attempt to get a budget in place, which is a glaring, maybe the top example of that.

This isn’t just a good, commonsense idea, something every family does, something every small business does; this also happens to be required by Federal law.

The Federal Budget Act mandates that we pass a budget by April 15 of every year. We have not done that. The House passed a budget. The Senate, quite frankly, has not even tried. The Senate Budget Committee has not even met to begin to do that in regular order, through the normal process. In fact, it is worse than that. The Senate didn’t even try to do that last year under the same current leadership. So we are now over 800 days and counting, that the Senate, under this leadership, has not even tried to comply with Federal law and adopt a budget.

Again, my amendment is very simple. It says first things first. We need a budget so any appropriations bill, any spending is only done consistent with and in the context of that budget.

That is the right way to do it. That is the right way to run a railroad. That is what every Louisiana family does in setting its plans. That is what every Louisiana business does in setting its plans. That is what the American people and the markets want from us.

In the last few weeks, there has been great discussion about Moody’s and Standard & Poor’s and the threats to downgrade U.S. Treasury notes. What they have been saying is loud and clear. It is not a pure focus on the debt ceiling; it is even a more important focus as well on the underlying issue of spending and debt. They have been saying what every economist also says: We are on a completely unsustainable path in terms of spending and debt. They want to see a real change in that—the start of a real change, adding up to at least \$4 trillion of deficit reduction. We need to do that.

Step one to doing that is to have a budget. We can’t begin to do that without a budget plan, without an outline.

Again, that goes to the core, the simple, fundamental, straightforward and important point of this Vitter amendment. I urge my colleagues to put first things first. I urge my colleagues to say we need to start doing our business, starting with a 2012 budget.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KIRK. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KIRK. Madam President, we are wrapping up to a vote that we hope will occur on Senator VITTER's amendment at noon. I will summarize where we are.

We are completing debate on a bill that provides funding for the Veterans' Administration and military construction needs. This bill backs up over 22 million veterans who have served our country.

The reason I and the Republicans on the Appropriations Committee have unanimously supported this bill is, it is marked to the House budget resolution, the Paul Ryan budget resolution number. We cut funding by \$1.2 billion in budget authority discretionary numbers below the President's level. This bill comes in \$620 million below the 2011 enacted level, and it is even \$2.6 million below the House-passed level just adopted earlier this year, Chairman CULBERSON's bill in the House of Representatives.

The Senate voted by a vote of 71 to 26 for cloture to bring up this bill. This is the first of the working appropriations bills. I hope there are many others. The legislation is important. People may ask: How did we make the funding cuts to come in at the House level? The answer is, Chairman JOHNSON and I made some difficult decisions. We cut 24 separate military construction programs. A list is available in the report that accompanies this bill.

We made some very tough calls regarding spending that was proposed for Bahrain, for Germany, and for Korea. There was a worthwhile project proposed for the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims. They wanted a brandnew building and a courtroom. That was denied outright. Those tough decisions—those 24 reductions denying a new Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims building—making those cuts necessary then brought us under the House level, as approved by the Paul Ryan budget.

I remind Members the legislation is endorsed by the VFW, AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America. It had the unanimous support of Republicans in the subcommittee and in the

full committee because it comes in at the House budget level. That is why I think it is necessary to move forward, especially as we talk about a budget crisis, in which checks may or may not go out. I very much hope they do. I think it is an important signal to send that the Paul Ryan-approved budget number, which is what this bill is at, goes forward, which ensures 2012 appropriated funding for our veterans and the military construction needs of our men and women in uniform.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the Vitter amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Vitter amendment pending before the Senate is another attempt to derail the progress we have made in a bipartisan fashion on the MilCon/VA bill.

The Senate has voted twice on this issue during consideration of this bill. At the outset of debate, the ranking member of the Budget Committee raised a point of order against consideration of this bill without prior adoption of a budget resolution. I made a motion to waive that budget point of order and the Senate voted 71 to 26 to cut off debate on the motion to waive. The Senate then agreed to waive the point of order 56 to 40.

Now we have an amendment that says none of the critical funding provided in the bill can be obligated in excess of a budget resolution that does not exist. The strictest interpretation of this means the VA can't spend money on benefits for vets, and our military can't construct new training, housing, or other critical facilities until we have a budget agreement.

I don't disagree that it is important to pass a budget, but the Senate has overwhelmingly voted to move this bill so as to not delay essential funding for our troops and vets while negotiations on the debt ceiling and budget continue.

I remind my colleagues this bill is \$618 million below the current level, \$1.25 billion below the President's budget request, and \$2.6 million below the House-passed bill. This is a responsible and bipartisan bill, and the pending amendment would stop all progress we have made. Therefore, I move to

table the amendment No. 568, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 113 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Akaka	Franken	Menendez
Alexander	Gillibrand	Merkley
Baucus	Graham	Mikulski
Begich	Hagan	Murkowski
Bennet	Harkin	Murray
Bingaman	Heller	Nelson (NE)
Blumenthal	Hoeven	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Hutchison	Pryor
Brown (MA)	Inouye	Reed
Brown (OH)	Isakson	Reid
Burr	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Kerry	Sanders
Cardin	Kirk	Schumer
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Kohl	Stabenow
Chambliss	Landrieu	Tester
Cochran	Lautenberg	Udall (CO)
Collins	Leahy	Udall (NM)
Conrad	Levin	Warner
Coons	Lieberman	Webb
Cornyn	Manchin	Whitehouse
Durbin	McCain	Wicker
Feinstein	McCaskey	Wyden

NAYS—30

Ayotte	Hatch	Portman
Barrasso	Inhofe	Risch
Blunt	Johanns	Roberts
Coats	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Coburn	Kyl	Sessions
Corker	Lee	Shelby
Crapo	Lugar	Snowe
DeMint	McConnell	Thune
Enzi	Moran	Toomey
Grassley	Paul	Vitter

NOT VOTING—1

Boozman

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 2:15 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we are going to move to a debate on our budget deficit, particularly on the debt ceiling we face on August 2. The proposal before us was enacted by the House yesterday on a virtually partisan roll-call, with one or two exceptions. The Republicans passed a proposal which they have characterized as cut, cap, and balance, and they will bring it to the floor of the Senate for consideration. It tries to project spending targets and cuts in spending for the years to come and also to include in the conversation the balanced budget amendment.

It is interesting, the way they approach it, because the balanced budget amendment is literally an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and those of us who take our oath seriously—and I assume that is every Member of Congress and the Senate—understand that we are sworn to uphold this Constitution. In other words, it is to be treated as the guiding document for our actions as Members of Congress. I have taken that oath many times as a House and Senate Member, and I take it seriously.

Also, because of that oath, I am skeptical of those who come forward and want to amend the Constitution on a regular basis. We have had 27 amendments to the Constitution. They have been enacted over the course of our Nation's history. They address some of the most serious issues and most historic moments in our history. I think we should address that document, that Constitution, with an air of humility, a feeling that before we add our words, whatever they may be, to this great document that has endured for more than 200 years, we should take care and be serious about it.

I don't often question the motives or the intentions of others who come to the floor, and I won't do it in this instance, but I will say that to have before us, as we will later in the day, a proposal that we amend the Constitution of the United States by choosing one of three options—and that literally is what we will face, three different versions of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and what we will consider here will address choosing one of them. I don't think we were

elected to the Senate and sworn to uphold the Constitution to be part of a multiple-choice test about what the next amendment will be. I think we should be much more serious in our undertaking.

I will also tell you that I have been here in Congress long enough to remember a little bit of history. There once was a President named Ronald Reagan, and Ronald Reagan, as President of the United States, was in a leadership position of the United States at a critical moment in our history, there is no question about it. Some amazing things occurred during his administration, but when it came to the budget side of things, there was some history made there as well.

We are considering the debt ceiling of the United States. What is the debt ceiling of the United States? The debt ceiling of the United States is the authority Congress gives to the President to borrow money.

Each year, the Treasury Secretary will call the President and say: I need additional authority to borrow money. Why does he ask for additional authority? Because Congress—the House and the Senate—sent requests for more spending, and the President has to borrow money to honor those requests. How much does the President have to borrow? In this day and age, about 40 cents for every dollar we spend.

So the President has been told that August 2 is the drop-dead date. He needs more authority to borrow money for the actions taken by Congress. As an example, many Members of Congress—even some who now say they won't give the President this authority—voted for America to go to war not once but twice, and in so voting, for example, on the war in Afghanistan, they are committing the United States of America to spending \$10 billion a month in defense of our men and women in uniform, members of our family who are waging this war. They voted for that.

Now President Obama has said to them: The bill is coming in for the war in Afghanistan, and I have to borrow money to pay for it. These same Members of Congress—the House and Senate—who voted for the war in Afghanistan are now saying: We won't pay the bills. We won't extend the debt ceiling. We won't allow you, Mr. President, to borrow the money to sustain our military forces in Afghanistan.

That is literally what we are talking about here in this debate. The American people are starting to come to understand because when you first ask a person, do you want to extend the debt ceiling, the obvious answer is, no, are you crazy, Senator? Why would I want more debt in this country? We need less debt, not more. Don't you get it?

Understandably, that is the public reaction. But when you go to the point of explaining that this is to pay for debts

we have already incurred—and it is not just to wage war; it is a debt incurred to pay for Medicare. We said to 65-year-olds across America: You get a health insurance plan called Medicare, and it will be there when you need it. When you go to the hospital and turn in your bills, we will pay that doctor and we will pay that hospital. And we borrowed money to do it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Would the assistant majority leader yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I appreciate the Senator's comments about where we were. About 10 years ago, we had a budget surplus in this country, as you recall. We had a number of years of quarter after quarter of economic growth, and we know that when you have economic growth, obviously the budget gets in a better situation. But then it was the tax cuts in 2001 and 2003 that I believe the Senator opposed, as I did when I was in the House of Representatives, that went overwhelmingly to the wealthiest taxpayers; and then the two wars the Senator talked about that the people enthusiastically—some, not the Senator—voted for but didn't see a reason to pay for them; and then this Medicare bill, which was basically a bailout to the insurance and drug companies in the name of privatizing Medicare, and we are in a situation now where we are simply trying to pay the bills.

I appreciate the Senator's thoughts and comments about where that takes us. It seems to me it is not like raising your credit card debt limits. These are obligations we have, and we have to be responsible elected officials, as we would as responsible citizens, and pay the debts and the obligations we have incurred as a nation, correct?

Mr. DURBIN. That is correct. And I would say to the Senator from Ohio that when you look back in history, since 1939 when we had this debt ceiling, President after President has extended the debt ceiling because the cost of government—the debt of the United States—has generally gone up in most administrations.

The record holder for extending the debt ceiling in U.S. history since 1939: President Ronald Reagan, on 18 different occasions during an 8-year period of time, extended the debt ceiling. During his administration, we tripled our national debt, and so we needed to keep borrowing. So to say this debt ceiling extension is the product of a Democratic President is to misstate the case. Every President has faced it. Ronald Reagan asked for those debt ceiling extensions more than any other President. When it comes to incurring debt in 8 years in office, Ronald Reagan has the record for tripling the national debt, and coming in second is George W. Bush for doubling the national debt while he was in office and asking on

seven different occasions to extend the debt ceiling.

The point I am making is that President Obama has asked to extend the debt ceiling, and there is ample history—some 89 different times—that it has been done, and it is done to pay for obligations we have already made, debts we have already incurred.

Now what happens if we don't extend the debt ceiling? Well, what would happen if the Durbin family of Springfield, IL, did not make our mortgage payment on our home this month? Not good. We are likely to get a call from the bank at some point saying: You probably overlooked it, but there was a mortgage payment due. And if you said: We are just not going to pay it, we are not going to continue to borrow money from your bank, they would say there are consequences. And the same thing is true if you don't extend the debt ceiling.

If we don't extend the debt ceiling of the United States and authorize the President to borrow money to meet our obligations, two things will happen. The credit report of the United States of America is not going to look good the next day. The same thing is true for individuals and families: If you don't pay your bills, your credit report doesn't look so hot. What is the difference? For the United States of America, it means the AAA credit rating we have enjoyed throughout our history will be in danger. It means the interest rates charged to the United States for our own debt will go up and interest rates across the economy will go up, affecting every family and business in America that borrows money, which would be most families and businesses.

Raising interest rates with this high rate of unemployment is exactly the wrong thing to do. Every single day, the Federal Reserve, under Ben Bernanke and his Board of Governors, sits down and tries to figure out a way to make interest rates low so the economy will grow and jobs will be created. If we have a self-inflicted wound of not increasing the debt ceiling, the net result will be a higher interest rate on our government and higher interest rates on families and businesses. A 1-percent increase—1-percent increase—in the interest rate paid by our government on its debt costs us \$130 billion a year—1 percent.

We are running the risk, by missing the deadline of August 2, of raising that interest rate, killing jobs, making it more difficult for businesses to expand, and increasing the deficit. Can we imagine three worse outcomes at this moment in our history?

So when Members of the Senate and the House come and make these pious pronouncements of "I am never going to vote for an extension of the debt ceiling," they are jeopardizing our economic recovery and the debt we face.

Some of them have said: I will tell you what. I will vote for a debt ceiling if we can amend the Constitution and put in a balanced budget amendment.

Throughout my time of service in the House and the Senate, I have never—underline "never"—voted for a balanced budget amendment and here is the reason: We don't need the Constitution to tell us what to do. We know what we need to do. We should have the will to do it. For those who have been guilty of voting for all this spending and now want a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, it reminds me of the person who says: I will not promise I will not steal again, but I will vote for the Ten Commandments. Well, great. Wouldn't it be better if they changed their conduct and the way they acted? Wouldn't it be better if Congress dealt with this budget deficit forthrightly? And we can.

For those who say we don't have a very good track record, they are right. But efforts are underway on the part of what is known as the Group of 6, which is expanding in size, which is trying to, on a bipartisan basis—Democrats and Republicans—come up with a way through this budget deficit problem. It is not easy. We have been at it for more than 6 months. We have produced a plan which is now being carefully scrutinized and will be worked on, I am sure, for a long time to come, but it moves us in the direction of \$4 trillion in deficit reduction. It does it by putting everything on the table—everything—including spending cuts, entitlement programs, and revenue.

Spending cuts are easy compared to the other two—easier for us, I might add, because they generally involve future spending, and we make the reductions thinking, perhaps, it will not have the negative impact in the future that some imagine.

When it comes to the entitlement programs, I think we deal with a different mindset when it comes to the American people. I believe Social Security and Medicare have become even more important to American families than they were 25 years ago because of the vulnerability of families today. Many families planned for their retirement and saved some money and maybe they had a pension plan at work and then they had Social Security. Well, over the years, perhaps the savings took a hit when the stock market went down some 30 percent a few years ago. Many of the pension plans didn't survive corporate restructuring or bankruptcy, and Social Security was the last game in town for a lot of the people retiring.

So when we talk about changing Social Security, people all across America—40 million or 50 million Americans—perk up and say: Senator, what do you have in mind because we are counting on it and we don't want you to mess it up.

Here is what I can say about Social Security. Untouched, with no changes—no changes—Social Security will make every promised payment with a cost-of-living adjustment for 25 years—25 years. That is pretty good. There isn't another program in government that can say the same. But what happens at the end of 25 years? Then the trouble starts. We start running out of money and reducing Social Security payments 22 percent. About one-fifth—or a little more—of the payment a person is receiving today would disappear in 2 years. So what we are talking about in all the deficit conversations is to find ways to extend the life and solvency of Social Security.

There are ways to do it. We have talked about a variety of different ways to do it. Any savings in Social Security will stay in Social Security. It is similar to Las Vegas. We are going to make sure the savings we put in Social Security will be reinvested in the program to make it stronger longer.

I also want the program to be fair—we all do—in terms of beneficiaries, particularly the most vulnerable beneficiaries. About 20 percent of Social Security beneficiaries—the lowest 20 percent—are below the poverty line, even after they get the Social Security check. We need to change that. We shouldn't allow that to happen. These are mainly elderly people who, with the helping hands of our government and Social Security, should be lifted above the poverty level.

Medicare is much the same. If we don't deal with Medicare, the increasing cost of health care is going to cause that program to run into trouble. What we need to do is to make certain at the end we protect the benefits under Medicare but find ways to reduce the cost. We have to reward value rather than volume when it comes to medical treatment, and we have to keep our promise to the Medicare beneficiaries.

There have been proposals made. One was made by the House Republicans in their budget, the so-called PAUL RYAN budget, which would have dramatically changed Medicare. Out-of-pocket expenditures by senior citizens would have more than doubled to \$6,000 a year. So \$500 a month, by a person who is retired, can be a hardship, if not an impossibility. Even worse, the House Republican budget would have taken Medicare as we know it and turned it upside down and said: In the future, under the House Republican plan, Medicare is going to be managed in the tender loving arms of private health insurance companies. I don't think most Americans feel a sense of confidence or relief to hear that.

So as we begin this debate this afternoon on the so-called cut, cap, and balance, the point I wish to make is this: We should not be considering a plan which does not put in specific language a balanced budget amendment but asks

Members of the Senate to vote for a multiple choice test as to what the next amendment to the Constitution will look like. Secondly, we should carefully scrutinize every word of that amendment. Those who have say they are poorly drafted and have no place in the most important document in America. Third, let's accept the responsibility to do what we were elected to do—to reduce spending, to bring this budget to balance, and to do it in a sensible and humane way. The notion we would somehow amend our Constitution and wait for three-fourths of the States to ratify it is, in my mind, not responsible.

I am going to oppose this. I am not going to oppose efforts to reduce our deficit, but I am going to oppose this notion that somehow a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution is going to be our salvation. As the old Pogo cartoon used to say: We have met the enemy and they are us.

We have to do this ourselves—Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). Without objection, it is so ordered.

GANG OF 6 PROPOSAL

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, if there was ever a time in the modern history of America for the American people to become engaged in what is going on here in Washington, now is that time. Decisions are being made as we speak which will impact not only our generation but the lives of our children and our grandchildren for decades to come. I fear very much that the decisions being contemplated are not good decisions, are not fair decisions.

Right now, there is a lot of discussion about two things: No. 1, the importance of the United States not defaulting for the first time in our history on our debts—I think there is increased understanding that would be a disaster for the American economy, that would be a disaster for the world's economy, and we should not do that—but, secondly, there is increased discussion now on long-term deficit reduction, how we address the crisis we face today of a record-breaking deficit of \$1.4 trillion and a \$14 trillion-plus national debt—a debt, by the way, that was caused by two unpaid-for wars, huge tax breaks for the wealthiest people in this country, a Medicare Part D prescription drug program written by the insurance companies, and the lack of

revenues coming in because of a recession caused by the greed and recklessness and illegal behavior on Wall Street.

Be that as it may, regardless of how we got to where we are right now, there are efforts to develop long-term deficit reduction plans. One of them has to do with a so-called Gang of 6. While we do not know all of the details of that proposal—in fact, we never will because a lot of that proposal boots the issue to committees, such as the Finance Committee, that have to work out the details, and no one can know what those details will be at this time—I think it is fair to say that Senator COBURN, Senator CRAPO, and Senator CHAMBLISS deserve a word of congratulations. Clearly, they have won this debate in a very significant way. My guess is they will probably get 80 or 90 percent of what they wanted, and in this town that is quite an achievement. They have stood firm in their desire to represent the wealthy and the powerful and multinational corporations. They have threatened. They have been very smart in a number of ways. They have been determined. And at the end of the day, they will get 80 or 90 percent of what they want.

That is their victory, and I congratulate them on their victory. Unfortunately, their victory will be a disaster for working families in this country, for the elderly, for the sick, for the children, and for low-income people.

I did want to mention, based on the limited information we have—and as I get more information, I will be on the floor more often, but I think it is important to at least highlight some of what is in this so-called Gang of 6 that the corporate media, among others, is enthralled about.

Some may remember that for a number of years leading Democrats said: We will do everything we can to protect Social Security, that Social Security has been an extraordinary success in our country, that for 75 years, with such volatility in the economy, Social Security has paid out every nickel owed to every eligible American.

I have heard Democrats say Social Security has nothing to do with the deficit. And that is right because Social Security is funded by the payroll tax, not by the U.S. Treasury. Social Security has a \$2.6 trillion surplus today and can pay out every benefit owed to every eligible American for the next 25 years. An enormously popular program, poll after poll from the American people says: Do not cut Social Security.

Two-and-a-half years ago, when Barack Obama—then Senator from Illinois—ran for President of the United States, he made it very clear, if you voted for him, no cuts in Social Security. Yet what Senators COBURN, CRAPO, and CHAMBLISS have managed to do in the Gang of 6 is reach an

agreement where there will be major cuts in Social Security.

Do not let anybody kid you about this being some minor thing. It is not. What we are talking about is that under this so-called Gang of 6 proposal, Social Security cuts would go into effect by the year 2012—virtually immediately. What that means is that 10 years from now, the typical 75-year-old person will see their Social Security benefits cut by \$560 a year, and the average 85-year-old will see a cut of \$1,000 a year.

For some people here in Washington—maybe the big lobbyists who make hundreds of thousands of dollars a year—\$560 a year or \$1,000 a year may not seem like a lot of money. But if you are a senior trying to get by on \$14,000, \$15,000, \$18,000 a year, and you are 85 years old—the end of your life, you are totally vulnerable, you are sick—a \$1,000-a-year cut in what you otherwise would have received is a major blow.

So I congratulate Senator COBURN, Senator CRAPO, and Senator CHAMBLISS for doing what President Obama said would not happen under his watch, what the Democrats have said would not happen under their watch: major cuts in Social Security.

But it is not just Social Security. We have 50 million Americans today who have no health insurance at all. Under the Gang of 6 proposal, there will be cuts in Medicare over a 10-year period of almost \$300 billion. There will be massive cuts in Medicaid and other health care programs.

There will be caps on spending, which means there will be major cuts in education. If you are a working-class family, hoping you are going to be able to send your kid to college, and that you will be eligible for a Pell grant, think twice about that because that Pell grant may not be there.

If you are a senior who relies on a nutrition program, that nutrition program may not be there. If you think it is a good idea that we enforce clean air and clean water provisions so our kids can be healthy, those provisions may not be there because there will be major cuts in environmental protection.

I have heard some people say: Well, all that is not so good, but at least finally our Republican friends are saying we need revenue and we are going to raise \$1 trillion in revenue.

Well, Mr. President, let me ask you this. If you read the outline of the Gang of 6 proposal, which is admittedly vague—I think they would acknowledge that; they do not have all of the details—there are very clear provisions making sure we are going to make massive cuts in programs for working families, for the elderly, for the children. Those cuts are written in black and white.

What about the revenue? Well, it is kind of vague—kind of vague. The projection is that maybe we will raise over a 10-year period \$1 trillion in revenue. Where is that coming from? Is it necessarily going to come from the wealthiest people in this country? Is it going to come from large corporations that are enjoying huge tax breaks? That is not clear at all.

What happens if we do not reach that revenue of \$1 trillion? What mechanism is in place to say it happens? That mechanism, in fact, does not exist. What we do know—and, in fairness, I think the authors of this proposal would acknowledge not all the details are out there, but certainly I want middle-class families to understand when we talk about increased revenues, do you know where that may come from? It may come from cutbacks in the home mortgage interest deduction program, which is so very important to millions and millions of families. It may mean if you have a health care program today, that health care program may be taxed. That is a way to raise revenue. It may be that there will be increased taxes on your retirement programs, your IRAs, your 401(k)s. But we do not have the details for that. All we have is some kind of vague promise that we are going to raise \$1 trillion over the next 10 years. There is no enforcement mechanism and no clarity as to where that revenue will come from.

So I think it is terribly important that the American people become engaged in this debate, which will have a huge impact not only on them, but on their parents and on their children. I believe very strongly what the American people must fight for is not a big deal or a small deal but a fair deal.

At a time when the wealthiest people in this country are doing phenomenally well—their effective tax rate is the lowest on record—at a time when the top 400 individuals in this country own more wealth than 150 million Americans, at a time when corporate profits are soaring, and in many instances these same corporations pay nothing in taxes, at a time when we have tripled military spending since 1997, there are fair ways to move toward deficit reduction which do not slash programs that working families and children and the elderly desperately depend upon.

I believe the issue we are dealing with is of enormous consequence. It is clear our Republican friends have succeeded, and I congratulate them on getting 80, 90 percent of what they wanted.

I want people to think back 3 years ago—just 3 years ago—to think that there would be a serious proposal on the floor of the Senate with all of these devastating cuts. I think very few people would have thought that possible. So I congratulate my Republican colleagues for their apparent victory. But this Senator is going to fight back. I

was not elected to the Senate to make devastating cuts in Social Security, in Medicare, in Medicaid, in children's programs, while I lower tax rates for the wealthiest people in this country. That is not what I was elected to do, and I do not intend to do that.

So I hope the American people get engaged in this issue, stand, and demand that the Congress pass a fair and responsible deficit reduction program, not what we are talking about today.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILCON APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma which would undo decades of policies on how we treat veterans who are suffering from diseases associated with Agent Orange exposure. That violates the promise we have made to a generation of veterans. The legacy of Agent Orange exposure among Vietnam veterans is one of tragedy, roadblocks, neglect, pain, and then more roadblocks. It is the legacy of our military spraying millions of gallons of poisonous herbicide indiscriminately, without any consequences or without any repercussions.

At the time of the Vietnam war—and for far too long after it—the U.S. Government neglected to track Agent Orange exposures. Then, in the decades following the war, our government stonewalled veterans who developed horrible ailments of all kinds from those exposures.

To further compound the problem, for decades our government also failed to fund any research on Agent Orange and any other toxins that Vietnam veterans were exposed to. Those mistakes, those decades of neglect, have a cost. It is a cost to the veterans and their loved ones, a cost to the government that sent them to war, and a cost to all of us as Americans. It is a cost that, even in difficult budget times, even with our backs against the wall, we cannot walk away from.

I am not here to question any Senator's commitment to our veterans, but what I am here to do is to question the standard by which this amendment says they should be treated. This amendment that was offered says we should change the standard by which we have judged Agent Orange cases for two decades.

Currently, Vietnam veterans are presumed to be service-connected when

the VA Secretary determines that a positive association exists between exposure to Agent Orange and a certain disease. One of the reasons Congress chose that mechanism is because it was impossible for these veterans to prove their exposure to Agent Orange caused their cancers or other diseases. These veterans were exposed decades ago. They don't know where exactly they were exposed or how much they inhaled. However, under the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, Vietnam veterans would be asked to now prove the impossible. They would be asked to prove they would never have gotten cancer or heart disease or any other disease or condition if not for Agent Orange.

Vietnam veterans who have diabetes or prostate cancer or lung cancer or blood-borne diseases would be denied care and benefits under this amendment. Not only would this be a new hurdle Vietnam veterans could never overcome, it would change the rules midstream. It would literally treat Vietnam veterans whose diseases have already been presumptively service-connected different than those whose diseases have not yet been positively associated with Agent Orange exposure.

I will not deny that compensation for exposure is a difficult issue and one that we continually have to look at. We have grappled with this issue in relation to Vietnam veterans and exposure to Agent Orange. Today we continue to deal with this issue as Iraq and Afghanistan veterans come home with illnesses potentially associated with their exposure to toxins released from burn pits or other environmental exposure.

Ultimately, we have to look at the facts with reason and compassion and weigh the years of our military's failure to track these exposures, the inevitable existence of uncertainty, and the word of our veterans. That is exactly what we have to do.

On the one hand, we have thousands of veterans who have come forward and believe their cancers and ailments were caused by an exposure to a known killer. We have studies that show veterans who were exposed to Agent Orange are more likely to have heart disease, cancer, or other conditions. We have the Institute of Medicine that has recommended giving veterans the benefit of the doubt, and we have the Secretary of Veterans Affairs who has decided that we must move forward to provide compensation to presumptively service-connected veterans exposed to Agent Orange for cancer and heart disease.

On the other hand, we may have a compelling fiscal case, but the Senator from Oklahoma hasn't presented one shred of evidence that Agent Orange does not cause heart disease, cancer, or any other condition. What has been

presented is an amendment that asks veterans to wait, wait, wait until there is more scientific evidence.

Well, these veterans have been waiting for 40 years. How much longer should they wait?

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs decided that the time for waiting was over. I ask that we respect and support this decision, and that we also remember that even in the midst of this whirlwind debt and deficit debate, we have made a promise to veterans, one that doesn't go away.

Vietnam veterans have paid enough for that war. They should not end up paying for our debt. It is us who owe them a debt.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HATCH and I be allowed to participate in a colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAXING AND SPENDING

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, many of our good colleagues like to suggest our Nation has historic deficits because the American people are not taxed enough. Some claim the so-called Bush tax cuts are the culprit, but the numbers tell a different story. In fact, these tax cuts were fully implemented in 2003. Annual revenues have increased steadily from \$1.782 trillion to \$2.524 trillion in 2008, and they increase every year, for an increase of more than 40 percent. That is double the rate of inflation after the tax cuts took effect.

In fact, since the recession of 2008 and the weakest economic recovery in modern history, revenue has now declined. That makes sense. With high unemployment there are fewer taxpayers and, naturally, revenue declines.

Going forward, however, the CBO projects revenue as a share of the GDP will rise to 18.4 percentage points of GDP by 2021. That is assuming extension, not elimination, of the 2001 and 2003 tax reductions. Revenue is therefore projected to return to its historic 18.4 percent average.

It would seem, then, that the American people are already taxed enough to finance a government whose spending has grown wildly out of control. The real problem is, while revenue will return to its historic average, if nothing is done to slow spending, annual outlays will increase from \$3.7 trillion today to \$5.7 trillion by 2021, for an increase of more than 50 percent. As a share of GDP, spending will remain, on average, above 23 percent of GDP. That is nearly 3 percentage points above the historic average.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I could not agree more with the Senator's

point on the real driver of our deficit and debt. We have this debt because government is spending too much. But this is not a matter of personal preference; this is an indisputable and empirically verifiable fact. The systemic problem this country faces is too much spending, not too little tax revenue.

I understand our friends on the other side of the aisle are in a tough spot. They know this, but their left wing base refuses any changes to the spending programs driving these deficits and debt. They don't want to scare off middle-class Americans by recommending the tax increases necessary to close the gap without major changes for spending programs.

When it comes to offering any real plans, they have resorted to burying their heads in the sand, as indicated on this photo. They choose to ignore the real problem. They hope their friends in the media do the same thing—ignore the fact that they are ignoring the problem. As you can see from this chart, the problem is spending.

Mr. SESSIONS. Our friends on the other side of the aisle are almost exclusively focused on hitting up the taxpayer for more revenue.

Mr. HATCH. That is right. They are talking about revenue, but the tax increases they are recommending are more distracting than illuminating. I think it is fair to say that all of the talk by the President and his congressional allies about corporate jets and yachts is a classic red herring. On this chart, it indicates this:

The name of this fallacy comes from the sport of fox hunting in which a dried, smoked herring, which is red in color, is dragged across the trail of the fox to throw the hounds off the scent. Thus, a "red herring" argument is one which distracts the audience from the issue in question through the introduction of some irrelevancy.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, we use this turn of phrase all the time, but I am afraid it is worth discussing how politicians use it.

Mr. HATCH. As you can see, that is what they are doing. I am glad the Senator brought this up. As I just read, my research found that the term "red herring" comes from the sport of fox hunting. Again, a red herring argument is one that distracts the audience from the issue in question through the introduction of some relevancy.

In my view, all of these tax issues that President Obama and those on the other side of the aisle are discussing are red herrings. They want to distract Americans from the real driver of our deficits and debt and the real choices Democrats have to but are refusing to make.

Let me walk through some examples. If we were to raise the depreciable life on corporate Jets from 5 years to 7 years, as the Democrats propose, it would yield us \$3.1 billion over 10 years.

Mr. SESSIONS. How many days of debt reduction over that 10-year period

would a \$3 billion savings or increase in taxes amount to?

Mr. HATCH. To hear the President talk, you would think this is the key to balancing our budget. We all know he is overstating the case. It would provide only a month of debt reduction is about all it would do? Given its essential role in his deficit reduction proposals, you would hope so. But I am sorry to disappoint my friend from Alabama, because, according to our calculations, that amount equates to only 20 hours and 23 minutes of the debt over the next 10 years. Unfortunately, that doesn't even begin to solve the problem. Of course, as you can see here, \$13 trillion, the Obama debt; there would be \$3.1 billion over time with the corporate jet taxes; and remaining above the debt—assuming they didn't spend more, which is an assumption you can't make—would be \$12.9 trillion. Is the problem solved? Of course not.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, let me say I appreciate the work of the ranking member of the Finance Committee, a longtime member of that committee. It seems to me pretty clear that the President's budget he submitted earlier this year—which I have to say was voted down 97 to 0 in the Senate—would have increased the deficit over 10 years by \$13 trillion. He has also suggested his plan to increase taxes on corporate jets by \$3 billion would somehow make a difference in that. I think Senator HATCH is right, that is not accurate.

How about other proposals we hear from the Democratic side, such as cutting back mortgage interest deduction for yachts used for second homes?

Mr. HATCH. Well, in other words, by our calculations, the savings from this proposal would be even more meager. If Congress enacted this change, we could cover the debt from the Obama budget for all of 15 hours and 47 minutes. Again, this is not solving the problems of the burdensome debt the President is piling on.

Mr. SESSIONS. It is shocking to see how small those numbers are, and we aren't hearing that in the press and in the national discussions. From the talk we have heard about these proposals, you would think they would yield more than 2 days of debt reduction over 10 years.

Mr. HATCH. You would think so. But the other 3,651 days of debt under the 10-year Obama budget would not even be touched.

There is a third red herring that has been thrown out there. Maybe that one closes the gap. We have all heard the President talk about hitting American oil companies by reducing or eliminating domestic energy incentives. This is a real priority of his and of congressional Democrats.

We had a cloture vote on a bill by our friend from New Jersey to extract \$21

billion in revenue from U.S. oil companies. The Finance Committee had a hearing where the other side touted the benefits of this tax increase by grilling the CEOs of the top five oil companies. If you listened to my friends on the other side, one would think an additional \$21 billion would solve all our fiscal problems. Their rhetoric suggests this is the only thing standing between more money to send kids to college and provide school lunches.

But I wonder if my friend from Alabama might put into perspective how much of the 10 years of debt under the President's budget this proposal would cover.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, with \$13 trillion—that is 13 thousand billion—\$21 billion won't amount to much.

Mr. HATCH. Well, here is how many days of the 10-year debt of the Obama budget that would be covered. Keep in mind, this proposal originated from our friend from New Jersey, the head of the Senate Democratic campaign operation, and his tag teammate, the head of the Senate Democratic message operation—the so-called war room—the senior Senator from New York. I will let others decide whether this proposal was more political than substantive, but people should at least know the facts about this proposal before deciding.

As a deficit reduction proposal, this is very weak tea. This is a much ballyhooed proposal, and it would cover the deficit for, in actuality, 5 days 18 hours and 47 minutes.

As you can see, here is the oil rig proposal. We have a \$13 trillion debt—actually it is about a \$13.5 trillion debt right now—and you would save \$21 billion from the extra taxes on oil and gas. Even at that, we would have a remaining debt of \$12.9 trillion. So is the problem solved? Of course not.

Mr. SESSIONS. The Senator has served on the Finance Committee for a number of years and is now the senior ranking Republican there. If you listen to our friends on the other side of the aisle, it would appear that all fiscal problems could be resolved by taxing millionaires. Is that an argument that the Senator is familiar with?

Mr. HATCH. Well, I sure am. Anyone watching C-SPAN will see our friends on the other side making the argument day in and day out. When I hear this argument, I often think of a saying from the distinguished former chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator Russell Long. When talking about tax reform, Senator Long said: "Don't tax you, don't tax me, tax that fellow behind the tree."

And since there are a lot more folks who aren't millionaires than are, the Democrats have calculated the politics of class warfare works. All of our problems could be solved if the rich paid their fair share, according to the

Democrats. As politics, this might sound—I don't even think it sounds good, but as tax policy and its proposal to reduce our deficits and debt, this is the fourth red herring. It does not come close to fixing the deficit from the Obama budget.

Our friends on the other side frequently cite the Tax Policy Center—or TPC—for tax data. That makes some sense. TPC is a professional think tank that is a joint venture of two center-left think tanks, the Urban Institute and the Brookings Institution. With the exception of its director, Donald Marron, TPC is largely staffed by highly qualified tax professionals who worked in Democratic Treasury Departments and Democratic Hill offices. TPC is a solid professional outfit, but you can't ignore its institutional perspective. To be fair, I would say the same thing about the Heritage Foundation. Their institutional perspective is more likely to line up with folks on my side of the aisle. Nevertheless, I am drawing from TPC data, some of the assumptions with which I might not agree.

According to TPC models and estimates, for 2011, American households earning more than \$1 million account for 12 percent of the Nation's pretax income, they pay 19 percent of Federal taxes and carry an average tax rate of 29 percent.

Even more critical from my perspective, these taxpayers also account for 38 percent of all flow-through income. Flow-through income is predominantly earnings from the ownership of small businesses. So raising rates on the rich will squarely hit those who create and expand the small businesses that need to be the engine of our economic recovery.

But let us be clear about something: Higher taxes on these wealthy individuals will not only have adverse economic consequences, it will not even provide the deficit and debt reduction suggested by the left. Even if all the income—every dime they earned, of those earning more than \$1 million—were confiscated with a 100-percent rate—with the unlikely assumption of no taxpayer behavioral response—for the year of confiscation, these higher taxes would yield about \$893 billion. That would be a one-time confiscation. Surely none of these folks would continue to work, save, or invest in the future if the government were to confiscate all their income. They would have to cover all their other expenses, including State and local taxes, from savings. After taking everything from the folks behind the tree—in this case, the folks earning more than \$1 million—how many days of the 10-year Obama budget debt would be eliminated?

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, not many, is my answer to that. But as often as the President talks about taxing the rich or spreading the wealth around as a

cure for our fiscal problems, you would think it would balance the budget. But would he get us there?

Mr. HATCH. I say to my friend from Alabama, confiscating all the income from those earning over \$1 million does not even fix 1 year of the 10 years of projected Obama debt. It would cover 244 days, 16 hours and 34 minutes. That is it. Not even 1 year.

Look at this. Federal policymakers could kiss that revenue source goodbye after an event such as confiscation. So there you are: \$13 trillion. Take the \$893 billion. If we took every dime that millionaires make this next year, the \$893 billion, we would be down to \$12.1 trillion in remaining debt. Is the problem solved? Of course not.

Mr. SESSIONS. Going back to the other chart on taxation and spending under the Obama budget, I would note President Obama's budget raised taxes significantly, increased spending even more, and as a result, over 10 years, created more debt projected than if he had made no budget at all.

Mr. HATCH. That is right.

Mr. SESSIONS. That is a stunning thing. You can talk about raising taxes on American workers, on families, on small businesses and on the wealthy and investors all you want, but this talk is easy. It ignores the root causes of the deficit and debt problem here in Washington: out-of-control spending.

It may sound like a cliché to the American people that Republicans are always talking about out-of-control spending. We wish it were a joke, but sadly, it is true.

Mr. HATCH. I wish it were too. I am surprised about this debate. The press is not pushing Democrats on what a joke their proposals about jets and yachts are, but the American people—the people I represent in Utah—understand these are red herrings. These proposals deal with the President's legacy of debt for less than 2 days—less than 2 days—over the next 10 years. Add in the much-publicized tax hit on the hated oil companies and you get another 5 days.

So after all the demagoguery on jets and yachts and oil companies, you get about 1 week of deficit reduction. And even throwing in a one-time confiscation of all the income for taxpayers earning above \$1 million, you can only add 244 days. Add it all up and there is still less than 1 year. All those tax increases don't even get to one-tenth of the debt President Obama will add over the next 10 years.

It is class warfare. We all know that. All the talk from the White House and from our friends on the other side is on behalf of proposals that would address, at best, less than 10 percent of the debt forced on American families by the President's budget.

I ask my friend from Alabama if he might conclude with the classic definition of a red herring.

Mr. SESSIONS. Let's take another look at the definition of red herring on the chart. It says: The name of this fallacy comes from the sport of fox hunting in which a dried, smoked herring, which is red in color, is dragged across the trail of the fox to throw the hounds off the scent. Thus, a "red herring" argument is one which distracts the audience from the issue in question through the introduction of some irrelevancy.

Our friends on the other side, using White House talking points, sophisticatedly prepared, appear to have resorted to red herrings with their deficit reduction proposals. They want the American people to think a few easy tax increases on the rich or yacht owners or corporate jet users or oil companies—the people behind the tree—can solve our debt crisis without spending reforms. They hope these red herrings will hide a serious Democratic vulnerability. If they are not going to address spending in a serious way, then massive tax increases on the middle class will be a necessity.

These red herrings are designed to throw those citizens who care deeply about reducing the \$13 trillion debt that the President's budget will incur off the trail.

The trail of deficit reduction leads to one of two places: restraining out-of-control spending; or crushing tax relief increases on middle-class families.

Restraining spending is not a red herring. It cuts to the heart of our fiscal problems. It goes to the root of the problem.

The President and his allies need to come clean with the American people. The President so far has refused to present a deficit reduction plan in these negotiations that are going on. He says he has one, but we never see it so it can be scored and analyzed. The White House seems content to produce cheap talking points justifying these red herrings, rather than meaningfully addressing our debt crisis. As I have said before, and will again, this shows a disrespect for the American people.

Our people deserve better. They need honest, fair analyses of the problems we face. I expect they will reward those who talk straight with them and offer serious grown-up efforts to reduce our debt with their support; and I think they will be unhappy once it is realized how little these proposals would impact the huge debt crisis we are now facing.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my colleague for his kind remarks.

I have to say that not only would it not impact it, but it would impact a lot of jobs.

I remember when we did the so-called yacht tax back in the early 1990s, the left thought that was a wonderful thing. We got after all these rich yacht owners. When they found out that thousands and thousands of jobs were

lost because of that bill, they immediately turned tail and got rid of the bill pretty quickly.

What we haven't said is we are assuming the \$13 trillion is going to stay the same. Actually, in the next 10 years there is a good chance it will double to over \$20 trillion and possibly as high as \$25 trillion or \$26 trillion the way this administration is spending. Frankly, we are going to have a very difficult time ever coming out of this hole we are in right now.

All I can say is I like the President personally, but he hasn't presented a program. He is calling on Congress to do it all, and we have our various problems here in getting together, but he hasn't led out on these programs, and neither have the other people down at the White House.

In fact, one of the problems is I can't name one person at the White House who has ever created a private-sector job. And let's face it, they are good at creating public-sector jobs, but they are not very good at creating private-sector jobs.

The real answer is to work our way out of them, and instead of talking about shared sacrifice, let's talk about shared prosperity by allowing the engine of this economy, the small business community, to pull us out.

Even so, we haven't even talked about the fact that the deficit this year, in 1 year, is \$1.5 trillion, \$1.6 trillion. I might add that we are going to have at least probably close to \$1 trillion deficit every year under the President's own actuarial program, every year up through 2020. You can imagine how we are going to continue to increase the debt without doing anything about it. Frankly, that is if his actuaries are right, and they are usually always wrong on the low side. That includes actuaries on both sides, to be honest with you. The expenses have always been more.

I think what is important here is that we get real about working together and coming up with a way of resolving these tremendous debt problems. The future of our young people in this country depend on that, and I don't want to let them down.

I want to thank my colleague for his colloquy with me and I appreciate it very much.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. 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. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I came to the floor. I heard an interesting colloquy going on between my colleagues, my friend from Utah and my friend from Alabama, and I saw that my name was invoked, so I thought I would come to the floor and maybe elucidate for them and set the record a little bit straight.

No. 1 is I am no longer the chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, so my focus in ending the tax breaks that the big five oil companies in this country get to the tune of \$21 billion that the taxpayers of this country give in essence to big five oil companies that will make \$144 billion in profits this year I simply think don't need it in order to be able to achieve what the marketplace has allowed them to do. And I am happy for them. I am happy for all their stockholders and shareholders and everyone else, but they don't need \$21 billion of the taxpayers' money and tax break—which, by the way, they describe them as these poor oil companies that, wow, we are going to stop domestic production.

One of the breaks I want to finish actually says you can't be doing what you are doing. Here in the United States, when you get access to the lands and waters to drill for oil and gas, you pay a royalty. Basically, a royalty is a license fee.

The oil companies figured out, Well, when I do this in other countries in the world, instead of paying a license fee, let me ask them to pay a tax for the same amount that it would have cost to pay a license fee. Because then I get the tax and I get to deduct it totally against my obligations here in the United States, which means that for those poor oil companies that I just heard about, we are, in essence, as taxpayers, subsidizing the exploration of foreign oil which goes on a world marketplace—does not come back to the United States—to the tune of \$21 billion.

If we want to talk about the poor, I want to talk about poor people whom Republicans, it seems, want to go after. They want to go after in their budget the things people need to get through every day. It is called Medicare for seniors and the disabled. I know it from my mother's own life. She worked in the factories of New Jersey, worked a lifetime to help build family and community. She had a terrible disease, Alzheimer's, and she would not have lived with the dignity she deserved in the twilight of her life but for what my sister and I were able to do for her and Medicare as her baseline of retirement security. That is what I call poor.

I call poor, young children who, under Medicaid, are getting money for specific health care that through no fault of their own they desperately

need in order to have the quality of life—to even be able to breathe, children with respiratory ailments—so they can fulfill their God-given potential in school. That is poor.

But oil companies that are going to make \$144 billion in profits, they are poor? Give me a break. I know we belittle the fact that it is only \$21 billion that we would put directly to deficit reduction, but if we start putting in those \$21 billion and then put in the billions in ethanol subsidies and then the horse racing industry and the corporate jets and we start adding it all up, maybe if, instead of working-class and middle-class working families whom our Republican colleagues in the Congress seem to want to put all the emphasis on, if we talked about the wealthiest people in the country and said to them: We need you to help the country get out of this difficult time, they, I think, would be incredibly patriotic.

I have talked to a lot of wealthy people who told me if it is to help the country and if we are going to get our house in order, I am willing to help the country. I am willing to pay a little bit more.

But, no, that is not possible to even talk about. It is not possible to talk about big oil companies that are going to make record profits. It is not possible to talk about ethanol. It is not possible to talk about the wealthiest in the country, millionaires, multimillionaires, and billionaires. Yet I did not hear any of these voices when Ronald Reagan raised the debt ceiling 17 times for the equivalent of \$4 trillion in today's money. I never heard any of these voices say how irresponsible it was when George Bush raised it seven times, for \$5 trillion—basically, the same amount of money he used to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in the country but which became the collective debt of the United States. No, I did not hear any of it then.

I had no intention of coming to the floor. But when the facts are wrong and my name is invoked, I intend to come and set the record straight. I am happy to debate my colleagues. We need to make sure working-class, middle-class families in this country do not bear the overwhelming consequences of our effort to end our deficits and meet our obligations. We cannot continue to hear we cannot close the loopholes in the Tax Code for the poor oil companies, poor corporate jets, poor multimillionaires and billionaires, all because that would somehow be a tax increase, but we can take it right out of the pockets of middle-class and poor families by virtue of the services we deny them—so they will not have the money to be able to produce or scrounge or keep what little they have been able to acquire—and say that somehow is not a tax increase.

I hear about entitlements all the time. I have a new sense of what my

Republican colleagues mean by entitlements. The oil companies are entitled to their \$21 billion. Those are just two provisions. I could come up with a whole bunch of others for which they get tax breaks. The oil companies are entitled. The ethanol producers, they are entitled. The large agribusinesses in the country, they are entitled. But families who struggle every day to make ends meet? No, they are not entitled. We have to cut their entitlements.

Something is wrong with that equation. A nation, at the end of the day, in its budget, talks about its values as a country. We all have a budget. We may not think about it as a budget in our personal lives, but it is income, however we derive it, through gainful employment, the job we have, maybe some investments we make, maybe some interests we get from our savings. That is our revenue. Then there are our expenditures. The house we keep for our family, the insurance we provide for their health care, the education, the tuition we pay for the education we want them to achieve, the church or synagogue we tithe to, the charitable contribution we make to an organization that we believe is worthy of the work we do, that is an expression of our personal values.

The Nation's budget, which is both revenues and expenditures, is an expression of our collective values as a country. I cannot understand, in that expression of collective values, how it is that the very wealthy, that the very influential, that Big Oil is entitled but working-class families and the poorest among us are not entitled to realize their hopes, dreams, and aspirations in the greatest country on the face of the Earth.

Anyhow, I wanted to come, since I heard my name invoked before. I think the facts were not quite up to par. There is, obviously, a different view.

Having had the opportunity to set the record straight, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE ACTION

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I wanted to take this occasion to acknowledge a very important event that occurred last night. It occurred in the other body, where we had a vote for the first time since we have been deliberating and debating and wrestling with this challenge of what to do with our debt limit and the fact we have

reached that debt limit. We have had a vote by one of the two bodies that have a say in this matter on this very issue, and the House voted yesterday by a significant margin, with a bipartisan vote—although it was mostly one-sided, there were Members of both parties—in favor of raising the debt limit. The House voted to raise the debt limit, in fact, by the full amount the President requested. The House voted to raise the debt limit by \$2.4 trillion, which would completely eliminate this problem, this struggle we have had over this looming deadline we have been given.

However, the vote came with one condition. It came with the condition that the President join Congress in putting our Federal Government on a path to a balanced budget. That is the requirement. That is the contingency. The way the House bill achieves that is by establishing three parts: The first is cuts in spending, the second part is caps on spending, and the third is a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. The colloquial name this approach has been given is the “cut, cap, and balance” approach.

This is a big deal because until last night, among the three parties to this debate—the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the President—nobody had previously laid out a case that said: Here is how we will raise this debt limit and deal with this problem. The House has now done so. They have passed this measure by a significant margin.

I would like to quickly walk through the three elements of it—the cuts, the caps, and the balance. They are really all different pieces designed to achieve one goal, which is to put our Federal budget on a path to balance.

The cut refers to cuts in spending in this next fiscal year, which begins soon. It begins on October 1. The cut is 3 percent from this year's spending level—3 percent. So under the House-passed plan, next year we would spend 97 percent of everything we are spending this year, but we would cut 3 percent. Now, anybody who has run a business, anybody who has run a household knows that if you have to, you can cut 3 percent from any big budget. I guarantee you, from the enormously bloated and oversized \$3.7 trillion U.S. Government budget, 3 percent is not much, but that is the cut. That is the first part. That is the level of spending for next year—about 3 percent or \$111 billion.

The next part is the caps. These are the statutory limits as to how much the Federal Government would be permitted to spend in each of the subsequent years for the next 10 years. These levels have spending growth every year. Some suggest these are Draconian, savage cuts in spending. Actually, it is increases, but it is increases in spending at a slower rate than we

have had in the past and certainly slower than what others have proposed—what the President's budget proposed and what the Congressional Budget Office is expecting. Therein lies savings. Therein lies the opportunity to put us on a path to a balanced budget because I think we all acknowledge that, unfortunately, we are not going to be able to achieve a balanced budget overnight. Can't do it. We have dug too deep a hole. So we need a little time to get there. The spending caps provide that discipline as we move in that direction.

The final piece is a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, which is something most Americans have strongly supported for a long time. If we achieve that, frankly, we would never have to worry about raising the debt limit anymore because we wouldn't run a deficit. We would be forbidden. Without a deficit, you don't need to issue a new debt, so the debt would never rise, and this problem would be permanently resolved, but much more important, we would have our Federal Government on a sustainable, strong, viable fiscal path, and that would create the opportunity for strong economic growth.

I am convinced that part of the reason we are having such a weak economy and such poor job growth is because of the uncertainty we have created not so much over whether we are going to raise the debt limit on August 1 or 2 or 3 or whenever it is but whether we are going to solve the big fiscal challenge we face, the problems dragging down Europe now, and the problems that loom for us.

The President and the Treasury Secretary have been extremely alarmed about the prospect that we might not raise the debt limit on August 2. To that very point, the Treasury Secretary said—and I quote from a May 13 letter he sent to Members of Congress:

This would be an unprecedented event in American history.

He is referring to a failure to raise the debt limit.

A default would inflict catastrophic, far-reaching damage on our Nation's economy, significantly reducing growth, and increasing unemployment.

President Obama had a similar message of great alarm, again referring to a scenario in which we did not raise the debt limit by August 2. He said:

If investors around the world thought that the full faith and credit of the United States were not being backed up, if they thought that we might renege on our IOUs, it could unravel the entire financial system . . . We could have a worse recession than we already had, a worse financial crisis than we already had.

So this is how serious the President and the Treasury Secretary say their concern is that we raise the debt limit. Well, the House just did it. The House said: Mr. President, we hereby vote—

and they did vote—to raise the debt limit by \$2.4 trillion, the full amount the President asked for. They have said this is the only condition: You, Mr. President, need to join us in putting our budget on a path to balance, taking care of this fiscal crisis, and giving us a sustainable fiscal footing so we can have strong economic growth.

So the question today before us is, Will the President join us? Will the President embrace this? The President, as I have just quoted, has indicated great alarm at the prospect of not getting the debt limit increase he has asked for. The House has just said: Here it is.

Actually, I think, if not every Republican Senator, a big majority of Republican Senators will support what the House has done. I hope there will be many Democrats who will support this as well because none of us wants to test the proposition of what happens if we don't raise the debt limit.

So the opportunity is here now. For the first time, we have a bill that has been passed in one of these two bodies that would do exactly what the President has asked for, with just this one condition.

Let me comment for a moment on one of the reasons I think it is so important that the President join us in putting our budget on a path to balance. We have heard from various rating agencies that several of them are considering downgrading the credit standing of the United States. This is an appalling thought.

I was involved in the bond market in my first career when I got out of college, and the United States stood above ratings. We didn't talk about having a AAA rating because we were above even that. Our rating was so superior to anyone else's, the rating system didn't even really apply to the United States. Well, now, not only does it apply, but the danger is that we won't even qualify for the top rating.

Do you know what it is that would cause them to downgrade the debt of the United States? It is not a failure to raise the debt limit by August 2; it is the failure to address this fiscal imbalance, these massive, unsustainable deficits. That is what they have told us has to be corrected or else the downgrade follows, and a downgrade will be enormously problematic because it has all kinds of knock-on effects.

So we have heard about a lot of different ideas that have been floated, and I congratulate and commend everybody who has been involved in putting in a lot of effort. I don't agree with everything that everybody has talked about doing, but I think we have seen people from both parties make a good-faith effort to try to solve this problem one way or another. But the fact is there is only one proposal on the table that has passed either body, and there is only one proposal that actually solves our

long-term fiscal challenge in the law that has already passed—the bill that has already been passed.

So my question now is, Will the President join us and put our government on a path to a balanced budget? We don't expect to get there overnight. By the way, the various levels of cuts and spending and the exact terms of the balanced budget amendment naturally would be subject to discussion. But will the President join us in this effort to restore fiscal sanity and give us the basis for strong economic growth? That is the question, and that is the opportunity for the President.

Now, I know the President has been dismissive of the idea of balancing our budget, but I certainly hope he is not so opposed to balancing our budget that he would reject the debt limit increase that he has said we desperately need. There is an opportunity here to solve two problems at once—to solve this problem over the looming date of August 2 by which he has said we absolutely must raise the debt limit, but the more important opportunity is to put our house in fiscal order.

The House took a very important step in that direction. The Senate will have a vote later this week. I hope my colleagues in the Senate will embrace this opportunity and the President will join us and will put our Federal Government on a path to balance.

With that, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). Morning business is closed.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012—Continued

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I rise to address amendment No. 570, offered by Senator WYDEN, regarding closure of the Umatilla Chemical Depot. It is an amendment on which I am proud to partner with him.

This is a very important issue to my home State of Oregon. We have a situation where 20 years of planning have gone forward to arrange for the final transition of this chemical depot based on the recommendations of the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Indeed, the BRAC Commission, as it is known, noted:

On completion of the chemical demilitarization mission in accordance with treaty obligations, close Umatilla Chemical Depot, Oregon.

This was language that was specifically done to recognize that the chemical depot had to complete its work dismantling the chemical weapons stored there according to the Chemical Weapons Convention Treaty. That treaty had a deadline of April 29, 2012, and thus it wasn't clear that the work would be done within the 6 years outlined for most of the BRAC's work. So they changed the language from "close the Umatilla Chemical Depot" to "on completion of the chemical demilitarization mission in accordance with treaty obligations."

So since this has been a discussion for so long, with the community working so hard with so many stakeholders in order to put the plans together to transition this base to a productive civilian role, it came as a complete shock recently when the community was notified by the Army that, despite the specific language that accommodated the treaty deadline of April 2012, they were going to rule that the transfer under the BRAC legislation could not be completed because it was an exception—even an exception written into the law—to the initial 6 years.

It was quite a shock because a local reuse authority has been formed and has been working hard with representatives from all local stakeholders to make sure this base is transferred in a way that creates the best possible economy and best use of this land. It has been a complicated task. It has been an earnest effort.

This is not the time for the Army to change the rules, digging up a clause and misapplying that clause, ignoring the exception written into the law, and claiming that this work done over all this time doesn't matter.

That is why I am so delighted to join with Senator WYDEN in putting a clarification into statute that says, yes, what the original legislation said with an April 2012 deadline recognizing our treaty obligations must be honored and the BRAC process must be honored for the best use of this land in the community.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to return to morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE RYAN PLAN

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, I quote former Reagan Economic Adviser Bartlett on the House Republican plan.

Distributionally, the Ryan plan is a monstrosity. The rich would receive huge tax cuts while the social safety net would be shredded to pay for them. Even as an open-

ing bid to begin budget negotiations with the Democrats, the Ryan plan cannot be taken seriously. It is less of a wish list than a fairy tale, utterly disconnected from the real world, backed up by make-believe numbers and unreasonable assumptions. Ryan's plan isn't even an act of courage. It is just pandering to the Tea Party. A real act of courage would have been for him to admit, as all serious budget analysts know, that revenues will have to rise well above 19 percent of GDP to stabilize the debt.

Former Reagan administration economic adviser Bruce Bartlett from Capital Gains and Games Blog, "Imbalanced Budget."

I would clarify the impact of the balanced budget proposal. He has called it sheer idiocy. That comes from the former Reagan economic adviser.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 575

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 575, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Ms. AYOTTE] proposes an amendment numbered 575.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. 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 Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in coordination with the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, to submit a report to Congress detailing the Secretary's plans, and identifying challenges, both technical and administrative, to ensure that advanced, next-generation prosthetics are made available to injured members of the Armed Forces and veterans in a timely manner)

On page 112, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 230. (a) Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in coordination with the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report, in writing, on the plans of the Secretary to make available to injured members of the Armed Forces and veterans the next generation of advanced prosthetics.

(b) The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Details of the strategic plan and timetable of the Secretary to make available to injured members of the Armed Forces and veterans the next generation of advanced prosthetics

(2) A description of the challenges, both technical and administrative, that could delay injured members of the Armed Forces and veterans access to prosthetics described in paragraph (1).

(3) The plans of the Secretary to address these challenges described under paragraph (2).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I have offered an amendment to H.R. 2055. It seeks to help to make sure our wounded warriors get the benefits of next-generation advanced prosthetics in a timely fashion.

This amendment would require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report within 90 days, identifying the bureaucratic hurdles and redtape we need to cut through to make sure the research that is being done and the next-generation advanced prosthetics that are being developed to help our wounded warriors will get to them as quickly as possible.

We have invested substantial taxpayer dollars, including through the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency, or DARPA, in developing this great technology in advanced next-generation prosthetics.

Last week, I had the chance to go to Walter Reed Hospital and meet with some of our wounded warriors. They are absolutely amazing Americans, and what they have done for our country is incredible. We can never repay the sacrifices they have made. But the last thing they should have to put up with is waiting for years of delay through the FDA or other government agencies to make sure they can get the very best technology available for next-generation advanced prosthetics. That is why I offer this amendment.

I hope this amendment will be passed to make sure we can cut through the redtape, that the Veterans' Administration will identify any hurdles that are present, that we can get through those hurdles and get that technology to our wounded warriors as soon as possible, given what they have done for our country and continue to do in fighting on our behalf. They are heroes, and they deserve to not have to wait and wade through government bureaucracy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 577

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside any pending amendments and call up amendment No. 577.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] proposes an amendment numbered 577.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. ____ No later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the status and improvement plan for all DODEA schools with an overall condition rating of Q3 (poor) or Q4 (failing) as identified in the October 2009 Report to Congress on Department of Defense Education Activity's Military Construction Program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, the Department of Defense runs schools that serve over 86,000 children across America, Europe, and in the Pacific region. That is why I was able to get together with Senator GRAHAM and Senator INHOFE to work on a way we could get those schools fixed because they are crumbling. Since a picture is worth a thousand words, I will show this picture from one of the schools.

We can see the tiles on the roof crumbling. We have had that in our public schools, before we woke up. Literally, these tiles fall down, and it is just by the grace of God that a child or a teacher doesn't get hit and very hurt. Clearly, we need to do something about it.

What I would like to say is, we started off with an amendment that actually required the DOD to fix these schools. Now we are asking for a report that they do it because we have to avoid some parliamentary procedure problems of legislating on approps. So we believe we have done this.

I think everyone should be read last month's Newsweek. They published an investigation by the Standard for Public Integrity, which documented the conditions of DOD-run schools with serious problems, leaks, corrosion, mold and overcrowding and relying on temporary facilities.

My amendment has the strong support of the National Military Families Association. They sent me a statement and I will close with this.

DOD schools, especially at U.S. installations overseas, are a community focal point and a key element in the support network for our military families stressed by a decade of war. Poorly repaired or out-of-date buildings can also create the perception among military families that their children's education is not a priority for our Nation.

I urge support for this bipartisan amendment, and I would yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Johnson-

Kirk amendment No. 556 be modified further with the changes that are at the desk; that Senator WARNER be added as a cosponsor to the Johnson-Kirk amendment; that the pending amendments be set aside and two amendments from Senator HUTCHISON be called up, No. 562 and No. 563 en bloc, and following the reporting of the Hutchison amendments, the following pending amendments be agreed to: Johnson-Kirk No. 556, as further modified; Wyden No. 570; Hutchison, No. 562; and Hutchison No. 563; further, the pending McCain amendment No. 553 be withdrawn; that no other amendments, motions or points of order be in order other than motions to table or budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive; that at 4:45 p.m., the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed below: Ayotte amendment No. 575, Boxer amendment No. 577, and Coburn amendment No. 564; that upon disposition of the Coburn amendment, the substitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to; the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to a vote on passage of the bill, as amended; and the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table; finally, that upon passage, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, with a ratio of 9 to 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I would ask that my request be modified to allow 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, between the votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 556, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

The amendment (No. 556), as further modified, is as follows:

On page 114 between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

SEC. 301. Not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Executive Director of Arlington National Cemetery shall provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives; the Senate Armed Services Committee; the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee; and the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee detailing the strategic plan and timetable to modernize the Cemetery's Information Technology system, including electronic burial records. The report should also include a description of the steps taken by the Executive Director in 2011 to implement information technology and management systems improvements, and identify any remaining information technology and systems infrastructure needs of Arlington National Cemetery.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 562 AND 563

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Hutchison amendments.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] proposes amendments numbered 562 and 563.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 562

(Purpose: To restrict the use of funds for a permanent United States Africa Command headquarters outside of the United States)

On page 84, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 127. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this title may be obligated or expended for a permanent United States Africa Command headquarters outside of the United States until the Secretary of Defense provides the congressional defense committees an analysis of all military construction costs associated with establishing a permanent location overseas versus in the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 563

(Purpose: To limit the availability of funds for military construction projects at Grafenwohr and Baumholder, Germany, pending a report on the brigade combat team scheduled to be withdrawn from Germany in 2015)

On page 84, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 127. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this title may be obligated or expended on a military construction project at Grafenwohr, Germany, or Baumholder, Germany, until the Secretary of the Army submits to Congress, in writing, a report on installations and properties in Germany that the Army intends to return to the host nation, including—

(1) intended timelines for closures along with the list of military construction projects required at other installations to facilitate the downsizing and consolidation of Army forces in Germany;

(2) an identification of the brigade combat team that will be withdrawn from Germany; and

(3) an estimate of costs (including operation and maintenance costs and military construction costs) to be incurred during fiscal years 2012 through 2015 in connection with keeping the brigade identified in Germany through September 30, 2015 versus stationing a similar brigade in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 556, as further modified, and amendments Nos. 570, 562, and 563 are agreed to.

Amendment No. 553 is withdrawn.

The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 564

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I rise in support of the Coburn amendment and ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I think it is important for us to understand what this amendment is about.

It does not affect the decisions regarding disability as a result of Agent Orange that have already been decided under the guidelines that were extended by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. This is a prospective amendment. So any allegation that this

somehow affects previous awarding of disability payments is not correct. It is a prospective amendment for cases that will be decided in the future.

The issue of disability is always one that is very difficult because we start on the basis that concerns men and women who have served honorably in the military. Obviously, the predilection is, appropriately, to grant disabilities where those claims are made. But we now have a situation where somewhere around \$40 billion, \$41 billion, simply over the issue of heart disease, can be awarded without what appears to be a direct connection to Agent Orange.

There were many of our men and women who were serving in the conflict in Vietnam who were exposed to Agent Orange, but there were many more who were not. I don't think one can make a case that someone who was stationed on a ship in the Gulf of Tonkin and was many miles from any Agent Orange, that one could make a plausible case that Agent Orange was the cause of this disability.

What this amendment tries to do is give a realistic set of parameters for the awarding of disability payment for those who actually were exposed, and not only exposed but also that there is a direct connection between the exposure to herbicides and the outcome.

There are many needs amongst our veterans. They are there every single day. The purpose of this amendment is to make sure there is a legitimate need for compensation for those who were exposed to Agent Orange and a direct connection between that exposure and certain disabilities, particularly heart disease, Parkinson's disease, Hodgkin's, et cetera. What we are trying to do is make sure those who were actually exposed, and there is a direct connection, are rewarded, and adequately so, but at the same time not have a situation where it is an open-ended expenditure of taxpayers' dollars.

The Veterans' Disability Benefits Commission endorsed the need for establishing a new framework for presumptions with more transparent processes but failed to take the full step of embracing causality in decision-making. This amendment will achieve that goal identified by the Institute of Medicine to ensure that scientifically based causality is at the heart of the disability determination process.

I would match the commitment of the Senator from Oklahoma and my own for veterans with the commitment of anyone in this body, but there also has to be some rationality associated with it. I was a great admirer of the Honorable Tony Principi, who was the former Secretary of Veterans Affairs. Again, I want to quote from his statement:

If the American people lose faith in the integrity of our disability benefit system, veterans and their families will be the ones who

suffer. The surest way for that to happen is for the public to be convinced that presumptive service connection decisions are based on anything other than sound scientific advice.

These presumptions, as they presently exist, are not based on sound scientific advice. With some I am sure this amendment is not popular, but I thank my colleague from Oklahoma for bringing it to the attention of this body.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Arizona. We want to make sure any veteran who has a positive causation factor from any aspect that would lead to any disability, that we meet that need. That is not what this is about.

This has been looked at two times by the Institute of Medicine. The first time there was no study—none of the studies they cited showed even positive association. The last time we had two that showed some positive association but absolutely no causation. There is a big difference in science. Something can be associated with something and doesn't mean it causes it. On that basis, the Secretary committed this country to make payments to people for disabilities that are not associated with their service. The point is, in a limited budget going forward, if we are paying for disabilities that are not associated with service, that means we are going to have less money available for those veterans who do have a disability.

We have heard, No. 1, this will reverse all that has come before. It will not. It is prospective only. It will not change the presumption that if someone was in or above Vietnam they have the presumption of being exposed to Agent Orange. That will not change at all. The previous scientific diseases that were based on causation will not be eliminated at all. But, in fact, those that are not associated with causality will be eliminated.

Will they be eliminated in the future? If the science at some point in time shows us that there is a causal relationship between that exposure and disease, then we can do something about it. But now we are throwing money at disabilities that are not associated and not caused by veterans' exposure to this herbicide.

I ask, given where we are in this country and the fact that we are going to have a tough time funding veterans programs in the future anyway, that we ought not spend a dollar on something that is not directly caused by a veteran's exposure to Agent Orange so that we have that dollar to pay for those who truly were exposed and truly have a disability.

I yield back to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. I ask him, I have heard anecdotally the eligibility for

disability under the guidelines as issued by the Secretary of the Army—and, by the way, we are talking about \$40-some billion additional of taxpayers' money. I think that should be the subject of legislative action rather than a decision made by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Is it not true that, anecdotally, we have heard that people who were in the Korean war and not the Vietnam war have somehow become eligible? And people who were on ships in the Gulf of Tonkin, not anywhere near Agent Orange, have also been declared eligible?

Mr. COBURN. They are eligible, and there are some reasons for that. But that is not what this debate is about. We are not questioning it. We are just saying on this basis we are not using science how we have used it in every other aspect of veterans' disability. Now we are going beyond science.

When we look at the total number of studies, rarely 3 percent or so show any association, and association does not imply any causation. So we have the Secretary who has made a decision to commit this country to \$42 billion of additional expenditures not based on sound science but the fact that he can do that, and that is what I think is wrong. If the veterans committee thinks there is the science to do that, they should bring a bill to the floor and do that. But the science is not there. I have looked at it. I have read it. It is not there.

The Institute of Medicine says it is not there, and they say disability ought to be based on causation, not on association.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 577, AS MODIFIED

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Boxer amendment No. 577 be modified with the changes that are already at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 577), as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. ____ No later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall report to the Congressional Defense Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the status and improvement plan for all DODEA schools with an overall condition rating of Q3 (poor) or Q4 (failing) as identified in the October 2009 Report to Congress on Department of Defense

Education Activity's Military Construction Program.

Mrs. BOXER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 575

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 575.

The amendment (No. 575) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 577, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the Boxer amendment No. 577, as modified.

The amendment (No. 577), as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 564

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided on the Coburn amendment.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. This is a commonsense amendment that will secure this for veterans and make sure we are not paying for disabilities for those who are not truly service connected, that are not based on science or causation. I know it is a tough vote, but in the environment we face today we ought to be using science to positively connect causality with any disability we grant.

With that, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mrs. MURRAY. So my colleagues know, there is a reason we have made this type of compensation like Agent Orange presumptive. It is because our military did a miserable job of tracking these exposures, and it is because no veteran will ever be able to go to a map and tell you with certainty where they were exposed. No veteran will tell you what and how much of this poison Agent Orange they inhaled. So we have to look at the facts with reason and compassion, and in this case on the one hand we have the knowledge that we sprayed a known killer throughout the area where a number of these veterans were serving.

We have had thousands of veterans who have come forward and believe their cancers and ailments were caused by that exposure. We have studies that show veterans exposed to Agent Orange are more likely to have heart disease, cancer, and other conditions. We have the Institute of Medicine which has recommended giving these veterans the benefit of the doubt, and we have the Secretary of Veterans Affairs who has decided we need to move forward to provide compensation.

On the other hand, you have an amendment today—while it makes a compelling case for saving money, it hasn't presented any evidence at all that Agent Orange did not cause the conditions faced by these Vietnam veterans coming forward. An amendment that asks our veterans to wait longer? That is something they have already done too much of. They have been waiting and getting sicker. They have been dying for 40 years or more. We should not ask them to wait longer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Chair. I urge my colleagues to vote to table this amendment. And if the Senator wants to finish his remarks, I will move to table when he is finished.

Mr. COBURN. I wish to make one point. The Institute of Medicine did not recommend this. As a matter of fact, their recommendation was that causality ought to be the only way in which we would do this.

I would ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I move to table the amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be 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 Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 114 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Akaka	Hagan	Murkowski
Ayotte	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heller	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Hoeven	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Inhofe	Pryor
Bingaman	Inouye	Reed
Blumenthal	Isakson	Reid
Boxer	Johanns	Roberts
Brown (MA)	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Kerry	Rubio
Burr	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cantwell	Kohl	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Shaheen
Carper	Lautenberg	Snowe
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Levin	Tester
Conrad	Lieberman	Thune
Coons	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Franken	Merkley	Webb
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Grassley	Moran	Wyden

NAYS—30

Alexander	Cornyn	Kirk
Barrasso	Crapo	Kyl
Blunt	DeMint	Lee
Chambliss	Enzi	Lugar
Coats	Graham	McCain
Coburn	Hatch	McConnell
Cochran	Hutchison	Paul
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Portman

Risch Sessions Shelby Toomey Vitter Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Boozman

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to express my support for the fiscal year 2012 Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill.

As a nation we are dedicated to taking care of our troops, those same troops who deploy into harm's way regardless of whether we are able to come to an agreement on our debt ceiling.

We are also dedicated to upholding our commitment to our veterans who have fought past wars and did so because they believed in this country and the freedoms we all enjoy today.

This bill passed the Appropriations Committee unanimously on June 30, and I'm pleased the Senate moved quickly to bring this measure to the floor for debate.

Our Nation has been at war for almost a decade. We are involved in three wars. In support of our troops on the front lines, we need to make sure they have the infrastructure they need to train and the family housing facilities they deserve.

The bill includes \$11.1 billion for military construction worldwide to provide for barracks, readiness centers, schools, hospitals and clinics.

In particular, it provides the entire requested amount, \$1.2 billion, for reservist construction projects.

Several of these projects from the President's budget are in Illinois, totaling some \$146 million. The bill provides for Army Reserve centers in Homewood and Rockford, IL. It also provides for an Army National Guard Readiness Center in Normal, IL, as well as renovations to the Great Lakes Naval Station.

The bill provides funding for necessary projects like these all across the country.

Without them, our Guard and Reserve would struggle to maintain the training and preparations necessary in a time of war.

The bill also keeps our commitment to our veterans, some of whose lives have changed forever as a result of their service.

We are all committed to providing our veterans with the care, services and facilities they deserve, even in tough budget years.

As such, the bill provides VA medical research at \$72 million above the budget request for mental health, traumatic brain injury, spinal cord injury, burns and sensory loss.

These are key areas for a cohort of veterans who are surviving in larger numbers than previous wars due to improved medical care.

To take one example: Our men and women on the front lines are increasingly suffering brain injuries from improvised explosive device, IED, blasts.

While we have advanced our understanding of how traumatic brain injury, TBI, affects the brain, there is still a lot more to learn through this research.

This funding will also continue work with prosthetics. Walter Reed Army Medical Center has done amazing work with providing prosthetics that even help return some servicemembers to their pre-injury jobs in the military.

Many use their new prosthetics and relearn how to not only take care of themselves, but also ski, ride a bike, and even fish. Without this funding our troops and veterans would not have access to the amazing medical advances which make these activities possible.

Another key area of this bill fully funds the information technology infrastructure at the VA. This will allow the agency to continue developing and improving electronic health records, paperless claims systems, and implementing the seamless integration between the DOD and the VA.

These systems should help address the claims backlog—a problem our veterans deserve to have addressed.

Yes, the VA has expanded eligibility to include those exposed to Agent Orange, a policy long time coming. Yes, there are large numbers of OEF and OIF veterans submitting claims, an unfortunate state of events.

But not one of these veterans deserves to wait for months and years for a response to their disability claim. We can do better. And we must do better.

And for our veterans who have been severely injured as a result of their service and now require full-time care, the VA has already begun accepting applications for the Caregivers Program. Over 1,100 applications have been received nationwide by the end of last month.

I am proud to have helped create this program as part of the Caregiver and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2009.

The Caregiver Program helps keep the promise our country has made to our veterans by providing comfortable and dignified home care by a family member for post-9/11 veterans.

I have met several of these veterans and their caregivers in Illinois. It has been a long and winding road, but we are finally going in the right direction and supporting those families whose servicemember was severely injured.

This bill provides 100 percent of the President's request, \$208 million, for implementation of the Caregivers Program, and our veterans and their families are depending on the passage of this bill.

Americans are counting on us to pass bills and legislate. Our servicemembers are counting on us to fund their needs so they can get on with the business of keeping us safe. And our veterans are expecting us to honor our commitment and honor their service by paying for

the care and services they have so rightly earned.

Senator JOHNSON and Senator KIRK, the managers of this bill, have put a great deal of effort into creating a spending bill that is fiscally responsible without sacrificing the needs of our men and women in uniform. I look forward to the conclusion of debate on this bill and moving to final passage.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues two amendments that Senator WEBB and I have filed to the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for 2012.

Each of these amendments relates to the Navy's proposal to build a new nuclear pier facility to support east coast aircraft carriers. With annual recurring costs, this new project would likely cost just shy of a billion dollars.

At a time when our Nation is in a severe fiscal crisis and the Navy cannot pay to maintain the infrastructure it currently owns. As Admiral Mullen has said, the greatest challenge to our national security is our mounting debt.

Together, these amendments would save nearly \$15 million for an unnecessary Navy military construction project at Naval Station Mayport, FL. We are awaiting completion of an independent GAO assessment of the strategic risks to our carrier fleet which include manmade and natural disasters. It would also consider the cost and benefits of what other measures we can take to mitigate risk.

This is not a small project, the Navy estimates its homeporting plan will cost nearly \$600 million, but that cost could escalate to up to \$1 billion during the eight years ahead. Tack on to that more than \$20 million in annual maintenance costs currently estimated for an additional homeport and we are signing the taxpayer up for a big bill, much of which is not funded. It is in the "outyears" as they say.

The justification for a new homeport is the mitigation of the risk of a terrorist attack, accident, or natural disaster occurring at the nuclear handling facility at the existing carrier homeport at Norfolk, VA.

However, the current Navy plan fails to take into account the two additional east coast carrier capable facilities at Newport News, VA, and the Naval Shipyard. Each of these facilities maintains separate nuclear handling sites located many miles apart. If there were damage to the existing Naval base, the Navy could simply disperse the carriers to other piers. That is a lot cheaper and more efficient than building a new, duplicative facility.

Additionally, recent Navy briefings indicate there is a 50-percent greater chance of a major hurricane hitting Mayport than Norfolk. Why would we want to build a new facility at a higher risk location?

The Navy has also identified unfunded priorities totaling \$11.8 billion

between fiscal year 2008 and fiscal year 2012. These priorities are in critical areas including shipbuilding, military construction, maintenance, and acquisition programs—programs which are critical to both our current and future readiness.

We must maintain our existing infrastructure properly before pursuing a duplicative homeporting project. It is more fiscally responsible for the Navy to reduce its current unfunded requirements, which total tens of billions of dollars.

With our serious fiscal reality, it is much more responsible to focus on taking care of the infrastructure we have then embarking on buying new infrastructure which we cannot afford and piles more money onto our national debt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I would like to yield to Senator KIRK for any final remarks he may have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I remind Members, we are now moving to final passage on our first appropriations bill of this Congress. It has been 2 years since the Senate has passed a separate freestanding appropriations bill, but this is a bipartisan measure. It is marked to the House budget level, the Paul Ryan budget. We made difficult decisions cutting 24 separate military construction programs. We denied the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims a new building. We came in below the President, about \$1.2 billion below the President; \$620 million below last year, and even \$2.6 million below the House-passed bill.

This is the bill that takes care of over 22 million veterans and our military construction needs. I thank Chairman JOHNSON for his work as we get the Appropriations Committee going again in a bipartisan way.

With that, I yield back to the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, shortly we will be voting on final passage of the MILCON-VA appropriations bill. I would like to thank Leaders REID and MCCONNELL and Chairman INOUE and Vice Chairman COCHRAN for their leadership and support in getting us to this point.

I would especially like to thank my ranking member, Senator KIRK, for his

cooperation and support in crafting this bill and steering it through the Senate. I am confident we would not be where we are today without his help and hard work on this bill.

I also thank my colleagues for helping us to move this bill forward by rejecting dilatory amendments and by showing restraint in offering amendments to this bill. A number of Senators have filed amendments that are very important to them but are also controversial or not relevant to the bill. I appreciate their willingness to postpone debate on some of these issues so as not to bog down this bill.

For example, I know Senators WEBB and WARNER feel very strongly about their amendments regarding the homeporting of a Navy carrier on the east coast, and I know the Florida Senators have equally strong feelings on this subject. I understand the Defense authorization bill includes a provision mandating a GAO report on this issue, and I appreciate the willingness of both delegations to postpone the debate on the carrier issue so we can focus on timely passage of this appropriations bill.

Mr. President, I also thank the subcommittee staff who do the heavy lifting in the drafting and managing of the bill on the Senate floor.

As I have said many times, this is a good bill. It is bipartisan, and it is responsible. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. KIRK. If the Senator would yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. KIRK. I also thank Dave Schiappa, Laura Dove, and Ashley Messick on the Senate floor for guiding this bill through; Chairman INOUE and especially his staff director, Charlie Houy; Vice Chairman COCHRAN and his staff director, Bruce Evans.

I thank Chairman JOHNSON and especially Tina Evans, Chad Schulken, Andy Vanlandingham, Dennis Balkham, D'Ann Lettieri, and Patrick Magnuson who have brought this first appropriations bill of this Congress through.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 115 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Akaka	Grassley	Murkowski
Alexander	Hagan	Murray
Ayotte	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Barrasso	Hatch	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Heller	Paul
Begich	Hoeven	Portman
Bennet	Hutchison	Pryor
Bingaman	Inhofe	Reed
Blumenthal	Inouye	Reid
Blunt	Isakson	Risch
Boxer	Johnson	Roberts
Brown (MA)	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Burr	Kerry	Sanders
Cantwell	Kirk	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sessions
Carper	Kohl	Shaheen
Casey	Kyl	Shelby
Chambliss	Landrieu	Snowe
Coats	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Cochran	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Lee	Thune
Conrad	Levin	Toomey
Coons	Lieberman	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Lugar	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
DeMint	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Webb
Enzi	McConnell	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Menendez	Wicker
Franken	Merkeley	Wyden
Gillibrand	Mikulski	
Graham	Moran	

NAYS—2

Coburn

Corker

NOT VOTING—1

Boozman

The bill (H.R. 2055), as amended, was passed, as follows:

H.R. 2055

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 2055) entitled "An Act making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes.", do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, \$3,066,891,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: Provided, That of this amount, not to exceed \$255,241,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent pub-

lic works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy and Marine Corps as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$2,187,622,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: Provided, That of this amount, not to exceed \$84,362,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, \$1,227,058,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: Provided, That of this amount, not to exceed \$81,913,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, \$3,380,917,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: Provided, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as the Secretary may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: Provided further, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$439,602,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: Provided further, That of the amount appropriated, notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$24,118,000 shall be available for payments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for the planning, design, and construction of a new North Atlantic Treaty Organization headquarters.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$773,592,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: Provided, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$20,671,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Director of the Army National Guard determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both

Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$116,246,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: Provided, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$9,000,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Director of the Air National Guard determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$280,549,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: Provided, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$28,924,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of the Army determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$26,299,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: Provided, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$2,591,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of the Navy determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$33,620,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: Provided, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$2,200,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of the Air Force determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized by section 2806 of title 10, United States

Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$272,611,000, to remain available until expended.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$186,897,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, \$494,858,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$100,972,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, \$367,863,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$84,804,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, \$404,761,000.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, \$50,723,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, \$2,184,000, to remain available until expended, for family housing initiatives undertaken pursuant to section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, providing alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND

For the Homeowners Assistance Fund established by section 1013 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, (42 U.S.C. 3374), as amended by section 1001 of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5; 123 Stat. 194), \$1,284,000, to remain available until expended.

CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of construction, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for the

destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, as currently authorized by law, \$75,312,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, which shall be only for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives program.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 1990

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990, established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), \$323,543,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 2005

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005, established by section 2906A(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), \$258,776,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Department of Defense shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress 14 days prior to obligating an amount for a construction project that exceeds or reduces the amount identified for that project in the most recently submitted budget request for this account by 20 percent or \$2,000,000, whichever is less: Provided further, That the previous proviso shall not apply to projects costing less than \$5,000,000, except for those projects not previously identified in any budget submission for this account and exceeding the minor construction threshold under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds made available in this title shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for construction, where cost estimates exceed \$25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

SEC. 102. Funds made available in this title for construction shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Funds made available in this title for construction may be used for advances to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, for the construction of access roads as authorized by section 210 of title 23, United States Code, when projects authorized therein are certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 104. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to begin construction of new bases in the United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 100 percent of the value as determined by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, except:

- (1) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court;
- (2) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or the designee of the Attorney General;
- (3) where the estimated value is less than \$25,000; or
- (4) as otherwise determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the public interest.

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used to:

- (1) acquire land;
- (2) provide for site preparation; or
- (3) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been made available in annual Acts making appropriations for military construction.

SEC. 107. None of the funds made available in this title for minor construction may be used to transfer or relocate any activity from one base

or installation to another, without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 108. None of the funds made available in this title may be used for the procurement of steel for any construction project or activity for which American steel producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been denied the opportunity to compete for such steel procurement.

SEC. 109. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction or family housing during the current fiscal year may be used to pay real property taxes in any foreign nation.

SEC. 110. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to initiate a new installation overseas without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 111. None of the funds made available in this title may be obligated for architect and engineer contracts estimated by the Government to exceed \$500,000 for projects to be accomplished in Japan, in any North Atlantic Treaty Organization member country, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea, unless such contracts are awarded to United States firms or United States firms in joint venture with host nation firms.

SEC. 112. None of the funds made available in this title for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea, may be used to award any contract estimated by the Government to exceed \$1,000,000 to a foreign contractor: Provided, That this section shall not be applicable to contract awards for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a United States contractor exceeds the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a foreign contractor by greater than 20 percent: Provided further, That this section shall not apply to contract awards for military construction on Kwajalein Atoll for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid is submitted by a Marshallese contractor.

SEC. 113. The Secretary of Defense is to inform the appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress, including the Committees on Appropriations, of the plans and scope of any proposed military exercise involving United States personnel 30 days prior to its occurring, if amounts expended for construction, either temporary or permanent, are anticipated to exceed \$100,000.

SEC. 114. Not more than 20 percent of the funds made available in this title which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

SEC. 115. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be available for construction authorized for each such military department by the authorizations enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 116. For military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, expired or lapsed funds may be used to pay the cost of associated supervision, inspection, overhead, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds made available to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which funds for such project were made available, if the funds obligated for such project:

(1) are obligated from funds available for military construction projects; and

(2) do not exceed the amount appropriated for such project, plus any amount by which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 118. In addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, proceeds deposited to the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207(a)(1) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (10 U.S.C. 2687 note) pursuant to section 207(a)(2)(C) of such Act, may be transferred to the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), to be merged with, and to be available for the same purposes and the same time period as that account.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 119. Subject to 30 days prior notification, or 14 days for a notification provided in an electronic medium pursuant to sections 480 and 2883, of title 10, United States Code, to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, such additional amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to:

(1) the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund from amounts appropriated for construction in "Family Housing" accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund; or

(2) the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund from amounts appropriated for construction of military unaccompanied housing in "Military Construction" accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund: Provided, That appropriations made available to the Funds shall be available to cover the costs, as defined in section 502(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct loans or loan guarantees issued by the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing, military unaccompanied housing, and supporting facilities.

SEC. 120. (a) Not later than 60 days before issuing any solicitation for a contract with the private sector for military family housing the Secretary of the military department concerned shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the notice described in subsection (b).

(b)(1) A notice referred to in subsection (a) is a notice of any guarantee (including the making of mortgage or rental payments) proposed to be made by the Secretary to the private party under the contract involved in the event of—

(A) the closure or realignment of the installation for which housing is provided under the contract;

(B) a reduction in force of units stationed at such installation; or

(C) the extended deployment overseas of units stationed at such installation.

(2) Each notice under this subsection shall specify the nature of the guarantee involved and assess the extent and likelihood, if any, of the liability of the Federal Government with respect to the guarantee.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 121. In addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, amounts may be transferred from the accounts established by sections 2906(a)(1) and 2906A(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), to the fund established by section 1013(d) of the

Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3374) to pay for expenses associated with the Homeowners Assistance Program incurred under 42 U.S.C. 3374(a)(1)(A). Any amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the fund to which transferred.

SEC. 122. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this title for operation and maintenance of family housing shall be the exclusive source of funds for repair and maintenance of all family housing units, including general or flag officer quarters: Provided, That not more than \$35,000 per unit may be spent annually for the maintenance and repair of any general or flag officer quarters without 30 days prior notification, or 14 days for a notification provided in an electronic medium pursuant to sections 480 and 2883 of title 10, United States Code, to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, except that an after-the-fact notification shall be submitted if the limitation is exceeded solely due to costs associated with environmental remediation that could not be reasonably anticipated at the time of the budget submission: Provided further, That the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) is to report annually to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress all operation and maintenance expenditures for each individual general or flag officer quarters for the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 123. Amounts contained in the Ford Island Improvement Account established by subsection (h) of section 2814 of title 10, United States Code, are appropriated and shall be available until expended for the purposes specified in subsection (i)(1) of such section or until transferred pursuant to subsection (i)(3) of such section.

SEC. 124. None of the funds made available in this title, or in any Act making appropriations for military construction which remain available for obligation, may be obligated or expended to carry out a military construction, land acquisition, or family housing project at or for a military installation approved for closure, or at a military installation for the purposes of supporting a function that has been approved for realignment to another installation, in 2005 under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note), unless such a project at a military installation approved for realignment will support a continuing mission or function at that installation or a new mission or function that is planned for that installation, or unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that the cost to the United States of carrying out such project would be less than the cost to the United States of cancelling such project, or if the project is at an active component base that shall be established as an enclave or in the case of projects having multi-agency use, that another Government agency has indicated it will assume ownership of the completed project. The Secretary of Defense may not transfer funds made available as a result of this limitation from any military construction project, land acquisition, or family housing project to another account or use such funds for another purpose or project without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress. This section shall not apply to military construction projects, land acquisition, or family housing projects for which the project is vital to the national security or the protection of health, safety, or environmental quality: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees within seven days of a decision to carry out such a military construction project.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 125. During the 5-year period after appropriations available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing operation and maintenance and construction have expired for obligation, upon a determination that such appropriations will not be necessary for the liquidation of obligations or for making authorized adjustments to such appropriations for obligations incurred during the period of availability of such appropriations, unobligated balances of such appropriations may be transferred into the appropriation "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction, Defense", to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 126. Amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in an account funded under the headings in this title may be transferred among projects and activities within the account in accordance with the reprogramming guidelines for military construction and family housing construction contained in Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation 7000.14-R, Volume 3, Chapter 7, of February 2009, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 127. (a) CLOSURE OF UMATILLA ARMY CHEMICAL DEPOT, OREGON.—The closure of the Umatilla Army Chemical Depot, Oregon, and subsequent management and property disposal, may be carried out in accordance with procedures and authorities contained in the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(b) RETENTION OF PROPERTY AND FACILITIES.—The Secretary of the Army may retain minimum essential ranges, facilities, and training areas at Umatilla Army Chemical Depot, totaling approximately 7,500 acres, as a training enclave for the reserve components of the Armed Forces to permit the conduct of individual and annual training.

(c) OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Office of Economic Adjustment Activities of the Department of Defense may make grants and supplement other Federal funds, using funds made available by title, in connection with the closure and management and disposal provided for in this section, and the projects so supported shall be considered to be authorized by law.

SEC. 128. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this title may be obligated or expended for a permanent United States Africa Command headquarters outside of the United States until the Secretary of Defense provides the congressional defense committees an analysis of all military construction costs associated with establishing a permanent location overseas versus in the United States.

SEC. 129. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this title may be obligated or expended on a military construction project at Grafenwohr, Germany, or Baumholder, Germany, until the Secretary of the Army submits to Congress, in writing, a report on installations and properties in Germany that the Army intends to return to the host nation, including—

(1) intended timelines for closures along with the list of military construction projects required at other installations to facilitate the downsizing and consolidation of Army forces in Germany;

(2) an identification of the brigade combat team that will be withdrawn from Germany; and

(3) an estimate of costs (including operation and maintenance costs and military construction costs) to be incurred during fiscal years 2012 through 2015 in connection with keeping the brigade identified in Germany through Sep-

tember 30, 2015 versus stationing a similar brigade in the United States.

SEC. 130. No later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall report to the congressional defense committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the status and improvement plan for all DODEA schools with an overall condition rating of Q3 (poor) or Q4 (failing) as identified in the October 2009 Report to Congress on Department of Defense Education Activity's Military Construction Program.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation benefits to or on behalf of veterans and a pilot program for disability examinations as authorized by section 107 and chapters 11, 13, 18, 51, 53, 55, and 61 of title 38, United States Code; pension benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by chapters 15, 51, 53, 55, and 61 of title 38, United States Code; and burial benefits, the Reinstated Entitlement Program for Survivors, emergency and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits and certificates, payment of premiums due on commercial life insurance policies guaranteed under the provisions of title IV of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 541 et seq.) and for other benefits as authorized by sections 107, 1312, 1977, and 2106, and chapters 23, 51, 53, 55, and 61 of title 38, United States Code, \$58,067,319,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed \$32,187,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be reimbursed to "General operating expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration", "Medical support and compliance", and "Information technology systems" for necessary expenses in implementing the provisions of chapters 51, 53, and 55 of title 38, United States Code, the funding source for which is specifically provided as the "Compensation and pensions" appropriation: Provided further, That such sums as may be earned on an actual qualifying patient basis, shall be reimbursed to "Medical care collections fund" to augment the funding of individual medical facilities for nursing home care provided to pensioners as authorized.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by chapters 21, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 51, 53, 55, and 61 of title 38, United States Code, \$11,011,086,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That expenses for rehabilitation program services and assistance which the Secretary is authorized to provide under subsection (a) of section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, other than under paragraphs (1), (2), (5), and (11) of that subsection, shall be charged to this account.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, servicemen's indemnities, service-disabled veterans insurance, and veterans mortgage life insurance as authorized by title 38, United States Code, chapters 19 and 21, \$100,252,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS HOUSING BENEFIT PROGRAM FUND

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program, as authorized by subchapters I through III of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That dur-

ing fiscal year 2012, within the resources available, not to exceed \$500,000 in gross obligations for direct loans are authorized for specially adapted housing loans.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$154,698,000.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, \$19,000, as authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That funds made available under this heading are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$3,019,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, \$343,000, which may be paid to the appropriation for "General operating expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration".

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERAN HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program authorized by subchapter V of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, \$1,116,000.

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL SERVICES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs and veterans described in section 1705(a) of title 38, United States Code, including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Department, and including medical supplies and equipment, food services, and salaries and expenses of health care employees hired under title 38, United States Code, aid to State homes as authorized by section 1741 of title 38, United States Code, assistance and support services for caregivers as authorized by section 1720G of title 38, United States Code, and loan repayments authorized by section 604 of Public Law 111-163; \$41,354,000,000, plus reimbursements, shall become available on October 1, 2012, and shall remain available until September 30, 2013: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish a priority for the provision of medical treatment for veterans who have service-connected disabilities, lower income, or have special needs: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall give priority funding for the provision of basic medical benefits to veterans in enrollment priority groups 1 through 6: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may authorize the dispensing of prescription drugs from Veterans Health Administration facilities to enrolled veterans with privately written prescriptions based on requirements established by the Secretary: Provided further, That the implementation of the program described in the previous proviso shall incur no additional cost to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

MEDICAL SUPPORT AND COMPLIANCE

For necessary expenses in the administration of the medical, hospital, nursing home, domiciliary, construction, supply, and research activities, as authorized by law; administrative expenses in support of capital policy activities; and administrative and legal expenses of the Department for collecting and recovering amounts owed the Department as authorized under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code,

and the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651 et seq.); \$5,746,000,000, plus reimbursements, shall become available on October 1, 2012, and shall remain available until September 30, 2013.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities and other necessary facilities of the Veterans Health Administration; for administrative expenses in support of planning, design, project management, real property acquisition and disposition, construction, and renovation of any facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department; for oversight, engineering, and architectural activities not charged to project costs; for repairing, altering, improving, or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Department, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; for leases of facilities; and for laundry services, \$5,441,000,000, plus reimbursements, shall become available on October 1, 2012, and shall remain available until September 30, 2013.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For necessary expenses in carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development as authorized by chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, \$581,000,000, plus reimbursements, shall remain available until September 30, 2013.

NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the National Cemetery Administration for operations and maintenance, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor; cemeterial expenses as authorized by law; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for use in cemeterial operations; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and repair, alteration or improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the National Cemetery Administration, \$250,934,000, of which not to exceed \$25,100,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2013.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary operating expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses in support of Department-Wide capital planning, management and policy activities, uniforms, or allowances therefor; not to exceed \$25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, \$431,257,000, of which not to exceed \$21,562,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2013: Provided, That \$15,000,000 shall be to increase the Department's acquisition workforce capacity and capabilities and may be transferred by the Secretary to any other account in the Department to carry out the purposes provided therein: Provided further, That funds provided under this heading may be transferred to "General operating expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration".

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES, VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Benefits Administration, not otherwise provided for, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and reimbursement of the Department of Defense for the cost of overseas employee mail, \$2,018,764,000: Provided, That expenses for services and assistance authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), (5), and (11) of section 3104(a) of title 38, United States Code, that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines are necessary to

enable entitled veterans: (1) to the maximum extent feasible, to become employable and to obtain and maintain suitable employment; or (2) to achieve maximum independence in daily living, shall be charged to this account: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed \$105,000,000 shall remain available until September 20, 2013: Provided further, That from the funds made available under this heading, the Veterans Benefits Administration may purchase (on a one-for-one replacement basis only) up to two passenger motor vehicles for use in operations of that Administration in Manila, Philippines.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS

For necessary expenses for information technology systems and telecommunications support, including developmental information systems and operational information systems; for pay and associated costs; and for the capital asset acquisition of information technology systems, including management and related contractual costs of said acquisitions, including contractual costs associated with operations authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, \$3,161,376,000, plus reimbursements: Provided, That \$915,000,000 shall be for pay and associated costs, of which not to exceed \$25,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2013: Provided further, That \$1,709,953,000 shall be for operations and maintenance as designated in the President's 2012 budget justification, of which not to exceed \$110,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2013: Provided further, That \$536,423,000 shall be for information technology systems development, modernization, and enhancement as designated in the President's 2012 budget justification, and shall remain available until September 30, 2013: Provided further, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be obligated until the Department of Veterans Affairs submits to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, and such Committees approve, a plan for expenditure that:

(1) meets the capital planning and investment control review requirements established by the Office of Management and Budget;

(2) complies with the Department of Veterans Affairs enterprise architecture;

(3) conforms with an established enterprise life cycle methodology; and

(4) complies with the acquisition rules, requirements, guidelines, and systems acquisition management practices of the Federal Government: Provided further, That amounts made available for information technology systems development, modernization, and enhancement may not be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Veterans Affairs submits to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a certification of the amounts, in parts or in full, to be obligated and expended for each development project: Provided further, That amounts made available for salaries and expenses, operations and maintenance, and information technology systems development, modernization, and enhancement may be transferred among the three subaccounts after the Secretary of Veterans Affairs requests from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued: Provided further, That the funds made available under this heading for information technology systems development, modernization, and enhancement, shall be for the projects and in the amounts, specified under this heading in the report accompanying this Act.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, to include information tech-

nology, in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), \$112,391,000, of which \$6,600,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2013.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities, including parking projects, under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, and 8122 of title 38, United States Code, including planning, architectural and engineering services, construction management services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is more than the amount set forth in section 8104(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code, or where funds for a project were made available in a previous major project appropriation, \$589,604,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$5,000,000 shall be to make reimbursements as provided in section 13 of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 612) for claims paid for contract disputes: Provided, That except for advance planning activities, including needs assessments which may or may not lead to capital investments, and other capital asset management related activities, including portfolio development and management activities, and investment strategy studies funded through the advance planning fund and the planning and design activities funded through the design fund, including needs assessments which may or may not lead to capital investments, and salaries and associated costs of the resident engineers who oversee those capital investments funded through this account, and funds provided for the purchase of land for the National Cemetery Administration through the land acquisition line item, none of the funds made available under this heading shall be used for any project which has not been approved by the Congress in the budgetary process: Provided further, That funds made available under this heading for fiscal year 2012, for each approved project shall be obligated:

(1) by the awarding of a construction documents contract by September 30, 2012; and

(2) by the awarding of a construction contract by September 30, 2013: Provided further, That the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall promptly submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a written report on any approved major construction project for which obligations are not incurred within the time limitations established above.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities, including parking projects, under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including planning and assessments of needs which may lead to capital investments, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, 8122, and 8162 of title 38, United States Code, where the estimated cost of a project is equal to or less than the amount set forth in section 8104(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code, \$550,091,000, to remain available until expended, along with unobligated balances of previous "Construction, minor projects" appropriations which are hereby made available for any project where the estimated cost is equal

to or less than the amount set forth in such section: Provided, That funds made available under this heading shall be for:

(1) repairs to any of the nonmedical facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department which are necessary because of loss or damage caused by any natural disaster or catastrophe; and

(2) temporary measures necessary to prevent or to minimize further loss by such causes.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

For grants to assist States to acquire or construct State nursing home and domiciliary facilities and to remodel, modify, or alter existing hospital, nursing home, and domiciliary facilities in State homes, for furnishing care to veterans as authorized by sections 8131 through 8137 of title 38, United States Code, \$85,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF VETERANS CEMETERIES

For grants to assist States and tribal governments in establishing, expanding, or improving veterans cemeteries as authorized by section 2408 of title 38, United States Code, \$46,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 201. Any appropriation for fiscal year 2012 for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred as necessary to any other of the mentioned appropriations: Provided, That before a transfer may take place, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall request from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and such Committees issue an approval, or absent a response, a period of 30 days has elapsed.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 202. Amounts made available for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2012, in this Act or any other Act, under the "Medical services", "Medical support and compliance", and "Medical facilities" accounts may be transferred among the accounts: Provided, That any transfers between the "Medical services" and "Medical support and compliance" accounts of 1 percent or less of the total amount appropriated to the account in this or any other Act may take place subject to notification from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the amount and purpose of the transfer: Provided further, That any transfers between the "Medical services" and "Medical support and compliance" accounts in excess of 1 percent, or exceeding the cumulative 1 percent for the fiscal year, may take place only after the Secretary requests from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued: Provided further, That any transfers to or from the "Medical facilities" account may take place only after the Secretary requests from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued.

SEC. 203. Appropriations available in this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, hire of passenger motor vehicles; lease of a facility or land or both; and uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by sections 5901 through 5902 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 204. No appropriations in this title (except the appropriations for "Construction, major projects", and "Construction, minor projects") shall be available for the purchase of

any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

SEC. 205. No appropriations in this title shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons (except beneficiaries entitled to such hospitalization or examination under the laws providing such benefits to veterans, and persons receiving such treatment under sections 7901 through 7904 of title 5, United States Code, or the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)), unless reimbursement of the cost of such hospitalization or examination is made to the "Medical services" account at such rates as may be fixed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 206. Appropriations available in this title for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" shall be available for payment of prior year accrued obligations required to be recorded by law against the corresponding prior year accounts within the last quarter of fiscal year 2011.

SEC. 207. Appropriations available in this title shall be available to pay prior year obligations of corresponding prior year appropriations accounts resulting from sections 3328(a), 3334, and 3712(a) of title 31, United States Code, except that if such obligations are from trust fund accounts they shall be payable only from "Compensation and pensions".

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 208. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during fiscal year 2012, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, from the National Service Life Insurance Fund under section 1920 of title 38, United States Code, the Veterans' Special Life Insurance Fund under section 1923 of title 38, United States Code, and the United States Government Life Insurance Fund under section 1955 of title 38, United States Code, reimburse the "General operating expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration" and "Information technology systems" accounts for the cost of administration of the insurance programs financed through those accounts: Provided, That reimbursement shall be made only from the surplus earnings accumulated in such an insurance program during fiscal year 2012 that are available for dividends in that program after claims have been paid and actuarially determined reserves have been set aside: Provided further, That if the cost of administration of such an insurance program exceeds the amount of surplus earnings accumulated in that program, reimbursement shall be made only to the extent of such surplus earnings: Provided further, That the Secretary shall determine the cost of administration for fiscal year 2012 which is properly allocable to the provision of each such insurance program and to the provision of any total disability income insurance included in that insurance program.

SEC. 209. Amounts deducted from enhanced-use lease proceeds to reimburse an account for expenses incurred by that account during a prior fiscal year for providing enhanced-use lease services, may be obligated during the fiscal year in which the proceeds are received.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 210. Funds available in this title or funds for salaries and other administrative expenses shall also be available to reimburse the Office of Resolution Management of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Office of Employment Discrimination Complaint Adjudication under section 319 of title 38, United States Code, for all services provided at rates which will recover actual costs but not exceed \$42,904,000 for the Office of Resolution Management and \$3,360,000 for the Office of Employment and Discrimination Complaint Adjudication: Provided, That

payments may be made in advance for services to be furnished based on estimated costs: Provided further, That amounts received shall be credited to the "General administration" and "Information technology systems" accounts for use by the office that provided the service.

SEC. 211. No appropriations in this title shall be available to enter into any new lease of real property if the estimated annual rental cost is more than \$1,000,000, unless the Secretary submits a report which the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress approve within 30 days following the date on which the report is received.

SEC. 212. No funds of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall be available for hospital care, nursing home care, or medical services provided to any person under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, for a non-service-connected disability described in section 1729(a)(2) of such title, unless that person has disclosed to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in such form as the Secretary may require, current, accurate third-party reimbursement information for purposes of section 1729 of such title: Provided, That the Secretary may recover, in the same manner as any other debt due the United States, the reasonable charges for such care or services from any person who does not make such disclosure as required: Provided further, That any amounts so recovered for care or services provided in a prior fiscal year may be obligated by the Secretary during the fiscal year in which amounts are received.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 213. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, proceeds or revenues derived from enhanced-use leasing activities (including disposal) may be deposited into the "Construction, major projects" and "Construction, minor projects" accounts and be used for construction (including site acquisition and disposition), alterations, and improvements of any medical facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Such sums as realized are in addition to the amount provided for in "Construction, major projects" and "Construction, minor projects".

SEC. 214. Amounts made available under "Medical services" are available—

(1) for furnishing recreational facilities, supplies, and equipment; and

(2) for funeral expenses, burial expenses, and other expenses incidental to funerals and burials for beneficiaries receiving care in the Department.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 215. Such sums as may be deposited to the Medical Care Collections Fund pursuant to section 1729A of title 38, United States Code, may be transferred to "Medical services", to remain available until expended for the purposes of that account.

SEC. 216. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may enter into agreements with Indian tribes and tribal organizations which are party to the Alaska Native Health Compact with the Indian Health Service, and Indian tribes and tribal organizations serving rural Alaska which have entered into contracts with the Indian Health Service under the Indian Self Determination and Educational Assistance Act, to provide healthcare, including behavioral health and dental care. The Secretary shall require participating veterans and facilities to comply with all appropriate rules and regulations, as established by the Secretary. The term "rural Alaska" shall mean those lands sited within the external boundaries of the Alaska Native regions specified in sections 7(a)(1)-(4) and (7)-(12) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1606), and those lands within the Alaska Native regions specified in sections 7(a)(5) and 7(a)(6) of the Alaska Native

Claims Settlement Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1606), which are not within the boundaries of the Municipality of Anchorage, the Fairbanks North Star Borough, the Kenai Peninsula Borough or the Matanuska Susitna Borough.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 217. Such sums as may be deposited to the Department of Veterans Affairs Capital Asset Fund pursuant to section 8118 of title 38, United States Code, may be transferred to the "Construction, major projects" and "Construction, minor projects" accounts, to remain available until expended for the purposes of these accounts.

SEC. 218. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to implement any policy prohibiting the Directors of the Veterans Integrated Services Networks from conducting outreach or marketing to enroll new veterans within their respective Networks.

SEC. 219. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a quarterly report on the financial status of the Veterans Health Administration.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 220. Amounts made available under the "Medical services", "Medical support and compliance", "Medical facilities", "General operating expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration", "General administration", and "National cemetery administration" accounts for fiscal year 2012, may be transferred to or from the "Information technology systems" account: Provided, That before a transfer may take place, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall request from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 221. Amounts made available for the "Information technology systems" account for development, modernization, and enhancement may be transferred between projects or to newly defined projects: Provided, That no project may be increased or decreased by more than \$1,000,000 of cost prior to submitting a request to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress to make the transfer and an approval is issued, or absent a response, a period of 30 days has elapsed.

SEC. 222. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs may be used in a manner that is inconsistent with—

(1) section 842 of the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-115; 119 Stat. 2506); or

(2) section 8110(a)(5) of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 223. Of the amounts made available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2012, in this Act or any other Act, under the "Medical facilities" account for non-recurring maintenance, not more than 20 percent of the funds made available shall be obligated during the last 2 months of that fiscal year: Provided, That the Secretary may waive this requirement after providing written notice to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 224. Of the amounts appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2011 for "Medical services", "Medical support and compliance", "Medical facilities", "Construction, minor projects", and "Information technology systems", up to \$241,666,000, plus reimbursements, may be transferred to the Joint

Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund, established by section 1704 of title XVII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 3571) and may be used for operation of the facilities designated as combined Federal medical facilities as described by section 706 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4500): Provided, That additional funds may be transferred from accounts designated in this section to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund upon written notification by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 225. Such sums as may be deposited to the Medical Care Collections Fund pursuant to section 1729A of title 38, United States Code, for healthcare provided at facilities designated as combined Federal medical facilities as described by section 706 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4500) shall also be available:

(1) for transfer to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund, established by section 1704 of title XVII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 3571); and

(2) for operations of the facilities designated as combined Federal medical facilities as described by section 706 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4500).

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 226. Of the amounts available in this title for "Medical services", "Medical support and compliance", and "Medical facilities", a minimum of \$15,000,000, shall be transferred to the Department of Defense/Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund, as authorized by section 8111(d) of title 38, United States Code, to remain available until expended, for any purpose authorized by section 8111 of title 38, United States Code.

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

SEC. 227. (a) Of the funds appropriated in title X of division B of Public Law 112-10, the following amounts which will become available on October 1, 2011, are hereby rescinded from the following accounts in the amounts specified:

(1) "Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical services", \$1,400,000,000.

(2) "Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical support and compliance", \$100,000,000.

(3) "Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical facilities", \$250,000,000.

(b) In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, an additional amount is appropriated to the following accounts in the amounts specified, to become available on October 1, 2011, and to remain available until September 30, 2013:

(1) "Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical services", \$1,400,000,000.

(2) "Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical support and compliance", \$100,000,000.

(3) "Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical facilities", \$250,000,000.

SEC. 228. The Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of all bid savings in major construction projects that total at least \$5,000,000, or 5 percent of the programmed amount of the project, whichever is less: Provided, That such notification shall occur within 14 days of a contract identifying the programmed amount: Provided further, That

the Secretary shall notify the committees 14 days prior to the obligation of such bid savings and shall describe the anticipated use of such savings.

SEC. 229. The scope of work for a project included in "Construction, major projects" may not be increased above the scope specified for that project in the original justification data provided to the Congress as part of the request for appropriations.

SEC. 230. (a) Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in coordination with the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report, in writing, on the plans of the Secretary to make available to injured members of the Armed Forces and veterans the next generation of advanced prosthetics.

(b) The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Details of the strategic plan and timetable of the Secretary to make available to injured members of the Armed Forces and veterans the next generation of advanced prosthetics

(2) A description of the challenges, both technical and administrative, that could delay injured members of the Armed Forces and veterans access to prosthetics described in paragraph (1).

(3) The plans of the Secretary to address these challenges described under paragraph (2).

TITLE III

RELATED AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one-for-one replacement basis only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$7,500 for official reception and representation expenses; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by law of such countries, \$61,100,000, to remain available until expended.

FOREIGN CURRENCY FLUCTUATIONS ACCOUNT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, for purposes authorized by section 2109 of title 36, United States Code.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR

VETERANS CLAIMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims as authorized by sections 7251 through 7298 of title 38, United States Code, \$30,770,000: Provided, That \$2,726,323 shall be available for the purpose of providing financial assistance as described, and in accordance with the process and reporting procedures set forth, under this heading in Public Law 102-229.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, including

the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$45,800,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds available under this heading shall be for construction of a perimeter wall at Arlington National Cemetery. In addition, such sums as may be necessary for parking maintenance, repairs and replacement, to be derived from the Lease of Department of Defense Real Property for Defense Agencies account.

Funds appropriated under this Act may be provided to Arlington County, Virginia, for the relocation of the federally owned water main at Arlington National Cemetery making additional land available for ground burials.

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME
TRUST FUND

For expenses necessary for the Armed Forces Retirement Home to operate and maintain the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Washington, District of Columbia, and the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Gulfport, Mississippi, to be paid from funds available in the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund, \$67,700,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall remain available until expended for construction and renovation of the physical plants at the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Washington, District of Columbia, and the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Gulfport, Mississippi.

SEC. 301. Not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Executive Director of Arlington National Cemetery shall provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives; the Senate Armed Services Committee; the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee; and the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, detailing the strategic plan and timetable to modernize the Cemetery's Information Technology system, including electronic burial records. The report should also include a description of the steps taken by the Executive Director in 2011 to implement information technology and management systems improvements, and identify any remaining information technology and systems infrastructure needs of Arlington National Cemetery.

TITLE IV
GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 402. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2012 for pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 403. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any program, project, or activity, when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that the program, project, or activity is not in compliance with any Federal law relating to risk assessment, the protection of private property rights, or unfunded mandates.

SEC. 404. No part of any funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by an agency of the executive branch, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, and for the preparation, distribution, or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television, or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress, except in presentation to Congress itself.

SEC. 405. All departments and agencies funded under this Act are encouraged, within the limits of the existing statutory authorities and funding, to expand their use of "E-Commerce" technologies and procedures in the conduct of their business practices and public service activities.

SEC. 406. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 407. Unless stated otherwise, all reports and notifications required by this Act shall be submitted to the Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 408. (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this Act, shall, subject to subsections (b) and (c), post on the public website of that agency any report required to be submitted by the Congress in this or any other Act, upon the determination by the head of the agency that it shall serve the national interest.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a report if—

(1) the public posting of the report compromises national security; or
(2) the report contains confidential or proprietary information.

(c) The head of the agency posting such report shall do so only after such report has been made available to the requesting Committee or Committees of Congress for no less than 45 days.

SEC. 409. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense in this Act may be used to construct, renovate, or expand any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense unless authorized by Congress.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

This Act may be cited as the "Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate insists on its amendment, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair appoints:

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. INOUE, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. TESTER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. COATS, and Mr. COCHRAN, conferees on the part of the Senate.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for the work they have done on this bill. It took a little longer than we wanted, but they got it done. They have been excellent managers of this important legislation. It is our first appropriations bill. Senator MCCONNELL and I want to do other appropriations bills. It would be a new day to do these bills rather than having a big omnibus bill. Again, I express my appreciation to the managers.

There will be no more rollcall votes today. Tomorrow, I am going to move

to proceed to the bill that we call the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill received from the House today. Under the rules of the Senate, a cloture vote on the motion to proceed will occur Saturday. Therefore, I expect a cloture vote sometime before lunchtime.

I am committed to allowing a full and fair debate on this bill. I want the proponents and the opponents to have plenty of time to air their views. If the proponents of the bill would like to have the vote sooner, they can let me know and we will try to work something out. There may be efforts to try to advance that vote. As far as I am concerned, we should have a full and fair debate, and I look forward to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me echo the remarks of the majority leader regarding the chairman and the ranking members of this subcommittee, who have done a fine job. I commend Senator KIRK, who has served around here for the last couple of years. It is truly remarkable to pass an appropriations bill. We passed it at a level where it is likely to be conferred successfully with the House. I congratulate both Senators—in particular our new Senator from Illinois.

I also share the view of the majority leader that we should have a vigorous debate over cut, cap, and balance. I look forward to being here Saturday to vote to proceed to that bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. 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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now 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.

Mr. REID. 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. KIRK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILCON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I extend my thanks to Chairman JOHNSON

again. This bill passed by a vote of 97 to 2. It is the first appropriations bill separately passed by the Senate since November of 2009. It represents a substantial achievement of bipartisan cooperation between the majority and minority. It meets the needs of our over 22 million veterans and the military construction needs of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and allied services around the world.

I am happy that the Senate has begun working again on separate appropriations bills. I commend Chairman INOUE and Vice Chairman COCHRAN for moving forward, as well as the leadership staff. I only hope that further subcommittees can bring other bills forward, as Chairman JOHNSON and I have done, to return regular order to the Senate and its appropriations process.

With that, 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. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. THUNE. I have been coming to the floor for several weeks to talk about the need to restrain spending and cut our deficit. As we look at the next few days, we are going to have an opportunity to debate something that does that. We are going to be talking about the Cut, Cap, and Balance plan.

The third part of the plan—the balanced budget amendment—is something I have supported since I first ran for the House of Representatives about 15 years ago. This past week, I received a letter from a Boy Scout in South Dakota, who was writing in to earn a merit badge. I will read an excerpt from the letter. This is what he said:

I feel that the Federal Government needs a balanced budget. If we don't, the debt gets larger each year. I feel that there are two solutions for this. In our house, we are careful to only spend what my Mom and Dad earn. The needs come first and what is left is for wants. Many times we were told no when we asked for something. With my allowance and lawn mowing money, I divide it between donations, savings and spending. I can't spend more than I make.

I think there are two very powerful thoughts in this statement. First is that the need for a balanced budget is obvious—even to this young man because, like him, we cannot spend more than we make. The second is that this

has a profound impact on the younger generation. The debts we are running up now will have profound impacts on our children and our grandchildren.

The Senator from New Hampshire is on the floor. She is fairly new to the Senate, but she has already had an immediate impact on many of these budget debates. She is also the mother of two young children, each of whom is carrying a \$46,000 debt. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire about those two young children and the \$46,000 burden that has been placed on them by the \$14.3 trillion national debt we have. Does she feel comfortable having her children essentially owe \$46,000 of this massive national debt we have accumulated now for the past several years?

Ms. AYOTTE. I thank my colleague from South Dakota. This is such an important issue, as he has pointed out, and as his constituent has written him.

As a mother of two children, I am deeply concerned with what is going to happen to the next generation if we continue to kick this can down the road and if we don't use common sense to balance our budget.

I have heard from constituents in New Hampshire—and I am sure the Senator from South Dakota hears the same—that basically only in Washington would the notion of balancing your budget be called “extreme.”

It is common sense that you can't spend more money than you have. We need to pass the Cut, Cap, and Balance plan, because it is a commonsense proposal to ensure that we don't continue along this cycle of continuing to increase our debt and not have a plan to pay our bills.

And borrowing money from China—that has to stop. When you think about all the money we have borrowed from a country such as China, which doesn't share our values—right now, there is no other plan that has been presented but the Cut, Cap, and Balance plan, which was just passed by the House. We can do this now and put our nation on a path to a balanced budget and make sure that the Senator's constituents—and I know he is a father as well—and our children don't bear the burden of our failure to make the tough decisions today. We owe it not only to everybody in our generation but to our children and our grandchildren.

I wanted to ask the Senator from South Dakota this: The cut, cap, and balance plan puts emphasis on cutting spending instead of raising taxes to bring down our deficit and our \$14 trillion debt. Does he believe that is the right approach for America?

Mr. THUNE. Absolutely. I say to my colleague from New Hampshire that the cut, cap, and balance approach is the correct way to approach this problem, because it makes cuts to spending today—real cuts—this year, to this year's budget. It caps spending in the near term, and then it puts into place

a balanced budget amendment that would require Congress to balance its budget in the future years. Obviously, that is something many States have. My State of South Dakota has that. I know that the “live free or die” State of New Hampshire has some very distinct and direct views about the role of government and making its role limited, keeping spending under control, and living within your means.

Cut, cap, and balance is the correct approach because it puts the emphasis on getting spending under control. If you look at the five times our country balanced the budget since 1969, the average amount we spent was just under 18.7 percent of GDP—our entire economy. This year, we are set to spend 24.3 percent of our GDP. That is just on the Federal Government—a historic high.

The President spends substantially above this average in his budget for every year. You literally have to go back to the end of World War II to find a time when we spent this amount as a percentage of GDP on the Federal Government.

Part of the reason for this is the huge increase we have seen in nondefense discretionary spending from 2008 to 2010. In those 2 years, in which the economy was hurting and families everywhere were cutting back, these accounts increased by a mind-boggling 24 percent.

This year, part of our deficit is also caused by low tax receipts, which are caused by a slow economic recovery. If you look at the tax revenue that we brought in in 2006 and 2007, we brought in over 18 percent of GDP in both years. So if we are able to constrain spending, we know we will be able to balance our budget once our economy improves.

I argue that one of the ways we help our economy improve and get back on track is to get Federal spending under control. In 2006 and 2007, the income Tax Code—the way we collected taxes was similar to what we have today. We brought in over 18 percent of GDP in both of those years. So if we get back to a more normal footing in terms of the economy, we will see revenues start to come back. But we have to get spending controlled and actually start to rein in the out-of-control spending we are seeing here in Washington, DC.

If there is still a gap, even if we get back to 18 percent of GDP in terms of what we collect in the form of tax receipts, there is still 23, 24, 25 percent of GDP that the President wants to be comprised of Federal spending. The gap cannot be met through tax increases. It has to be dealt with through spending restraint.

A couple of years ago—and I want to get back to my colleague from New Hampshire in just a moment—Senator AYOTTE's predecessor in this job, Senator Gregg of New Hampshire, who was a great fiscal mind around here and

somebody who was very focused on spending and debt, along with Congressman RYAN, asked the Congressional Budget Office to estimate how high tax rates would have to rise to pay for our projected spending. CBO's response had two parts. First, they said marginal rates would have to more than double to cover the expected expenditures of our government. They said:

The tax rate for the lowest tax bracket would have to be increased from 10 percent to 25 percent. The tax rate on incomes in the current 25 percent bracket would have to be increased to 63 percent. And the tax rate at the highest bracket would have to be raised from 35 percent to 88 percent. The top corporate income tax rate would also increase from 35 percent to 88 percent.

That is a quote from the Congressional Budget Office in response to an inquiry from Senator Gregg and Congressman RYAN about what the tax rates would have to be in order to get our budget back into balance.

CBO also said that, practically speaking, this is impossible; you cannot increase tax rates and create this huge disincentive that would have a profound impact on our economy and our ability to create jobs.

So we know that amount of revenue would never be collected when you raise tax rates that high. We know the real way to deal with the budget and to get the budget balanced and under control in this country is to get spending under control. So I think the cut, cap, and balance approach is the correct way in which to proceed because it puts that focus on spending. We need to make sure to constrain spending and live within our means. The cut, cap, and balance approach does that.

By the way, I would like to make one observation about that because there are people who have said the balanced budget amendment that has been proposed by Republicans is too Draconian and won't work. The cut, cap, and balance plan doesn't specify or prescribe a specific balanced budget amendment; it just says a balanced budget amendment.

I think my colleagues on this side would be more than happy to work with our colleagues on the other side to come up with a balanced budget amendment that actually would work to ensure we don't spend more than we take in each and every year, which is what almost every State in the country has in its constitution. That is why they are able to live within their means.

I would say to my colleague from New Hampshire, I am told she recently held a townhall meeting back in New Hampshire, and I am interested in knowing what her constituents had to say because I think New Hampshire has always been a good barometer when it comes to fiscal issues. What did they think about the crisis we are facing? Do they believe the way we ought to

deal with this would be to constrain spending and to get our budget balanced in that way, as opposed to moving toward raising taxes, which is what many of our colleagues on the Democratic side and the President have suggested doing?

Ms. AYOTTE. I thank my colleague. What I have heard from my constituents in New Hampshire—and we do have a requirement to balance our budget, and it is not easy to make those tough choices—is that they do not understand why in Washington there is controversy over the notion of balancing the budget because at home people are balancing their budgets. Families balance their budgets, and businesses balance their budgets.

I meet with businesspeople, and they look at me in disbelief and say: I don't understand why in Washington they don't look at what they have to spend and then stick within a strict budget. It really comes down to common sense.

One of the biggest issues I have heard about from my constituents is that they are concerned that it has been over 2 years—over 800 days—since the Democrat-controlled Senate last passed a budget. The notion that we have been operating without a budget and running well over trillion-dollar deficits and haven't sat down and done the hard work of rolling up our sleeves, allowing the Budget Committee to do its work, astounds New Hampshire citizens because they understand that if we don't have a basic spending blueprint for our country, the end result is that we are going to continue to run up deficits and spend money we don't have, borrowing from countries such as China, which doesn't share our values.

One of the things that is very important about this cut, cap, and balance plan is that it cuts \$111 billion in fiscal year 2012 and it places firm caps on future spending, contingent upon the House and Senate passing a balanced budget amendment, which is so important.

As we have talked about, let's let the States decide. Really, this is about sending it to the people of this country and allowing them to say whether we should balance our budget. I know what the answer will be in New Hampshire. They will say: Yes, please, balance the budget.

If you look at where we are, as Senator THUNE has mentioned, with respect to spending in terms of the size of our economy, we are over 24 percent of our GDP that we are spending right now—well above our historical level, well above the amount of money we are bringing in. Yet the only fiscal plan the President brought forward would massively increase our debt over the next decade, so much so that not even one Member of his own party in the Senate voted for that budget.

So when we talk about a real plan to get America back on track, this cut,

cap, and balance plan has a very commonsense approach. We will cut spending right away, put together a responsible fiscal plan for America, and then make sure we have those caps in place so we don't continue to spend close to 24, 25 percent of our GDP. I mean, the President has increased our debt 35 percent since he has been in office.

Finally, let's put to the States the question of whether they think it makes sense to balance our budget. I think we know what the answer will be. They will say: Yes, please balance your budget, as we have to do at home, as we do in State government.

The other issue we are facing right now is, of course, what the rating agencies have said about our failure to handle this fiscal crisis. We have heard about the concerns that if we do not come up with a credible plan that really cuts spending right now, our credit ratings will be threatened. That will further impact our economy, and that is why we can't continue to put off the tough decisions. This cut, cap, and balance plan will put forward \$6 trillion of cuts over the next decade. That will help make sure we preserve our credit ratings for this country. It will make sure we focus on real economic growth that get people back to work.

If we raise taxes the way CBO has suggested based on the questions from Senator Gregg and Congressman RYAN, we know that is going to hurt the American taxpayer. It is going to hurt job creators in this country.

I also happen to come from a small business family. I know the impact of raising taxes in the way that was described. If we have to raise taxes to address the spending problem we have in Washington, it is going to hurt our small businesses—those who create the jobs in this country—and that is the last thing we should be doing when we have over a 9-percent unemployment rate.

So I hope my colleagues will pass the cut, cap, and balance plan right away. The House has passed it, and we can raise the debt ceiling with a responsible plan to cut spending right away, impose spending caps, and send a balanced budget amendment to the States.

I would ask my colleague from South Dakota, when the Senator was first elected, before he served in the Senate, I know he had a career in the House of Representatives and served the people of South Dakota there. There was a vote on the balanced budget amendment at the time in the Senate, and it only failed by one vote. What does the Senator believe our current fiscal situation would be had the balanced budget amendment passed the Senate at that time?

Mr. THUNE. What is remarkable about that is when I first got here, there was a vote in the Senate in 1997. We didn't have the opportunity to vote

on it in the House of Representatives, although I think we could have passed it with a two-thirds majority there at the time. It failed in the Senate by one vote. It got 66 votes in the Senate and it needed 67.

I can't help but think how different things would be today had we passed the balance budget amendment then and sent it to the States. I presume, as does the Senator—and New Hampshire is not unlike South Dakota—that we would certainly have ratified it. The 38 States would have ratified it, and it would have put us on a path that is fiscally sustainable. Ironically, at that time the debt was about \$5 trillion. We are talking about \$14 trillion today. Back then, it was \$5 trillion. So that is a \$9 trillion increase. If we had passed a balanced budget amendment, we wouldn't have run up this debt.

Now, it is interesting because—and I will point this out to my colleague from New Hampshire too—if you go back 29 years ago this week, President Reagan led a rally of people—thousands of people on the Capitol—calling for a balanced budget amendment. He said:

Crisis is a much abused word, but can we deny that we face a crisis?

I would say to my colleague from New Hampshire that the Federal debt at that time was \$1 trillion, and President Reagan thought that was a crisis at that time. Obviously, we are in a situation now where the debt is 14 times that amount—\$14 trillion since President Reagan 29 years ago suggested we needed a balanced budget amendment because of the debt crisis we faced then.

A lot of our Democratic colleagues say we just need to balance our budget; we don't need a balanced budget amendment. My response to them is, as the Senator from New Hampshire pointed out, where is your plan? We have been sitting here for 812 days since the Democrats passed a budget in the Senate, and even then that was a budget that didn't balance. The President's budget submitted earlier this year, as the Senator from New Hampshire pointed out, was rejected by the Senate 97 to 0. When the President sent a budget up here, it was actually voted on in the Senate and didn't get a single vote, either Democrat or Republican. So the President took a mulligan on that budget, and he gave a speech outlining the framework for how he would cut the deficit. That didn't balance either.

So it is clear the Democrats don't have the will to balance the budget now. But if we had a balanced budget amendment, they would, along with all of us—Republicans and Democrats because we have all contributed to where we are today—be required to balance the budget every single year, and that would have a huge impact on what our future is going to look like and what

the future for your two children and my two children will be.

The rating agencies are considering, as the Senator from New Hampshire mentioned, downgrading us if we don't take concrete steps to reduce our deficits. It would have a tremendous impact on interest rates if that happened. As I mentioned earlier today, 3-year government bond interest rates for Portugal are 19.4 percent; for Greece, they are 28.9 percent; and for Ireland, 12.9 percent. We are already suffering from slower economic growth because of our debt and deficit.

There is a study by economists Reinhart and Rogoff that found that debt levels above 90 percent of GDP were associated with economic growth that was 1 percentage point less than it would be otherwise.

We know from the President's own economic advisers that translates into the loss of about 1 million jobs every year. So it is clear we need to cut spending now, we need to balance our budget, we need a discipline imposed on Congress. A balanced budget amendment would do that, as it has done for so many States around the country.

But the cut, cap, and balance approach cuts spending, as the Senator from New Hampshire mentioned, now, today, by over \$100 billion this year, cuts spending over the next decade by almost \$6 trillion, and then puts in place a balanced budget amendment that would ensure that going forward into the future we learn to live within our means, that we don't continue to spend money that we don't have.

So I appreciate the observations of my colleague from New Hampshire, as I said. She represents a State that has a great tradition when it comes to keeping spending and government under control. We need that tradition in Washington, DC. I would simply say to my colleague from New Hampshire, I hope we can find the support among our colleagues in the Senate when we have this vote—and it sounds like now it is going to be scheduled for sometime on Saturday—to get a big bipartisan vote in support of cut, cap, and balance.

I know that is what my colleague from New Hampshire hopes as well. I do believe it is the pathway that will get us toward fiscal sustainability for the future of this country and put us on a trajectory that is good for our children and grandchildren, doesn't put this Nation on the verge of bankruptcy, doesn't have the adverse economic impacts that we are experiencing in real time both in terms of jobs lost, potential for much higher interest rates that would affect homeowners, people who are trying to get student loans, auto loans, people who are trying to start businesses. It would be absolutely devastating to this economy if that happened. If we don't get our fiscal house in order, that is the train wreck we are headed for.

Ms. AYOTTE. I thank my colleague from South Dakota. And I, too, hope we will have bipartisan support for this cut, cap, and balance plan. It is so critical, and as the President's own fiscal commission said:

Our challenge is clear and inescapable. America cannot be great if we go broke. Our businesses will not be able to grow and create jobs and our workers will not be able to compete successfully for the jobs of the future without a plan to get this crushing debt burden off our backs.

Well, the cut, cap, and balance plan will help get this crushing debt burden off our backs to allow our job creators to actually create jobs.

Also, when we think about starting from where we began this discussion, our children, we have to act now. I don't want my two children looking at me one day in the future and saying: Mom, what did you do about the fiscal crisis that everybody saw coming? Right now in the Senate, we can come together around this cut, cap, and balance plan. Once and for all, let's commit to passing a balanced budget amendment. Let's send that question to the States. Let's let the people of this country weigh in, because we know they will weigh in with common sense because they do it at the State level, they do it at a family level, they do it in their small businesses.

So I, too, hope we will work with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle; that we will get this cut, cap, and balance plan passed. I look forward to working with all the Senators in this Chamber, and particularly the Senator from South Dakota who, I know, has been such an advocate and such a strong fiscal conservative, wanting to preserve our country and the greatness of America to make sure we get this plan passed now.

Mr. THUNE. I think our colleagues in the House have shown us the way. They passed this last night. They have given us an opportunity now to have this vote, and it is long overdue. In my view—and I think the numbers bear this out—this is not a revenue problem. This is not a problem of having too little tax revenue. This is not a problem, as I pointed out, that can be solved by tax increases, which would devastate the job creators in this country and make it more difficult for our economy to recover and to get people back to work. But this is really about spending.

This is about getting Federal spending back to a level that is historically normal. If we could do that, we will have done a great thing for the future of this country, for our children and grandchildren. It is so important, in my view, that we not wait any longer. We can't afford to wait. The time is now.

We are going to have this vote coming up, it looks like probably on Saturday. I hope we will have a big bipartisan vote in support of this approach

that would cut spending today, cap it in the future, and get a balanced budget amendment on the books.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of our time.

REMEMBERING THOMAS "BROWN" BADGETT, SR.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to note for my colleagues the passing of a distinguished Kentuckian and my friend, Mr. Thomas "Brown" Badgett, Sr., who passed away this June 30 at the age of 88. A leading citizen of Madisonville, KY, Brown was a philanthropist who will be remembered for his many gifts to his community.

From the Brown Badgett Sr. Energy and Advanced Technology Center on the Madisonville Community College campus to the Brown Badgett Loop roadway and Badgett Athletic Complex there that also bear his name, he will have an enduring legacy.

Brown was able to make this mark not only because he was so highly successful in his chosen fields of coal, real estate and highway construction, but also because he was successful at reaching out to other people and sharing his success and his zeal for life. I extend my deepest condolences to his many beloved family members and friends for their loss. He will be missed by many.

The Louisville Courier-Journal recently published an obituary for Mr. Thomas "Brown" Badgett, Sr., and I ask unanimous consent that said article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, July 1, 2011]

THOMAS BROWN BADGETT SR.

MADISONVILLE.—Badgett, Thomas Brown Sr., 88, died Thursday, June 30, 2011 at 8:10 a.m. at his residence.

He was born January 17, 1923, in Bellefonte, Ark., to the late Russell and Rheaetta Badgett. In addition to his parents, he was preceded in death by his wife, Helen "Heidi" Badgett; a daughter, Deidre Badgett Griffin; one son, Owen Kinsley Badgett; one brother, J. Rogers Badgett; and one sister, Julia Badgett Badger.

Mr. Badgett loved his community, and he served all walks of life such as the coal business, highway construction, and real estate. He received his Eagle Scout in 1991. Mr. Badgett was a philanthropist who supported education with donations to college and high schools. His favorite saying was, "The youth of today are going to be running this country in the next 20 to 30 years, and they need to be educated." Mr. Badgett is survived by a daughter, Heidi K. Honchariw, of Asheville, N.C.; a son and daughter-in-law, Thomas Brown and Sue Badgett, Jr., of Madisonville; two grandchildren, Corbett G. and Casey McCormick, of Naperville, Ill., and Kyle Owen Yates, of Madisonville; and five great-grandchildren, Lily McCormick, Gavin McCormick and Ryder McCormick of Naperville, Brice Yates of Madisonville and Kyle Owen Yates II, of Central City, Ky.

Funeral services will be 1 p.m. Sunday at Barnett-Strother Funeral Home with Russell Badgett III officiating and Dr. William Klompus and Terry McBrayer to speak. Burial will follow in Odd Fellows Cemetery. Visitation will be 4-7 p.m. Saturday and after noon Sunday at the funeral home. Pallbearers will be Calvin Griffith, Bennie Mouser, Oda Inglis, Jr., John Davis, Don Gish, Bentley Badgett, II and Russell Badgett, III. Honorary pallbearers will be Frank Ramsey, Jr., Coach Joe B. Hall, Terry McBrayer, O.T. Rudd, C.M. Newton and Dr. William Klompus.

Memorials may be made to Boy Scouts of America Shawnee Trails Council, P.O. Box 487, Owensboro, KY 42302, or Green River Hospice, 418 N. Scott St., Madisonville, KY 42431.

37TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INVASION OF CYPRUS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise in my capacity as cochairman of the Helsinki Commission to again draw attention to the tragic consequences of Turkey's invasion and ongoing occupation of the Republic of Cyprus begun 37 years ago today. I applaud the leadership demonstrated by President Christofias in an attempt to bring about a comprehensive settlement and reunification of his country based on a bizonal, bicomunal federation with political equality, as defined in the relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions, with a single sovereignty, single citizenship and single international personality. Attempts to resolve the Cyprus issue are exacerbated by Turkish intransigence; the continued deployment of tens of thousands of Turkish troops in occupied northern Cyprus; and the introduction of an estimated 160,000 settlers from mainland Turkey. Indeed, the reality is that settlers outnumber indigenous Turkish Cypriots altering the demographic composition of that community by a margin of about two to one.

Previously, I have addressed a number of specific human rights concerns stemming from the ongoing occupation, including freedom of movement, property rights, and freedom of religion. Under my chairmanship, the Helsinki Commission convened a public briefing, "Cyprus' Religious Cultural Heritage in Peril" to document the desecration and destruction of sacred sites in occupied Northern Cyprus.

Today, I want to focus on the situation in the city of Famagusta, the once thriving commercial center and tourist destination on the east coast of Cyprus, featuring the country's deepest water port. This cosmopolitan city, home to nearly 50,000 Cypriots, was a center for trade and finance as well as culture, known for its many museums and vibrant nightlife. The second wave of the Turkish invasion, launched in August 1974, targeted Famagusta and the surrounding region. Seaside hotels that attracted tourists from throughout the world and other important high

rise buildings were targeted for bombardment as residents were forced to flee. Today, barbed wire rings the city of Famagusta, a veritable ghost town except for Turkish troops patrolling the perimeter of this once bustling urban center. What looters left behind is slowly being reclaimed by nature and decades of exposure to the elements.

The only thing I can compare this scene to comes from my walk along the deserted streets in the city of Prypiat, a Ukrainian city of similar size to Famagusta, located in the Chornobyl exclusion zone a short distance from the site of the world's worst nuclear accident. While health concerns keep the residents of the former away, armed Turkish troops prevent lawful residents of Famagusta from returning.

Notwithstanding numerous U.N. resolutions on Cyprus, including provisions specifically addressing the city of Famagusta, Turkey continues to illegally occupy a third of Cypriot territory, preventing Greek Cypriots from returning to their homes and businesses in the occupied area, including Famagusta. In keeping with these UN resolutions and principles enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act, it is time for Turkey to end its illegal occupation of the sovereign Republic of Cyprus. Agreement allowing the lawful residents to return and rebuild the city of Famagusta would be an important step in the right direction.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, on July 20, 1974, Turkey invaded Cyprus. Thirty-seven years later, Turkish troops continue to occupy 37 percent of the island. The invasion and occupation resulted in the deaths of more than 5,000 Cypriots and made some 200,000 Cypriots refugees in their own land.

Since 1974, more than 75 resolutions have been adopted by the U.N. Security Council and more than 13 by the U.N. General Assembly, calling for the return of the refugees to their homes and properties and for the withdrawal of the Turkish troops from Cyprus. In addition to these Resolutions, the European Court of Human Rights has in various judgments held Turkey responsible for the violation of the basic human rights and fundamental freedoms of Greek Cypriots, such as the right to life, the right to liberty and security, the right to respect for family life, the right to the protection of property and the prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment.

Building on past meetings in November 2010 and January 2011, President Christofias again this month met with Turkish Cypriot leader Mr. Eroglu in the presence of U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-moon in Geneva, where they agreed to intensify discussions on the difficult "core issues" of the negotiations, including the sharing of power and authority between the two communities of Cyprus, territorial adjustments, property issues, and the issue of

the withdrawal of foreign troops, security and guarantees. The Cypriot government is working in good faith to achieve a viable agreement and I remain supportive of the Cypriot government's insistence that this process remain a Cypriot-led process, with any solution agreed upon by the Cypriots and for the Cypriots, without any external arbitration or timeframes, while recognizing that a solution cannot be reached without the full and constructive cooperation of Turkey.

As Cypriot-Americans join with Cypriots from throughout the world in this effort to unify their homeland, and as they seek to secure an economically prosperous state free of illegal occupation, I will stand by them. I will work to ensure that the Turkish occupation comes to an end.

This week, we remember those who perished in the invasion of Cyprus, and honor those who survived and who continue to live under Turkish occupation. We have not forgotten and our thoughts and prayers are with them and their families.

Remembering together the events of July 20, 1974, in solidarity gives reverence to historical events we cannot afford to forget as we move forward to a peaceful, just solution and a hopeful tomorrow.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise in remembrance of the disastrous invasion of Turkish armed forces into the Republic of Cyprus. On this day, 37 years ago, Turkish soldiers began the forcible expulsion of approximately 200,000 Greek Cypriots from the island's northern territory. It is in support of the liberty and human dignity of those evicted that I stand to address my colleagues today.

At this moment, there are more than 43,000 Turkish troops on Cyprus—that is roughly one Turkish soldier for every two Turkish Cypriots. And regrettably, their presence continues to perpetuate the usurpation, occupation, and destruction of Greek Cypriot-owned property. So too continues the egregious desecration of Greek Orthodox churches and religious artifacts that are not only sacred to millions of faithful believers, but also beautiful and irreplaceable historic sites and objects of inherent cultural value to all of humanity.

Since 1974, more than 75 resolutions have been adopted by the United Nations Security Council calling for the withdrawal of Turkish troops from Cyprus and the return of refugees to their homes and properties. Yet despite 37 frustrating years of diplomatic stops and starts, a procession of U.N. special representatives and envoys, and untold hours of negotiations, Turkey continues to occupy this region in complete violation of international law.

It is imperative that Turkey withdraw its forces and at long last concede that the Cyprus question is one that

can only be resolved through mutual agreement on a solution, not the imposition of one. In this way, Turkey must contribute practically and substantially to the negotiating effort and embrace in concrete terms a reunified and prosperous Cyprus where Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots can live together in peace.

As a fellow democracy, the Republic of Cyprus shares basic values with the United States and has remained a close friend and ally for many years. Indeed, the U.S.-Cyprus friendship remains an anchor of American foreign policy in this region.

We must, in our solemn role as a nation that champions human rights and adherence to the rule of law, stand with Cypriots to bring peace, stability, and prosperity to their island. I therefore urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Cyprus settlement process with the goal of finding a fair and lasting agreement for the benefit of all Cypriots.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING JAMES NOEL SMITH

• Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to pay tribute to the life of a fine Montanan and good friend, James Noel Smith. Jim passed away last month after a long and courageous battle with cancer.

Raised in the mountainous northwest Montana town of Thompson Falls, Jim grew up with a deep reverence for the land, the water, and the wise stewardship of our natural resources. This became his calling in life.

After graduating from the University of Montana, Jim heard the noble call of public service. He was inspired by national leaders like President Kennedy and Montana's Senators Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf. Senator Metcalf, in particular, became Jim's mentor. Jim, his wife Camie, along with their young son Mark—who later served on my staff for a number of years—made their way back to Washington where Jim worked as a legislative aide for Senator Metcalf. In their early days in Washington, Jim and Camie had a daughter Terry. As a young adult, Terry found her way back to Montana, where she lives in Bozeman today.

Jim went on to serve with distinction at the Interior Department, the Environmental Protection Agency, and several conservation organizations. During the latter part of his career, Jim organized the Council of Infrastructure Financing Authorities, a trade association dedicated to helping municipalities pay for infrastructure improvements.

While they remained in Washington for four decades, Jim and Camie were never Washingtonians. They were Mon-

tanans. Thus, when they decided to retire, it came as no surprise to those of us who knew them that they headed home to the "Big Sky."

They settled in Bozeman, sharing their love of Montana, its land, and its people. Jim immersed himself with his work on the board of directors of the Gallatin Valley Land Trust, GVLTL, an organization that protects open land and promotes recreational opportunities throughout the Gallatin. While environmental issues too often turn fractious, Jim respected GVLTL's consensus-based approach. He thought it got results and made a difference.

That is the way Jim lived his life—striving for consensus, getting results, and making a difference. Mel and I offer condolences to Camie, Mark, Terry, and their family.●

DELMONT, SOUTH DAKOTA

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Delmont, SD. The town of Delmont will commemorate the 125th anniversary of its founding this year.

Delmont was founded in 1886 after the first train passed through. Located in Douglas County, it boasts community members dedicated to supporting and growing local business. It is also home to the annual Kuchen Festival and the Harvest Festival. The citizens of Delmont have committed themselves to developing their strong heritage and traditions.

Delmont has been a successful and thriving community for the past 125 years, and I am confident that it will continue to serve as an example of South Dakota values and traditions. I would like to offer my congratulations to the citizens of Delmont on this landmark date and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.●

HERMOSA, SOUTH DAKOTA

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Hermosa, SD. The town of Hermosa will commemorate the 125th anniversary of its founding this year.

Located in Custer County in western South Dakota, Hermosa was founded in 1886 and was named after the Spanish word meaning "beautiful" because of its breathtaking landscape. Today, Hermosa's rich history, strong traditions and beautiful scenery continue to make it a great place to live.

Hermosa has been a successful and thriving community for the past 125 years, and I am confident that it will continue to serve as an example of South Dakota values and traditions. I would like to offer my congratulations to the citizens of Hermosa on this landmark date and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.●

TRENT, SOUTH DAKOTA

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Trent, SD. The town of Trent

will commemorate the 125th anniversary of its founding this year.

Located in Moody County, Trent was originally a post office for the early settlers of eastern South Dakota. Trent was officially given its name with the arrival of the railroad in the late 19th century and soon after, many settlers migrated to the town from neighboring states as well as other areas throughout South Dakota. Today, the citizens of Trent are known for their commitment to growing the community and their local businesses.

Trent has been a successful and thriving community for the past 125 years, and I am confident that it will continue to serve as an example of South Dakota values and traditions. I would like to offer my congratulations to the citizens of Trent on this landmark date and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO MALLORY REIS

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, today I wish to commend the heroic actions of Ms. Mallory Reis, of Johnston, Rhode Island. Last week, the Providence Journal reported that while vacationing in Massachusetts, Ms. Reis helped resuscitate a 3-year-old boy who had stopped breathing after choking and falling in the water.

Ms. Reis, an officer with the Cranston Police Department, reacted immediately upon hearing screams for help coming from the water's edge of Curlew Pond. She raced over to the crowd that had formed around the boy. His body was blue and limp, and he had no pulse. The boy needed cardiopulmonary resuscitation or CPR, and Ms. Reis was the first to arrive with the necessary training. Immediately, she began performing CPR and directed bystanders to call 911.

After Ms. Reis performed a series of chest compressions and mouth-to-mouth resuscitation, an off-duty New Bedford firefighter arrived on the scene. Together, they worked to clear the boy's airway and get him breathing again. Thanks to Ms. Reis' efforts, the boy is alive today and it is reported that he is recovering well.

The efforts of Ms. Reis underscore the vital role our first responders play in keeping our communities safe. Law enforcement officers, firefighters, and emergency medical personnel are often the first line of protection, taking risks to keep us and our families safe.

Today I would like to thank Ms. Reis for her swift and heroic response that saved this young boy's life, and commend the Cranston Police Department for providing officers of that caliber. I would also like to commend all our first responders who dutifully perform these acts of heroism every day, and express my deep appreciation for their unwavering commitment to our safety.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE FORMER LIBERIAN REGIME OF CHARLES TAYLOR AND ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY BLOCKING PROPERTY OF CERTAIN PERSONS AND PROHIBITING THE IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN GOODS FROM LIBERIA THAT WAS ESTABLISHED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13348 ON JULY 22, 2004—PM 14

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication stating that the national emergency and related measures dealing with the former regime of Charles Taylor are to continue in effect beyond July 22, 2011.

The actions and policies of former Liberian President Charles Taylor and other persons, in particular their unlawful depletion of Liberian resources and their removal from Liberia and secreting of Liberian funds and property, continue to undermine Liberia's transition to democracy and the orderly development of its political, administrative, and economic institutions and resources. These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 20, 2011.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:08 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2560. An act to cut, cap, and balance the Federal Budget.

At 5:41 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2553. 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 the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2560. An act to cut, cap, and balance the Federal budget.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2536. A communication from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Business and Industry Guaranteed Loan Program" (RIN0570-AA81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2537. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a series of violations of the Antideficiency Act including violations at the appropriation level occurring in a variety of Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) accounts, and one violation occurring at the apportionment level; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-2538. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 11-064, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible effects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2539. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 11-059, of

the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2540. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 11-020, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2541. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General James E. Cartwright, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2542. A communication from the Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to the Bank Secrecy Act Regulations—Definitions and Other Regulations Relating to Money Services Businesses" (RIN1506-AA97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2543. A communication from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Brokers or Dealers Engaged in a Retail Forex Business" (RIN3235-AL19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2544. A communication from the Chief of the Foreign Species Branch, Fish and Wildlife Services, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing the Salmon-Crested Cockatoo as Threatened Throughout Its Range with Special Rule; Final Rule" (RIN1018-AW38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2545. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Incorporation by Reference of Edition and Addenda to American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Codes and New and Revised ASME Code Cases into 10 CFR 50.55a" (RIN3150-AI35) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2546. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2011-0103A—2011-0112); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2547. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Filing, Retention, and Return of Export Licenses and Filing of Ex-

port Information" (RIN1400-AC91) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2548. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: International Import Certificate BIS-645P/ATF-4522/DSP-53" (RIN1400-AC85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2549. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of the Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2550. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Bullhead City Regatta, Bullhead City, AZ" ((RIN1625-AA00)(Docket No. USCG-2011-0410)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2551. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Independence Day Fireworks Celebration for the City of Martinez, Martinez, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0400)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2552. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Big Sioux River from the Military Road Bridge North Sioux City to the Confluence of the Missouri River, SD" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0528)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2553. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Missouri River from the Border between Montana and North Dakota" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0511)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2554. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile 856.0 to 855.0, Minneapolis, MN" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0198)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2555. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Delta Independence Day Foundation Celebration, Mandeville Island, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0395)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Com-

mittee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2556. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Stockton Ports Baseball Club Fourth of July Fireworks Display, Stockton, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0397)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2557. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Jameson Beach Fourth of July Fireworks Display" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0398)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2558. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; The Pacific Grove Feast of Lanterns, Fireworks Display, Pacific Grove, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0159)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2559. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Waterway Closure, Atchafalaya River from Mile Marker 117 (Morgan City Railroad Bridge) to Mile Marker 0 (Simmesport, LA)" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0433)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2560. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Mile Marker 98.5 West of Harvey Lock Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to Mile Marker 108.5 West of Harvey Lock Gulf Intracoastal Waterway" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0434)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2561. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Waterway Closure, Morgan City—Port Allen Route from Mile Marker 0 to Port Allen Lock" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0432)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2562. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Independence Day Fireworks Celebration for the City of Richmond, Richmond, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0399)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2563. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

“Safety Zone; Marine Events Requiring Safety Zones in the Captain of the Port Sault Sainte Marie Zone” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0542)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2564. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Shore Thing and Independence Day Fireworks, Chesapeake Bay, Norfolk, VA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0303)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2565. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Cape Charles Fireworks, Cape Charles Harbor, Cape Charles, VA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0304)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2566. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Fourth of July Fireworks Event, Pagan River, Smithfield, VA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0588)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2567. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; New Port River; Morehead City, NC” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0230)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2568. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zones; Multiple Firework Displays in Captain of the Port, Puget Sound Area of Responsibility” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0450)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2569. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zones; Fireworks Displays in the Sector Columbia River Area of Responsibility” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0448)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2570. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; July 4th Fireworks Displays within the Captain of the Port Miami Zone, FL” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0439)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2571. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; New York Water Taxi 10th Anniversary Fireworks, Upper New York Bay, Red Hook, NY” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0222)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2572. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Nicole Cerrito Birthday Fireworks, Detroit River, Detroit, MI” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0416)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2573. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Michigan Bankers Association Fireworks, Lake Huron, Mackinac Island, MI” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0265)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2574. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Augusta Southern Nationals Drag Boat Race, Savannah River, Augusta, GA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0438)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2575. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Barrier Testing Operations, Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Romeoville, IL” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0453)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2576. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Rochester Harbor Festival, Genesee River, Rochester, NY” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0374)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2577. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; M/V DAVY CROCKETT, Columbia River” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2010-0939)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2578. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Independence Day Fireworks Celebration for the City of Half Moon Bay, Half Moon Bay, CA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0396)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2579. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Fan Pier Yacht Club Fireworks, Boston Harbor, Boston, MA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0437)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2580. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Pantego Creek; Belhaven, NC” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0473)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2581. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Charleston Sharkfest Swim, Charleston Harbor, Charleston, SC” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0501)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2582. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Bay Point Fireworks, Bay Point Marina; Marblehead, OH” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0516)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2583. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; 4th of July Festival Berkeley Marina Fireworks Display Berkeley, CA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0370)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2584. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Hylebos Bridge Restoration, Hylebos Waterway, Tacoma, WA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0114)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2585. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zones; July 4th Weekend Fireworks Displays within the Captain of the Port St. Petersburg Zone, FL” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0350)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2586. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Truman-Hobbs Alteration of the Elgin Joliet and Eastern Railroad Drawbridge; Illinois River, Morris, IL” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0199)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2587. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zones; Marine Events in Captain of the Port Long Island Sound Zone" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0470)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2588. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Brandon Road Lock and Dam to Lake Michigan Including Des Plaines River, Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Chicago River, and Calumet-Saganashkee Channel, Chicago, IL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0228)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2589. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities; Structure and Practices of the Video Relay Service Program" ((CG Docket Nos. 03-123 and 10-51) (FCC 11-104)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2590. A communication from the Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Electronic Tariff Filing System (ETFS)" ((RIN3060-AJ41) (WC Docket No. 10-141)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2591. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (AIWW), Elizabeth River, Southern Branch, Chesapeake, VA" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2010-0879)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2592. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Superfund Site, New Bedford Harbor, New Bedford, MA: Anchorage Ground and Regulated Navigation Area" ((RIN1625-AA01 and RIN1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2010-1119)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2593. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation for Marine Events; Temporary Change of Dates for Recurring Marine Events in the Fifth Coast Guard District; Mill Creek, Hampton, VA" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0540)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2594. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Spe-

cial Local Regulation; Monongahela River, Morgantown, WV" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0235)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HARKIN for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Phyllis Nichamoff Segal, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2013.

*Lisa M. Quiroz, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring February 8, 2014.

*John D. Podesta, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2014.

*Matthew Francis McCabe, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2013.

*Marguerite W. Kondracke, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring June 10, 2014.

*Jane D. Hartley, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2014.

*Richard Christman, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for the remainder of the term expiring October 6, 2012.

*Dan Arvizu, of Colorado, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term expiring May 10, 2016.

*Alan I. Leshner, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term expiring May 10, 2016.

*William Carl Lineberger, of Colorado, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term expiring May 10, 2016.

*Aaron Paul Dworkin, of Michigan, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2014.

*Eric S. Edelman, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term of four years.

*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.

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. NELSON of Nebraska:

S. 1389. A bill to exempt any road, highway, or bridge damaged by a natural dis-

aster, including a flood, from duplicative environmental reviews if the road, highway, or bridge is reconstructed in the same location; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 1390. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify, modernize, and improve public notice of and access to tax lien information by providing for a national, Internet accessible, filing system for Federal tax liens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 1391. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the disability compensation evaluation procedure of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder or mental health conditions related to military sexual trauma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 1392. A bill to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 1393. A bill to prohibit the enforcement of a climate change interpretive guidance issued by the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1394. A bill to allow a Commissioner of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to continue to serve on the Commission if a successor is not appointed and confirmed in a timely manner; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 401

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 401, a bill to help Federal prosecutors and investigators combat public corruption by strengthening and clarifying the law.

S. 576

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 576, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve standards for physical education.

S. 605

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 605, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to place synthetic drugs in Schedule I.

S. 641

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of

S. 641, a bill to provide 100,000,000 people with first-time access to safe drinking water and sanitation on a sustainable basis within six years by improving the capacity of the United States Government to fully implement the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005.

S. 707

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 707, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide further protection for puppies.

S. 726

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 726, a bill to rescind \$45 billion of unobligated discretionary appropriations, and for other purposes.

S. 745

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 745, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to protect certain veterans who would otherwise be subject to a reduction in educational assistance benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 798

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 798, a bill to provide an amnesty period during which veterans and their family members can register certain firearms in the National Firearms Registration and Transfer Record, and for other purposes.

S. 810

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 810, a bill to prohibit the conducting of invasive research on great apes, and for other purposes.

S. 834

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve education and prevention related to campus sexual violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

S. 838

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 838, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to certain sporting good articles, and to exempt those articles from a definition under that Act.

S. 839

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Connecticut

(Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 839, a bill to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs.

S. 871

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 871, a bill to repeal the Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit.

S. 1000

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1000, a bill to promote energy savings in residential and commercial buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

S. 1013

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1013, a bill to renew the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to approve demonstration projects designed to test innovative strategies in State child welfare programs.

S. 1048

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1048, a bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to the Islamic Republic of Iran, North Korea, and Syria, and for other purposes.

S. 1069

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1069, a bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain footwear, and for other purposes.

S. 1171

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1171, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion from gross income for employer-provided health coverage for employees' spouses and dependent children to coverage provided to other eligible dependent beneficiaries of employees.

S. 1208

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1208, a bill to provide an election to terminate certain capital construction funds without penalties.

S. 1214

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1214, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, regarding restrictions on the use of Department of Defense funds and facilities for abortions.

S. 1219

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi

(Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1219, a bill to require Federal agencies to assess the impact of Federal action on jobs and job opportunities, and for other purposes.

S. 1228

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1228, a bill to prohibit trafficking in counterfeit military goods or services.

S. 1231

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1231, a bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007.

S. 1274

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1274, a bill to provide for a biennial appropriations process with the exception of defense spending and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 1301

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1301, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2012 to 2015 for the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, to enhance measures to combat trafficking in persons, and for other purposes.

S. 1316

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1316, a bill to prevent a fiscal crisis by enacting legislation to balance the Federal budget through reductions of discretionary and mandatory spending.

S. 1333

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1333, a bill to provide for the treatment and temporary financing of short-time compensation programs.

S. 1340

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1340, a bill to cut, cap, and balance the Federal budget.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1369, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt the conduct of silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements.

S. 1380

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Alabama

(Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1380, a bill to suspend until January 21, 2013, certain provisions of Federal immigration law, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 17

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 17, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

S. RES. 132

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 132, a resolution recognizing and honoring the zoos and aquariums of the United States.

S. RES. 216

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 216, a resolution encouraging women's political participation in Saudi Arabia.

S. RES. 228

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 228, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding coming together as a Nation and ceasing all work or other activity for a moment of remembrance beginning at 1:00 PM Eastern Daylight Time on September 11, 2011, in honor of the 10th anniversary of the terrorist attacks committed against the United States on September 11, 2001.

S. RES. 230

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 230, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that any agreement to reduce the budget deficit should not include cuts to Social Security benefits or Medicare benefits.

AMENDMENT NO. 556

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 556 proposed to H.R. 2055, a bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 563

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 563 proposed to H.R. 2055, a bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 1390. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify, modernize, and improve public notice of and access to tax lien information by providing for a national, Internet accessible, filing system for Federal tax liens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, as Congress continues to debate ways to reduce our national deficit, some Members of Congress are taking the time to reflect on the state of the Federal tax system and consider how we can simplify it and make it more efficient and fair. Today, as part of that effort, I along with my colleague Senator BEGICH are introducing legislation aimed at simplifying and modernizing the existing system for filing Federal tax liens, a key tool used by the Treasury to collect unpaid taxes. The bill has been endorsed by Citizens for Tax Justice, Tax Justice Network, Public Citizen, US Public Interest Research Group, and the FACT Coalition, an organization of public interest and business groups concerned with tax fairness.

It has been 45 years since Congress has made any significant changes to the laws regulating how the Internal Revenue Service, IRS, files Federal tax liens. Right now, outdated laws are forcing the IRS to waste taxpayer dollars on an old-fashioned, inefficient, and burdensome paper-based filing system spread out over 4,000 locations that should be replaced by a modernized electronic filing system capable of operating at a fraction of the cost. It is time to bring the Federal tax lien system into the 21st century. The Tax Lien Simplification Act, which we are introducing today, will simplify the process of recording tax liens at an estimated ten-year cost savings of \$150 million, while at the same time improving taxpayer service by making it easier to verify lien information and speed up the release of liens after taxes are paid.

Tax liens are a principal way to collect payment from persons who are delinquent in paying their taxes. By law, Federal tax liens arise automatically ten days after a taxpayer's failure to pay an assessed tax. The lien automatically attaches to the taxpayer's real

and personal property and remains in effect until the tax is paid. However, the tax lien is not effective against other creditors owed money by the same taxpayer, until a notice of the Federal tax lien is publicly recorded. Generally, between competing creditors, the first to file notice has priority, so the filing of tax lien notices is very important to the Government and to the taxpaying public if taxes are to be collected from persons owing taxes.

Current law requires the IRS to file public notices of Federal tax liens on paper in State, county, or city recording offices around the country, to ensure other creditors receive notice of the government's claim. There are currently more than 4,100 of these recording offices, many of which have developed specific rules regulating how such liens must be formatted and filed in their jurisdictions. This patchwork system developed more by default than by plan, as different offices developed procedures for filing a variety of legal documents affecting title to real and personal property.

In 1966, to help the IRS comply with a proliferating set of filing rules for Federal tax liens, Congress passed the Tax Lien Act to standardize certain practices. This act provided, for example, that liens against real estate had to be filed where the property was located, and required each State to designate a single place to file Federal tax liens applicable to personal property. Most States subsequently adopted a version of the Uniform Tax Lien Filing Act, enabling the IRS to file a notice of tax lien in each locality where the taxpayer's real estate is located, and a single notice where the taxpayer resides to reach any personal property. For corporations, States typically require the IRS to file a notice to attach real estate in each locality where the real estate is located, and a separate notice, usually at the State level, to attach other types of property. There are often additional rules for trusts and partnerships. The end result of the law was to reduce some but not all of the multiple sets of rules regulating the filing of Federal tax liens.

The bottom line today is that, in most cases, tax liens have to be physically filed in one of over 4,000 recording offices. In most cases, that filing is accomplished by mail, using paper documents. Some jurisdictions also allow electronic filings, but those jurisdictions are few and far between. The same is true if a lien has to be corrected, or a related certificate of discharge, subordination, or nonattachment needs to be filed, or when a tax liability has been resolved and the IRS wants to release a lien. Each action usually requires a paper filing in one or more recording offices and requires the additional involvement of third parties. If a paper filing is lost or misplaced, the IRS often has to send an

employee in person to deal with the problem, adding travel costs to other administrative expenses.

The paper filing system imposes similar burdens on other persons dealing with the tax lien system. Any person who is the subject of a tax lien, for example, or who is a creditor trying to locate a tax lien, is required to make a physical trip to one or more recording offices, which may not even be in the same State as the taxpayer, to search the documents, see if a lien has been filed, and verify or examine the information. Currently, there is no single database of tax liens that can be accessed by any taxpayer that is the subject of a federal tax lien, by any creditor, or by any member of the public. Not even IRS personnel have access to such a tax lien database. It does not exist.

The result is an inefficient, costly, and burdensome paper filing system that can and should be completely revamped. Businesses across the country learned long ago that electronic filing systems outperform paper; they save personnel costs, material costs, time, and aggravation. Government agencies have learned the same thing as they have moved to electronic databases and recordkeeping, including systems made available to the public on the Internet. Among the many examples of government-sponsored, Internet-based systems currently in operation are the contractor registry operated by the General Services Administration to allow persons to register to bid on federal contracts, the license registry operated by the Federal Communications Commission to allow the public to search radio licenses, and the registry operated by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to allow the public to search currently registered patents and trademarks. Each of these systems has saved taxpayer money, while improving service to the public.

Just as government agencies gave up the horse and buggy for the automobile, it is time for the IRS to move from a decentralized, paper-based tax lien filing system to an electronic national tax lien registry. But the IRS' hands are tied, until Congress changes the laws holding back modernization of the federal tax lien filing system.

The bill we are introducing today would make the changes necessary to enable the IRS to take immediate steps to simplify and modernize the federal tax lien filing system. The operative provisions would require the establishment of a national registry for the filing of tax lien notices as an electronic database that is Internet accessible and searchable by the public at no cost. It would mandate the use of this system in place of the existing system of paper filings. It would establish the priority of federal tax liens according to the date and time that the relevant notice was filed in the national reg-

istry, in the same way that priorities are currently established from the date and time of a paper filing. The bill would also shorten the time allowed to release a tax lien, after the related tax liability has been resolved, from 30 days to 20 days.

To establish this new electronic filing system, the bill would give the Treasury Secretary express authority to issue regulations or other guidance governing the establishment and maintenance of the registry. Among other obligations, Treasury would be required to ensure that the registry was secure and prevent data tampering. Treasury would also be required to work with industry and other potential users of the registry to develop accurate search criteria to identify persons who are the subject of a tax lien. In addition, prior to the implementation of the national registry, the Treasury Secretary would be required to review the information currently included in public tax lien filings to determine whether any of that information should be excluded from disclosure on the Internet. For example, the Treasury Secretary would end disclosure of social security numbers that are currently included in some tax lien filings. While such identifying information could continue to be included in a tax lien filing to ensure that the filing is directed toward the correct person, the registry could be constructed to prevent such information from being disclosed publicly and instead provide such information only upon request from appropriate persons involved in the enforcement of the tax lien or collection of the tax debt. By requiring this information review prior to implementing the national tax lien registry, the bill would provide greater privacy protections for taxpayer information than occurs in current tax lien filings.

To ensure a successful transition to the new system, the bill would require the Treasury Secretary to establish one or more pilot projects to be carried out within 2 years of enactment of the bill, and require a successful nationwide test of the tax lien registry before it can be made operational. The bill would also allow the IRS to continue to use the existing paper-based tax lien filing system, in parallel with the new system, for an appropriate period to ensure a smooth transition.

Moving to an electronic tax lien filing system using an Internet-based national registry of tax liens, would accomplish at least three objectives. It would save taxpayer dollars, streamline the process for filing, correcting, and releasing tax liens, and improve taxpayer and public access to tax lien information.

The IRS estimates that moving from a paper-based tax lien system to an Internet-based, Federal tax lien registry would save about \$150 million over 10 years. These savings would

come from the elimination of State filing fees, paper and mailing costs, IRS administrative and travel costs related to paper filing problems, and the cost of lost taxes whenever the IRS makes an error or a tax lien filing is misplaced or delayed. Filing fees, for example, vary widely from State to State, but typically cost at least \$10 per filing, and in some States cost as much as \$150. If a taxpayer has real estate in multiple jurisdictions, those costs multiply. A Federal tax lien system would standardize costs for all taxpayers, and require only one filing across all jurisdictions.

In addition, right now, an IRS service center is currently charged with filing tax liens nationwide and complying with the myriad filing rules in effect in the 4,100 recording offices across the country. Eliminating the paper filing system would free virtually that entire service center for other taxpayer services and enforcement work.

Electronic filing would not only save money, it would improve taxpayer service. Taxpayers who are the subject of a tax lien filing, for example, would benefit from an electronic registry in several ways. First, taxpayers would be able to review their liens as soon as they are filed online, without having to make a physical trip to one or more recording offices. Second, taxpayers would have an easy way to look up their liens on multiple occasions, identify problems, and correct any errors. A single tax lien registry would be particularly useful for taxpayers who move during the ten years that a tax lien can be in effect and have to look up liens in jurisdictions where they no longer live.

Third, once the underlying tax liability is resolved, the IRS would be required to release the tax lien in 20 days, instead of the 30 days allowed under current law. The longer 30-day period is necessitated by the current complexities associated with filing a paper lien in one or more offices across the country, requiring the action of multiple parties in different jurisdictions. These complexities would be eliminated by the establishment of an electronic registry. The registry would also enable taxpayers, after they pay their taxes, to make sure their liens have been lifted.

Creditors who need to research Federal tax liens would also benefit from a single electronic registry. Lenders, security holders and others, for example, would be able to use a simplified search process that could take place online and would not require procedures that, ultimately, require physical trips to multiple locations. A single tax lien registry would make it easier to locate tax liens for persons who have moved from the jurisdictions where the liens were first filed. Simplifying the search process would also provide greater certainty that all tax liens were found.

The ability to research Federal tax liens remotely and instantaneously should be of particular benefit to larger lenders and to creditors of taxpayers with assets in more than one county or State.

Tax liens are not a topic that normally excites the public's interest. But sound tax administration requires attention to efficient, effective and low-cost filing systems. Saving taxpayer dollars is more important than ever as Congress looks for ways to tackle the deficit.

Federal law is currently impeding development of a more efficient, cost effective tax lien filing system. Amending the law as indicated in the Tax Lien Simplification Act to streamline the tax lien filing system, moving it from a paper-based to an electronic-based system, would not only advance the more efficient, effective tax system we all want, it would also save taxpayer money. At the same time, it would make the system work better for individual taxpayers by reducing the possibility for mistakes and speeding up the release of liens for taxpayers who have paid. Modernizing our tax lien filing system makes sense in every way. I urge our colleagues to join us in enacting this bill into law this year.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 1392. A bill to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the EPA Regulatory Relief Act of 2011. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by my colleagues Senators WYDEN, ALEXANDER, LANDRIEU, PRYOR, and TOOMEY. Our legislation is straight forward: it would allow the EPA the time it needs, by its own estimate, to adequately consider and propose a reasonable, workable rule that affects boilers.

Our bill includes four key provisions. First, it provides the EPA with the 15 months it requested to properly analyze the best methods for implementing the application of the Clean Air Act to certain boilers. Second, it will give businesses adequate time to comply with any requirements the EPA adopts by extending the compliance deadline from 3 years to 5 years. Third, our bill will direct the EPA, when developing the new rules, to ensure that renewable and carbon-neutral materials remain classified as fuel and not solid waste. Fourth, our legislation will help ensure that the rules are achievable by real-world standards consistent with the President's directive to improve Federal regulations.

At a time when manufacturers are struggling to retain jobs, it is essential that this rule not jeopardize thousands of jobs in manufacturing, particularly in the forest products industry, by imposing billions of dollars of new costs. Our legislation provides common sense solutions to the challenges the EPA is facing in attempting to draft and implement these complicated rules, which if written without proper data, analysis, and consideration, would cost the industry billions of dollars and potentially thousands of jobs.

To be sure, the EPA performs some vital functions in helping to ensure that the air we breathe is clean and the water we drink is safe. We need, however, to make sure that as the EPA issues new regulations, it does not create so many roadblocks to economic growth that it discourages private investment, which is the key to maintaining and creating jobs.

The EPA's proposed "boiler MACT" rules, which would affect tens of thousands of boilers, have been an issue of great concern to many of my constituents in Maine. The forest products industry, in particular, is the economic backbone of many rural areas in our country, including in Maine. Mill managers and workers in Maine have expressed their concern to me about the impact of imposing excessively costly regulations on their mills at this time of economic hardship.

Since these rules were first proposed in April 2010, I have been very troubled that the cost of implementation would be far greater than EPA originally estimated. According to industry estimates, this rule could cost Maine businesses alone hundreds of millions of dollars and put many jobs at risk, when less expensive approaches could be used to address emissions from boilers. This is simply unacceptable in this economic climate.

Furthermore, these rules might force some of our mills in Maine to stop using biomass, a source of renewable energy, and instead dump the biomass in landfills and switch to fossil fuels. This makes no sense. As the President has stated, biomass is an important renewable energy source that our nation should promote in working to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Converting to fossil fuels alone would also cost mills hundreds of millions of dollars.

My colleagues and I have been concerned about this issue since the EPA proposed these new boiler MACT rules in April 2010. Last year, 40 of my Senate colleagues, including 17 Democrats, wrote to the EPA expressing our deep concern that the boiler MACT regulations would impose onerous burdens on U.S. manufacturers. We asked the EPA to set emissions standards based on what real-world, best-performing units actually can achieve. This letter reflected the widespread bipartisan con-

cern about the proposed boiler MACT rules.

It is important to remember that, under The Clean Air Act, a Maximum Achievability Control Technology rule, or "MACT" rule, is designed to reduce emissions to an achievable degree while also considering the economic impact on businesses. The MACT rule must also set its standard according to the best performing practices existing facilities. However, in the case of the boiler MACT rule, the EPA cherry-picked data without considering the real world operating practices of the facilities that will be affected by this rule.

In March 2011, I also asked Administrator Jackson at a hearing to explain why the EPA is not considering alternative standards for emissions since the MACT limits may be far more stringent than necessary to protect public health. Additionally, I have pressed officials at the Office of Management and Budget, such as Administrator of the Office of Regulatory Affairs, Cass Sunstein, about the very negative impacts EPA's Boiler MACT rules would have on the forest products industry.

In 2010, the EPA did request more time from the court to analyze and prepare the boiler MACT rules after it received thousands of comments that raised technical and cost concerns the agency had not originally considered. In response, the EPA appealed for an additional 15 months to implement the rule, noting that the public interest would be best served if it could obtain additional input from the public on these complex rules. Unfortunately, this plea was rejected by the D.C. District Court, and the agency was forced to re-propose the rule in a mere 30 days.

The stakes are too high for the EPA to be forced to rush a complex, multi-step process that could cost thousands of American jobs. Our bill will provide a balance that will help the EPA protect the environment and public health while ensuring that businesses in Maine and throughout the country are not faced with needlessly onerous burdens.

The EPA has claimed that the cost of the final rule has been lowered by 50 percent since the proposed rule last year; however, this is little comfort to manufacturers because the initial rule, according to industry estimates, was approximately \$4 billion in capital costs to the forest industry and over \$14 billion for all industrial sectors nationwide. The industry experts that I've talked with are very concerned that the standards are being set so high that they are going to have to make a massive new investment at a time when they can least afford it.

The EPA is making progress in reducing the costs and coming up with a more practical approach to the boiler

MACT rules, and I believe we can achieve the health benefits that we desire without putting thousands of people out of work. This bill will help ensure that result.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that the EPA has sufficient time to propose a well thought-out rule that minimizes the negative effect on the economy, while helping to protect public health and the environment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 20, 2011.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS: We are writing to express our united and strong support for legislation you are introducing today and for H.R. 2250, the "EPA Regulatory Relief Act of 2011," bipartisan legislation to address the serious concerns that remain with EPA's Boiler MACT rules. As they exist today, the final Boiler MACT rules will have serious economic impacts on a vast array of facilities across the industrial, commercial and institutional sectors. These rules place at risk tens of thousands of high-paying manufacturing jobs that our nation cannot afford to lose.

As finalized, the Boiler MACT rules are unaffordable, just as the proposed rules were. The rules are not achievable for real-world boilers across the range of fuels and operating conditions. EPA also has created a presumption that materials commonly used as fuels are wastes subject to the extremely costly and stigmatizing incinerator standards. This would not only impose billions of dollars in unreasonable costs, but it also would cause millions of tons of valuable materials to be diverted to landfills and replaced with fossil fuel—a bad result for the environment.

As EPA has acknowledged, the rules were finalized with serious flaws because EPA was forced to meet a strict court-ordered deadline. The final Boiler MACT rule alone would cost over \$14 billion in capital for the manufacturing sector, plus billions more in annual operating costs. Complying with the incinerator standards could cost several billion dollars more in capital.

Legislation is needed to resolve serious uncertainties and vulnerabilities, including to: ensure the rules are stayed for an adequate and certain period, as EPA's current administrative stay is being challenged in court; allow EPA adequate time to re-propose the rules and get them right, including time for stakeholders to conduct more emissions testing and to avoid mistakes that occur when rulemakings of this scope and importance are rushed and become vulnerable to legal challenge; provide direction and support for EPA to use the discretion it already has under the Clean Air Act and Executive Order 13563 to add flexibility and make the rules achievable; clarify that using non-hazardous materials as fuels does not result in boilers being treated as incinerators; and give facilities more time to comply with the complex and capital-intensive requirements of the rules.

If enacted, the "EPA Regulatory Relief Act" will provide the much-needed certainty

and time for EPA to get the rules right and for businesses that will be investing billions of dollars to rationally plan for the capital expenses. This legislation will preserve jobs and the competitiveness of the U.S. manufacturing sector while protecting the environment.

Thank you for your leadership on this issue of great importance to our industries and our workers.

Sincerely,
American Forest & Paper Association, American Chemistry Council, American Home Furnishings Alliance, American Petroleum Institute, American Wood Council, Association of American Railroads, Biomass Power Association, Brick Industry Association, Business Roundtable, Cement Kiln Recycling Coalition, Composite Panel Association, Construction Materials Recycling Association, Corn Refiners Association, and Council of Industrial Boiler Owners.

Hardwood Plywood and Veneer Association, International Falls Chamber of Commerce (MN), National Association of Manufacturers, National Federation of Independent Business, National Oilseed Processors Association, National Solid Wastes Management Association, NORA, An Association of Responsible Recyclers (formerly the National Oil Recyclers Association), Rubber Manufacturers Association, Society of Chemical Manufacturers and Affiliates, The International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, The United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Treated Wood Council, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Virginia Forestry Association.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, biomass energy development is not only a great economic opportunity for Oregon, it is an essential piece of the forest health puzzle. Biomass energy helps create a market and a way to pay for forest thinning and hazardous fuels programs. It is also a way for keeping local timber and wood products mills in business at a time when the industry, like many in the U.S. is going through hard times. Biomass also provides an important renewable energy option for the Nation as a substitute for coal and other fossil fuels. Every region of the country has biomass energy opportunities even if the exact nature of the biomass that would be used varies from region to region. Today, I am joining my colleague from Maine, Senator COLLINS, and a bipartisan group of Senators, in introducing legislation to make sure that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency can, and will, issue regulations under the Clean Air Act and the Solid Waste Disposal Act that ensure that the owners of these mills and biomass energy plants can continue to invest in them and maintain and create the jobs that are so badly needed.

Pending Environmental Protection Agency regulations governing boilers and incinerators will make it very difficult for biomass energy to be used in the U.S. To its credit, EPA recognizes this fact and has repeatedly proposed to rewrite those regulations to address

the concerns of biomass energy users, the forest products industry, and other industries. The legislation being introduced today is aimed at making sure that EPA can collect the necessary data and reissue its regulations in an orderly process that preserves biomass energy as a national energy option and allows economically hard pressed timber and forest products mills to remain in operation.

On December 7, 2010, EPA, which was under court order to issue new Clean Air Act regulations for boilers and incinerators, filed a request with the Federal Court overseeing the boiler emissions rules asking for a delay in the court-ordered deadline for issuing the rules by 15 months so that EPA could reevaluate its own proposed rules and address the problems raised by the forest products industry and others. However, the Federal judge hearing the case rejected EPA's request and gave EPA just a month to fix the rule. In February 2011, EPA met that deadline, but continuing to recognize the flaws in its regulations, it immediately triggered an administrative process known as reconsideration to allow affected industries to provide more information and for the agency to revise its regulations. In May, EPA agreed with industry comments that the rule needed to be reviewed and it agreed to stay, or delay, the implementation of the existing Clean Air Act rules for boilers and incinerators. Unfortunately, EPA did not issue a stay of a related rule which defines which materials can be burned in those boilers and which need to be burned in incinerators. EPA has now proposed a schedule, which it confirmed in letters to me and several other Senators, to consider additional comments by industry and others and develop new Clean Air Act rules.

Unfortunately, this is not the end of the story. Stays can be lifted by the courts. This legislation would statutorily affirm the EPA's stay of the Clean Air Act rules. And it would affirm EPA's proposal to issue new regulations by a date certain. That date would be 15 months from the date of enactment, the same period of time EPA claimed was necessary to draft a new rule. The goal here, which I believe EPA shares, is to issue Clean Air Act regulations that make sense, not to do away with Clean Air Act regulations for boilers and incinerators.

On the other hand, by not agreeing to make changes to the "what's a fuel and what's not" rule, EPA has made it very likely that many widely used boiler fuels can no longer be used, like wood scrap from door and window mills. And some results of the rule make little practical sense. For example, scrap tires that are picked up at a tire shop can continue to be burned as a fuel. Scrap tires that are picked up at a landfill cannot. EPA has indicated that

it will try to develop regulatory guidance to help industry navigate the regulatory confusion it has created.

I appreciate the fact that EPA recognizes that there is a problem with the fuel-or-waste rule and that they are offering to try to fix it by issuing regulatory guidance. However, I am not convinced that EPA can fix the problems with the rule by just by issuing guidance. This legislation will direct EPA to establish new rules on what materials can be burned as boiler fuel, and which cannot, and give EPA clear statutory direction on what can be included. This direction limits allowable fuels to a specific list so that there are no surprises or backdoor exceptions. EPA can add to the list only after notice and comment so the public knows what, if any, additions are being made.

This process for defining which fuels can be burned in a boiler and which cannot is very important to me. While it makes sense to continue to allow many materials that the wood products industry and others have used as boiler fuels for generations, I do not think that it's appropriate to simply decide that any fuel that was used in a boiler in the past should be grandfathered in. The provisions in this bill defining what materials can be burned in a boiler ensure that will not be the case. This was a major issue in litigation surrounding earlier versions of these rules and I do not think it is wise to ignore this fact. Congress has the opportunity to try to address the legitimate concerns about what is being burned in these boilers and it should.

Finally, the bill would extend the normal 3 year period for boilers to come into compliance to 5 years. It is my hope that once there a final regulations and industry knows what it has to do that it will not take that long. However, there some 2000 boilers in the U.S. that would all have to upgrade or replace their units all at the same time and coincident with similar rules going into effect for electric utility company boilers. This extra time will mean that there will be no excuse for not meeting the final standards.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that letters of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2011.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WYDEN: I appreciate the opportunity to meet with you on June 16, 2011, regarding the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Non-Hazardous Secondary Materials (NHSM) rule, the Boiler Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) rule, and the Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incinerators (CISWI) rule. Thank you for your constructive engagement on these priority issues. We are currently exploring

various pathways under existing authority to address your concerns.

As you know, the Boiler MACT and CISWI standards are currently subject to an administrative stay. Today, as part of a filing with the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, the EPA announced the intended schedule for reconsideration of the boilers and CISWI rules. To ensure that the agency's standards are based on the best available data and that the public is given ample opportunity to provide additional input and information, the agency intends to propose the reconsideration rule by the end of October 2011 and issue a final rule by the end of April 2012. This is the best approach to establish technically and legally sound standards that will bring significant health benefits to the American public.

We believe that this stay and the reconsideration period will provide ample time to administratively address the issues raised by various stakeholders on these corresponding rules.

The NHSM rule, which we discussed in our meeting, aims to ensure that the burning of solid waste is subject to appropriate emission controls required under the Clean Air Act and that exposure to harmful pollutants is minimized. We understand that biomass derivatives have long been used for energy purposes in the wood products industry and we believe our rule allows such use to continue without being subject to the CISWI standards, provided that criteria, referred to as "legitimacy" criteria, are met.

Since promulgation of our rule, questions have arisen about how these criteria will be applied and our goal has been to ensure that the flexibility provided by the rule is in fact realized. To that end, we have held several meetings with industry representatives to discuss and understand their concerns and to review newly available data. In addition, on June 21, 2011, my Assistant Administrator for Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Mathy Stanislaus, met with representatives of several industries that use biomass derivatives and other non-hazardous secondary materials as fuel to ensure that they understand the significant flexibility already afforded by the rule, and to discuss the EPA's concepts for further clarifying that flexibility.

As part of that discussion, Mr. Stanislaus explained that one of the options that EPA is considering is issuing clarifying guidance regarding the Agency's legitimacy criteria. Such guidance is a useful tool that is often used under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) to address these types of issues. The guidance could provide a clear guidepost for comparing traditional fuels with secondary materials. It potentially could clarify that certain nonhazardous secondary materials would not be considered solid waste when combusted and that the units combusting those materials can continue to be used as fuels without having to meet the CISWI standards. Mr. Stanislaus requested that the industry representatives provide the Agency with supporting data on traditional fuels that could further inform the development of such guidance, and asked for feedback on the approach he outlined. In addition to this approach, the Agency is also exploring other options.

We recognize that stakeholders have also raised other issues with the NHSM rule. We are continuing to evaluate those issues expeditiously.

I believe we have made significant progress in addressing the concerns raised by the industry. I will continue to watch the issue

closely and keep you informed. My goal is to bring these issues to closure as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

LISA P. JACKSON,
Administrator.

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY, OFFICE OF SOLID WASTE
AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2011.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WYDEN: Thank you again for the constructive dialogue regarding issues relating to EPA's Non-Hazardous Secondary Materials (NHSM) rule, the Boiler Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) rule and the Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incinerator (CISWI) rule. In the Administrator's letter of June 27, 2011 she indicated that the agency is exploring various pathways to address your specific concerns regarding implementation of the NHSM rule. EPA is committed to issuing guidance to assist industry in applying the legitimacy criteria, and had requested that industry representatives provide the agency with supporting data to further inform the development of such guidance.

We received additional information from industry and based on this information and further discussions, we have developed the enclosed concept paper for the development of guidance. The paper identifies approaches to the guidance that EPA continues to evaluate for determining whether concentrations of contaminants in the NHSM are "comparable" to concentrations of those same contaminants in traditional fuels. These comparisons are important in ensuring that NHSM are being legitimately recycled and are not solid wastes, as well as recognizing the varied uses of such secondary materials as product fuels.

We are optimistic about our ability to develop guidance that meaningfully addresses the industry concerns and we are giving it the highest priority within the agency. We intend to complete internal development of draft guidance based on the concept paper by August 31, 2011. In addition, we continue to evaluate all available options available to address the issues raised.

Please be assured that EPA will continue to keep you informed of our progress in addressing the issues involved with the NHSM rule, as well as the related Clean Air Act rulemakings. If you or your staff have any questions regarding the enclosed concept paper, please contact me or your staff may call Carolyn Levine in EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-1859.

Sincerely,

MATHY STANISLAUS,
Assistant Administrator.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 571. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. GRAMM, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2055, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 572. Mr. WEBB (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 573. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 574. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 556 proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. KIRK) to the bill H.R. 2055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 575. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2055, supra.

SA 576. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. CORKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 577. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. NELSON of Florida) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2055, supra.

SA 578. Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. SNOWE, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 571. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2055, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 84, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 127. (a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Over 86,000 children attend Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) schools across the United States, Europe, and the Pacific region.

(2) According to an October 2009 Report to Congress on Department of Defense Education Activity's Military Construction Program, 149 of 189 schools assessed, or nearly 79 percent, had facilities with an overall condition rating of either Q3 (poor) or Q4 (failing).

(3) The October 2009 Report to Congress also indicated that many DoDEA schools require significant recapitalization efforts to bring facilities up to current standards and eliminate space shortfalls and temporary facilities.

(4) In the Future Years Defense Plan for Fiscal Years 2012 through 2016, the Department of Defense has established a plan to recapitalize many but not all of these school facilities.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the state of disrepair of more than ¾ of Department of Defense Education Activity school facilities is deplorable, and that the Department of Defense should make every effort to accelerate the recapitalization of these facilities.

(c) RECAPITALIZATION OF SCHOOLS.—The Secretary of Defense is encouraged to include funding for each DoDEA school with an overall condition rating of Q3 (poor) or Q4 (failing) according to the October 2009 Report to Congress on Department of Defense Education Activity's Military Construction Program in the Future Years Defense Plan for Fiscal Years 2013 to 2017.

SA 572. Mr. WEBB (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment in-

tended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2055, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 117, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 410. No amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to implement or carry out any program that creates a price evaluation adjustment that is inconsistent with the holdings in the following:

(1) Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña, 515 U.S. 200 (1995).

(2) Rothe Development Corporation. v. Department of Defense, 545 F. 3d 1023 (2008).

SA 573. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2055, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 84, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 127. Not more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report that includes—

(1) an assessment of the property management and caretaker costs, including base security, fire protection, and maintenance of the military installations closed or realigned under the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment;

(2) a description of the risks to property value, safety, and human life if such costs are not funded;

(3) a description of the extent to which the Department of Defense is funding such costs; and

(4) if such costs are not fully funded, an explanation for the shortfall.

SA 574. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 556 proposed by Mr. JOHNSON, of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. KIRK) to the bill H.R. 2055, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike "Sec. 301. Not later" and all that follows and insert the following:

SEC. 301. (a) Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Executive Director of Arlington National Cemetery shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report on the efforts of the Executive Director to modernize the information technology and management systems of the Cemetery.

(b) The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A detailing of the strategic plan and timetable to modernize the information technology and management systems of the Cemetery, including digital burial records.

(2) A description of the steps taken by the Executive Director in 2011 to implement information technology and management systems improvements.

(3) Identification of any remaining information technology and systems infrastructure needs of the Executive Director for administration of the Arlington National Cemetery.

SA 575. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2055, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 112, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 230. (a) Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in coordination with the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report, in writing, on the plans of the Secretary to make available to injured members of the Armed Forces and veterans the next generation of advanced prosthetics.

(b) The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Details of the strategic plan and timetable of the Secretary to make available to injured members of the Armed Forces and veterans the next generation of advanced prosthetics

(2) A description of the challenges, both technical and administrative, that could delay injured members of the Armed Forces and veterans access to prosthetics described in paragraph (1).

(3) The plans of the Secretary to address these challenges described under paragraph (2).

SA 576. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. CORKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2055, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . NO BUDGET—NO APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting after "Sections" the following: "303(c)."; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2), by inserting after "sections" the following: "303(c).".

SA 577. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. NELSON of Florida) proposed an amendment to

the bill H.R. 2055, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. ____ No later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the status and improvement plan for all DODEA schools with an overall condition rating of Q3 (poor) or Q4 (failing) as identified in the October 2009 Report to Congress on Department of Defense Education Activity's Military Construction Program.

SA 578. Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. SNOWE, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2055, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 84, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 127. (a) LIMITATION ON CLOSURE OF COMMISSARIES.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this title may be obligated or expended to cease operations of any commissary until the Secretary of Defense has issued new instructions regarding commissary operations of the Armed Forces that clarify general and economic criteria used for establishing, continuing, or discontinuing commissary operations.

(b) SUBMISSION OF PROPOSED INSTRUCTIONS TO CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES.—The Secretary of Defense may not issue the instructions described in subsection (a) until 60 days after the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a copy of the proposed instructions and a description of the impact of those instructions on—

- (1) existing commissary operations;
- (2) operations of commissaries at locations affected by a base closure law;
- (3) future construction and operation of new commissaries; and
- (4) the operation and funding of commissary stores at which substantial percentages of users are from more than one military service.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in executive session on Wednesday, July 27, 2011, at 10 a.m. in SD-430 to mark-up the following: S. 958, the Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2011; S. 1094, the Combating Autism Reauthorization Act; S. ____, the Workforce Investment Act Reauthorization Act of

2011; and, any nominations cleared for action.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the committee on (202) 224-5375.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests. The hearing will be held on Wednesday, August 3, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the following bills:

S. 1024, to designate the Organ Mountains and other public land as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System and the National Landscape Conservation System in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

S. 1090, to designate as wilderness certain public land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes;

S. 1144, to amend the Soda Ash Royalty Reduction Act of 2006 to extend the reduced royalty rate for soda ash;

S. 1149, to expand geothermal production, and for other purposes; and

S. 1344, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to take immediate action to recover ecologically and economically from a catastrophic wildfire in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150, or by email to jake_mccook@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact David Brooks at (202) 224-9863 or Jake McCook at (202) 224-9313.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 20, 2011, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Building American Transportation Infrastructure through Innovative Funding."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 20, 2011, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. DURBIN. 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 on July 20, 2011.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 20, 2011, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Federal Regulation: A Review of Legislative Proposals, Part II."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 20, 2011, at 9:45 a.m. in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "S. 598, The Respect for Marriage Act: Accessing the Impact of DOMA on American Families."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Economic Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 20, 2011, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Access to Capital: Fostering Job Creation and Innovation through High-Growth Startups."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 20, 2011, at 10 a.m. in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Yellowstone River Oil Spill Oversight."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS, ATMOSPHERE, FISHERIES, AND COAST GUARD

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on

July 20, 2011, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Looking to the Future: Lessons in Prevention, Response, and Restoration from the Gulf Oil Spill."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 20, 2011, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Alexa Damis-Wulff be granted floor privileges for the balance of the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 21, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., tomorrow, Thursday, July 21; 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 until later in the day; that when the Senate considers the motion to proceed to H.R. 2560, the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act, the time until 2 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the next 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, tomorrow morning, the majority leader will move to proceed to H.R. 2560, the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act. There will be a full debate on this bill. We will decide how much time is needed. We will work on this as we proceed. If all the time is used, we will vote Saturday morning.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:48 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 21, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

MICHAEL WALTER FITZGERALD, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE A. HOWARD MATZ, RETIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531(A):

To be lieutenant colonel

MARY F. HART-GALLAGHER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531(A) AND 716:

To be major

RAYMOND S. COLLINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DAVID B. BARKER
DANISHIA A. BARTON
MELISSA J. BEASLEY
TERECA V. BENTON
JAMIE SUE BING
RANDOLPH T. BOSCH
MERRITT M. BROCKMAN
SCOTT A. BROWN
JAMES M. CAMILLERI
BRIAN M. CARUTHERS
MARIABETHY PULIDO CASH
KENNETH M. CHAPMAN
SHAWN M. COFFIN
DANIEL C. COLEMAN
BONITA Y. DENNIS
KELLY LYNN DETERING
JOI BLYTHE DOZIER
MICHAEL R. EMERSON
IAN C. ERSKINE
DAVID A. FERGUSON
STEVE V. FLEMING, JR.
STEVEN M. FOX
EMIRZA G. GRADIZ
RONICA S. GRUVER
CHANG M. HAN
FRED L. HARRIS
ADAM G. HENSON
TODD M. HOGGATT
KIRK D. HUNTSMAN
JAMIE M. KAAUAMO
ALEXEI KAMBALOV
NATHAN T. KELLETT
SYLVIA CHIHYUN KIM
AMANDA M. LAWSON
JOSHUA J. LESLIE
JORDAN H. LINDEKE
RANDALL L. LIVENGOOD
CHARLES E. LUEKER
PAUL E. MACDONALD, JR.
STEPHEN W. MARTIN
CHRISTOPHER B. MATHEWS
RENEE A. MCLENNON
WENDY J. MORENO
MARLON A. MUTHUVEERAN
JOY U. NAVARRO
PHILLIP D. OLIPHANT
LISA A. PERRY
BECKY K. QUENNEVILLE
DANIEL J. RIVAS
BRENDA TALINA ROBERTS
VICKI K. ROBLES
JAVIER A. RODRIGUEZ
TODD M. ROMAN
DAWN M. ROSE
JOSEPH H. ROUNTREE
TIMOTHY A. SCHMIDT
HEIDI P. SIMPSON
TANYA M. SIMULICK
STATWELL G. SINCLAIR, JR.
JAMES A. STEWART
LEWIS RANDOLPH TAYLOR
THOMAS JASON TELFER
ALISON M. THOMAS
JASON T. TOMPKINS
ROBERT E. TRAYLOR
NEVA J. VANDERSCHAEGEN
MERLINDA VERGONIOWILLIAMS
GLORIA JEN WALSKI
TOBIE A. WETHINGTON
JOCELYN M. WHALEN
LINDSEY KAY WILLHARDT
THOMAS E. WINDLEY
RYAN K. YATES
TANYA R. YELVERTON
ANGELA M. YUHAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531(A):

To be lieutenant colonel

WADE B. ADAIR
TRACY L. ALLEN
SUSAN G. ANGUS
NORA ASHBY
JOYCE C. BEATY
PAMELA BELLGARVIN
JACQUELINE L. BOWERS
WILLIAM CHADRICK BREEDLOVE
DAVID B. BROWN
TERA Y. CARTER
GREGORY A. COLEMAN
ANADIS COLLADOVALENTIN
JEFFREY N. COOK
SARAH A. COORS DAVIDSON
ROBERT A. CORBY
MANUEL DOMINGUEZ
STEPHANIE K. DUSZA
TOMMY D. FRANKLIN, JR.
RICHARD A. FRENCH
MARIA D. GRAVES
RONALD J. GREENAWAY
RODNEY A. GUMBISH
ALAN C. HARDMAN
ALISHA N. HENNING
JOHN J. ISTVAN
RANDALL G. IVALL
CHRISTOPHER R. JOSEPH
MATTHEW S. KRAUCHUNAS
TED C. LEMON
JAY T. LUDESCHER
ROGER E. LYNCH
KATHLEEN M. MACKEY
PATRICK R. MISNICK
ROYCE F. MOORE
JAMES F. MULLEN
KENNETH C. PERRY
CAROLINE D. PLAHUTA
LYDIA A. RADFORD
EDWARD E. RHODES III
JONATHAN E. RICHARDS
JENNIFER E. RIGGINS
MARK W. ROGERS
AMY ELIZABETH RUSSO
ANDREA NIKITAMONA RYAN
ALVIN SCOTT, JR.
BRYAN K. SIMPSON, SR.
JOSE A. SORTO
MARY E. STEWART
JAY W. VEEDER
ELIJO J. VENEGAS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531(A):

To be lieutenant colonel

JOHNATHAN M. COMPTON
MAURICE E. YOUNG

To be major

AMY M. HENSEL
BENJAMIN J. MITCHELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JESSE ACEVEDO
GILBERT A. ACOSTA
MARC M. ADAIR
CHARLES D. ADAMS
RYAN J. AERNI
JEREMY S. AGTE
KIRSTEN G. AGUILAR
PETER A. AGUIRRE, JR.
KRISTOPHER H.O. AHLERS
JAMES D. AKERS
TODD J. ALDRICH
JOSEPH R. ALKIRE II
MATTHEW S. ALLEN
ANTONIO ALVARADO
AIMEE C. ALVSTAD
ERIC K. AMISSAH
CAROLYN F. AMMONS
JOHN M. AMODEO
BRIAN P. ANDERSON
GRETCHEN E. ANDERSON
KYLE G. ANDERSON
MATTHEW P. ANDERSON
STEVEN J. ANDERSON
TOBIN G. ANDERSON
TORA B. ANDERSON
CHAD W. ANNUNZIATA
NOEMI ANTEDOMENICO
VERONICA V. ANTEOLA
ANTHONY F. ANTONLINE
ERIK J. ANTON
WILLIAM E. ANTONIUS
RICHARD M. ARCHER
NATHANIEL ARDS, JR.
JASON P. ARNOLD
ORBELIN ARREOLA
DAVID A. ARRIOLA
JACK R. ARTHAUD
WILLIAM H. ASHFORD
LAMONT ATKINS
DAVID A. ATKINSON
MATTHEW C. ATKINSON
PETER G. AXTELL
KATHERINE M. BAILEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

MICHAEL C. BAILEY
 RANDY S. BAILEY
 RYAN N. BAKAZAN
 MATTHEW B. BAKER
 JEFFERY A. BALDWIN
 PAUL D. BALDWIN
 JEFFREY B. BANKS
 SEAN K. BARDEN
 TERRY R. BARENBERG
 MARGARET A. BARKER
 RICHARD ALLEN BARKSDALE, JR.
 JOSEPH A. BARRY
 JUSTIN P. BARRY
 BRIAN C. BARTELS
 DERRICK Q. BARTON
 ALEXANDER D. BASCO
 MELVIN E. BASKERVILLE, JR.
 MATTHEW L. BAUGH
 JOHN A. BAYCURA
 BRIAN O. BEALES
 TODD W. BEARD
 ROBERT C. BEARDEN
 WILLIAM W. BEATTY
 JAMES D. BEATY
 GREGORY S. BEAULIEU
 JAMES A. BECKER
 JASEN J. BECKMAN
 KRISTI L. BECKMAN
 GREGG C. BEEBER
 CARY M. BELMEAR
 JOHN F. BELO
 BRIAN L. BELSON
 FRANCIS M. BENEDICT
 DAVID J. BENNETT
 KENNETH A. BENTON
 KYLE A. BENWITZ
 JONATHAN T. BERARDINELLI
 JENNIFER A. BERENGER
 KEVIN S. BERGAN
 MATTHEW M. BERGGREN
 SCOTT E. BERGGREN
 CHANDLER L. BIGELOW
 KENNETH L. BLACK
 JAMES A. BLACKMAN
 AARON M. BLAIR
 ANGIE I. BLAIR
 JOSEPH T. BLAIR
 DICK J. BLAKEMORE
 ALAN E. BLANCHARD
 BRYAN L. BOBECK
 TIMOTHY J. BODE
 BENJAMIN D. BOEHM
 JEFFREY W. BOGAR
 JOSHUA E. BOHNART
 MICHAEL B. BOND
 ERNEST L. BONNER
 ROBERT J. BONNER
 WILLIAM P. BOOTH
 MICHAEL J. BORDERS, JR.
 DAVID M. BORGESON
 TIMOTHY J. BOS
 BENJAMIN L. BOYD
 DAVID J. BOYD
 MICHAEL J. BOYER
 MATTHEW J. BRADLEY
 CHRISTOPHER P. BRADY
 AMANDA D. BRANDT
 MATTHEW L. BRANDT
 RICHARD W. BRANSON
 JEANNE M. BRASSEUR
 MARCUS D. BRAZELL
 JONATHAN H. BREINGAN
 JOSHUA D. BROOKS
 JIMMY K. BROWN
 MARK BROWN
 MATTHEW T. BROWN
 MICHAEL L. BROWN
 THOMAS W. BROWN
 MICHELLE R. BRUNSWICK
 SCOTT A. BRYANT
 GEORGE M. BUCH, JR.
 WILLIAM A. BUCKINGHAM
 DANIELLE M. BUDZKO
 JASON B. BURCH
 TRACY K. BURGE
 MICHAEL G. BURKOTT
 DANIEL C. BURTZ
 BENJAMIN C. BUSCH
 CHRISTOPHER M. BUSQUE
 JAY E. BUTTERFIELD
 ANDREW C. CAGGIANO
 CHARLES B. CAIN
 BRYAN T. CALLAHAN
 ANDREW J. CAMPBELL
 HARRIET L. CAMPBELL
 JASON S. CAMPBELL
 MICHAEL J. CAMPBELL
 RYAN A. CAMPBELL
 MICHAEL T. CANCELLARE
 RODOLFO G. CANCINO, JR.
 MATTHEW S. CANTORE
 APRIL J. CANTWELL
 RYAN K. CARIGNAN
 DAVID W. CARLSON
 MICHELLE C. CARNS JOLLEY
 JAMES R. CARROLL
 JOHN M. CARROS
 RICHARD P. CARVER
 SCOTT D. CASE
 BRANDON A. CASEY
 MICHAEL J. CASEY
 MARGARET E. CASTEEL

CHRISTINE A. CATRIB
 SEAN ANDRE L. CELI
 MARSHALL F. CHALVERUS
 JAMES I. CHAMBERS
 SIU FAI JOHN CHAN
 RAJA J. CHARI
 CHRISTOPHER R. CHERRY
 CHRISTOPHER E. CHILDRESS
 ROGNALD E. CHRISTENSEN
 MATTHEW E. CLAPP
 JASON T. CLARK
 MICHAEL A. CLARK
 EDWARD G. CLARKE IV
 CHAD W. CLEMENTZ
 BRIAN M. CLIFFORD
 MARK B. CLIFFORD
 RICHARD R. COALSON, JR.
 WILLIAM E. COBB
 MICHAEL A. COE
 JEFFREY S. COHEN
 JOHNSTON A. COIL
 SEVERINE R. COLBORG
 FREDERICK A. COLEMAN III
 DENVER J. COLLINS
 JUSTIN K. COLLINS
 BENJAMIN D. CONDE
 RAY D. CONLEY
 ANNEMARIE CONTRERAS
 MATHEW A. CONTRERAS
 BENJAMIN M. COOK
 CHARLES D. COOLEY
 MARCUS L. COOLEY
 JEREMY C. COONRAD
 JEFFREY B. COOPER
 OMAR F. CORAL
 PAUL S. CORNWELL
 EDITH I. CORREAPEREZ
 PAUL T. CORY
 KEVIN COUSIN
 AMY M. COX
 DAVID P. COYLE
 KEVEN P. COYLE
 BRIAN J. COYNE
 GREGORY F. CRAVEN
 CHARLES T. CREECH
 JONATHAN M. CREER
 DOUGLAS O. CREVISTON
 JERRY L. CRIGGER, JR.
 MIGUEL A. CRUZ
 FELIX J. CRUZMONTANEZ
 CHRISTOPHER M. CUNNIFF
 MATTHEW T. CUNNINGHAM
 THORSTEN H. CURCIO
 ANN M. CURTIS
 GREGORY K. CYRUS
 JONATHAN M. DAGLEY
 LISA K. DAHL
 RYAN R. DAHL
 MICHAEL D. DAILEY
 MARK K. DANGER
 THOMAS D. DANIEL
 CHRISTOPHER C. DANIELS
 HUMPHREY DANIELS III
 BART W. DARNELL
 JONATHAN G. DAVIS
 MATTHEW L. DAVIS
 MICHAEL N. DAVIS
 MICHAEL P. DAVIS
 RICHARD O. DAY
 DARTAGNAN R. DEANDA
 JOHN J. DEENEY IV
 KARRINA M. DEGARMO
 KIRK A. DEITRICH
 RAMON CARLOS P. DEJESUS
 JOHN D. DELBARRIO
 ANTONIO C. DELLELO
 JOSHUA D. DEMOTTS
 GAVIN W. DEPEW
 ANDREW E. DEROSA
 MICHAEL L. DEROSA
 JAMES M. DETWEILER
 ALEXANDER F. DEVOE
 BRIAN M. DEWITT
 KENNETH D. DEWLEN
 NICHOLL R. DIAL
 ANTHONY DIAZ
 CHAD DIAZ
 JOEY L. DIBLE
 JASON T. DIGIACOMO
 JOHN M. DILLARD
 JOHN D. DISEBASTIAN
 ERNESTO M. DIVITTORIO
 MATTHEW R. DOMSALLA
 JACK DONAHUE, JR.
 WILLIAM R. DONALDSON
 COLIN P. DONNELLY
 JOEL A. DOPP
 PHILIP C. DORSCH
 EURETHA T. DOTSON
 JASON D. DOTTER
 TYRONE D. DOUGLAS
 DANIEL D. DOYLE
 MICHAEL J. DROST
 ROSALIE A. DUARTE
 BRIAN T. DUFFY
 JOHN E. DUKES, JR.
 MASON R. DULA
 CHARLES E. DUNAWAY, JR.
 MICHAEL W. DUNN
 MATTHEW F. DURKIN
 BRADLEY S. DYER
 JEROLD S. DYKE

IRA S. EADIE
 OCTAVIO F. ECHEVARRIA
 CHARLES E. EDDY
 WILLIAM W. EDMUNDS III
 GORDON T. EDWARDS III
 MICHAEL A. EDWARDS
 ROGER EFRAMSEN
 MITZI L. EGGER
 ERIC E. EIBE
 JASON C. EISENREICH
 CHRISTIAN G. ELENBAUM
 JULIE ELIZABETH ELENBAUM
 DAVID M. ELLIOTT
 JEFFREY R. ELLIOTT
 HANS K. ELLISON
 DENISE R. EMERY
 TONY D. ENGLAND
 JOHN W. ENGLERT
 DAVID C. EPPERSON
 LISA L. A. EPPERSON
 KRISTOPHER J. EPPS
 RAYMOND R. ESCORPIZO
 MICHELLE C. ESTES
 MICKEY R. EVANS
 NICHOLAS B. EVANS
 WILLIAM M. EVANS, JR.
 REESE D. EVERS
 TODD R. EWY
 IAN M. FAIRCHILD
 BRIAN J. FAIRWEATHER
 NOLAN T. FAJOTA
 JAWAD FAROOQ
 TIMOTHY A. FARR
 DAVID A. FAZENBAKER
 MATTHEW S. FEHRMAN
 KEVIN W. FENNO
 IAIN D. M. FERGUSON
 MATTHEW U. FETZER
 JASON R. FICK
 JEREMY A. FIELDS
 ANTHONY S. FIGIERA
 JAMES A. FINLAYSON
 KENNETH A. FISHER
 SCOTT V. FITZNER
 RICHARD F. FLAMAND II
 RANDY R. FLORES
 DERRICK J. FLOYD
 JOHN S. FLYNN
 JACK W. FLYNT III
 DANIELLE D. FOLSOM
 BRYAN P. FORD
 BENJAMIN D. FOREST
 BYRON P. FORMWALT
 MATTHEW G. FORSYTH
 ROBERT J. FOSTER
 JONATHAN J. FRAMPTON
 STEPHEN R. FRANCE
 JOANN K. FRANK
 JOSEPH A. FRANKINO
 JASON M. FRAZEE
 GLEN A. FRAZIER
 KARL D. FREDERICK
 TIMOTHY A. FREDERICK, JR.
 JULIE A. FREEDMAN
 BRIAN K. FREEMAN
 ERIC FREEMAN
 JOEL P. FREYENHAGEN
 ERIC W. FRITH
 HEATH W. FRYE
 CHRISTOPHER K. FULLER
 JIMMY D. FULLER
 ALISTAIR D. FUNGE
 MICHAEL S. FURNES
 LAUREL V. GAMMON
 GLENN D. GARAY
 ALEJANDRO GARCIA, JR.
 MARCOS GARCIA, JR.
 MICHAEL S. GARRETT
 PATRICK K. GATES
 ANGEL M. GAUD
 CHRISTOPHER A. GAY
 F. SELWYN GAY III
 MATTHEW T. GENELIN
 STEVEN T. GEOHAGAN
 CHANCE W. GERAY
 MICHAEL S. GERNEY
 BORIS M. GERSHMAN
 WALTER D. GIBBINS
 DANE P. GIBSON
 COLLIN S. GILBERT
 RONALD E. GILBERT
 GREGORY W. GILLELAND
 KOUJI P. GILLIS
 BRIAN D. GILPATRICK
 JASON R. GINN
 FRANK J. GLAVIC
 MATTHEW G. GLEN
 BRIAN D. GOLDEN
 KEVEN J. GOLLA
 JEFFREY J. GOMES
 ERIC H. GONZALEZ
 FRANCISCO R. GONZALEZ, JR.
 KIMBERLY A. GONZALEZ
 REYNALDO GONZALEZ, JR.
 BRETT J. GOODEN
 LAURA G. GOODMAN
 MATTHEW G. GOODMAN
 MICHAEL C. GOODMAN
 RICHARD A. GOODMAN
 STEVEN T. GRACE
 BRYAN L. GRADDY
 ALLEN GRADNIGO, JR.

MELVIN D. GREEN III
 RICHARD I. GREENMAN
 CHADWICK D. GREER
 AIMEE N. GREGG
 NICHOLAS H. GREGOR
 LESTER M. GREGORY
 ANDREW C. GRIGGS
 BRENT W. GRIME
 MATTHEW M. GROLEAU
 ROBERT E. GROVER
 MARK D. GUILLORY
 CYNTHIA L. GUNDERSON
 RYAN E. HADEN
 GUY R. HAGEN
 TIMOTHY D. HALE
 SHANE N. HALL
 BRENDAN L. HALLORAN
 NICHOLAS A. HALUPKA
 JEFFREY A. HAMLIN
 COURTNEY A. HAMILTON
 DAVID K. HAMMER
 DAVID A. HAMMERSCHMIDT
 THOMAS W. HANCOCK
 MATTHEW C. HANDLEY
 RAYMOND F. HANDRICH
 GAGE E. HANDY
 CORY M. HANNA
 CHRISTOPHER F. HANSEN
 JACK F. HARMAN
 LEWIS B. HARPER, JR.
 CHAD MARTIN HARRIS
 DANIEL A. HARRIS
 MICHAEL B. HARRIS
 NICHOLE M. HARRIS
 TAMMIE L. HARRIS
 JOHN P. HARTIGAN III
 ANNETTE I. HARVEY
 STEPHEN M. HARVEY
 WILLIAM P. HARVEY
 ERIC S. HASSINGER
 TRAVIS J. HAWKER
 CHRISTOPHER S. HAWKINS
 BRIAN C. HAYNES
 KYLE B. HEAD
 NATHAN J. HEALY
 JEREMIAH S. HEATHMAN
 MARK D. HEDDEN
 DEREK B. HEIFNER
 DAVID O. HEIST
 KURT C. HELPHINSTINE
 JEFFREY M. HEMMES
 BRYAN S. HENDERSON
 DANIEL G. HENDRIX
 WADE A. HENNING
 TRAVIS W. HERBELIN
 MATTHEW L. HERDER
 RENE D. HERNANDEZ
 TIMOTHY A. HERRITAGE
 WENDELL S. HERTZELLE
 IVAN M. HERWICK
 MICHAEL S. HESSE
 IAN R. HESTER
 JERRY R. HICKEY
 CLIFTON L. HICKS
 JOHN G. HIGBY
 MATTHEW K. HIGGINS
 PATRICK N. HILGENDORF
 CRAIG A. HODGES
 MICHAEL R. HOGSED
 JASON T. HOKAJ
 BENJAMIN A. HOLLO
 MARK A. HOLMES
 JOHN E. HOLOVICH, SR.
 AUSTIN LINNELL HOLTHAUS
 WILLIAM D. HOLYFIELD
 JAMES D. HOOD
 AARON M. HOPPER
 SCOTT M. HOPPER
 MICHAEL G. HORLBECK
 FRANCISCO M. HORNSBY
 MICHAEL A. HOROWITZ
 ERIC W. HOSAFROS
 BRANDT L. HOUSE
 CHRISTOPHER M. HOWARD
 NATHAN R. HOWARD
 DENNIS H. HOWELL
 WILLIAM J. HOWERY
 KATHLEEN S. HUBSCHER
 COLIN R. HUCKINS
 FRANCIS RICHARD HUGHES
 JAROD C. HUGHES
 KIRK HUGHES
 MICHAEL E. HUGHES
 SARA M. HUISS
 CAELI A. HULL
 JASON I. HUMBLE
 JESSE W. HUNT
 WILLIAM H. HUNTER
 ANDREW B. HUNTOON
 KYLE R. HURWITZ
 ROBERT J. HUTT
 JAY E. HUTZELL
 DAMON A. INGRAM
 DREW M. IRMISCHER
 TODD A. IVENER
 SWAMINATHAN B. IYER
 DENNIS E. JACK
 THEOPHILUS D. JACKMAN
 HANK D. JACKSON
 ROBERT J. JACKSON
 SARAH E. JACKSON
 JIMMY T. JACOBSON

JOHN M. JACOBUS
 PIOTR R. JAHLOKOWSKI
 BERT B. JEAN
 COTINA R. JENKINS
 JAMES A. JERNIGAN
 DERYK W. JETER
 JAMES W. JETER III
 ANDREW M. JETT
 DAVID B. JOERRES
 FELIX S. JOHNFINN
 ANDRE T. JOHNSON
 BRANDON R. JOHNSON
 GREGG S. JOHNSON
 JARED M. JOHNSON
 JASON D. JOHNSON
 JAY A. JOHNSON
 MAX E. JOHNSON
 OLIVER R. JOHNSON, JR.
 SCOTT E. JOHNSON
 CHARLES E. JONES
 HUNTER KENT JONES
 JASON L. JONES
 JEREMY L. JONES
 MATTHEW E. JONES
 TIMOTHY L. JONES
 BENJAMIN R. JONSSON
 GARDNER J. JOYNER
 LORENA M. JUAREZ
 LAMONT A. JUBECK
 JENNIFER S. JUDD VELASQUEZ
 NED L. JUNE
 BRIAN W. KABAT
 JOY M. KACZOR
 CHRISTOPHER J. KADALA
 KENNETH R. KAUPP
 CHRISTOPHER S. KAY
 DUSTIN D. KECK
 LOREN D. KEENAN
 STEPHANIE R. KELLEY
 BURL E. KELTON III
 IAN W. KEMP
 ALBERT A. KENNEDY
 DIMITRI KESI
 JANETTE D. KETCHUM
 STEVEN A. KETCHUM
 SHAYNE K. KIEFER
 MICHAEL D. KING
 RONALD J. KING
 KEVIN J. KIRSCH, JR.
 BRYAN M. KITCHIN
 MICHAEL E. KLAPMEYER
 DAIN O. KLEIV
 JEFFERY W. KLEMSTINE
 KYLE W. KLOECKNER
 ERIC J. KNAUFF
 MICHELLE R. KNEUPPER
 TODD T. KNIGHT
 ROBERT G. KNOWLTON
 DANIEL E. KOBS
 JAMES A. KODAT
 ANDREW J. KOEGL
 DAVID A. KOEWLER
 DALE A. KOLOMAZNIK
 THOMAS A. KOORY
 KYLE R. KORVER
 KEVIN R. KOTULA
 JEFFREY J. KOTZ
 MICHAEL KOWAL
 TAYLOR E. KRENKEL
 CHRISTOPHER D. KRETSINGER
 DENNIS J. KRILL, JR.
 SEAN A. KROLKOWSKI
 CHRISTOPHER M. KUESTER
 JEFFREY D. KUHN
 COLBY J. KUHN
 DAVID D. KUNICK
 JAE H. KWAK
 SAMUEL KWAN
 TODD J. LAFORTUNE
 DAVID J. LAIRD
 TOM C. LAITINEN
 FRANK P. LANDRY III
 KALLIROI LAGONIK LANDRY
 MARC A. LANGOHR
 THOMAS S. LANKFORD
 JOHN B. LANTZ
 CHRISTOPHER LAPIETRA
 CHRISTOPHER J. LARDNER
 AARON J. LAROSE
 PETER L. LARSEN
 PETER S. LASCH
 WILLIAM S. LATIMER
 ANDREW S. LAUER
 JUSTIN W. LAVADOUR
 BARRY J. LAWLOR
 ANDREW G. LAWRENCE
 PAUL R. LAWRENZ
 MATTHEW A. LEARD
 BRIAN W. LEBECK
 ANGELA C. LECHOWICK
 CHRISTY N. LEE
 JAMES LEE
 ROBERT A. LEE
 THOMAS S. LEE
 NICHOLAS J. LEONELLI
 MATTHEW E. LEWIN
 MARK C. LEWIS
 TRAVIS W. LEWIS
 KATHERINE A. E. LILLY
 C. EVERETT LILYA
 ANDREW W. LIND
 STEVEN A. LINDQUIST

STEPHEN B. LINDSEY
 CHRISTIAN J. LINGENFELDER
 SCOTT E. LINTNER
 JOHN E. LITTECKY
 BARRY E. LITTLE
 SAMUEL A. LITTLE
 JOHN C. LOPTON III
 CATHERINE M. LOGAN
 LUKE S. LOKOWICH
 ROBERT A. LONG
 ROBERT F. LONG
 VALARIE A. LONG
 DAVE A. LOPEZ
 HECTOR G. LOPEZ
 JAMES R. LOVEWELL
 TAMMY K.C. LOW
 DONALD C. LOWE
 GREGORY B. LOWE
 SEAN E. LOWE
 WILLIAM E. LOWERY
 JAMES C. LOZIER
 TIMOTHY M. LUCAS
 ALEJANDRO LUYANDO III
 PHILIP W. LYNCH
 SCOTT D. LYNCH
 JAMES C. MACH, JR.
 KENNETH P. MAIN
 MICHAEL S. MAKSIMOWICZ
 CALEB ANDREW MALCOLM
 JAMES L. MALEC, JR.
 MARSHALL G. MALHOT
 EDZEL D. MANGAHS
 DANIEL J. MANGAN
 JAMES R. MANSARD
 GEDEON H. MARIAM
 JASON E. MARINO
 SUSANA S. MARKIN
 LOUIS J. MARNELL III
 NICHOLAS J. MAROTTA
 EDWARD F. MARQUEZ, JR.
 ANDREW L. MARTIN
 ANDREW P. MARTIN
 DOMINICK J. MARTIN
 JIM E. MARTIN
 KEVIN C. MARTIN
 WILLIAM R. MARTIN II
 MELCHIZEDEK T. MARTINEZ
 JASON L. MASCIULLI
 BRADFORD J. MATE
 PEDRO ENRIQUE MATOS
 MONICA M. MATOUSH
 CHRISTINE ANNE MAU
 MELVIN E. MAXWELL, JR.
 CONNIE M. MAY
 MICHAEL S. MAY
 MATTHEW W. MCANDREW
 ROBERT K. MCCABE
 RICKEY G. MCCANN, JR.
 RONALD D. MCCARTY
 KEITH E. MCCORMACK
 DAVID M. MCCOY
 GARRETT E. MCCOY
 MICHAEL T. MCCOY
 SCOTT A. MCCOY
 NEIL P. MCCracken
 RICHARD A. MCCURDY
 JASON D. MCCURRY
 ERIN S. MCDONALD
 JAYSON M. MCDONALD
 SHAWN P. MCGHEE
 RICHARD E. MCGLAMORY
 DANIEL J. MCLAGAN
 NATHAN A. MEAD
 SCOTT A. MEAKIN
 JEFFREY S. MEANS
 ERIN P. MEINDERS
 ROBERT J. MEISTER
 APRIL D. MENCH
 RICHARD MICHAEL MENCH, JR.
 EDWARD V. MENDONES
 LARRY D. MERCIER, JR.
 ROGER R. MESSER
 HEATHER K. MEYER
 JOSEPH R. MEYER
 JEFFREY L. MEYERS
 TRINIDAD K. MEZA
 THAD R. MIDDLETON
 MICHAEL V. MILEY
 DAVID S. MILLER
 DOUGLAS R. MILLER
 KENNETH J. MILLER
 WENDY J. MILLER
 JASON T. MILLS
 DAVID M. MILNER
 ANTHONY MINCER
 DWIGHT D. MINNICK
 LORI A. MINNICK
 KEVIN V. MINOR
 ANTHONY L. MIRANDA
 NATHAN B. MITCHELL
 CRAIG D. MOE
 SEAN R. MONTEIRO
 JASON R. MOONEY
 BRIAN D. MOORE
 EUGENE A. MOORE III
 DAVID E. MORGAN
 ERIC E. MORGAN
 GREGORY A. MORISSETTE
 MICHAEL C. MORMAN
 ROSS C. MORRELL
 CHRISTOPHER B. MORRIS
 JASON L. MORRIS

GERALD C. MULHOLLEN, JR.
 JUSTIN A. MULKEY
 MONTE T. MUNOZ
 DANIEL J. MUNTER
 DIZZY B. MURPHY
 ERIC M. MURPHY
 TAMARA C. MURPHY
 JESSE L. MURRAY
 YIRA Y. MUSE
 DARRELL A. MYERS
 ANTHONY M. NANCE
 TODD A. NATHANIEL
 RANDY S. NAYLOR
 JULIO A. NEGRON
 CHRISTOPHER M. NEIMAN
 BRYAN PAUL NELSON
 KEITH L. NELSON
 RAYMOND P. NELSON
 MARK C. NEMISH
 VICTORIA L. NEMMERS
 JOHN W. NEPTUNE
 DAVID T. NEUMAN
 MARK J. NEWBILL
 JOHN M. NEWTON
 TINA H. NGUYEN
 TUAN A. NGUYEN
 MARCUS W. NICHOLS
 THOMAS A. NIDAY
 JASON R. NIELSEN
 ALBERT NIEVES
 CALEB M. NIMMO
 GREGORY W. NITA
 MICAH NODINE
 JOEL C. NONNWEILER
 AARON G. NORRIS
 BRIAN P. NOWINSKI
 LEO M. NOYES
 JEREMY B. NYGREN
 ROBERT K. OAKES III
 ROY H. OBERHAUS
 DEVIN O. ODOWD
 GALEN K. OJALA
 MICHELE J. OLSEN
 MATTHEW L. OLSON
 RICHARD M. OPERHALL
 MATTHEW M. ORLOWSKY
 PATRICK J. OROURKE
 JAY A. ORSON
 STEVEN H. OSBORNE
 WILLIAM L. OTTATI
 DAVID B. OWEN
 JAMES P. OWEN
 MILKO R. PADILLA
 THOMAS P. PAGANO
 DAMIAN D. PANAJIA
 DAVID A. PAPINEAU
 ROBERT M. PARKER
 MICHAEL B. PARKS
 RUSSELL L. PARRAMORE
 JAMES J. PARSLAW
 RAYMOND G. PARTLOW
 YORK W. PASANEN
 WILLIAM P. PASTEWAIT
 ANDREW H. PATE
 DAVID K. PATTERSON
 DAVID S. PATTERSON
 JASON P. PAVELSCHAK
 BRIAN C. PAYNE
 ROBERT E. PEACOCK
 GEORGE A. PEASANT
 KENNETH E. PEDERSEN
 MICHAEL J. PEELER
 ANTHONY J. PELKINGTON
 AARON D. PEPKOWITZ
 CLAYTON JOSEPH PERCLE
 ELEANOR S. PEREDO
 VICTOR M. PEREIRA
 TODD J. PERLMAN
 CHRISTOPHER W. PETERS
 EDWARD C. PETERS
 MARK T. PETERS II
 ERIN D. PETERSON
 STEFANIE S. M. PETERSON
 CAREY E. PETTIT
 STEPHEN H. PEUTE
 STEPHEN PHILLIPS
 JOSHUA J. PICCIRILLO
 DAMIEN F. PICKART
 GREGORY B. PICKETTE
 PATRICIA Y. PIE
 JOHN M. PILONG
 DAVID L. PITTNER
 KIRSTIN L. PLAGGE
 CHRISTOPHER J. PLOURDE
 LYNN LOUISE PLUNKETT
 JAMES A. W. POINTER
 JOHN F. POLKOWSKI
 DANIEL E. POLSGROVE
 JOHN A. PORCHE
 TIMOTHY W. PORTER
 JEREMY P. POTVIN
 ORVAL A. POWELL
 CRAIG D. PRATHER
 SHELLY PRESCOD
 THOMAS J. PRESTON
 DEREK D. PRICE
 JEREMY E. PROVENZANO
 DAVID R. PRYOR
 ANDREW MICHAEL PURATH
 SCOTT GRAYSON PUTNAM
 DINA L. QUANICO
 JEFFREY M. QUEEN

CARLOS A. QUINONES
 NATHAN R. RABE
 MICHAEL J. RADERMACHER
 JASON J. RAFFERTY
 MICHAEL J. RAFFERTY II
 JEREMY A. RALEY
 MARCUS D. RANDALL
 ROBERT W. RANDALL
 ERIK J. RANKE
 JAMES R. RAPALLO, JR.
 MICHAEL C. RASBACH
 DAVID E. RAYMAN
 ROBERT T. RAYMOND
 DANIEL J. REBECKY
 BRYAN K. REDASH
 PETER S. REDDAN
 EDWARD J. REDDER
 BRIAN L. REECE
 KURT N. REGLING
 CHRIS E. REICHARDT
 JERIME L. REID
 ROBERT B. REID
 ROBERT D. REIMER
 CARRIE A. REINHARDT
 MATTHEW W. RENBARGER
 JASON M. REPAK
 JASON SANCHEZ RESLEY
 FRANK N. REYES
 RAMSAMOOJ J. REYES
 KEVIN R. RHODES
 CHRISTOPHER M. RICE
 TIMOTHY L. RICHARDSON
 MATTHEW B. RICHTER
 JEROD G. RICK
 JUSTIN A. RIDDLE
 JONATHAN D. RITSCHEL
 KEVIN A. RIVERO
 WILLIAM E. ROACH
 ROBERT R. ROBB
 SANDRA C. ROBERTS MORROW
 JOHN C. ROBERTS
 MARIA C. ROBERTS
 BENJAMIN S. ROBINS
 CLAYTON E. ROBINSON
 JORI A. ROBINSON
 JOHN D. ROCHE
 ROY V. ROCKWELL
 JUNE F. D. RODRIGUEZ
 CHAD A. ROGERS
 THOMAS C. ROGERS
 DANIEL S. ROHLINGER
 JONATHAN M. ROMAINE
 GEOFFREY J. ROMANOWICZ
 RICHARD J. ROMANSKI
 LANCE ROSAMIRANDA
 JAMES F. ROSS, JR.
 JOSEPH J. ROTH
 FRANCOIS H. ROY II
 JONATHAN S. ROYER
 CHAD E. C. RYTHER
 JOSEF E. SABLATURA
 JEFFREY A. SALEM
 KELLY M. SAMS
 PETER A. L. SANDNESS
 MARK A. SANDOR
 ELIOT A. SASSON
 DANIEL M. SAUCER
 LYNN E. SAVAGE
 MICHAEL A. SAVILLE
 MICHAEL M. SAX
 TRAVIS J. SCHEEL
 STEPHEN L. SCHEIN
 NICOLAS J. SCHINDELER
 CHRISTOPHER G. SCHLAK
 DAMIAN SCHLUSSSEL
 JASON A. SCHMIDT
 DANIEL T. SCHMITT
 MATTHEW A. SCHNOOR
 DONALD E. SCHOFIELD II
 JOHN M. SCHUTTE
 LAWRENCE J. SCHUTZ
 NATHAN C. SCOPAC
 JOHN DANIEL SCOTT II
 BARRY R. SECREST
 DAVID C. SEITZ
 PETER A. SELKEY, JR.
 JAMES D. SELLNOW
 CHRISTOPHER SENSENEY
 SHAWN A. SERFASS
 MARIO A. SERNA
 JASON R. SETTLE
 JOHN M. SEVIER
 DEVIN L. SHANKS
 GRANT BROOKE SHARPE
 JOSEPH L. SHEFFIELD
 JEROMIE K. SHELDON
 MICHAEL S. SHELDON
 DAVID R. SHORT
 JON L. SHUMATE
 JOSEPH P. SIBERSKI
 KENNETH A. SIERRA
 JAMEY P. SILLENCE
 CHAD A. SILVA
 MATTHEW M. SIMMONS
 TIMOTHY J. SIMMONS
 EDWARD H. SIMPSON
 JAMY L. SIRMANS
 TRAVIS D. SJOSTEDT
 JAMES D. SKELTON
 MARK ROBERT SLOAN
 ALBERT E. SMITH
 ANDREW M. SMITH

ANTHONY L. SMITH
 BENJAMIN T. SMITH
 DANIEL W. SMITH III
 JESSE D. SMITH
 TRACEY E. SMITH
 VERONICA E. SMITH
 WILLIAM H. SMITH
 BRIAN L. SNYDER
 DARREN D. SOKOL
 JONATHAN M. SONGER
 CADE R. SONNICHSEN
 WILLIAM G. SOSNOWSKI
 ANDREW A. SOUZA
 DANNE EMMETT SPENCE
 GUY T. SPENCER
 JAMES H. SPENCER
 MITCHELL R. SPILLERS, JR.
 EDWARD T. SPINELLI
 ERIC J. SPRINGER
 DANIEL C. ST PIERRE
 JAMES W. STAHL
 THOMAS W. STALEY
 DONALD L. STARLING
 WILLIAM R. STAUS
 BRADLEY J. STEBBINS
 DERICK N. STEED
 ANDREW J. STEFFEN
 RICHARD E. STEGGERDA
 KAYLE M. STEVENS
 RODNEY S. STEVENS
 WILLIAM M. STOVER
 DAWN M. STRAIGHT
 STEVEN A. STRAIN
 JOHN C. STRATTON
 THOMAS A. STRATTON
 KELLY L. STRONG
 ERIC M. STRUMPF
 KRISTOPHER W. STRUVE
 CHEN Y. SU
 BETH ANN SUBERO
 PATRICK C. SUBERMANN
 CLIFFORD V. SULHAM
 JOHN D. SULLIVAN
 LAWRENCE T. SULLIVAN
 SEAN P. SUTHERLAND
 GARY A. SWAIN
 BRETT T. SWIGERT
 STEPHEN C. SZTAN
 KIRSTIE I. TALBOT
 JEFFREY M. TANG
 RICHARD C. TANNER
 MICHAEL A. TARABORELLI, JR.
 ROY R. TATE, JR.
 MICHAEL B. TATUM
 ANDREW J. TAYLOR
 JASON T. TAYLOR
 STEPHEN T. TAYLOR
 TERENCE G. TAYLOR
 KEVIN B. TEMPLIN
 PETER G. TERREBONNE, JR.
 VINCENT M. TERRELL
 KATRINA A. TERRY
 CHAD R. TESKE
 BRIAN C. THILL
 BRYAN W. THOMAS
 DILTRICE M. THOMAS
 JOHN M. THOMAS
 MICHAEL A. THOMAS
 BRIAN A. THOMPSON
 LANE D. THOMPSON
 SHAWN O. THOMPSON
 GREGORY D. THORNTON
 CASEY J. TIDGEMAN
 MICHAEL C. TODD
 JAMES M. TRACHER
 JOHN D. TRAN
 TRENT W. TRIPLE
 CHRISTOPHER D. TROYER
 AARON A. TUCKER
 BRADLEY E. TURNER
 KENNETH D. UNDERWOOD
 ROBERT T. UNGERMAN III
 DENNIS W. UYECHI
 ROD L. VALENTINE
 TARA R. VALENTINE
 THOMAS B. VANCE, JR.
 JEFFREY S. VANDUSEN
 JERRY M. VANDYKE
 SPENCER T. VANMETER
 MATTHEW T. VANN
 JASON F. VATTIONI
 BRADY P. VAUCLIN
 OMAR A. VELASCO
 MARGARET F. VENCIOUS
 SHANE M. VETTER
 DOUGLAS W. VIEWEG
 DAVID L. VILLA
 JUSTIN M. VINCENT
 GRANT T. VINEYARD
 SHAD D. VINSON
 JILEENE M. VIVIAN
 JASON D. VOORHEIS
 CHRISTOPHER M. WACHTER
 WILLIAM O. WADE
 TED A. WAHOSKE
 ANTHONY L. WALKER
 BRADLEY C. WALKER
 JASON C. WALKER
 PHILLIP WALKER, SR.
 JEFFREY A. WALLACE
 WILLIAM M. WALLIS
 ERICK JOHN WALLMAN

SHAWN P. WALRATH
 STACY E. WALSER
 BRENDAN P. WALSH
 MICHAEL O. WALTERS
 BRANDE HELEN WALTON
 ZACHARY S. WARAKOMSKI
 BENJAMIN GRAY WARD
 RANDY S. WARDAK
 RICHARD L. WARR
 MICHAEL S. WATSON
 JEFFERY A. WEAK
 JAMES C. WEAVER
 JONATHAN D. WEBB
 JOHN S. WEIR
 JEFFREY H. WELBORN
 NAOMI M. WELCOME
 LINWOOD E. WELLS, JR.
 KIMBERLY LEE WELTER
 BRENT D. WENTHUR
 WILLIAM W. WENZEL
 DERRICK J. WEYAND
 SCOTT P. WEYERMULLER
 RYAN W. WHITE
 PAUL W. WHITFIELD, JR.
 JONATHAN C. WHITNEY
 JUSTIN A. WHITSON
 STACY S. WIDAUF
 JASON T. WIEHRDT
 DAVID A. WIELAND
 STEVEN T. WIELAND
 COLIN C. WIEMER
 JANINE O. J. WIGGINS
 CHRISTOPHER M. WILCOX
 BRIAN K. WILKERSON
 BRADY J. WILKINS
 GARY M. WILLIAMS
 NICHOLE L. WILLIAMS
 SARAH C. WILLIAMS
 SEAN A. WILLIAMS
 ALAN L. WILLINGHAM
 DARREN M. WILLIS
 CLINTON M. WILSON
 JAMES G. WILSON
 KEITH D. WILSON
 KYLE J. WILSON
 ROCKIE K. WILSON
 WAYNE W. F. WILSON
 AARON N. WILT
 HEATH WIMBERLEY
 JOSEPH H. WIMMER
 BRIAN D. WITKOWSKY
 JEFFREY S. WITT
 THOMPSON C. WOFFORD III
 KEITH M. WOLAK
 IAN S. WOLFE
 MARK R. WOLFE
 DAVID B. WOODLEY
 JOHN P. WOODRUFF
 CHRISTOPHER WORDEN
 CARRIE L. WORTH
 PAUL S. WRIGHT
 RASHEEM J. WRIGHT
 MICHAEL C. WYATT
 BENJAMIN A. WYSACK
 JARED C. YARRINGTON
 JASON D. YEATTS
 JEFFREY W. YOST
 MATTHEW J. ZAMISKA
 SHAO H. ZERBA
 JESSE B. ZYDALLIS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CINDY B. KATZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 4336(A):

To be colonel

WILEY C. THOMPSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

MARSHALL S. HUMES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

CYRUSS A. TSURGEON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

COLLEEN F. BLAILES
 CURTIS T. CHUN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be major

BRAD M. EVANS
 JAY S. KOST

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

MATTHEW J. BAKER
 RUSSELL B. CHAMBERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSEPH B. RUSINKO

To be major

VIRGLIO A. CANTU
 STANLEY H. CHAO
 PAUL S. LAJOS
 MARIO A. MIGLIETTA
 PAULA S. OLIVER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

CHARLESPAUL T. ANONUEVO
 BRECK S. BREWER
 KANIK A. DAVILA
 ABBY M. DEBONIS
 PETER N. DROUILLARD
 NICKOLI DUBYK
 JOSEPH M. DUTNER
 STEPHEN K. EDWARDS
 NASSER I. FIQA
 BRANDON M. GAGE
 ROBERT N. GILLIAM
 KAREN E. GONZALEZTORRES
 PRABHDEEP S. GREWAL
 ZACHARY H. HIGHBERGER
 JERRI D. HINES
 NGHIA N. HO
 WILLIAM C. JEFFREY
 MEENAL P. JOHNSON
 LELAND B. KIMBALL
 JACOB L. KITSON
 DAVID H. KWON
 TIMOTHY A. LEW
 KURTIS G. LIGHTHEART
 ANDREW C. MARSHALL
 ALVIN B. MATTESON
 SLOAN D. MCLAUGHLIN
 JAMES D. MEDWICK
 LARRY L. MUNK
 JUSTIN M. NELSON
 TIMOTHY J. NEUNER
 ADAM R. OCHSNER
 MILTON M. ONG
 ZACHARY A. PAUKERT
 MICHAEL S. PETERMAN
 SAMUEL E. POINDEXTER
 SHANE S. PORTER
 DAVID L. REDMOND
 MURRAY M. REEFER, JR.
 JASON D. ROE
 LUCERO SANABRIA
 MICHELLE D. SARNO
 MARC M. SERRA
 JESSICA S. SHARP
 KRISTIN L. SOLEAU
 CHRISTOPHER D. SWAGERTY
 FELICIA V. SWINNEY
 JEREMY M. THOMPSON
 MATTHEW B. THOMPSON
 SAMIRA F. THOMPSON
 JUSTIN M. TRISLER
 J. R. TUCKER
 JOHN F. UNDERWOOD
 JOHNNY R. VIDIC
 ALAN D. WALKER
 TRACY E. WALTERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

DAVID H. BURNHAM
 JAMES C. CLEMENTS
 ARMANDO V. CORRAL
 ANN DIRKS
 QUINCY GAINES
 JAMES R. HOCK
 MICHAEL E. LAMBERT
 GAETANO C. MANGANO
 WALLACE M. MATTOS
 FREDERICK PALMER
 PATRICK W. SCANLAN
 RANDALL S. VERDE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

MICHAEL A. ADAMS

JEFFREY B. ADLER
 JASPAL AHLUWALIA
 OMOLARA R. ALAO
 MAZER ALLY
 KAREN A. ALVAREZ
 JONG AN
 JASON ANDRES
 MATTHEW S. ANGELIDIS
 WASIL M. AQL
 KELLY A. ARBLASTER
 ANTHONY ARNETT
 GAVIN W. ARNETT
 SYLVIA G. ARORA
 CHARLES ASHER
 CHARLES ATKINSON
 EDWARD P. BAHK
 DREW C. BAIRD
 DAGOBERTO BALDERAS
 TODD P. BALOG
 RAYMONDA L. BARBOUR
 MICHAEL BARTOSZEK
 ROBERT A. BASSETT
 KELLY A. BEAR
 BRAD B. BECKMANN
 MEGAN M. BELPREZ
 ETHAN S. BERGVALL
 JOHNNY R. BERNARD
 KATHRYN E. BERRYMAN
 AARON M. BETTS
 ELIZABETH A. BLANK
 DAVID V. BODE
 NICHOLAS O. BOE
 SARAH BOLDT
 REED A. BONVICINO
 MELISSA L. BORDEN
 PAUL H. BORNEMANN
 ANDREW J. BRACKBILL
 JENNIFER BREDDELVE
 CHRISTOPHER C. BREUDER
 PAUL A. BREWER
 AARON C. BRINKMAN
 RICHARD A. BRODERICK
 ANGELA R. BRYAN
 SUMMER D. BRYANT
 JASON B. BUENAVENTURA
 MIKI A. CAIN
 CHRISTOPHER J. CALCAGNO
 SCOTT W. CALCAGNO
 TERRA L. CALLAHAN
 WILLIAM G. CALLIS
 NAPOLEON A. CAMPOS
 SAMUEL CANCELRIVERA
 JORGE E. CAPELLAGONZALEZ
 KEVIN A. CARTER
 JULIA M. CAVALLARO
 LACIA R. CHAPMAN
 JOHN B. CLARK
 MICHELLE S. CLARK
 TREVOR CLAYTON
 GUY CLIFTON
 JUSTIN P. COCO
 GARRETT W. COLBY
 SHAWN P. CORCORAN
 CHRISTOPHER COWAN
 BENJAMIN E. CRABB
 CRISTINA CRUZCRESPO
 JUSTIN M. CURLEY
 JOSEPH DAI
 LEO A. DAMASCO
 MATTHEW R. DEBIEC
 KRISTIAN E. DELGADO
 ANDREW S. DELMAS
 JESSE P. DELUCA
 SALLY P. DELVECCIO
 SKY A. DENNISTON
 JEREMIAH J. DEPUE
 ZACHARIAH M. DEYOUNG
 JONATHAN F. DICKENS
 MICHAEL M. DICKMAN
 MARY DIGIULIO
 CHRISTOPHER D. DOWNER
 IAN R. DRISCOLL
 SCOTT A. DRUMMOND
 MARK C. DUBER
 MELISSA E. DUBER
 LEIGH D. ECKERT
 KIM EDHEGARD
 JAMES ELDER
 BEAU ELLENBECKER
 TROY ELLIS
 ZAHER ELMIR
 MATTHEW EVANS
 ADAM EVERETT
 MELISSA FAGA
 TASHEEMA L. FAIR
 RUTH S. FAIRCLOTH
 MICHAEL J. FARRELL
 TODD FEATHERS
 DARELL J. FERGUSON
 COLBY A. FERNELIUS
 JAMES B. FESKO
 RYAN P. FOLEY
 MIRANDA C. FOWLER
 ANTHONY R. FRATTALONE
 SHARON L. FRATTALONE
 DENNIS T. FUJII
 BRIAN K. FUJIOKA
 JOHN J. GARTSIDE
 NICOLE M. GIAMANCO
 STEVEN W. GILROY
 MICHAEL E. GOLDBERG
 GARCIA H. GONZALEZ

SCOTT D. GOODROAD
 ROSCO S. GORE
 DAVID W. GRANT
 MAX L. GRATRIX
 JON R. GRAY
 CHARLES E. GROOTERS
 AMIT K. GUPTA
 JEFFREY A. GUTHRIE
 MITCHELL T. HAMELE
 ANDREW HAMMER
 CHADWICK B. HAMPTON
 BRIAN R. HANEY
 JACOB J. HANSEN
 STEPHEN A. HARPER
 JASON N. HARRIS
 LEAH E. HASTINGS
 TRAVIS T. HAWKS
 MAXIMILIAN W. HECHT
 JASON D. HEINER
 BRYCE C. HEITMAN
 RHINE N. HELFRAN
 PAUL W. HENDRIX
 BRANDI N. HICKS
 ERIC J. HILL
 TINA HILLS
 MICHELLE N. HOANGQUOCGIA
 MARC H. HOHMAN
 SUSANNA N. HOLT
 SONNY S. HUITRON
 OLIVIA T. HUNTE
 PAUL F. HWANG
 LUIS G. IZQUIERDO
 KHALID JABOORI
 JONATHAN JI
 CHRISTOPHER JOHN
 JACQUELINE M. JOHNSON
 JOSEPH S. JONES
 ROBERT A. JONES
 KAMALJEET S. KALSI
 GRACE KANG
 PATRICIA KAPUNAN
 BENJAMIN KASE
 SEAN KEARNEY
 DAVID M. KELLER
 JEREMY B. KENT
 LEAH K. KERNAN
 REBECCA A. KESSLER
 MATTHEW C. KIDD
 JEEHUN M. KIM
 YOUNG S. KIM
 KATE E. KINNAIRD
 ALISON R. KINSLER
 CHARLES A. KITLEY
 ELIZABETH A. KNAZEK
 CHIEF S. KNIFE
 TODD C. KNUDSON
 CHRISTINE J. KO
 CAROLINE M. KOLB
 GREGORY P. KRAUS
 BRIAN R. KRIETE
 MATTHEW D. KUHNLE
 MARY L. KWOK
 ELENA H. KWON
 CHAD E. LAMPHERE
 ANGELA LANTANG
 JOSEPH T. LANZI, JR.
 NOELLE S. LARSON
 JARED I. LENZ
 RICHARD N. LESPERANCE
 GARY LEVY
 TRACY L. LEVY
 LEYI LIN
 MATTHEW J. LINCOLN
 JEREME P. LONG
 ABRAHAM LOO
 CARLTON A. LOOMIS
 SPENCER E. LUDLOW
 EMILY E. LUERSSEN
 JAMES E. MACE
 JOSHUA MANDEVILLE
 ANTHONY L. MARK
 ANA E. MARKELZ
 JORGE I. MARTINEZOSORIO
 MITCHELL C. MARZO
 TABATHA H. MATTHIAS
 RYAN J. MCDONOUGH
 MEGAN H. MCKINNON
 HSIANG C. MCLAUGHLIN
 BRANDI S. MCLEOD
 LAWRENCE W. MCMILLION
 NATHAN E. MCWHORTER
 CHRISTOPHER J. MEYER
 MARCY MEYER
 JOEL MILLER
 LONNIE MILLER
 NATHANIEL R. MILLER
 DAUN J. MILLIGAN
 JOSHUA D. MITCHELL
 DAVID MOORE
 MELINDA J. MORTON
 BENJAMIN A. MOSES
 SUSAN M. MOSIER
 JOHN E. MUSSER
 CRISSY A. NAVEJAR
 JAMES R. NEINER
 SEAN R. NELSON
 JAMES NICHOLSON
 UPNEET K. NIJJAR
 TYLER M. NIXON
 DEREK T. NOEL
 TIMOTHY A. NYDAM
 CRYSTALE J. OAKMAN

FREDERICK P. OBRIEN
 KEARY E. OCONNOR
 COLLEEN M. OLSON
 ADAM R. OLSSON
 HEATHER M. OMARA
 BRIAN ORILLY
 LINDSAY R. ORMSBY
 RASTISLAV OSADSKY
 HAINES K. PAIK
 STEPHEN PARADA
 ANGELO H. PAREDES
 DENNIS J. PARK
 PATRICK M. PARKER
 SHIMUL S. PATEL
 TANVI D. PATEL
 VINCENT J. PAUL
 KATHRYN M. PAYNE
 KEVIN S. PAYNE
 JESSICA J. PECK
 ANGELA PENN
 KEITH H. PENSKA
 CORYELL J. PEREZ
 PAUL G. PETERSON
 THACH PHAM
 KIMBERLEY J. PHILLIPS
 SAMUEL C. PHINNEY
 JENNI PICKINPAUGHINOCENCIO
 TIMOTHY P. PLACKETT
 BENJAMIN F. PLATT
 MARK D. POIRIER
 JOHN J. POULIN
 DOUGLAS F. POWELL
 NATHAN F. PURSIFULL
 RAYMUNDO C. RACELA
 RASEL M. RANA
 MICHAEL A. REDD
 ANGELA L. RETZ
 KURT J. REYES
 ROBERT D. RICE
 SHANE M. RINEHART
 BRADLEY A. RITTENHOUSE
 PAUL M. ROBBEN
 MATTHEW D. RODGERS
 DEREK J. ROGERS
 CHRISTOPHER J. ROSEMEYER
 FRANCISCO C. RUBIO
 JEREMY K. RUSH
 JENNY L. RYAN
 KATHLEEN C. RYAN
 JUAN C. SAAVEDRA
 SHARI L. SAMMS
 JOHN R. SANTAANA
 ERIN S. SEEFELDT
 BRETT M. SHAFPER
 MOHAMMAD A. SHAH
 SHAHROOZ SHAYEGAN
 MALLA A. SHIMOKAWA
 PAUL J. SHOGAN
 JASON SIM
 JOHN W. SIMMONS
 MICHAEL P. SIMPSON
 JASON D. SMITH
 RYAN C. SMITH
 NIKOLAUS T. SNESHKOFF
 JON S. SOLBERG
 JAEKYUNG SONG
 ADAM T. SOTO
 KEVAN M. SPENCER
 CHRISTOPHER A. SPOJA
 DANIELLE A. STACKHOUSE
 GREG E. STARLEY
 LAUREL R. STEARNS
 THERON R. STINAR
 DANIEL STINNER
 FRANKLIN STUMP
 JOSHUA J. STUTZMAN
 THOMAS A. SUMMERS
 ZOE E. SUNDELL
 ERIC M. SWANSON
 DUSTIN TAUFERNER
 RANDOLPH TAYLOR II
 NATHANIEL TEAGUE
 HILLARY THOMAS
 KEVIN M. TOU
 CORY TRICKETT
 JEFF TZENG
 ALICE UY
 RAMESH VENKATARAMAN
 DAVID L. WAITE
 DANIELLE WARNER
 MATTHEW WEBB
 MARK WELCH
 MELANIE D. WHITMAN
 SCOTT WHITWORTH
 SCOTT WILCHEK
 SHAPRINA R. WILLIAMS
 BART J. WINTER
 KELLY J. WINTER
 SEAN R. WISE
 ALLAN G. YOUNG
 PAULA YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

GEOFFREY R. ADAMS
 SCOTT R. ALLEN
 PATRICK S. ALTENBURG
 PHILIP W. ANDERSON
 NIKOLAI L. ANDRESKY
 PAUL M. ARMSTRONG

SHERMAN ARMSTRONG
 ARIC N. ARNOLD
 ROBERT R. ARNOLD, JR.
 KENNETH S. ATEES
 DENNIS R. ATKINS III
 GAIL E. ATKINS
 CHRISTOPHER S. AUCLAIR
 ROBERT G. BAILEY
 VINCENT P. BAILEY
 JAMES J. BAIRD III
 DARIEN L. BAISLEY
 TODD E. BAJAKIAN
 KOO BAKER
 MICHAEL D. BAKER
 THOMAS W. BAMFORD
 GARY A. BANTAD
 SHAWN M. BARNES
 CATINA M. BARNESRICKS
 MAURICE O. BARNETT
 THOMAS J. BARRETT
 STEVEN T. BARRY
 AARON C. BARTA
 LISA M. BARTEL
 SCOTT L. BARTLEY
 LAWRENCE O. BASHA
 BASSEY E. BASSEY III
 BRETT A. BASSINGER
 JAMES E. BATCHELOR
 BRYAN K. BATSON
 TAMMY L. BAUGH
 RICARDO A. BAUTISTA
 TIMOTHY R. BECK
 GARY M. BELCHER
 VINCENT J. BELLISARIO
 JASON M. BENDER
 IAN S. BENNETT
 LEROY D. BENTON
 PAUL E. BERG
 STEPHEN M. BERT
 MICHAEL R. BIANKOWSKI, JR.
 DREW A. BISSELL
 WILLIAM R. BLACK
 JAY A. BLAKLEY
 PHILLIP J. BORDERS
 PETER S. BORETSKY
 JOSEPH W. BOSCIA
 KIRT R. BOSTON
 CLARENCE W. BOWMAN III
 EDWARD A. BRADY
 WILLIAM P. BRAMAN
 CHRISTOPHER C. BRESKO
 TIMOTHY S. BROADENAX
 KEVIN BROADNAX
 WILLIAM F. BROCKMAN III
 JARETT D. BROEMMEL
 GEORGE B. BROWN III
 ROBERT S. BROWN
 DUDLEY C. BROWNELL III
 JAMES E. BROWNLEE, JR.
 JAKOB C. BRUHL
 JEFFREY C. BRYSON
 JEFFREY D. BUCK
 ROBERT S. BUINISKIS
 DALE W. BURBANK
 ROBERT L. BURGESS
 CHARLES R. BURNETT
 LUCIEN CAMPILLO
 GREGORY A. CANNATA
 KEVIN S. CAPRA
 BARRY R. CARLSON, JR.
 ADAM J. CARSON
 CHRISTOPHER M. CARTER
 MARCUS D. CARTER
 RAFAEL E. CATHELLINEAUD
 CHAD C. CHALFONT
 MALCOLM O. CHANDLER
 DERRICK W. CHENG
 MARK S. CHILDRESS
 BRYAN J. CHIVERS
 ERIC CHOY
 DEREK P. CHRISTENSEN
 MARK W. CHRISTENSEN
 JUSTIN T. CHUMAK
 KENDALL J. CLARKE
 CHRISTOPHER J. CLAY
 DOMENIC P. CLEMENTI
 SPENCER J. CLOUTRE
 MARC A. CLOUTIER
 DANIEL K. COFFEY
 STEVEN R. COLE
 MICHAEL D. COLEMAN
 TIMOTHY E. COLLIER
 DARYL L. COLLINS
 RICHARD C. COLLINS
 KEVIN A. COMFORT
 MICHAEL W. CORLEY
 STACEY P. CORN
 TRAVIS W. CORNETT
 JIM B. CORRELL
 ORLANDO V. COSME
 PATRICK M. COSTELLO
 BARBARA R. CRAWFORD
 DAVID W. CRIFE
 JOHN R. CRISAFULLI
 EDWARD C. CROOT
 RODNEY J. CRUM
 MATTHEW J. CRYSTAL
 LUIS A. CUBILLANHERNANDEZ
 BENJAMIN F. CURETON
 JASON A. CURL
 JASON D. CZAR
 MATTHEW B. DALE

MARK R. DANNER
 JOHN P. DAVIS
 JOHNATON L. DAWBER
 ALLISON L. DAY
 ERIC J. DEAL
 JOSEPH S. DEGLIUOMINI
 CORY J. DELGER
 RICHARD A. DENNIS
 JEROME F. DENTE
 JAMES M. DEPOLO, JR.
 ALEXANDER G. DERANEY
 DAVID P. DIAMOND
 RYAN S. DILLON
 ABRAHM C. DIMARCO
 ROBERT B. DIXON
 BRAD L. DOBOSZENSKI
 NEIL B. DOHERTY
 DENNIS P. DONEGAN, JR.
 JAMES T. DONOVAN
 DARRELL A. DOREMUS
 MICHAEL A. DOUGLAS
 WILLIAM M. DOWLING
 JONATHAN H. DOYLE
 FREDERICK J. DUFALT
 RICHARD A. DUNBAR
 RICHARD L. DUNTON
 LUIS A. DUPERON
 JOHN R. DYKE III
 MICHAEL R. EASON
 DANIEL H. EDWAN
 DEYNEL M. EDWARDS
 DOMINICK L. EDWARDS
 EDWARD D. ELDRIDGE
 DANIEL G. ELLIOTT
 TROY N. ELLIS
 BRAD W. ENDRES
 JARED B. ERICKSON
 DANIEL A. J. ERKER
 JOSEPH E. ESCANDON
 SHANNON ESPINOZA
 MICHAEL L. ESSARY
 MARCOS A. ESTRADACASTRO
 EDWARD R. EVANS III
 LAKEI C. EVANS
 JASON A. EVERS
 PETER W. FARRELL
 KATHLEEN B. FARREN
 DAVID M. FAULK
 MICHAEL J. FAZIO
 THOMAS B. FENOSEFF
 JASON E. FIGUEREDE
 LUIS M. FONTANEZROLON
 BRETT C. FORBES
 LUIS A. FREGOSO
 ANGELA L. FUNARO
 ROBERT A. GAGNON
 ROBERT J. GARBARINO
 WILLIAM B. GARBER III
 RICHARD R. GARBY
 MARCUS A. GENGLER
 RANDY D. GEORGE
 MARK C. GILLESPIE
 JOHN W. GIOP
 DARRYL W. GLASS
 CHRISTOPHER N. GLOVER
 MICHAEL G. GONZALEZ
 DAVID W. GORDON IV
 THOMAS R. GORDON, JR.
 MICHELLE M. GOYETTE
 JOHN M. GRANTZ
 RICHARD A. GRAVES
 NATHAN M. GRAY
 TRAVIS B. GRAY
 THOMAS M. GRECO
 JAMES D. GREER
 DENNIS M. GRIMSLEY
 PAUL B. GUNNISON
 KARSTEN J. HAAKE
 DEWEY C. HAINES
 CHRISTINE E. HALE
 JOSEPH E. HALLORAN IV
 ROBERT D. HALVORSON
 GEORGE L. HAMMAR IV
 WILLIAM J. HAMPTON IV
 ROGER S. HARBISON
 PATRICK K. HARKINS
 BERNARD J. HARRINGTON
 CHAD M. HARRIS
 DUSTIN K. HARRIS
 BRADLEY P. HARVEY
 STEPHEN S. HARVEY
 ROBERT J. HASKIN
 BRANDON H. HAVRON
 JOSEPH A. HAWKINS, JR.
 BYRON S. HAYES
 BRADLEY J. HERMAN, JR.
 AXEL HERNANDEZ
 LUIS R. HERNANDEZ
 JOSHUA P. HIGGINS
 JOSEPH J. HODGSON
 CHARLES P. HOGBOOM IV
 DAVID A. HOLLIS
 KENNETH K. HOLMSTROM
 CAROLINE K. M. HORTON
 MARK C. HOUSTON
 JONATHAN D. HOWELL
 JOHN M. HUBBARD
 TIMOTHY L. HUDSON
 SEAN F. HUGGINS
 ANTHONY V. HUGHES
 BENJAMIN E. HWANG
 ERNEST J. IRVIN II

CHARLES E. JACK
 STEPHEN S. JACKMAN
 BRETT G. JACKSON
 EDWARD M. JAGODZINSKI
 JAMES M. JAMES
 MICHAEL R. JAZDYK
 PHILLIP G. JENISON
 PETER R. JENSEN
 EDWARD J. JOHNSON, JR.
 ERIC M. JOHNSON
 MARK C. JOHNSON
 SEBASTIEN P. JOLY
 JASON J. JONES
 WILLIAM L. JUDDSON
 MARK G. KAPPELMANN
 ELLEN J. KELLEY
 MATTHEW F. KETCHUM
 JASON T. KIDDER
 DOUGLAS D. S. KIM
 JAMES M. KIMBROUGH IV
 MILTON L. KINSLOW
 KEVIN L. KIRBY
 WILLIAM L. KIRBY
 SCOTT W. KIRKPATRICK
 SCOTT W. KOAST
 MATTHEW J. KONZ
 PAUL J. KREMER
 TIMOTHY R. KREUTTNER
 SCOTT C. KRUSE
 SEAN H. KUESTER
 CORNELIUS W. KUGLER
 CHRISTOPHER T. KUHN
 DOMINIC Y. KUSUMOTO
 JOSE R. LAGUNA
 MARC V. LAROCHE
 PAUL L. LARSON
 SCOTT A. LEBLOND
 THEODORE J. LECOUFFE
 DANIEL L. LEE
 JAMES K. LEE, JR.
 DARREN D. LEMASTER
 HEATHER A. LENTZ
 ALLEN D. LETH, JR.
 ALEXANDER F. LEWIS
 APISIT LEWIS
 CHAD B. LEWIS
 MARK A. LIBBY
 ANDREW N. LIFFRING
 PETER A. LIND
 TRAVIS J. LINDBERG
 ERIC N. LINDSAY
 TIMOTHY A. LINDSAY
 MATTHEW R. LITTLE
 JOHN T. LITZ
 BRIAN S. LOCKE
 ANDREW R. LOEB
 RONALD E. LOFTON, JR.
 JAMES B. LOVE
 KEVIN J. LOVELL
 JEREMIAH C. LUMBACA
 CREDE J. LYONS
 ROMEO R. MACALINTAL, JR.
 JON P. N. MADDALONI
 RYAN O. MAENDER
 TOBIN A. MAGSIG
 SCOTT J. MALONE II
 ISAAC C. MANIGAULT
 GERALD G. MAPP
 STEPHEN T. MARCHANT
 TANYA T. MARKOW
 RAUL E. MARQUEZHERNANDEZ
 HUNTER M. MARSHALL
 TODD H. MARSHBURN
 HARRY C. MARSON V
 RICHARD A. MARTIN
 ROBERTO R. MARTINEZ
 THOMAS R. MATELSKI
 ERIC L. MAXWELL
 MATTHEW R. MAYBOUER
 VIRGINIA A. MCCABE
 MICHAEL C. MCCAY
 CAROL A. MCCLELLAND
 CLIFTON R. MCCREADY
 IAN A. MCCULLOH
 KIMEISHA Y. MCCULLUM
 ERIN A. MCDANIEL
 KENNETH P. MCDANIEL III
 JOHN J. MCDERMOTT III
 BRIAN D. MCDONALD
 JEFF H. MCDONALD
 GEORGE F. MCGRATH III
 LADD D. MCGRAW
 ANDREW S. MCINTYRE
 DANIEL S. MCKEEGAN
 CHRISTOPHER T. MCKINNEY
 GEOFFREY A. MCLAUGHLIN
 THELONIOUS F. MCLEANBURRELL
 MICHAEL G. MCLENDON
 SEAN J. MCWILLIAMS
 CHRISTOPHER MEDINA
 BRIAN C. MELLEN
 RICHARD V. MELNYK
 NORBERTO R. MENENDEZ III
 OTMARO A. MENJIVAR
 DOUGLAS W. MERRITT
 MARK D. METZGER
 RUSSELL D. MEYER
 HILARY J. MILLER
 GEORGE O. MIMS
 MICHAEL A. MINENI, JR.
 JAMES E. MIXSON III
 CHARLES F. MOEHLNBROCK

MACEDONIO R. MOLINA
 RAPHAEL B. MONTGOMERY
 PAUL M. MOODY
 JULIO V. MORALES III
 MICHAEL P. MORAN
 RANDOLPH M. MORGAN
 JEROME S. MORRISON
 JOHN C. MORROW
 SINLAN MORROW
 THEDRIC J. MOSELEY
 FRANCIS R. MOSS
 JOHN C. MOSTELLAR
 VANESSA Y. MOYE
 MICHAEL S. MULLINS
 STEVEN E. MUNDY
 JEANJACQUES T. MURPHY
 ROBERT A. MURPHY
 WILLIAM C. NALL
 GREGORY J. NARDI
 SCOTT C. NAUMAN
 CHRISTINE M. NELSONCHUNG
 MATTHEW P. NEUMAYER
 STEPHEN T. NEWMAN
 KEVIN T. NICHOLAS
 SHANNON E. NIELSEN
 KATRISA L. NORWOOD
 JOSEPH M. OCALLAGHAN, JR.
 JOSE H. OCASIOSANTIAGO
 SHAWN P. OCONNOR
 BENJAMIN R. OGDEN
 PATRICK M. OHARA
 DAVID J. OLSON
 CAMERON M. ONEILL
 MARK P. OTT
 JOSEPH E. PACE
 MARK A. PAPPAL
 WILLIAM M. PARKER
 GREGORY A. PARKINS
 MICHAEL D. PARSONS
 RODEL F. PASIBE
 MATTHEW C. PAYNE
 BRIAN A. PEDERSEN
 JON S. PENDELL
 MICHAEL N. PERRY
 LEE I. PETERS III
 WILLIAM R. PETERSON
 PAUL A. PFEIFFER
 ROBIN K. PICKEL
 JEROME L. PIONK
 CHRISTOPHER S. PITTMAN
 CARTER L. PRICE
 KEVIN B. PRICE
 RUSSELL M. PRICE
 CHARLES A. PUDIL II
 JASON M. RAILSBACK
 RENE RAMOSRIVERA
 BRIAN C. RAU
 OWEN G. RAY
 BRENDAN C. RAYMOND
 GREGORY J. RECK
 PAUL M. REEB
 KENNETH N. REED
 KYLE A. REED
 TIMOTHY J. REED
 BRANDON E. REEVES
 JOHN T. REINERT
 LUIS O. REMIGIO
 DANA E. RESNICK
 MICHAEL A. REYBURN
 EDWIN REYESMONTANEZ
 JENNIFER A. REYNOLDS
 JOHN M. REYNOLDS
 NATHAN P. REYNOLDS
 JESUS T. REYNOSO
 STEPHEN M. RHUDY, JR.
 DANIEL L. RICE
 ARIE C. RICHARDS
 JOHN P. RICHARDS
 ALVARO F. ROA
 WALTER G. ROBERSON, JR.
 KURT W. ROBERTS
 SAMUEL R. RODRIGUEZ
 RICHARD K. ROPER
 STEPHEN V. RUZICKA
 SEAN J. RYAN
 RAFAEL SAENZ
 DENNIS A. SALCEDO
 ERICK J. SALISBURY
 IKE L. SALLIE
 MICHAEL J. SALVO
 ANDREA L. SAMPSON
 STEVEN M. SATTINGER
 MATTHEW C. SAUNDERS
 TIMOTHY L. O. SAVIDGE
 MATTHEW SCALIA
 MICHAEL A. SCARPULLA
 FRANK P. SCHANTZ
 ROBERT J. SCHEXNAYDER
 ERIC A. SCHMIDT
 TIMOTHY J. SCHMITT
 JEFFREY SCHRICK
 DARRYL T. SCHROEDER
 GERD D. SCHROEDER
 JAMES C. SCHWARTZ, JR.
 GREGORY C. SCRIVENS
 STACY M. SEAWORTH
 ALLAN M. SELBURG
 SCOTT A. SENDMEYER
 TIMOTHY R. SHAFFER
 WILLIAM J. SHAVCE
 JEFFREY A. H. SHAW
 JERAL J. SHELTON

MARK B. SHERKEY, JR.
DAVID R. SHOUBE
SAMUEL S. SHRAIDER
JAMES D. SIDES
PAUL A. SIGLER
CHRISTOPHER A. SIKES
ALEXANDER V. SIMMONS
RAYMOND T. SIMONS
JEFFEREY A. SLOWN
BRADFORD W. SMITH
CHARLES J. SMITH
CLOYD A. SMITH, JR.
EDLYN E. SMITH
JASON E. SMITH
KELSEY A. SMITH
TYLER B. SMITH
WAYNE C. SODOWSKY
ERIC G. SORENSON
PHILLIP D. SOUNIA
JOSEPH R. SOWERS
JON R. SPELL
KEVIN SPIELMAN
WARREN E. SPONSLER, JR.
STEPHEN J. STASEVICH
JENNESS F. STEELE
MICHAEL P. STEPHENS, JR.
MICHAEL A. STINNETT
CARRINGTON L. STOFFELS
KEVIN J. STOLL
TOMMY E. STONER
DANA T. STOWELL
DAVID A. STRANGE
JENNIFER L. STRIEGEL
ERIC S. STRONG
PATRICK J. SULLIVAN
RICHARD J. SUROWIEC
GRAHAM R. SWENSON
NEIL TATOR
T G. TAYLOR
TONY TAYLOR
JAMES L. TENPENNY
ERICH R. THEN
CHRISTOPHER W. THOMAS
JOEL W. THOMAS II
CHARLES S. THOMPSON
MARK W. THOMPSON
MICHAEL A. THOMPSON
MICHELE A. THOMPSON
JEFFREY A. TIEGS
MATTHEW J. TIESZEN
ERIC B. TOWNS
STEVEN B. TRAUM
MARK L. TROMBLEE
MICHAEL J. TROTTER
JAMES J. TUITTE IV
JAMES E. TURLEY
MARCIA J. TUTT
TIMOTHY S. TYSON
RONALD H. UPTON
JOHN B. VAN HOOK
CHRISTIAN G. VAN KEUREN
GEOFFREY R. VANEPPS
MARK D. VERTULI
TIMOTHY C. VILES
TITO M. VILLANUEVA
SAMUEL L. VOLKMAN
WILLIAM D. VOORHIES
CHRIS A. WADE
BLAINE N. WALES
JOSHUA H. WALKER
BRADLEY J. WALLACE
DOUGLAS R. WALTER
JOHN P. WALTON
CHRISTOPHER J. WARD
MARK S. WARDEN
STEPHEN WARGO
RONALD A. WARNER
MICHAEL B. WEATHERS
SETH A. WEAVER
SYLVESTER O. WEGWU
HEATHER E. WEIGNER
MATTHEW R. WEINSHIEL
SHAMAI T. WELLONS
PATRICK C. WENTZ
CHRISTOPHER M. WHELAN
EDWARD S. WHITAKER
JOHN C. WHITE, JR.
RYAN H. WHITTEMORE
MARCUS A. WILDY
CURTIS D. WILEY
PATRICK S. WILKINS
JOHN C. WILLIAMS
JOHN M. WILLIAMS
LEEVAINE WILLIAMS, JR.
RAYMOND E. WILLIAMS
RHONDA Y. WILLIAMS
ANTHONY T. WILSON
JEREMY S. WILSON
MARK A. WINKLER
SCOTT M. WINTER
KEVIN D. WISSEL
AARON W. WOLF
PHILLIP E. WOLFORD
FREDERICK D. C. WONG
ROBIN S. WOODY
JOHNNY WORKMAN, JR.
BRIAN K. WORTINGER
NANCE J. WRIGHT
TED D. YATES
RODNEY R. YOUNG
WILLIAM R. YOUNG

DAMON M. YOURCHISIN
JOHN J. ZEIGLER
ANDREW S. ZIESENIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ALISSA R. ACKLEY
STEPHANIE R. AHERN
THOMAS S. AKIN
ANDY R. ALLEN
DANIEL P. ALLMACHER
ROBERT R. ANDERSON
MARIA T. ANGELI
WANDRA F. ARNOLD
SCOTT C. BAGER
STEPHEN K. BARKER
MARK W. BARLOW
CHRISTOPHER T. BARRY
JOHN M. BARRY, JR.
CHAD T. BATES
ERIK M. BAUER
JOHN W. BAUER
DAMON A. BECKNEL
CEASAR P. BERGONIA
BRIAN A. BISSONNETTE
WARD T. BLACKLOCK III
MARK A. BOEKE
BRIAN C. BOLIO
CRAIG J. BONDRRA
AQUANITA R. BONDS
TIMOTHY B. BORAAS
WILLIAM E. BOSWELL
JESUS E. BOTELLO
COOPER D. BOWDEN
STEVEN T. BOWER
DONALD W. BRADY, JR.
WILLIAM H. BROOKS III
ERIC L. BROWN
JUSTIN W. BROWN
JAMES W. BRYANT, JR.
TED M. BRYANT
BENJAMIN D. BUALAT
WILLIAM B. BURLEY
JEREMY D. BUSHYAGER
RAYMOND D. BUTLER
RICHARD D. BUTLER
JASON C. CALDWELL
TERENCE A. CALIGUIRE
JAMES J. CAMERON
CHAD E. CAMPFIELD
SHAWN B. CARDEN
DAVID F. CARRY
SHAWN E. CARPENTER
HORACE CARTER, JR.
RICHARD K. CASSEM II
ROBERTO R. CASTILLO
JENNIFER CHAPMAN
DONALD J. CHARRON
JAMES A. CHARTERS
CHRISTA M. CHEWAR
KEITH T. CHINN
BRIAN J. CHWOJDAK
CHRISTOPHER W. CIRINO
GREGORY S. COBURN
JOHN D. COLWELL, JR.
KRIS M. COLWELL
JASON P. CONROY
BRADLEY J. COOK
BRANT R. CORNISH
DAVID J. CREASMAN
DANIEL J. CURTIS
TIMOTHY G. DALTON
BRIAN S. DAVIS
JACQUELINE H. DAVIS
ROGER K. DAVIS
KEITH L. DAWSON
PHILIP H. DAWSON
MICHAEL R. DEAN
MATTHEW S. DENNY
KAREN J. DILL
JOHN J. DISMER
JAMES R. DOOLEY
THOMAS W. DORREL, JR.
JAMES L. DOTY III
SEAN P. DUVAL
MARY T. EBERST
DAVID P. ELSEN
MICHAEL C. ENOS
SAMUEL A. ESCALANTE
CHARLES D. FAINT
DUANE A. FAIRFAX
GARY E. FARLEY, JR.
ANDREW T. FERGUSON
JENNIFER P. FINCH
MICHAEL D. FORBIS
YVETTE FOSTER
IAN E. FRANCIS
RONALD L. FRANKLIN, JR.
STEVEN J. FREDERIKSEN
ERNEST A. FREUND
JOSEPH A. FUNDERBURKE
COREY S. GERVING
KURT D. GIESE
MATTHEW T. GILL
SCOTT D. GILMAN
JOHN C. GIORDANO

MICHAEL A. GLODE
BRANDON S. GLOVER
CURBY W. GRAHAM
JESSICA L. GREGRIS
JON D. GRIESE
GREGORY C. GRIFFIN
JENNIFER S. M. GRIFFIN
RANDALL D. GRIGG, JR.
GEORGE C. HACKLER
CHAD K. HACKLEY
JAY W. HALEY
MICHAEL P. HANSEN
TIMOTHY L. HARDY
WILLIE J. HARRIS, JR.
TANYA L. HARRIS
ANTHONY J. HARTSOOK
RONALD C. HASZ
DONALD A. HAUSSER, JR.
JUSTIN M. HAYNES
MARVIN G. HAYNES IV
BENNETT E. HAYTH
CHRISTOPHER K. HEATH
JON L. HEFFNER, JR.
DUANE I. HENDERSON
OBIE C. HENDERSON
RAY C. HERNANDEZ
DAVID HERNANDEZMORALES
STEVEN J. HILDEBRAND
ALBERT C. HILL, JR.
ERIC M. HIU
GREGORY L. HOLDEN
CHRISTOPHER R. HOLLIFIELD
PETER H. HOPEWELL
ROBERT E. HORNE
KEVIN G. HOSIER
JEFFREY M. HOWELL
CHRISTOPHER G. HURLBURT
SCOTT E. HUTCHISON
KENNETH P. HYNES
UNKYONG IM
BOB A. ISAAC
CHAD S. JACKSON
WILLIAM K. JAKOLA
EDWIN B. JANKOWSKI
MATTHEW A. JESOP
CHARLES L. JOHNSON
RICHARD H. JOHNSON, JR.
JACKIE D. JONES, JR.
OLIVIA A. JONES
ALVIN L. JORDAN, JR.
JONG H. JUN
DEBORAH S. KARAGOSIAN
BRIAN A. KASTNING
DANIEL J. KEEL
RHONDA L. KEISTER
JEMAIN L. KEMP
MATTHEW R. KENT
LEONARD W. KERGOSIEN
RAYMOND A. KIMBALL
WARREN E. KIMMEL
MICHAEL J. KING
JOSEPH KLOIBER
QUINT A. KLOPPLEISCH
JONATHAN P. KLUG
RODGER D. KNEDEL
HYUNJU V. KO
MICHAEL A. KOEHL
KEVIN W. KOERNER
CHERYL R. KORVER
JEREMY S. KOTKIN
ROBERT J. KRESS
CHRISTOPHER A. LAMBERT
ANNMARIE K. LAROQUE
KARL F. LEDEBUHR
SHAWN E. LEONARD
JOHN F. LEOPOLD
GEORGE D. LEWIS IV
DAVID T. LIBERT
JASON T. LIDDELL
JOSEPH M. LINQUIST
DERRICK C. LONG
WENDY Y. LUPO
STUART A. LUTTRELL
ALEXANDER D. MACCALLMAN
KELLY G. MACDONALD
JILL L. MACKIN
CECIL R. D. MACPHERSON
VERONICA H. MAGNOTTO
MELVIN T. MAGSINO
RYAN M. MARRO
CHRISTOPHER S. MARTIN
JUAN F. MATA
JONATHAN S. MATEY
JAMES S. MATTHEWS IV
STUART T. MCCALL
HUGH P. MCCAULEY
BRIAN W. MCCLAUGHLIN
LOUIS P. MELANCON
JOHN C. MICHAUD
MELISSA C. MILES
TRICA M. MILES
TIMOTHY W. MILLER
CHRISTOPHER D. MILLS

SAMUEL T. MITCHELL II
 JEFFREY T. MORAN
 HOWARD A. MURRAY
 MARGARET M. MUSSER
 SCOTT C. NAYLOR
 GARY P. NELON
 JAMES H. NELSON
 JEFFREY S. NELSON
 JOHN E. NELSON
 JAMES E. NICHOLS III
 MELVIN J. NICKELL
 QUENTIN C. NOREIGA
 GRETCHEN M. NUNEZ
 JEFFREY P. O'DONNELL
 KEVIN M. ONEIL
 ROBERT J. ORSI
 AARON D. OSBURN
 JOHN D. PAGE
 DAVID J. PALAZZO
 CHARLES G. PALMER IV
 JASON N. PALMER
 MATTHEW S. PALMER
 DAVID W. PARKES
 SAMUEL L. PARTON
 JON F. PARVIN
 RICHARD S. PEEKE
 JOSE PEREIRA
 JAY L. PERSONS
 AARON L. PETERSON
 DONALD PETERSON, JR.
 KEVIN L. PETERSON
 GARY D. PHILMAN
 ROBYN L. PIETRON
 BURCHELL O. PORTER
 GARY L. PRATER
 TED M. PREISTER
 DOUGLAS A. PRYER
 ALAN J. QUATTRIN
 RALPH J. RAGOSTA III
 CHAD O. RAMBO
 RONALD V. RANALLI
 THOMAS B. RANSOM
 RICHARD A. RASSBACH
 JOHN C. RAYBURN
 MARK G. REARDANZ
 DONALD W. REEVES
 DWAYNE D. B. REEVES
 MASON J. RICE
 JOHNNIE L. RICHARDSON, JR.
 WALTER E. RICHTER
 PAUL H. RIGBY
 JAMES F. RILEY
 JAWARA RILEY
 NED C. RITZMANN
 JOSE R. RIVAS
 BRIAN L. ROBINSON
 DARELL M. ROBINSON
 PAUL R. ROMANO
 FRED D. ROTHENBUSH, JR.
 PETER J. ROWELL
 JONATHAN A. RUFENACHT
 TODD D. SABALA
 BILL N. SABBAGH
 AARON D. SAMMONS
 ROBERT SAYRE
 ADAM C. SCHLANG
 ROBERT F. SCHLICHT
 CRAIG M. SCHLOZMAN
 KURT P. SCHOMAKER
 ADAM D. SELLERS
 EDWIN S. SERRANO
 JOHN D. SHANNON
 MICHAEL P. SHANNON
 ANTHONY E. SHEPARD
 CARLOS R. SHIPPY
 ROBERT E. SHOLL
 SAMUEL R. SMITH, JR.
 DERRICK C. SMITS
 MICHAEL D. SPAKE
 PAUL S. SPARKS
 ERICH C. SPRAGG
 RYAN R. SQUIRES
 NICOLE J. STANFORD
 JOHN W. STANLEY
 ROGER E. STANLEY
 BRIAN M. STEPHAN
 ALEXANDER D. STEPHENSON
 HEATHER L. STEWARTJOHNSTON
 BERNIE E. STONE
 DONALD B. STREATER
 BRENDA J. SUGGARS
 MARNE L. SUTTEN
 SULEV A. SUVARI
 STEPHEN P. SZYMANSKI
 IAN J. TARASEVITSCH
 DAVID A. TARVIN
 JAMES S. TAYLOR, JR.
 EDWARD B. TEAGUE IV
 JAMES C. TEAGUE
 KIRBY K. TEAGUE
 STEPHEN D. TERSTEGGE
 ENRIQUE P. TORRES
 STONEY A. TRENT
 WILLIAM M. UNDERWOOD
 SCOTT L. UNSWORTH
 HEIDI A. URBEN
 CAINAZ A. VAKHARIA
 LITA VAN HOOK
 ERIC J. VANDENBOSCH
 BRYAN D. VELARDE
 NATALIE C. VINES
 JOSEPH W. VONGSVARNRUNGUANG

JOHNNIE R. WALKER, JR.
 MARK D. WALTERS
 ALEX L. WEHMEYER
 JEFFREY J. WEINHOFER
 JAMES R. WEST
 DALE M. WHITE
 CARLOS A. WILEY, SR.
 RONALD D. WILKES
 DENNIS G. WILLE
 TUWANDA F. WILLIAMS
 TERRI A. WISE
 KIEU D. WOLFORD
 ERNEST Y. WONG
 BRIAN D. WOOLWORTH
 CHRISTOPHER J. YOUNG
 JOSEPH J. ZELAZNY
 KIRK F. ZIMPEL
 RAYMOND C. ZINDELL III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

THOMAS H. AARSEN
 KRISTIN A. ABERG
 PAUL E. ALESSIO
 CHRISTINE E. ALLEN
 RONNIE D. ANDERSON, JR.
 JOHN M. ASKEW
 GERALD AVILA
 ALEJANDRO AYALA
 CHAD A. BAGLEY
 JAMES E. BAGLEY
 JEFFREY E. BAKER
 SCOTT R. BAKER
 ANDREW M. BALANDA
 THOMAS M. BALLENGER III
 SHANE A. BARNA
 SHANE C. BARNES
 LESLIE A. BARNETT
 SEAN G. BARRETT
 ANTHONY C. BAUER
 HEATHER O. BELLUSCI
 GARRICK B. BENSON
 TYRONE C. BENTINCK
 LAWRENCE W. BITTNER
 JOSEPH C. BLANKENSHIP
 DENNIS BOWERS
 MATTHEW R. BOWLER
 KENNETH C. BRADFORD
 ANGELIQUE O. BROUGH
 TODD A. BROWNING
 BRADLEY N. BRUCE
 BOBBY W. BRYANT
 LETITIA L. BRYANT
 ANGELA R. BUCHANAN
 TODD E. BUHR
 SEAN M. BURKE
 DONALD L. BURTON
 JAMES M. CALLIS II
 JONATHAN G. CAMERON
 LANCE CANGELOSI
 HEATHER J. CARLISLE
 ANDREW T. CARTER
 JOHN H. CHAFFIN IV
 KEVIN S. CHANEY
 JAMES C. CLARKE, JR.
 KELVIN R. CLAUDE
 JAMES L. CLIFT
 NOAH C. CLOUD
 JERRY E. COBURN
 BRENT D. CORYELL
 LAWRENCE M. COUSINS
 JESSE A. CRISPINO
 LESLIE E. DARLING
 MARY M. DASILVA
 CHERRIE L. DAVIS
 JOSEPH M. DAVIS
 ANDREW J. DEKEVER
 ANTHONY R. DEKEYZER
 TROY M. DENOMY
 DAVID S. DINKELMAN
 JULIAN A. DOMINGUEZ
 MICHELLE K. DONAHUE
 STEVEN T. DOWNEY
 CHARLES P. DOWNIE
 DEREK J. DRAPER
 MICHAEL C. DUSABLON
 BRYAN D. EDWARDS
 JASON T. EDWARDS
 DANIEL P. ELLINGER
 PAUL A. ESMAHAN
 JOSEPH E. FAGAN
 RAY C. FALLARIA
 RYAN D. FEARNOW
 ROBERT S. FEATHERS
 ANGEL M. FELICIANOCASILLAS
 KEVIN E. FINCH

AARON P. FITZSIMMONS
 CHRISTOPHER A. FORD
 GREGORY S. FORTIER
 MICHAEL P. FRANK
 JOHNATHAN B. FRASIER
 TIMOTHY R. FULLER
 DEZZAIRE D. FULTON
 DONOVAN O. FUQUA
 WILLIAM A. GALINGER
 ADAM GAMEZ
 JAMES M. GARRETT
 RAYFUS J. GARY
 JERRY E. GAUSSOIN, JR.
 WAYNE J. GAVIN
 EDWARD J. GAWLIK III
 PATRICIA L. GEORGE
 RODNEY M. GIBSON
 GLENDA A. GILL
 MARSHANNA M. GIPSON
 EDWARD C. GOSLINE III
 SIDNEY M. GOURDINE II
 KIMBERLY K. GRAHEK
 DANIEL M. GRAY
 DAMIAN A. GREEN
 ROCHELLE Y. GREEN
 MICHAEL H. GREENBERG
 JOEL M. GREER
 RUDOLPH C. GRIMES
 KEVIN J. GROTH
 BORIS A. HALL
 JOHN F. HALL
 MATTHEW T. HAMILTON
 RAPHEAL J. HAMILTON
 SIDNEY A. HARRIS
 JAMEY P. HAUKAP
 KELDA S. HAWKINS
 DANIEL J. HEAPE
 NICOLE M. HEUMPHREUS
 JUSTIN L. HIGHLEY
 KELSIE C. HILLHUSTON
 LINNEN E. HODO
 GARY A. HOFFMAN, JR.
 LANNY A. HOGABOOM II
 CAIN A. V. HOPSON
 LOWELL E. HOWARD, JR.
 STEPHEN M. HOWELL
 CORT J. HUNT
 ANGELA R. HUTCHERSON
 EDWARD A. IVEY
 ERIK A. JABLONSKI
 JASON K. JEFFERIS
 PAIGE M. JENNINGS
 GREGORY S. JOHNSON
 TRAVIS H. JONES
 ROGER L. KEEN, JR.
 RAYMOND D. KELLER
 MILTON G. KELLY
 KEVIN H. KERBY
 STEFAN S. KING
 TIMOTHY W. KLENESKE
 MATTHEW H. KNORR
 MICHAEL J. KOVACS
 BRIDGET A. KROGER
 WILLIAM D. LASH
 NOEMI LAUREANO
 ANTHONY Q. LEE
 STEPHANIE J. LEGGETT
 BRIAN A. LESIAK
 JEREMY R. LEWIS
 CHRISTOPHER R. LIERMANN
 JOSEPH L. LISELLA
 ELISABETH S. LITVIN
 WALTER LLAMAS
 BRIAN D. LOFTON
 JARED T. LONGFIELD
 BRETT K. LORD
 JOHN M. LORENZEN
 JON A. LUST
 GABRIELLE M. MADDALONI
 DENNIS C. MAJOR
 ANTHONY T. MANERI
 CHASE S. MARTIN
 DANIEL P. MARTIN
 MISTY L. MARTIN
 RICHARD MARZANCOLLAZO
 CHERYL B. MASISAK
 WILLIAM W. MAY
 MARK W. MAYS
 JAMES J. MCANDREWS
 TAMARA MCLENDON
 MICHAEL J. MCCURTY
 SCOTT W. MCINTOSH
 KELLEY L. MCINTYRE
 WANDA Y. MCLEAN
 MICHAEL B. MCNEELY
 JAMES K. MCPHERSON
 BRIAN A. MEINSHAUSEN
 CHRISTOPHER E. METZ
 RICHARD L. MICHAELS
 MICHAEL T. MOORE
 STACEY A. MOORE
 MARCUS A. MOTLEY
 HAROLD L. MOXLEY
 ROBERT C. MURRAY
 MICHAEL S. NAVARRO
 JAMES T. NAYLOR
 WIL B. NEUBAUER
 KHOI T. NGUYEN
 THOMAS H. NGUYEN
 COLIN P. NIKKILA
 SETH A. NORBERG
 CHARLES G. NOVOTNY

JASON J. NOWAK
 SEAN M. O'BRIEN
 KENNETH G. O'DONNELL
 CARL S. OELSCHEG
 MARSHAL R. OLLER
 MICHAEL D. OLSON
 CHRISTOPHER C. OSTBY
 ARTHUR A. PACK
 MARK E. PARSONS
 RICHARD G. PETERSEN, JR.
 STEVEN A. PETERSEN
 ROBERT L. PHILLIPS III
 JOSEPH C. PISANI, JR.
 LAURA N. POSTON
 BRYCE D. PRINGLE
 KERRY S. PROWELL
 HEATHER J. PUTMAN
 JEFFREY E. REDECKER
 MARK J. REED
 BRADLEY L. REES
 RYAN G. REGTUYT
 THOMAS J. RICE
 BRIAN K. RICHIE
 TIMOTHY C. RIGGS
 LORENZO P. RIOS
 STEVEN D. RIOS
 MICHAEL T. RITTENHOUSE
 MONIQUE N. RIVERA
 SANDRA E. ROBINSON
 LUIS A. RODRIGUEZ
 LUIS E. ROJAS
 CHRISTOPHER J. ROMERO
 GARY D. ROWLEY
 ROBERT W. RUGG
 MICHAEL J. RUTHERFORD
 BRYAN W. SALYERS
 DARCY L. SCHNACK
 JONATHAN E. SCHRADER
 STEPHEN R. SEIGER
 TYRA S. SELLERS
 NOBERT G. SIMONNET
 ROBERT C. SLOSSON
 BRIAN A. SMITH
 GREGORY S. SMITH
 JOEY R. SMITH, JR.
 KEVIN Z. SMITH
 VICTORIA L. SNOW
 TOY Y. SOBERS
 ROY W. SPEAKS
 MARC D. STAATS
 MEGAN B. STALLINGS
 JAMES M. STEPHENS
 JONATHAN A. STEVENS
 EMILLY M. STOFFEL
 SENODJA F. SUNDIATAWALKER
 JACOB C. SWANTKOWSKI II
 TODD N. TERRAL
 GREG R. THAYER
 ARMOND THOMAS III
 JARRETT A. THOMAS II
 STEPHEN THOMAS
 WILLIAM M. THORNHILL II
 PATRICK M. TIEMANN
 MICHAEL S. TITUS II
 WILLIAM TRIMBLE, JR.
 MICHAEL T. TRIPLETT
 PATRICK W. TRIPLETT
 JOHN K. TULIFUA
 JAMES L. TURNER V
 MICHAEL N. TURNER
 MICKEY A. TURNER
 DANE A. TYNES
 FELIX J. VALENTIN
 STEWART J. VANBUREN
 JENNIFER S. WALKAWICZ
 FRANK E. WALKER
 ANDREW H. WARNINGHOFF
 MICHELLE G. WASHINGTON
 DAVID C. WELCH
 KENNETH W. WICAL
 JOHN S. WIEMAN
 JESSE R. WIGHTMAN III
 XAVIERA C. WILLIAMS
 WESLEY J. WILLIAMSON
 GARTH K. WINTERLE
 MARK D. WOLF
 DAVIE L. WRIGHT, JR.
 STEVEN C. WRIGHT
 MITCHELL L. YBARRA
 MICHAEL R. ZAHURANIC

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

MATHEW R. LOE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

MICHAEL J. O'DONNELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

LAWRENCE BRANDON, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

ROBERT A. SLAUGHTER
 ROBERT THOMAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5589:

To be lieutenant commander

ANTHONY DIAZ
 TAMI M. LINDQUIST
 ERROL K. MANDRELL
 TODD A. MCINTYRE
 JANE E. MCNEELY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

CARISSA L. GAREY
 BRYAN E. LONG
 DANIEL G. NICASTRI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

TIMOTHY M. DERBYSHIRE
 TOMASZ DMITRUKOWSKI
 VON H. FERNANDES
 BARBARA E. JONAS
 RICHARD L. MCKNIGHT II
 CHRISTINA E. ORTEGA
 DANIEL G. UPP
 CHRISTINA J. WONG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JEREMIAH E. CHAPLIN
 ROBERT J. CLEARY
 ERIC L. DALEY
 DAVID W. DAMRON
 CASEY J. GON
 JAMES D. HARRIS
 DARIN H. KEETER
 GREGORY J. KURTZ
 RAZA A. O. LAIYEMO
 JENNIFER J. LANDRY
 NATALIE A. LAUDIER
 ANGELA S. LEPLER
 STEPHEN A. MCINTYRE
 MATTHEW W. MCKENZIE
 JEANETTE SHEETS
 ADAM B. SHINABARGER
 PAMELA A. TELLADO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

PAIGE H. ADAMS
 ALEXANDER J. BEECROFT
 GRETCHEEN A. BUNDYDLADOWICZ
 JEFFERY L. BURKE
 CHARLES Y. CHA
 DAVID E. DWIGGINS, JR.
 CRAIG A. FOWLER
 RAYMOND G. FREDRICKS, JR.
 LONNIE N. GRIFFITH, JR.
 BRANDY L. GROSSI
 JONATHAN M. HAY
 PHILLIP L. HICKMAN, JR.
 GENE J. JACKSON
 ERIC L. KIRK
 CASANDRA L. KOISTINEN
 GARY A. MCCONAGHY, JR.
 JASON A. TRACEY
 BRIAN P. WALSH
 CORNELL A. WOODS
 DURKE A. WRIGHT
 ANDREW F. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ROBERT S. BAIR
 BRIAN R. BAKER
 TRISTAN M. BORNE
 DANNY R. BOUIE
 ANTHONY A. BUMATAY
 JAMES E. DELOSSANTOS
 BRIAN A. EVANS
 AARON C. GEARY
 ERVIN B. HATCHER
 ROBERT N. JOHNSON

WILLIAM R. JOHNSON
 JUDITH L. LEMLEY
 HENRY A. MARTINEZ II
 CODY K. MORTENSEN
 PHILLIP C. PETERSEN
 RALPH J. STEPHENS
 PATRICIA R. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

KIRKLAND M. ANDERSON
 MARTIN J. ARA
 STACY A. BELDEN III
 MATTHEW R. BLANCHETTE
 TRAVIS Z. BODE
 SEAN P. BOYLE
 LAWRENCE R. CADENA
 JAMES G. CARVER
 RUSSELL D. CHAPMAN
 TRAVIS R. CLEMINS
 RONALD B. CLOVE
 JOHN C. COPELAND
 MATTHEW P. DOMINGOS
 ADRIAN A. DY
 ANDREA C. EASTON
 LYNDON D. EASTON
 SCOTT K. EMLEY
 RICHARD E. FAROTTEKRUCHAS
 NATHAN A. FEEZOR
 JASON M. FLOOD
 TYRONE T. GABRIEL
 BERTHEA G. HAMPTON
 JOHN D. HEAVRIN
 JOHN M. HERMAN
 ERIN E. HIGGINBOTTOM
 KARL T. HJEMBO
 SEAN R. HOLMAN
 CHRISTIAN E. JIMENEZ
 CHARLES K. JONES
 PAUL C. KELLER
 RYAN K. KING
 MELISSA A. MACLIN
 ROBERT A. MADDEN
 NICK D. MARTINEZ
 DAVID H. MILLNER
 AMANDA J. MITTELSTADT
 DAVID M. MROSEK
 JON J. MUHOBERAC
 SUNG D. NGUYEN
 ROBERTO R. PEREZ
 JEFFREY M. ROARK
 DAVID N. SAVERY
 KIMBERLY K. SHELBURNE
 STEFANIA A. SIGURDSSON
 JEFFERY C. STEPHENSON
 ROBERT J. STORER
 MICHAEL B. STURM
 SETH F. TAYLOR
 GABRIEL A. THOMAS
 BRIAN E. WALKER
 FRANK A. WARNER
 KATHRYN E. WATSON
 GEOFFREY J. WEBER
 DAVID M. WHITE
 WILLIAM D. WHITEMAN III
 JEREMY B. WILGUS
 SHANE A. WINKER
 MARTHA A. WITTOSCH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CHERYL E. AIMESTILLMAN
 JEFFRY A. ALSUP
 DAVID C. ANDERSON, JR.
 ROSS M. ANDERSON
 TODD A. ATKINSON
 JAMES S. BALDWIN
 MICHAEL J. BALDWIN
 ANTHONY C. BARBER
 JOHN P. BARD
 LANCE O. G. BARKER
 BRAD A. BAUER
 MATTHEW J. BELLAIR
 ANTHONY J. BELLVILLE
 BRENT J. BENLEN
 BRYAN G. BENNETT
 WILLIE J. BERNARD
 DOWAYNE BISTLINE
 GEORGE V. BODINE
 LESTER F. BOERNER
 KELLY V. BORDEN
 CURTIS BROWN
 KENNETH A. BRUCE
 FRED E. BRUMMER
 ROBERT W. BURGETT
 ZEVEK L. BUTTS
 PABLO CAMARILLO III
 STEVEN S. CARPENTER
 CRAIG A. CARSTEN
 EDWARD CASAS
 JOEL A. CASTILLO
 JAMES M. CATTEAU
 THOMAS S. CAVANAGH
 MICHAEL L. CAWYER
 JAMES C. CLARK
 JOHN W. CLINE
 DAVID A. CONTI

PETE A. COORE
 HARVEY J. COPELAND
 MICHAEL K. CRUTCHFIELD
 MICHAEL C. CURETON
 JON R. DAVIS
 RANSOM A. DAVIS, JR.
 ROBERT D. DAVIS, JR.
 JASON A. DAVY
 BRIAN C. DEMANGE
 WILLIAM A. DENNIS
 JAMES W. DESROSIERS, JR.
 SHAWN W. DEVLIN
 PATRICK D. DONOVAN
 MARK R. DUMAS
 LYNOR A. DUNCAN
 ANDREW B. DUNHAM
 ALAN V. DUNN
 GARY D. DUNN
 SCOTT M. DURDLE
 ROBERT DURHAM
 STEPHEN J. DURHAM
 FRANK A. DURSO
 KELLY D. EGGLEHOFF
 WILFREDO A. ESLAO
 RICHARD E. EVANS
 JOHN S. FAIRWEATHER
 SHAUN W. FISCHER
 TAYLOR R. FORESTER
 ROBERT C. FRY
 FELIPE D. GARCIA
 MARK T. GEORGE
 CARL J. GERHARD
 PHILIP L. GESAMAN
 RUSSELL J. GOFF, JR.
 ALBERT GUAJARDO
 BRUCE A. HAMILTON
 CHAD M. HAMM
 MICHAEL L. HANKE
 JOHN A. HARDESTY
 RONALD A. HARMON, JR.
 LEE M. HART
 SCOT A. HAVEN
 BRIAN HEASLEY
 MILES G. HICKS
 RICHARD D. HILTON
 HAROLD E. HONEYCUTT
 ROBERT L. HYLTON, JR.
 SHAWN W. IRISH
 MICHAEL R. ISAAC
 DWIGHT A. JEFFERSON
 MICHAEL B. JENSEN
 BRANDON L. JOHNSON
 ROBERT M. JOHNSON
 MITCHELL R. JONES
 LOYAL A. KAMM, JR.
 STEPHEN E. KASHUBA
 MARVIN L. KEEN, JR.
 ARTHUR C. KEENAN II
 SCOTT F. KESLER
 BRIAN L. KING
 PAUL J. KITE
 DEBRA A. KLEINSMITH
 JEFFREY S. KLINKER
 JOHN A. KNOLLA
 RICHARD K. KNOTT
 FREDDIE B. KOONCE
 BRIAN J. LADIEU
 GARY L. LANE
 RUSSELL A. LAWRENCE
 LINDA K. LAWS
 THOMAS E. LAYNE
 GERARD P. LETOILE, JR.
 GARY A. LOCK, JR.
 MANUEL LOPEZ, JR.
 JON O. MAGNUSON
 MICHAEL J. MARTIN
 DAVID M. MARTINEZ
 KENNARD L. MASSIE
 ANDREI L. MCARTHUR
 NIGEL L. MCDONALD
 DARNELL C. MCNEILL
 GLEN A. MECKES
 JOSEPH E. MIKOLAJCZAK
 BRENT A. MILLER
 RICHARD E. MILLER III
 TEREETHA A. MINTZ
 RUSSELL A. MOSER
 LELAND M. MURPHY
 TROY L. NAATUS
 TODD D. NELSON
 GREGORY F. NOTARO
 JAMES A. O'BRIEN
 RONALD K. OCHELTREE
 JUNSIMON A. OLIVEROS
 BENICIA I. ONEAL
 ROBERT L. PAGE

DAVID W. PIERCE
 ERIC J. PIERCE
 ANTHONY D. PINK
 BLAINE C. PITKIN
 KEITH D. PLAVNICK
 BRIAN PONCE
 DAVID P. PRATT
 JOHNNY QUEZADA
 DAVID A. QUINTON II
 ROBERT E. RAMSEY
 WESLEY D. REEDY
 JAMES L. REMINGTON, JR.
 SAM C. RENNEN
 FLOYD F. RINEHOLD
 GREGORY K. RING
 MARVIN G. ROBINSON
 CHARLES B. ROEGIERS
 MARK V. ROLLSTON
 STEPHEN R. ROSE
 DAVID J. RUSSELL
 MICHAEL A. RUSSELL
 STEPHEN L. RUSSO
 WAYNE N. SALGADO, JR.
 RAMIL Y. SALVADOR
 SAMANTHA J. SAVAGE
 ELIZABETH A. SAMANOW
 SCOTT N. SHENK
 JAMES R. SHIRLEY
 RONALD R. SHORTER
 GREG N. SHUPP
 JAMIE J. SIGALA
 ERICK W. SMITH
 RICHARD T. SNYDER
 MICHAEL J. SPANGLER
 DENYSE F. SPRINGER
 JOHN A. STALEY II
 BOBBY C. STANCL
 CLINTON STONEWALL III
 ROBERT J. STREMMEL
 LUKE S. SULLIVAN
 OTIS S. SUMMERS
 LARRY E. TARVER
 GREGORY L. TAYLOR
 TODD N. TAYLOR
 MONTE R. TEMPLE
 JOHN T. THOMPSON
 ANTOINE D. THORNTON
 BARON D. TILLINGHAST
 GARY A. TINCHER
 TOMMY L. TINNEY, JR.
 DAVID R. TOLINE
 ERIC A. TRAINI
 SHAWN A. TRISLER
 SCOTT TROJAHN
 MICHAELANGELO T. TUNGOL
 KARL E. VAUGHN
 JAMES M. WALKER
 THOMAS S. WARE
 STEVEN R. WHEATLEY
 GARY E. WHITE
 DEAN E. WHITEHOUSE
 PEGGY S. WHITENER
 BENJAMIN J. WIECHERT III
 STERLING R. WOOLRIDGE
 MICHAEL J. WORKS
 RICHARD D. WRIGHT
 GILBERT A. YARBROUGH, JR.
 HECTOR R. YOUNG
 ELLIOTT W. YOUNGBLOOD
 JON E. ZATLOKOWICZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ARCHIE L. BARBER
 AARON E. BETZ
 PETER BISSONNETTE
 KRISTINA M. CHENERY
 JAMES J. CULNEN, JR.
 MICHELE R. EWING
 RICHARD G. GLASGOW II
 KIMBERETTA Y. GREEN
 LOUIS F. IMBODEN
 RANDALL D. KREKELER
 KELLY A. MAKSEM
 LAURA L. MCDONALD
 DEANNE B. MCPHERSON
 TERESA S. MITCHELL
 JEFFREY L. MORIN
 SCOTT A. MOWERY
 CHRISTOPHER C. MULLER
 JAMES R. PEDERSON
 ERIC L. POND
 GUNER L. SANDERS

CHRISTOPHER J. SCHLOBOHM
 CHRISTY N. SIBLEY
 MELODY L. STAHR
 ZAVEAN V. WARE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

MYLENE R. ARVIZO
 GREGORY P. BALL
 DARRIN E. BARBER
 BOBBY A. BASSHAM
 MARK F. BOSEMAN
 PERRY L. BRANCH
 JEREMY J. BRAUD
 JAMES L. BRAWLEY
 KRISTIN D. CARTER
 CEDRIC N. DEDBAUX
 SCOTT R. DELWICHE
 COLIN J. DUNLOP
 JOHN M. GALLEBISHOP
 JONATHAN W. GANDY
 RICHARD C. GARGANO
 JOHN A. GENTA
 JASON A. HICKLE
 ANTHONY C. HOLMES
 JOHN D. JUDD
 BIRUTE I. JURJONAS
 ANDREW M. LAVALLEY
 JOSEPH J. MARRA
 ARMANDO MARRONFERNANDEZ
 CHRISTOPHER K. MATASSA
 JEROME S. MCCONNON
 DAVID A. MCGLOONE
 JOSEPH D. MEIER
 HECTOR A. OJEDA, JR.
 MATTHEW R. ONEAL
 ANGELA C. OWENS
 JONATHAN E. PAGE
 TRAVIS J. PLUMMER
 UPENDRA RAMDAT
 JOHN A. RAMSEY
 SARAH B. RICE
 CHRISTOPHER M. SCHINDLER
 BRIAN D. SNEED
 WILLIAM J. SUMSION
 JACK A. TAPPE
 CHAD N. TIDD
 ERROL A. WATSON, JR.
 ASHLEY S. WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

AMELIA F. DUDLEY
 JESSIE J. HALLAN
 JASON SAGLIMBENE
 BRANDON D. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

RICHFIELD F. AGULLANA
 SAMUEL A. BORNINO, SR.
 DEREK H. BURNS
 LEANNE R. CARTER
 HARRY D. CHREST
 RICHARD MERCADO
 ERIC A. NAGLEY
 SHANTELE J. OVERLY
 MICHAEL D. PHILLIPS
 BECKY L. RAMOS
 DANIEL D. REID
 JAMES L. RORER
 ANDREW L. RUTHERFORD
 THOMAS A. SCHROEDER
 FRANKLIN A. SUELA
 SHANNON P. THOMPSON
 JERICHO B. TIMOG
 CHIEH YANG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CHARITY C. HARDISON
 ZACHARY F. HARRELL
 PAUL D. MACAPAGAL
 STEPHANIE B. MURDOCK

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, July 20, 2011

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 20, 2011.

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

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

UNCLE SAM—THE GREAT LANDOWNER

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we've heard the song:

"This land is your land;

"This land is my land;

"From California to the New York Island;

"This land was made for you and me."

But we need to understand that, in America, the greatest, largest landholder is Uncle Sam—Uncle Sam, the great landowner. He owns 27 percent of all the land in America.

This poster here shows the holdings of Uncle Sam. All of the red in the United States, including the red in Alaska, is owned by Uncle Sam. Over 50 percent of the land in the West is owned by Uncle Sam.

Now, if we were to transfer all of these acres to the east coast, that's about the size of all of the land east of the Mississippi that is owned by Uncle Sam. Looking at it another way, let's go across the seas, to Europe. If you were to take all of the land that Uncle

Sam owns and superimpose it on Europe, it would include the United Kingdom, Spain, France, Switzerland, Netherlands, Italy, Austria, Germany, and Poland. That would be how much land Uncle Sam would own if he owned that portion of Europe.

So the great landholder is none other than the Federal Government. The Federal Government owns about 27 percent of all the land in America—623 million acres.

We are now talking about how to increase the revenue for this country.

Maybe we should do something that was thought of years ago. Ronald Reagan may not have been the first, but he did mention in the 1980s that the Federal Government ought to sell some of that land to Americans to help—get this—pay down the debt. This has even been talked about in the White House. President Obama, a couple of weeks ago, discussed selling just one little 300-portion acre in Los Angeles that was worth approximately \$2 billion.

Maybe we should sell some of that.

So I introduced the American Land Act, which will do this:

It will require that the Bureau of Land Management and the Forestry Service sell a portion of their land for the next 5 years, and that will be a 26 percent decrease in total land in the United States owned by Uncle Sam. Now, bear in mind—I'm going to make this clear—this does not include the national parks; this does not include the Fish and Wildlife Service, the marshes, the coastal plains, the environmentally sensitive areas. The Federal Government would make the decision as to what would be sold. In 2005, the landholdings of the United States, according to OMB, was worth about \$1.1 trillion. So I think, if we sold a portion of this land, it would raise revenue for the United States, approximately \$200 billion or less.

Plus, it would do other things.

It would put the land in the hands of Americans. Americans would own the land, and they would pay taxes. They could pay taxes not only to local and State governments, but when they build a business or make a business, they would bring in more Federal income tax. It will save the Federal Government the cost of maintaining ownership, and it will raise revenue and pay down the debt.

Real property in the hands of real Americans.

What a thought.

It will create productivity.

Sell American land to Americans. Let Americans own more of America.

Uncle Sam shouldn't prevent Americans from having a stake, or a share, in America. The United States owns most of the grand estate of our great country, and it's time to let more Americans own it—because this land was made for you and me.

And that's just the way it is.

THE DEBT LIMIT

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

Ms. CHU. In less than 2 weeks, on August 2, we must raise the debt limit or the American Government will go into financial default. If we don't, it will be a disaster for the economy, and real American families will pay the price.

That's why for almost 95 years we have kept our promises and paid our bills. Congress has voted to avoid economic default nearly 100 times since 1917 because it was the right thing to do. The debt limit was raised 17 times under Ronald Reagan, four times under Bill Clinton and seven times under George W. Bush; but now Republicans are shying away from their duty, spreading misinformation about the serious threat we are facing, saying there will be no impact on the average American and that it will not hurt our economy.

But that's not true. Let me tell you why.

If we default on our bills, the interest on all our loans would skyrocket just as your interest rate would go up if you missed a credit card payment. This means disaster for all American families. The median 30-year home loan would increase by almost \$20,000, or 10 percent. This would hurt an already struggling housing market, pushing home sale prices down and potentially leaving more borrowers underwater.

If we default on our bills, the stock market could plunge, and Americans in their fifties would lose almost \$9,000 immediately from the typical 401(k). The S&P 500 could lose 6.3 percent in value in just 3 short months. These losses would affect millions of Americans, who would have fewer savings for their retirements, their supposed golden years.

If we default on our bills, prices for gas, electronics, clothes, and other imported goods could dramatically increase. A U.S. default would create economic chaos, forcing the value of our dollar to decrease, making many products we use every day more expensive at a time when our household dollars are already stretched thin.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

We cannot let this happen, but Republican leaders in Washington are playing political games with our economic security. With 2 weeks left and the clock ticking, the time for playing childish political games should be over. Republicans should come back to the table and work with Democrats on a compromise that will avert economic catastrophe, and they should work on a compromise that doesn't hurt the most vulnerable amongst us.

Seniors earn an average of only \$19,000 a year. Contrast that to millionaires, who, because of the Bush-era votes, are getting almost \$140,000 in tax breaks from the government every year. There is no reason that our seniors and the neediest amongst us should struggle to pay their hospital and electric bills just so we can subsidize a millionaire's yacht.

Yet Republicans want to gut the programs that benefit seniors most—Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare—in exchange for their votes on the debt limit. They actually want to hold your senior years hostage just so they can make a political statement on the debt limit. We cannot balance the budget on the backs of seniors.

For those who believe that the potential for default is not real, let me quote a famous President who said 25 years ago: "Congress consistently brings the government on the edge of default before facing its responsibility. This brinkmanship threatens the holders of government bonds and those who rely on Social Security and veteran benefits. Interest rates would skyrocket; instability would incur in financial markets, and the Federal deficit would soar." That President was Ronald Reagan, making his plea to Congress.

Today, the American people are calling again on this body to do what's right.

I know that, if we can move past all the political posturing, we can reach a bipartisan agreement that protects Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare, that reduces the debt, and that saves our economy from the disaster of default. We must do it now.

□ 1010

HOUSE REPUBLICANS LEADING THE WAY TO RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to be here earlier with Congressman TED POE from Texas explaining about the Federal lands and how they could be developed to create jobs and opportunity. It is particularly fitting that the Speaker pro tem at this moment is DANIEL WEBSTER, Congressman from Florida, because over his head is inscribed a state-

ment, a very wise statement, from the previous Daniel Webster, the statesman of our country. In the inscription over the head of our Speaker pro tem at this moment it says, "Let us develop the resources of our land."

And so we know that the original Daniel Webster was correct, and we know that Judge TED POE is correct, and our Speaker pro tem is correct.

Mr. Speaker, last night, the House passed the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act of 2011. As the cosponsor of this legislation, I am grateful to have my colleagues support this measure with bipartisan votes by Republicans and five Democrats. It cuts spending by \$111 billion in 2012. It enacts statutes that will enforce spending caps on the Federal Government for the next 10 years to promote jobs. Finally, it requires passage of a balanced budget amendment in order to raise the debt limit.

This positive legislation goes beyond politics and puts forth measures that address the needs our Nation faces. These policies force Washington to do what families and small businesses must do every day: balance the budget. Rather than devise a plan of their own, liberals in Congress simply want to raise taxes. These taxes will harm more families and kill more jobs. As the President said in 2009, "You don't raise taxes in a recession." Of course, today we have nearly 15 million unemployed persons in our country. Unemployment under the failed policies of our President has increased to 9.2 percent. We need to change course.

Cut, Cap, and Balance is a plan I encourage the Senate to pass in order to put our country back on the path to prosperity creating jobs.

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

DEBT CEILING DEBATE

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to start first of all by talking about the tenor of debate in this Chamber. Historically, we've had great debates in this Chamber. I think that the Speaker of the House, JOHN BOEHNER, is an honorable man who cares deeply about this institution, and I think on both sides of the aisle we have very intelligent people who care passionately about their beliefs. We have a Nation that's in the midst of the worst recession since the Great Depression. It prevails on us as Americans to come together and face the problems that our Nation is currently dealing with.

You heard Representative CHU mention it earlier. Ronald Reagan did so at that time with a Democratic Speaker, Tip O'Neill. He did so by appealing to

both Chambers about the need to come together, facing the daunting reality of defaulting for the first time on the country's full faith and credit and the impact that that would have on the global economy, on the Nation's economy, but I daresay, more importantly, on one's household economy. From my perspective as a Member here and going back home and listening to our constituents, I think that's the most important thing, is their household economies that are hanging in the balance here.

Washington can oftentimes provide great theater and great back and forth, but we do not want this to become the theater of the absurd as our constituents look on in the pain and agony of being out of work and wondering whether or not their government is going to be there for them.

So I hope that we're able to pass a clean debt ceiling, as Ronald Reagan did 17 times, the same kind of thing that was afforded Bill Clinton and George W. Bush seven times most recently, so that we can get on with the concerns that we care deeply about: whether it's dealing with the national debt and dealing with the issues of spending and making cuts that will strategically grow the economy, or whether it's dealing with investing in the American people and making sure that revenues that come in do so to put America back to work, like the creation of an infrastructure bank funded by the private and public sectors working together to create those much needed jobs, but essentially putting America back to work.

I recently received a letter from one of my constituents, and I think this sums up the feeling of America. I want to read her words because they tell the story of all too many Americans:

"I'm worried, afraid for myself and all in my situation, and saddened. If I still have not been hired to work in the next few weeks, I will lose the financial ability to live in a room or an apartment and will lose the parts of my life that literally had to be placed in storage, most notably my family photos of my deceased parents, of my children, due to the lack of income or savings to pay the rental fees. I have no one who will take me in or who can afford to do this."

She went on to say, "How can you not agree that this is comparable to a natural disaster when individual lives are at stake and left as if to be swallowed by an abyss of dark uncertainty?"

These are the people of our country who we are sworn to serve. This debate is important on the floor. The debt ceiling could be lifted tomorrow, but the pain and agony of the American people are stated more eloquently by the people who are actually suffering, and when she says "to be swallowed up by an abyss of dark uncertainty," that

is a moral obligation for us. Rather than talking about staying here over the weekend to make sure we deal with the debt ceiling and all the machinations that are going on between the two Chambers, let's stay here till we put America back to work. That's what we should be doing: out-innovating, out-building and out-educating the rest of the world.

RESTORING AMERICA

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had a very vigorous debate about the unsustainable debt that our country is facing, and we passed a bill, the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill. That bill is really the only one that's been on the table, House or Senate, so far.

So we asked in the Senate, where's their proposal? We asked the White House, give us a proposal that the Congressional Budget Office can actually give us a score on, on how we're going to do this. We need legislative language to move forward on these things. We can't just base things on speeches, as has been said yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this country is at a very pivotal point in its history. There's no question about it. We're at a pivotal point. We can decide, is the United States going to lead in the 21st century as it did in the 20th century and in the 19th century, or will we be swallowed in a sea of red ink, high unemployment and very sluggish growth? That is the basic fundamental problem we're faced with today.

It's within our power in Congress to make policy decisions that will change this equation for the good or the bad for the American people. We have decisions to make, tough decisions. And it's time. It's time to make those decisions.

□ 1020

Now yesterday we debated the unsustainable debt problem that this country is facing, a situation that is going to swallow up savings for every single American, currently, \$46,000 for every man, woman, and child in this country; and it's rising. And that doesn't count the unfunded liabilities.

So the debt is clearly a problem, and we have to set the country on a sustainable path with a credible plan to move us forward. But there's another side to the problem that's not being talked about enough, and it's the fact that we are not growing this economy. We are not growing private sector jobs. The previous speaker, my friend from Connecticut, talked about the plight of so many who are without jobs. We have to grow this economy if we're going to create jobs, and that means having a well-thought-out energy strategy for

the United States. It means fundamental tax reform to put us on a very competitive footing, whether it's a small business or a large U.S. company, and it also means a very aggressive trade strategy for the United States.

Now I want to talk about trade for a minute because it really does not get enough discussion here in this body. I got some very encouraging news just last week from the World Trade Center of New Orleans, in my home State. It released some quarterly trade figures. In the first quarter of fiscal year 2011, exports from Louisiana manufacturers and farmers grew by almost 50 percent compared to the previous period last year. This is incredible news because Louisiana is rapidly transforming its economy into a global trading economy that helps our farmers, helps our manufacturers. We sell to the world. We create private sector jobs that pay better than the average jobs around the United States. One out of five jobs in Louisiana is related to international trade where we export. This is critical. If we're going to grow this country and grow private sector jobs, we need a trade strategy in place to do this, to help it, to open markets overseas for our farmers, our manufacturers, our small businesses.

We're seeing rapid growth in Asia and South America right now, all based on trade. Hundreds of trade agreements have been basically voted upon in these countries and implemented. Regional trade agreements. Here in the United States, it's been 4 years, and no activity. We have three pending agreements right now: Panama, Colombia, and South Korea. These will basically open markets in countries that are already having pretty much unfettered access into our market. These will create, by the President's own estimate, 250,000 jobs in this country. Those are direct jobs in the short term. That doesn't even speak to the number of jobs that will be created going forward. It is critically important that we move forward on this. There will be \$13 billion in exports from these three agreements alone, exports. These are American companies, American farmers selling their goods overseas. This will stimulate growth in this economy and job creation. This is why we need to move forward on it.

But there are other important aspects to this. These three agreements were negotiated in good faith. And so just like the full faith and credit of the United States is on the line with regard to dealing with our debt problem, our credibility internationally is on the line as to whether we're going to be a leader in this world or we're just going to sit back and shrink and see high unemployment and sluggish job growth and lost opportunities for our children and grandchildren. That's what's at stake with this.

These three trade agreements need to be done now. The President could easily send these to Congress, and we can vote on them. That's what we need to do. That's a step forward to restore American competitiveness, to restore American credibility, and to restore American confidence. Come on, Mr. President, lead.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

IN GOD WE TRUST

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

Mr. RANGEL. A previous speaker referred to our distinguished Speaker pro tem with that historic name and was suggesting that we look for something to guide us that would be over the podium. What I see is "In God We Trust," not the Congress, not the House, not Democrats, and certainly not Republicans, but in God we trust.

Recently, I took this to be a very serious thing. I was saying that in the process of increasing the debt ceiling and cutting back spending, that a lot of people were vulnerable, and I called upon our spiritual leaders not to forget them. And, indeed, whether we're talking about Social Security or Medicare or Medicaid, that all of these things were going to be on the block, subject to being cut. The press said that I was calling upon Jesus to help Democrats.

Well, that's not so. I was calling upon religious leaders, whether they were Christian or Protestant or Jewish or Gentile or Mormon or Muslim to say "in God we trust," and that there comes a time when human beings, regardless of their party registration, need some help in deciding the crucial issues that actually, actually affect the lives of people. And whether we're talking about peace or war, with thousands of people being killed, no one can deny that this is a moral issue, if we were asked whether we support it or not. But yet we find that most Members of Congress cannot even give a reason why we're in Iraq and Libya and Afghanistan.

But having said that, let's face it. It would be ridiculous to assume that I'm making an appeal for Democrats when what I'm talking about is those people who are vulnerable. When flaws in our financial center caused people to lose their homes, it wasn't just Democrats. There were Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and those that have no faith in government who woke up in the morning, they have lost their jobs; they lost their homes; they lost their pension funds; they lost their savings; they had to pull their kids out of

school; they lost their self-esteem; some lost their homes. I don't remember anywhere where we're talking about people who are registered Democrats. These are Americans that expected more from their government than just saying that we will be able to address your needs in the by-and-by.

And the very people that are aged, God knows we're not talking about a party label. When we talk about our sick, when we talk about Medicaid, when we are talking about Medicare, when we are talking about Social Security, how in God's name can we say we are just talking about Democrats? No. We're talking about all Americans that invested in this country that now see that some of them are so hopeless.

We had hoped that we would deal with the debt ceiling which gives the President the ability to say, When America borrows, America pays back. We thought that the integrity of our great country would never be challenged, certainly by Members of the Congress. But that's not the case. The President is being held hostage. And what's being held hostage is the budget.

On the other side of the issue is the question of taxes. So it appears to me that wherever you find the vulnerable, somebody should be protecting them since the lobbyists are not knocking on their door saying, Protect the poor. And this is a great opportunity, since the President is being held hostage, that we can reform some of the things that we wanted to do, whether it's the tax system, Medicare, Social Security. But these things are supposed to go through a process.

I was honored to chair the Ways and Means Committee, which constitutionally deals with all tax issues, all fiscal issues. It deals with trade. It deals with Medicare. It deals with Social Security. And it deals with taxes. So you wake up in the morning, and you find out that the Congress, 435 of us who now have this important decision to make as we hopefully move forward after the deadline of August 2, and the Senate are to decide these questions by the Gang of Six. Well, I'll be back because no longer am I making an appeal for the Congress; God bless the Gang of Six in trying to save this great Nation.

□ 1030

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY'S AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, last night this body passed a piece of legislation that takes a first good step toward fixing America's spending problem, toward taking on our spending ad-

diction and addressing the enormous deficits and debt that our Nation faces.

But we all know there's a second component to making sure that we solve this deficit and debt crisis, and that's economic growth. It's jobs. It's allowing the American entrepreneur, the American consumer to have affordable products, and in the case of Kansas, the American farmer and agriculture producer to survive, to continue to do the things that they need to do to feed the world.

I've been in Congress just 6 months now, and I've watched this administration's Environmental Protection Agency act with respect to our agriculture community with radical indifference or, worse, outright hostility. These are folks who are providing affordable food for our entire world, and yet this administration—this administration—seeks to regulate it. It seeks to harass it. It seeks to impose burdens which will cause this great source of wealth for our Nation to leave. I want to talk about that because it's so important for the growth of our Nation and the success of our Nation to continue to have that industry thrive, and I want to talk about some of the things I've seen in just these 6 months.

The American farmer needs energy. The American farmer needs affordable energy. In this morning's Wichita Eagle, our primary utility in western Kansas and south central Kansas said that the utility rules that this administration is about to impose will put them in a place where they cannot comply. Now, I'm not talking about increased costs. We know that this administration has driven higher electricity rates. We're talking about a utility that will not be able to comply with a set of regulations this administration is putting in place. That's not good for the agriculture community in Kansas. They rely on affordable energy.

The examples go on. This administration, under the Clean Air Act, has attempted to regulate dust. Now, I don't know about folks that live out further this way, but in Kansas, on a dry day like today when it's 110 degrees, there's a little bit of dust when you drive your truck down the road. Yet they want to say, no, that's a regulated particulate matter. Where's the common sense?

Today they're changing the clean air rules to take a set of chemicals that are already regulated under a set of regulations that have been in existence for decades and saying, no, we want to add another layer. We want you to now have to be permitted to have these chemicals that have already been demonstrated to be safe in their use in agricultural production.

We've seen what they've tried to do with greenhouse gas regulation as well. We saw this body respond by not giving the President cap-and-trade, and I'm thankful for that. But we've now get

the Environmental Protection Agency that's trying to do the same through regulatory fiat. And now the Department of Transportation is chiming in as well, trying to regulate trucks, farm equipment under rules that are normally intended for cross country truckers and trying to regulate them in the same way, putting an additional burden on the agricultural community that has been operating their farm equipment in south central Kansas in an incredibly safe way for decades.

I hope that this administration will reconsider. We cannot continue to drive costs. We cannot continue to regulate the Kansas agricultural community. We cannot harass it into its leaving our country. We know this is important. If we drive up the cost of food, we'll drive up inflation. That's good for no one.

I hope this administration will reconsider, that they'll use some common sense. Our farmers, our agriculture producers want clean air. They make it happen. They need clean water. They ensure that it happens every day. We do not need this administration to harass them into leaving the very profession that is so important to our country.

CUT, CAP, AND CONTINUE WARS

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I'm here catching my breath after the debate over the extreme Tea Party legislation that we considered yesterday. It's easily one of the worst bills I can remember in nearly 20 years of service here in this body. Every time I think they can't possibly go any farther, the majority blows me away with the audacity of their proposals and the cruelty of their priorities.

H.R. 2560, yesterday's debt ceiling proposal, almost makes the Ryan budget look progressive. It makes the continuing resolution passed back in April look positively generous. On this side of the aisle, we call it the Cut, Cap, and End Medicare plan, which is completely accurate. But I'm going to give it another name today, Cut, Cap, and Continue Wars, because throughout the debate over the debt ceiling there's been an elephant in the room, if you'll pardon the expression, that hardly anyone is willing to acknowledge, and that is the impact of waging not one, not two, but three wars is having on our Nation's fiscal health.

Afghanistan alone is costing \$10 billion a month, with the total price tag for Iraq and Afghanistan, going back 10 years, \$3.2 trillion. And that's a conservative estimate, Mr. Speaker. These are staggering figures, especially during a recession when Americans are

crying out for Washington to do something about creating jobs and breathing life back into our economy.

And what are the taxpayers getting for their trillions of dollars in war spending? More than 6,100 dead Americans, continued violence in Iraq and a Prime Minister who's cozying up to Iran, and an ongoing civil war in Libya, a corrupt regime in Kabul, insurgents that continue to kill at will, in Afghanistan a nation still under crushing poverty, and an Afghan Government that cannot protect its own people.

By any measure, these wars have been a devastating failure. And yet, with barely any scrutiny, barely any debate, and certainly no outrage from Republican leaders, we continue to write that check. Meanwhile, we have domestic programs that work, proven investments in the survival and prosperity of our people: Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid, school lunches, student loans, food stamps, unemployment insurance. But the majority says these programs have to be cut and capped so we can continue three wars.

Republicans want to cut programs that are keeping Americans alive while they want to continue funding the wars that have killed more than 6,100 Americans. It blows my mind, Mr. Speaker.

How about we ask the American people: Which do they prefer? These wars that have been failing us for 10 years or the guaranteed Medicare benefits that will allow them and their families to retire with dignity?

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Do you really believe everything should be on the table? Everything? If you do, let's talk about war spending. And if you're really and truly serious about restoring fiscal sanity, where were you when the Congressional Progressive Caucus released a plan that will put us back in the black within 10 years?

The Congressional Progressive Caucus budget proves that we can balance the budget, but we don't have to amend the Constitution to do it. We don't need to shred the safety net to do it. We don't need to tear the heart out of Medicare to do it.

We can do it by bringing fairness back to the Tax Code, by ending subsidies, handouts, and giveaways to people and corporations who will do just fine without them, we can do it by passing a clean debt ceiling and putting our people to work, and, Mr. Speaker, we can do it by ending these wars once and for all and bringing our troops home where they belong.

COLOMBIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. CANSECO. Mr. Speaker, there are many concerns on the minds of

Americans today. But there's one concern that dominates discussion in every coffee shop, grocery store, barber shop, civic clubs or everywhere else that Americans gather, and that is the need to turn our economy around and create jobs.

The American people are right to be concerned about the economy and jobs. We've had 29 straight months with the unemployment rate at 8 percent or higher, the longest streak since the Great Depression. Fourteen million Americans are unemployed, and month after month the jobs reports show anemic job growth.

□ 1040

Over 2 years ago, the American people were told by President Obama and other Washington liberals that if we would just spend over \$1 trillion on the so-called "stimulus" bill, the unemployment rate would not exceed 8 percent. Well, in the entire Obama presidency there has only been one month—January of 2009—that the unemployment rate did not exceed 8 percent. Every month since the stimulus bill was signed into law in February of 2009 has seen unemployment rates at 8 percent or higher.

It is clear that the approach of attempting to spend and borrow our way to a better economy has not worked. That's why Congress needs to look to policies that will create jobs, like passing the three pending free trade agreements our Nation has with Colombia, Panama and South Korea.

Beyond the fact that the Business Roundtable estimates these agreements will create more than 250,000 jobs and are important for our economy, these agreements are also important to the United States' role in the world. There is no better illustration of this than the agreement we have pending with Colombia. Colombia is an important ally in Latin America, and I do say that today Colombians celebrate Colombian Independence Day. They're serving as an example for other nations and in stark contrast to the dictatorial regimes in Venezuela, Cuba and Bolivia. Colombia should not only enjoy a strategic relationship with the United States, we should also enjoy a strong commercial relationship. Passage of the free trade agreement would build upon the existing relationship and further strengthen it.

Apart from being beneficial for an important ally, this agreement is important for the U.S. economy. Here are just a few of the benefits that will occur with passage of the Colombia Free Trade Agreement: Duty-free access to the Colombian market for more than 80 percent of U.S. consumer and industrial goods, exports, with remaining tariffs phased out in 10 years; immediate duty-free access to more than two-thirds of current U.S. agricultural exports with the remaining tariffs

phased out over time; strengthened intellectual property and investor protections; open services markets; and enhanced transparency in government procurement. However, perhaps the most important reason to pass this agreement is that if we don't, our competitors will.

Our competitors worldwide are aggressively moving to pass trade agreements. We have already seen our market share in Colombia jeopardized. For instance, although Colombia has doubled its agricultural imports over the past 5 years, the U.S. has seen its market share shrink by one-half. In 2008, American farmers held a 46 percent share of the Colombian market. Today, that share has diminished to 21 percent. In 2000, China was Colombia's 12th largest trading partner. Today, China is the second biggest trade partner for Colombia behind the United States.

Failure to pass the free trade agreement will allow our competitors to enjoy an artificial advantage. At this point in our economy, why do we not want to do everything we can to keep the jobs we have and create new ones? We need to put the politics aside and recognize the importance of the Colombia Free Trade Agreement, not only for our economy but for our strategic interests. It's time to pass the Colombia Free Trade Agreement.

GANG OF SIX AND CHAINED CPI

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, yesterday the so-called "Gang of Six" on the Senate side—six very important Senators—unveiled sort of an outline about how to save \$4 trillion over the next 10 years. Immediately it was embraced by President Obama. We really don't know much about it, nor does he, but he immediately embraced it.

We know one thing about it. It contains something called a chained CPI. Okay. Well, who cares about a chained CPI? Well, seniors, they care a lot about a chained CPI; middle-income taxpayers, they care about it—they don't know it yet; veterans, and a whole host of other people.

What is a chained CPI? Well, the pointy heads, like Mr. Furman who work for President Obama, say we're understating and overstating inflation with the way we adjust. There is something called substitution effect. So when prices of things go up, you buy something cheaper, so that means there isn't inflation. Well, no, wait a minute; the thing you used to buy is still more expensive and you're buying something else? But in the pointy-head economics world, this makes sense.

So let's say how this would work for someone on Medicare: Okay, you can't afford your heart bypass, so instead

you'll say to the doc, "Hey, look, I can't afford the copay on the heart bypass. Why don't you do a hernia instead?" That's substitution. In Mr. Furman's world, this makes sense.

Now what this would do to seniors on Social Security, we already understate inflation. Seniors haven't gotten a COLA for the last 2 years. Tell me the price of prescription drugs and medical care hasn't gone up over the last 2 years. We need, in fact, a different measure for seniors, for Medicare, for our veterans and others who consume more health care and more essentials, which the CPI doesn't measure. It just measures junk that people buy. That's all it measures. And they're saying because people buy cheaper junk, we should change the CPI. That means the senior, by the time they reach 85 in this brave new world of the chained CPI, will get 100 bucks less a month in their Social Security—not too good. Veterans would see their benefits also be restrained and go down about the same amount.

And then there is this other little impact they're not mentioning. If you're earning \$20,000 a year, the tax brackets get adjusted every year. Well, they wouldn't get adjusted so much anymore under the chained CPI. So someone who earns \$20,000 a year over 10 years would see their taxes go up 14 percent, but for the rich people, you earn \$500,000 a year, you're already at the top; their taxes will only go up .3 percent, three-tenths of 1 percent. Fourteen percent for someone who earns \$20,000 a year; .3 percent for someone who earns \$500,000. And Obama has embraced this?

What's happened down there at the White House? They're listening to these pointy-head economists, and they're going after programs that are important to the American people. All of this, all combined of this great "Gang of Six," would save \$4 trillion over 10 years. That is, seniors will pay more, working people will pay more, veterans will pay more—rich people, not so much—but it would save \$4 trillion. Guess what? If we let all the Bush tax cuts expire at the end of next year—all of them, and the stupid Social Security tax holiday—that would be \$5 trillion over 10 years and we wouldn't have cut Social Security, we wouldn't have cut veterans benefits, we wouldn't have asked low-income and middle-income people to pay more in taxes. Now does that make more sense? I think so.

Let's hope they rethink this down at the White House, and I hope the American people are watching closely.

CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE

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

Mr. MORAN. Last night, we were asked to amend the Constitution, after

two-and-a-quarter centuries, in a way that will permanently limit the ability of our government to foster competitiveness in a global economy, to generate greater equality of opportunity, to treat our seniors with dignity and respect, and to defend and define this great Nation as an ever-shining democratic beacon of hope and prosperity.

So I was proud to vote against the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act. It is the House Republicans' vision for America's future. This is a vision in which the country turns its back on the achievements of the last century and chooses not to invest in meeting the challenges of the next century.

Republicans aim to use a crisis of their own making to hamstring future Congresses, limiting our ability to make necessary infrastructure investments, to care for the poor, aged and disabled, and to respond to national and international crises.

The 18 percent spending cap mandated by the bill would return the government to spending levels not seen since the establishment of Medicare and Medicaid. The impending retirement of more than 70 million baby boomers means that these spending levels are woefully inadequate, unless we condemn our grandparents to a severely diminished quality of life.

□ 1050

The Republican Party would enshrine constitutional protections for tax cuts and loopholes for wealthy individuals and corporations, requiring an unattainable two-thirds majority in both the House and the Senate for the government to increase the currently unsustainably low revenue levels of roughly 15 percent of GDP.

This would necessarily result in unprecedented cuts in student loans and grants, transportation, education, environmental protection, law enforcement—in other words, the physical and the human infrastructure of our economy.

The only budget plan that comes close to meeting the requirements of these constitutional amendments is the Republican Study Committee budget which eliminates 70 percent of non-defense discretionary funding by 2021, contains deep cuts to Medicare, cuts Medicaid, food stamps, supplemental security income for the elderly and disabled and poor in half by the end of the decade, and raises the Social Security retirement age to 70 years of age.

Yesterday's vote means that the Republican majority is demanding that in return for avoiding an economically disastrous default on our debt, we make \$111 billion in immediate spending cuts. These cuts seriously increase the likelihood of a double-dip recession. It is estimated that they could cause the loss of more than a million public sector jobs just in the next year alone.

Last month, the economy added an anemic 18,000 jobs; but the private sector added 57,000 jobs, while 39,000 public sector jobs were lost in addition to the 49,000 public sector jobs lost in the prior month. This is a continuing trend. Half a million public sector employees have now lost their jobs, 200,000 of them teachers, while student enrollment has increased by 750,000. Firing more government workers will only decrease aggregate demand, making it that much harder to sustain the recovery.

We have witnessed this before. In 1937, President Roosevelt responded to similar conservative pressure by substantially reducing Federal spending before the Great Depression was fully in the rearview mirror. It drove us right back into economic depression. The economy wouldn't recover until the increased spending and hiring that accompanied the World War II armaments buildup got the country moving again. After the war, spending on education and housing for our GIs, the Marshall Plan for Europe, and the construction of the interstate highway system established a permanent middle class and sustainable prosperity.

This is not the time for the Democratic Party to sacrifice our values, values held by a majority of the American people, even in the face of opposition that has reached unprecedented levels of ideological radicalization.

We have to address our long-term deficits for the sake of future generations, but we must do so in a balanced manner, combining rational spending cuts and increased revenue. That's what has worked in the past. That's what we need to do now. We must not abandon the people that depend upon the government for a decent quality of life, but we must not let this great Nation become a second-class society and a third-rate economy. If the bill that was passed last night were to be enacted into law, that's the limited vision it would yield. That's why I was proud to vote against it.

WIC ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to clarify a mischaracterization of the administrative costs of the supplemental nutrition program for Women, Infants and Children, commonly known as WIC.

It's interesting, you can come down here to the floor or speak in committee, and we are protected as Members of Congress to say anything we want. It isn't required that everything we say is factually correct. Sometimes those mischaracterizations, misstatements get into the record. And in this case, the complaint or the statement in subcommittee and full committee and even in debate here on the

floor of the Agriculture appropriations bill, it was asserted that the administrative costs in this program are up to 40 percent of the total cost of WIC, this is a misstatement of fact, although it was included in the report language and it was adopted by the committee.

So I come today to point out that the 40 percent administrative cost claimed by the majority is based on selective data from a 2008 Brookings Institute report. It didn't come from the Department of Agriculture, which administers the program. The Brookings report collapsed several legislative mandated nonmonetary programs, including the education of nutrition, the requirement that we support and inform people on how to do proper breast feeding, other client services, issues like health care referrals, even immunization screenings, these were counted as administrative costs when they are mandated by us in Congress to be carried out. They are programmatic costs, and it wasn't proper for the Brookings report to include those as administrative costs.

Breast feeding, nutrition education, and immunization screening are vital programs which improve birth outcomes and reduce the incidence of health problems for WIC participants. They should not be categorized as administrative costs for the purpose of budgeting.

So today, I would like to point out in a recent letter to our Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, of which I am the ranking member, from the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary

Vilsack, and I will include this letter at the end of my comments today, he notes that the food and nutrition service delivers its program management and actual administrative costs at a steady 9.09 percent rate, far less than the 40 percent purported in the Brookings Institute report and included in the committee report.

WIC is effective in improving the health of pregnant women, new mothers and their infants. I feel it is important to clarify that the WIC program is meeting its mission. It is meeting the law to safeguard the health of low-income women, infants, and children who are at nutrition risk by providing nutritional food and supplemental diets and information on healthy eating and referrals to other health care services.

As Members of Congress, we should not do the program any further disservice by erroneous figures being included in the report. So today, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the letter from Secretary Vilsack pointing this out and to make the record clear that the WIC program is indeed being administered very soundly and fiscally conservatively.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, Washington, DC, July 14, 2011.

Hon. SAM FARR, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FARR: Thank you for your work on behalf of the Department of Agriculture's (USDA) appropriations for fis-

cal year (FY) 2012. I appreciate the difficult decisions and choices that were before you and the Committee.

As identified in the Statement of Administration Policy, the Administration has serious concerns with H.R. 2112; however, I wanted to weigh in specifically on what I perceive as misstatements regarding administrative costs for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC). I understand that during full committee debate and on page 43 of the committee report, selected data from a 2008 Brookings Institute report were referenced, giving the impression that administrative costs in the WIC Program are over 40 percent of Federal expenditures for the program. The true figure is much lower.

Beyond simply providing assistance in the form of supplemental food benefits, WIC provides low-income mothers, infants, and children with other legislatively mandated non-monetary program benefits, including nutrition education, breastfeeding support, and other client services such as healthcare referrals and immunization screening, which improve birth outcomes and reduce the incidence of health problems for WIC participants. The Brookings Institute report collapses these important additional benefits under the category of administrative costs. However, these legislatively mandated program benefits provided to participants should not be classified as administrative costs.

For reference, I asked USDA's Food and Nutrition Service to provide me with a breakdown of the Federal cost of food benefits, non-monetary program benefits and administrative expenses for FY 2010. I am sharing this information with you to correct the record and so that you can share it with your colleagues:

Category	Obligations	Percentage of obligations
Supplemental Food Benefits	\$4,561,570,027	70.44%
Nutrition Services and Admin. (NSA):		
Additional Benefits:		
Nutrition Education	418,437,331	6.46%
Breastfeeding Support	149,133,594	2.30%
Other Client Services	758,015,711	11.70%
Program Management	588,984,767	9.09%
Total Nutrition Services & Admin. (NSA)	1,914,571,403	29.56%
Total Food and NSA	6,476,141,430	100.00%

I consider the category of program management, which is 9.09 percent of total Federal obligations, to be the true measure of administrative costs needed to deliver the complete suite of benefits to WIC participants. This percentage has remained consistent over the past 5 years.

It is my hope that this will clear up any misunderstanding regarding administrative costs in WIC, and I look forward to working with you in the future. A similar letter is being sent to Congressmen Jack Kingston, Harold Rogers, and Norman Dicks.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. VILSACK,
Secretary.

SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE MILITARY

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, for the last few months I have come to this

floor every week to talk about a moral black eye on this country—the issue of rape and sexual assault in the military. I have mentioned the fact that the Pentagon has estimated that 19,000 servicemembers are raped or sexually assaulted each and every year. The victims typically are blamed and the assailants are promoted.

I have shared the personal stories of several women who needed to have a bright light shined on this ongoing epidemic. But it is not only females in the military that are victims. Men are being victimized as well.

In an April 2011 article entitled “The Military’s Secret Shame,” Newsweek looked at the subject hardly anyone talks about: male on male rape and sexual assault. Mr. Speaker, it is time to break this silence.

Last year, nearly 50,000 male veterans screened positive for “military

sexual trauma.” Think about that, 50,000 men. That’s nearly double what it was in 2003. Another 110 men made confidential reports of sexual assault by other men, nearly three times what it was in 2007. We know the number of actual victims is much higher.

The latest Department of Defense report showed that only 13 percent of those who are raped in the military actually report them. Men keep quiet for the same reasons women do—a military system that gives them virtually no chance of justice.

In 2010, the Pentagon anonymously asked active duty soldiers who had been sexually assaulted why they did not report their attacks. Half of them said they didn’t want anyone to know. A third of them said they didn’t think anything would be done. And 30 percent said they were afraid of retaliation or reprisal.

□ 1100

I now want to share with you the story of Blake Stephens. I warn you that some of the material is graphic.

Stephens joined the Army in 2001. The verbal and physical attacks started quickly and came from virtually every level of the chain of command. In one of the worst incidents, a group of men tackled him, shoved a soda bottle into his rectum, and threw him backward off an elevated platform onto the hood of a car. When he reported the incident, his platoon sergeant told him, "You're the problem. You're the reason this is happening," and refused to take action. His assailants told him that once deployed to Iraq, they would shoot him in the head.

I recently received an email from Heath Phillips, who joined the Navy at the young age of 17, in 1988. Phillips was attacked on multiple occasions beginning his first weekend on duty. When he reported the assault, he was called a liar, a baby, mama's boy, and a few other choice words. He would complain to the chain of command and be told to shut up, and asked for witnesses. In one particularly horrific incident, a group of men attacked Phillips in the shower and sodomized him with a toilet brush handle. They laughed and joked about it the whole time. After he went to the infirmary, bleeding and in pain, he was told he was fine and to take the day off. Phillips eventually went AWOL to protect himself. He still suffers to this day.

Mr. Speaker, this is a moral black eye on the military, it's a moral black eye on this Congress, and it's a moral black eye on this Nation. It is time to stop talking and to take action.

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR OF INVASION AND OCCUPATION OF CYPRUS

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as I do each year on the anniversary of Turkey's unlawful invasion of Cyprus, to again call upon Turkish authorities to end the 37-year military occupation of this island nation. The tragic history of the occupation is well-documented. Sadly, with each passing year, still more indignities are visited upon the Cypriot people.

On Christmas morning, 2010, a large number of Orthodox Christians made their way to the Saint Sinesios Church. During the prayer service, the Turkish occupation authorities barged into the church, drove out the worshipers, and sealed the doors of the building. This was an assault on religious freedom. A few months ago, on May 2, Turkish occupation authorities demolished the 200-year old Chapel of Saint Thekla located in the village of Vokolida. This,

too, was an assault on religious freedom. These are among countless examples of the systematic repression and destruction of the Orthodox Christian faith that is carried on by Turkish authorities on the island.

The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, the body that is tasked by this Congress on the state of religious freedom throughout the world in terms of advising us on that situation, reports that gross violations of religious freedom occur in the areas under the control of the Turkish occupation authorities. Turkey's foreign minister, the Honorable Ahmet Davutoglu, has proclaimed that Turkey's foreign policy is rooted in the doctrine of "zero problems with its neighbors." Unfortunately, the fruits of this doctrine appear to be wholly absent in Turkish relations with the Republic of Cyprus.

Under the auspices of the United Nations, Turkey agreed as a confidence building measure in 1979 to withdraw and hand over the uninhabited city of Famagusta to its rightful inhabitants. Despite the annual calls of the United Nations for Turkey and the Turkish occupation authorities to honor this agreement, Famagusta remains a ghost town. The international community continually demands the withdrawal of the overwhelming Turkish military presence on Cyprus. However, the Turkish occupation authorities have not even considered a reduction of military troops.

As a candidate country seeking accession to the European Union, Turkey has been advised to open its air and sea ports to the Republic of Cyprus as a condition for the further negotiation of the accession chapters. Turkey nonetheless refuses to open its ports to Cypriot-flagged vessels. Cyprus will hold the presidency of the European Union in the second half of 2012. Rather than seize the opportunity to put its "zero problems" doctrine into effect, Foreign Minister Davutoglu just the other day threatened the European Union that Turkey will freeze relations with that body when the Republic of Cyprus holds its presidency.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the conduct of a country serious about joining the family of democratic nations. The United States, the European Union, and the United Nations all call for a just and lasting settlement that reunifies Cyprus as a bizonal, bicommunal federation. After 37 years of broken promises, it is high time that this Chamber demand that Turkey conduct itself in accordance with the standards and values expected of a democracy, a member of NATO, and a candidate country of the European Union.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until noon today.

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

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker 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. Bless the Members of this assembly as they set upon the work of these hours, of these days. Help them to make wise decisions in a good manner and to carry their responsibilities steadily, with high hopes for a better future for our great Nation.

Deepen their faith, widen their sympathy, heighten their aspirations, and give them the strength to do what ought to be done for this country.

May Your blessing, O God, be with them and with us all this day and every day to come, and may all we do be done 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 Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BUCSHON 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.

HONORING U.S. ARMY SPECIALIST JAMES A. WATERS

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor U.S. Army Specialist James A. Waters. Specialist Waters, a

21-year-old native of Cloverdale, Indiana, lost his life in combat on July 1 in Kandahar, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered from an improvised explosive device during an insurgent attack.

Specialist Waters was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 32nd Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division in Fort Drum, New York. Indiana lost a great citizen, who was affectionately known as Jimmy. He planned to marry his high school sweetheart in December.

His sacrifice and valor should be commended, and I would like to offer my most heartfelt condolences to Specialist Waters' family and friends. From a grateful Nation, he will be missed but not forgotten.

IOM REPORT ON WOMEN'S PREVENTATIVE HEALTH SERVICES

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the work of the Institute of Medicine's Committee on Preventive Services for Women, who released their critically important final report yesterday. The IOM's recommendations are clear. Women need access to annual well-woman preventive visits, access to screening for domestic violence, gestational diabetes, and a full range of sexually transmitted diseases. They need to have increased breastfeeding support, and they need to have access to contraceptives, all without cost sharing.

In these hard economic times, these recommendations underscore the imperative that women and their families should not have to choose between preventive care and paying their bills.

The IOM was bold. It broke through the extreme politics surrounding women's health and, instead, relies on rigorous science to make its determinations. We must follow the IOM's lead and ensure all women have access to these services, no matter where they get their health care or how much they earn.

GANG OF SIX

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Gang of Six? The Gang of Six? How about that gang of 234 people yesterday, Republicans and Democrats, who passed the plan that doesn't raise taxes and averts the crisis?

RHODE ISLAND COUNCIL OF COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the extraordinary work of the Rhode Island Council of Community Mental Health Organizations. Representatives from the Rhode Island Council of Community Mental Health Organizations are on Capitol Hill this week advocating for the millions of Americans who suffer from mental illness.

The council's work is vital because, according to the National Institute of Mental Health, an estimated 26 percent of American adults will suffer from a diagnosable mental disorder in a given year, and approximately 6 percent of Americans will suffer from a serious form of mental illness.

Since 1979, the council has led critical efforts to raise awareness about mental health and emphasize the importance of mental health care funding. The council's efforts to integrate behavioral health with primary care has saved lives and cut costs in our State, setting an example for the Nation.

The Rhode Island Council of Community Mental Health Organizations is a true leader in the field of mental health. I believe we must make mental health care and full implementation of mental health parity a major priority as we continue to protect health care as a right for all.

I commend the Rhode Island Council of Community Health Organizations on their work to improve and promote mental health care.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF ARCHBISHOP CHARLES CHAPUT

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise before you to recognize the hard work and dedication of Archbishop Charles Chaput, who has served the Colorado Catholic community for over a decade. It was announced this week that he has been reassigned to lead the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. While I am saddened that Archbishop Chaput will be leaving our great State, he leaves behind a legacy of defending the innocent and helping the weak that we can all celebrate with pride.

He first came to Colorado in 1977 to be pastor of Holy Cross Parish in Thornton. After many years of ministry, and having held various important positions in the Church, in 1977 Pope John Paul II appointed and installed him Archbishop of Denver. He has fought against anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance, working tirelessly to advance religious freedom around the globe. His outreach to the Hispanic community is second to none.

I first met him at the Colorado State Legislature where I came to know him as a man of high integrity and deep, deep faith. I admire the archbishop's dedication to all people of faith.

I'd like to offer him my most sincere thanks for all of his work in Colorado and wish him the best of luck in all of his future endeavors.

DEFAULT WOULD DESTROY AMERICAN JOBS

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, Republicans want deep spending cuts with no new revenues as the price of raising the debt limit. Some Republicans have downplayed the impact that defaulting on the national debt would have on our economy and our people, and most Republicans have downplayed the impact on average Americans of the budget cuts they're calling for. This doesn't come as a surprise, but what is surprising is how out of touch they are with mainstream Americans.

Most Americans say their biggest concern isn't government spending; it's jobs. But rather than pursue a real job-creation agenda, House Republicans have passed legislation that would actually slow the economy and kill American jobs. Their demand for even bigger spending cuts in exchange for raising the debt ceiling is the latest and greatest effort yet to kill middle class American jobs.

They say either we cut government spending deeper, or they're going to force us into default, which every economist agrees causes a deeper recession and throws hundreds of thousands of middle class Americans out of work.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for House Republicans to get a grip and offer an agenda that actually creates jobs.

WE MUST PRESERVE AMERICA'S SPACE LEGACY

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago today, Neil Armstrong took one small step on the lunar surface. It was the culmination of a national initiative to put men on the Moon. But although our mission was achieved, it didn't end our yearning to explore. In many ways it only deepened, and I believe it still exists today.

Tomorrow, STS-135 Atlantis is scheduled to land in Florida; and with the completion of the mission, the shuttle program will have come to an end. We now face the uncertainty of where our next steps in space will be.

America's legacy as the unrivaled world leader in space exploration enters into a new and uncertain era. As chairman of the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee, partnered with Chairman RALPH HALL, I will work within Congress, with NASA, and with private entities to ensure America's space exploration legacy is maintained and

that last year's NASA reauthorization bill is implemented.

We must continue developing the Space Launch System and Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle in order to achieve assured access for American crews to the international space station. Even in challenging economic times, I urge my colleagues to prioritize human space flight, for it is in times like these that inspiration is needed more than ever.

□ 1210

WE NEED JOBS

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, Republican slash-and-burn politics have not created a single job for hardworking Americans and Republicans have not presented a bill on jobs in this Congress. The fact is we need jobs and we need innovative jobs, and the Democrats have proposed a jobs plan that emphasizes innovation.

We had an opportunity last week to have more investment in solar—less in fossil fuels—solar green jobs that are innovative, create more jobs and protect us in the future so we don't have to spend money on defense to protect those lines that bring us oil from the Middle East, yet we didn't do it.

We need to invest in education, and the Democrats have tried to do that. But the Republicans want to cut Pell Grants and cut workforce investment opportunities. We need to have an educated workforce, and we need to have creative ways to create jobs and not just be slaving to Big Oil and Wall Street.

Jobs is our most important business here. And while I speak of jobs, we have one job the American public wants us to do, and that is prevent a default on our debt and embarrass the United States and wreck the world's economy. That's more important than any pledge, Mr. Speaker, that anybody has taken. Don't default.

CALL FOR SENATE ACTION

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House passed the cut, cap, and balance plan to control government spending and raise the debt limit. Now we need the Senate to act and put their plan on the table.

While it was good to hear yesterday that at least six Senators have reached agreement on a plan to control our debt, what we really need is the other Chamber to bring a plan to the floor and pass it out of the Senate. We have passed a clear plan, one that can be

scored by the CBO, a plan that calls for a long-term solution to keep Congress responsible, the balanced budget amendment.

It is clear that we need to act on the debt ceiling soon. Our credit rating is certainly at risk. However, we cannot forget that what is truly at risk is the long-term solvency of our Nation. If we continue on the current path, we will end up being controlled by our creditors, just like Greece, Portugal, and Ireland. Our very independence is at stake here.

By acting responsibly now, we avoid greater pain later. Kicking the can down the road is only kicking our Nation's future.

DEBT LIMIT

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, unless this Congress takes action on August 2, our Nation will stop paying our bills because we refuse to come together and take shared responsibility. These bills pay for policies already purchased, such as the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the 2003 prescription drug benefit, tax cuts, and emergency measures to save our economy.

Yesterday, House Republicans passed a bill that asked for sacrifices from seniors, veterans, and children but exempted corporations from giving up even their most egregious tax loopholes, like those that encourage shipping jobs overseas. That bill also all but guarantees a default by requiring a two-thirds vote from both Chambers before we can pay our bills. To return to the balanced budgets of the 1990s will require a long-term commitment from the entire country, a commitment that will only come if everyone contributes.

We do not need to end Social Security and Medicare, as some would do. We can and must reduce the deficit in a balanced way that ensures the well-being of every American.

JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we need bipartisan efforts that focus on fiscal responsibility while maintaining important investments in our communities that will create jobs and grow the economy.

Even now, I am trying to be confident that the best interests of the American people will prevail, but it is terribly disappointing that ending Medicare for seniors is so important to Republicans that they continue to pursue this agenda at all costs and willingly put our national economy in peril.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has been under the control of the Republicans for nearly 200 days, and they have yet to bring a single job-creating bill to the floor. This is an issue that should always be above partisan politics. It seems that they would rather see the United States default on its existing debt for the first time in history, watch our economy lose hundreds of thousands of jobs, and cause interest rates and consumer goods to skyrocket in the process.

We must do something about it.

DON'T DEFAULT

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I look across my congressional district and across this country where people have lost their homes, they have lost their jobs, and they have sacrificed their retirement accounts because our fiscal house hasn't been in order, and here today we sit awaiting the opportunity to do for the American people what we ought to, which is to prevent a default, to prevent a default that would result in further sacrificing of retirement savings and jobs and homes across this country. They're really depending on us.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to say that we have an important responsibility to our seniors to protect their Medicare and their Social Security benefits, to make sure that we're creating opportunities for education for their children, to make sure that we're creating jobs, rebuilding our infrastructure, our roads, our bridges, our highways, our rail systems, and we haven't done our job.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say it's time for us to stop the silliness, to prevent the default, and to get on with the Nation's business.

STOP PLAYING GAMES, DON'T DEFAULT

(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, I rise today to say what my colleagues and I'm sure many Americans across the country are saying: Stop playing the games and get the work done.

I understand we all come here with values, ideas, and principles that we hold dear, but when the facts dispute our ideology, we don't get the choice to change the facts; you change your ideology.

Failure to pay our bills will be catastrophic to our economy; it's that simple. This isn't a question of enabling future deficits. The Federal Government needs to cover promises it made

to our soldiers, to our veterans, to our seniors, and to our creditors.

Responsible people in countries pay their bills. Our 40th President knew this. In a radio address he delivered in 1987, Ronald Reagan admonished Congress for bringing the government to the edge of default and urged them to face their responsibility.

Here's what President Reagan said: "Interest rates will skyrocket, instability will occur in the financial markets, and the Federal deficit will soar."

We cannot ignore the facts, and allowing our Nation to default no way fixes our budget problems.

Stop playing the games; get the work done; move the country forward.

EMERGENCY WATERSHED PROTECTION PROGRAM

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

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of important conversations that are taking place today, but it's important that we talk about what has happened in New Mexico recently.

New Mexico has been hit by a series of wildfires during this extremely dry fire season. Many communities have been threatened by fires as families have lost their homes and livestock and tribal lands have been damaged.

At a time when many counties are struggling with a drought, the fire damage to our watersheds, which provide New Mexico with the majority of its surface water, has impacted drinking water supplies and increased the threat of floods during monsoon season.

With the Midwest recovering from floods and tornados and the West battling fires and drought, the current resources available to fight these disasters are simply not enough. Funds for the Natural Resource Conservation Service's Emergency Watershed Protection program, which assist with the protection of watersheds that have been impacted by natural disasters, have almost been depleted as a result of the disasters around the country. It's vital that we provide more resources for this critical program that can strengthen watersheds affected by the combination of fire, damage, high temperature, and lack of rainfall.

I encourage my colleagues to support efforts to address funding shortfalls to the Emergency Watershed Protection program so we can help our communities recover.

□ 1220

WARRIORS' WATCH RIDERS

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the contributions of the Warriors' Watch Riders, a troop support group, for their commitment to our veterans, their families and our community.

Rain or shine, the Warriors' Watch Riders in my district provide a motorcycle escort to our servicemembers and welcome them home as they return to our community.

When one of our servicemembers makes the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty, the Warriors' Watch Riders recognize their sacrifice, honor their memory, and offer support to their families.

I have seen firsthand how the Warriors' Watch Riders bring communities together with the roar of their motorcycles. Bonds are built, tears are shed, and families, friends, and neighbors come together with the Warriors' Watch Riders to show respect for the sacrifices those in uniform make to ensure our freedom.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Warriors' Watch Riders for all they do for the men and women who serve our country.

MEDICARE GUARANTEE THREATENED

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, the Republican bill cuts, caps, and balances all right; cuts Medicare, caps Medicaid, and balances the budget on the backs of our seniors, people with disabilities, and the middle class.

When Willy Sutton was asked why do you rob banks, he said, because that's where the money is.

Asking the elderly and people with disabilities to shoulder the responsibility for our national debt—really? Nearly half of Medicare beneficiaries have income at or below 200 percent of poverty. The median income for seniors is just over \$19,000 a year. The Republican proposal will end the Medicare guarantee, double out-of-pocket costs for seniors and people with disabilities, and send them an invoice for \$6,000.

Of course we need to address our fiscal challenges, but not by ending Medicare in the process.

REPUBLICAN FRESHMEN CUT SOCIAL SECURITY

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our Republican friends jumped for joy when they passed a draconian bill that would cut \$6 trillion and jeopardize a lifeline for millions of Americans, and that is Social Security. We have all been refer-

ring to a President that endeared himself to this whole country, President Reagan. His letter to Senator Baker said: The Nation can ill-afford to allow such a result. The risk, the costs, the disruptions, and the incalculable damage lead me to but one conclusion: The Senate must vote to raise the debt ceiling—in 1983 when the country was much smaller.

But what do we face here? Frivolous activity like Republican freshmen who, in their manner of affect, showing disrespect for the Office of the President. One Member said: "I have a challenge for the President. I dare him, I double dare him to even think about cutting Social Security." What about the Member? Should he be dared to not cut Social Security? The Republican vote yesterday already cut Social Security. And you've just cut Social Security as Republican freshmen. Why don't we engage in negotiation and let the approach be negotiation and resolution—not obstruction. Why don't we engage in negotiation and work together as a Nation, as the American people want? I would like a little more respect from my colleagues for the President of the United States, President Barack Obama.

CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE DEAD ON ARRIVAL

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, last night we voted once again in the House of Representatives to cut Medicare, to cut Social Security, and to reward the wealthiest 2 percent of our Nation with tax cuts, and of course big business with tax cuts. The Republican majority wasted a crucial day of debate instead of protecting and working on the financial security for our Nation.

We could have debated a strong jobs agenda like the Make It in America agenda that the Democrats have. We could have discussed how we could strengthen partnerships with businesses to retain America's workers for the jobs that are actually needed here.

But what did they do? As one former Republican budget adviser calls it, they debated something that was "a misleading political cheap shot."

The Republicans Cut, Cap, and Balance Act is harmful for this country, and it is not a serious proposal. It is not going to be signed into law. They wasted our time. So I am glad that that bill is dead on arrival in the Senate. But I really wish, I really wish they would get down to working for America.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2553, AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2011, PART IV

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 357 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 357

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2553) 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 the airport improvement program, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this rule and the underlying bill. House Resolution 357 provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2553, the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV.

So far in the 112th Congress, three short-term extensions have been signed into law to allow for the continued aviation trust fund revenue collections and aviation program authority necessary to operate America's airports. The latest short-term extension expires this Friday, July 22.

H.R. 2553 would extend the program for a little less than 2 months, until September 16. The bill maintains current funding levels for FAA, its employees, and airports around the country. The bill includes two simple Essential Air Service (EAS) reform provisions, one of which has already passed the Senate by unanimous consent.

Both the House and Senate have passed separate versions of multiyear reauthorization bills, so this short-

term extension will hopefully give the House and Senate the time needed to work out the differences between the two bills so we can stop kicking the can down the road.

To say that, that is exactly what we are doing. For starters, this is the 21st extension of the FAA program since the last reauthorization. We have been at this exact juncture 20 other times. The last reauthorization, shepherded by Chairman MICA, was over 7½ years ago. That is a long time. Since September 30, 2007, the FAA has been operating on a series of short-term, stopgap extensions.

Quite simply, it is time to stop doing this. It is too much. The safety of our airline passengers is something we ought to take into consideration and pass a necessary, meaningful and long-term FAA reauthorization.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has worked to provide us yet another short-term extension which will ensure the continued safety of airline passengers, with the hope that the Senate and the House can finally come to the table and realize a long-term reauthorization.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV, extends aviation trust fund revenue collections and aviation program authority at current funding levels through September 16 of this year while also imposing new restrictions on the Essential Air Service program.

Frankly, it is no substitute for a long-term Federal Aviation Administration authorization, and casts further doubt on airport construction and safety improvements instead of ensuring air passenger safety, creating jobs, or investing in air traffic control modernization.

□ 1230

As I'm sure most Americans would agree, the word "uncertain" does not belong in a conversation about our Nation's aviation system and it certainly does not belong in the same sentence as air passenger safety. I note a friend in the House who is a pilot agrees with that statement. Over the course of almost 4 years, however, great uncertainty surrounding long-term funding for the FAA has threatened and continues to threaten both. Without steady funding, the FAA is unable to best manage the long-term programs and projects that are vital to the future of our aviation system, including

lifesaving airport safety improvements and the transition to the very important Next Generation Air Transportation System that we know as NextGen.

Make no mistake, the United States has the safest, most efficient aviation system in the world. We can all thank our highly skilled, dedicated aviation professionals for that. But in order to ensure that it remains that way, we must stop kicking the FAA reauthorization can further down the road. I know these cans around here get tired of being kicked down the road.

The measure before us is the 21st short-term FAA extension to be considered since the last FAA authorization bill. Vision 100 expired at the end of September 2007. I repeat: This is the 21st short-term FAA extension we have considered in less than 4 years. It is also the sixth extension of operation authority for fiscal year 2011. Meanwhile, there has been no progress for weeks on a long-term authorization.

While short-term extensions have their place in the legislative process, they should be the exception, not the rule, especially when authorizing the important safety and modernization activities of the FAA. The extension not only fails to address the long-term aviation needs of our Nation, but also denies many of our small and rural communities the air service and economic opportunity made possible by the Essential Air Service program.

By including these policy riders, House Republicans risk a shutdown of our aviation system. Senator ROCKEFELLER, after our Rules Committee meeting last night, made that very clear in a letter from him to Chairman MICA.

Instead of appointing conferees, as the Senate did 100 days ago, House Republicans seem to be pointing fingers and effectively forcing a vote on the future of the EAS program ahead of conference legislation. While House Republicans continue to play the blame game with the Senate, American businesses and workers are losing out on much needed economic opportunities.

Aviation, as we all know, is an economic engine for the United States, contributing \$1.3 trillion to our economy, accounting for more than 11.5 million jobs and \$396 billion in earnings, and contributing 5.6 percent to our Nation's gross domestic product.

Without full-year funding for the FAA, local officials are unable to move forward with project proposals. Because of this, the FAA is an estimated \$800 million to \$1 billion behind in obligating funding, which translates to tens of thousands of jobs. Furthermore, if the FAA is unable to utilize these funds before the end of the fiscal year, they risk being reprogrammed or rescinded. This, in my view, is irresponsible, dangerous, and unacceptable. The FAA will have to do more with less,

which reduces its ability to help airports finance safety improvements such as special runway overshoot areas, runway resurfacing, proper signage and lighting, and equipment to prevent snow and ice buildup on runways.

These measures not only save lives but increase efficiency at a time when air traffic is projected to continue growing significantly. According to the FAA, the number of passengers on U.S. airlines is forecasted to increase by about 75 percent within the next 20 years and to reach 1 billion passengers annually within the next decade. We must invest more in our aviation system, not less. Long-term FAA authorization should be an immediate priority.

In the 110th and 111th Congresses, the House, under Democratic leadership, passed FAA reauthorization bills that would have created jobs, improved aviation safety, and provided the FAA with the tools necessary to modernize airport and air traffic control infrastructure.

My friends on the other side should do the responsible thing and appoint conferees so that the House and Senate can work out their differences and finalize a long-term FAA reauthorization bill. Unfortunately, my friends on the other side of the aisle are clearly preoccupied with further isolating small and rural communities than moving this debate forward. In fact, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has held no hearings specifically on the EAS program this year, nor did they hold a markup on the measure before us.

The Senate is not going to pass this. The letter from Senator ROCKEFELLER makes it very clear, as the chair of the relevant committee in the Senate, that this is not going to pass in its form with the policy riders attached. Yet, without the ability to offer amendments on the floor, as I requested in the Rules Committee last night, to consider a clean extension, one free of the policy riders that will hurt our small and rural communities, we face a shutdown. I believe my good friend from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) said on Friday this short-term extension would expire and then our aviation system stands to shut down. That would be most unfortunate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. I thank my colleague for yielding, and I'd like to thank my colleagues on the Rules Committee for so expeditiously bringing up this rule for consideration this afternoon of I think it's the 21st temporary extension of the reauthorization of the FAA legislation.

This reauthorization has been held hostage for several years, and it is not cost-free. It's interfering with the efficiency of operations, the ability to

plan and to expend funds on needed airport improvements all across the country. So we're paying a price for this sort of thing, and I really don't think we should be allowing people to assert that they have the right unilaterally to hold up the whole process, that it's their way or the highway, especially when what we're doing in this particular mild change to reform a needed part of this legislation, Essential Air Service, which is badly in need of reform, is basically acceding to language that's already in the Senate bill. By agreeing to the bill that in this respect has passed the other House, this is non-negotiable that we can be so bold as to simply say, Fine, we'll agree to the language that you have which basically provides that if an airport is within 90 miles of a major airport, it's not eligible for Essential Air Service.

□ 1240

The other provides that the cap on subsidy from the Federal Government would be \$1,000 per passenger.

Now, what are we talking about? You can rent a car for a lot less than \$1,000; and most people, frankly, prefer not to go through a couple of changes, to a feeder airline to a hub to another destination, if you're able to avoid it. An hour 45 minutes, hour and a half air travel is certainly perfectly reasonable, especially when you consider in addition that if it really is essential, the Secretary of Transportation has the ability to waive this legislation. So people are just unilaterally assuming that somehow some terrible thing will happen when the authority already exists in the executive branch to prevent that from happening.

So to further hold the whole system hostage over a small effort to reform what really has been, I think, over a period of years an accumulation of earmarks—people had the ability to provide for a subsidy for an airport in their district in this area or that area because they were in leadership on the committee or in the Congress, and we've seen this pile up and pile up, and it's really about time it gets addressed.

And asking people to find a way to get to an airport, if it's less than 90 miles that they have to find alternative transportation, rather than having the Federal Government subsidize it in a few airports around the country seems to me to be something that is badly in need of doing. It saves money for the taxpayer. Not a whole lot, but I think estimates are between \$8 million and \$9 million a year. I guess around here that doesn't amount to a whole lot, but in most communities and families and other areas, that's a lot of money.

Of course, we have to remember the Federal Government isn't the only government concerned. If people really do want a subsidized service because of some local need, the community or the

State or the county involved is certainly perfectly free to do that.

So why we should be picking a couple dozen communities around the entire United States and subsidizing to the extent of over \$1,000 per passenger to provide this sort of almost air limousine service for a few individuals in these communities is beyond me.

Yet if this is nonnegotiable and we can't concede to the language already in the Senate bill and we're going to have to shut down the whole system, except for essential air service, because of trying to do this modest reform after 23 extensions or 24 extensions, we've really come to a pretty kind of arbitrary and unreasonable place here in this House.

So I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman. And I want to associate myself with his very detailed and well-stated opening statement on this legislation.

I think the premise should be that all of us agree on the importance of the FAA. I have served as the chairwoman of the Transportation Security Subcommittee of the Homeland Security Committee and now serve as its ranking member. Through that timeframe, I have seen the overlapping need to view particularly FAA's work and particularly air traffic controller work as part of both the safety and security of this Nation.

I remind my colleagues of the activist role that air traffic controllers in particular took during 9/11. During the massiveness of confusion and the loss of the destination or the placing of three of our major airlines and planes that were flying in, airplanes, the air traffic controller was really a team that was on the first response, if you will. So their work is enormously important.

And my colleague mentioned some numbers that I think are extremely important: \$1.3 trillion is what we find as the revenue in the airline industry, 11½ million jobs, a 75 percent increase in employees within 20 years and 1 billion in the next decade. I want to say that this means that we have a great obligation to protect the American traveling public.

I also want to associate myself with the idea of not protecting our small airports and disadvantaging those airports by this legislation. And again I assume Chairman ROCKEFELLER's comments play to that as well.

But I had offered an amendment that was sent to the Senate to establish a mandate that at the top 20 United States airports there should be no fewer than three air traffic controllers

on duty during periods of airfield operations. I firmly believe this provision will ensure that air traffic control towers at high-volume airports in this country will be appropriately staffed at all times.

Mr. Speaker, we engaged with the conference committee very diligently. We have all heard the recent stories of air traffic controllers falling asleep or being locked out of the control tower or, for whatever reason, not being able to be on the job, on duty at critical times.

Now, I know that air traffic controllers reflect the diversity of America and the various ills and concerns. We also know they have long concentrated hours and it's a difficult job. Just recently there was a question of whether or not an air traffic controller was inebriated on the job, whether he drank on the job or he came to the job, he or she, with this condition. But if that was the case and there was one air traffic controller there, there's zero. If that was the case and there were two, then there was one.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlelady an additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

I submit that by simply having a codified policy that at the busiest and most critical airports we mandate there be personnel redundancy in control towers, we can make the aviation system much safer and much more secure.

The American passenger has value. Those dear souls who lost their lives on 9/11 who were not exposed to this concept of terrorism had value. The American passenger is entitled to safety and security. Think about the people on planes flying across our country. They are our grandmothers, husbands, wives, babies, family members, businesspersons, associates, colleagues. They're American passengers and their lives have value. To ensure their safety and security, I believe we need more than what is presently moving in this bill that has not come to the floor, and I believe we should move on with the conferees to be appointed because, as I said, I sent my language to the initial negotiation. We need to move on so there's an opportunity for us to work this idea.

But this is more than a study. We don't need another study. We have already seen the mishaps. On 9/11 we discovered the value and importance of these particular workers, and we now have discovered the problem.

I ask my colleagues to raise the question and to question this rule and this bill, or this extension, because we are putting our American passengers in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider yet another extension for FAA programs, I rise today to dis-

cuss a key issue that I urge the conferees on the FAA Reauthorization bill to consider.

Prior to H.R. 658 being sent to the Senate, I offered an amendment to establish a mandate that at the top 20 U.S. airports, there shall be no fewer than three air traffic controllers on duty during periods of airfield operations. I firmly believe this provision will ensure that air traffic control towers at high volume airports in this country will be appropriately staffed at all times. This is a matter of national security.

We have all heard the recent stories of air traffic controllers falling asleep, or being locked out of the control tower, or for whatever reason, not being able to be on the job, on duty at critical times.

I submit that by simply having a codified policy that at the busiest and most critical airports we mandate there be personnel redundancy in control towers, we can make the aviation system much safer.

The American Passenger has value. The American Passenger is entitled to Safety and Security.

Think about the people on planes flying across our country. They are our grandmothers, husbands, wives and babies. They are American Passengers and their lives have value. To ensure their safety and security we must insist that Air Traffic Controllers are vigilant. To ensure their vigilance we must set reasonable minimum standards.

After 9-11, we discovered the vital importance of protecting our domestic airspace. Air Traffic Controllers are part of the front line of defense to protect the ensure the safety of our air space. If they lose contact with a plane, they can alert authorities. If an Air Traffic Controller at a major domestic and international airport is asleep at the wheel who will make that call?

It is unfair to put the lives of American passengers at high volume airports at ANY time in the hands of one individual, who may at some point be incapacitated. Even pilots have co-pilots. What if the Controller fell ill? What then? What would you tell those passengers on the plane? Hope for the best? We need to provide the support that Air Traffic Controllers need in addition to the responsibility.

This language I support creates a mandate, that at all times there must be a minimum of three air traffic controllers in the tower during hours of airfield operation. I commend Secretary LaHood for ordering a second air traffic controller to be on duty overnight at National Airport. However, the Secretary's action simply evidences that there is no current mandate for multiple air traffic controllers. According to the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, most airports operate 24 hours a day with two controllers in the tower for the midnight-to-6 a.m. shift. The operative word is "most", we must act to create a uniform nationwide standard, verifiable and enforceable by the FAA. Again, safety and security are mutually needed to protect the public. This mandate of 2 air traffic controllers on duty at the top 20 airports is vital to America's National Security.

I urge the conferees to adopt this important provision.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 min-

utes to my very good friend from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we meet this afternoon to consider this very necessary legislation, too many Americans are looking at yet another Friday without a paycheck. Too many Americans are leery when they hear the phone ring for fear it's another dunning phone call from a creditor they can't pay. Too many Americans are stuck for yet another week in a part-time job that doesn't come anywhere close to paying their families' bills.

The country has a jobs crisis. We have the same number of private sector jobs in America today that we had in 2001, and we have 14 percent more people looking for work. We have a jobs crisis.

This is the 196th day of the majority that now runs the House of Representatives, and on not one of those days has the majority taken advantage of the opportunity to come to the floor, work together on legislation that would address this jobs crisis here in our country.

□ 1250

I believe that resolving this crisis requires us to work together in three areas:

First, we have to get our fiscal house in order as a government. We can no longer borrow 40 cents of every dollar we spend, and we certainly cannot let this country fail to meet its obligation to pay its bills—a deadline that is on August 2. Failure to do that would mean more than simply failing our country's national obligations. It would mean higher mortgage rates; it would mean higher car loan rates, higher small business rates; and if we miss the deadline, it would mean not enough money to pay Social Security checks or our troops or our creditors. We cannot let that happen.

Just across this Capitol, there are signs of hope, where Members of the other body from both political parties have begun to have a serious proposal put on the table that would significantly address our budget problem by reducing entitlement spending, which we must do; by reducing spending on regular government programs, which we must do; by reducing spending on defense in areas that would not weaken our country, which we must do; and yes, by requiring the wealthiest and most successful of Americans to pay a bit more towards solving this problem. That is a fair and balanced way to approach this problem. I am heartened by the fact that, across the Capitol, both Republicans and Democrats are beginning to make that effort. We should make the same effort here, something we could agree to.

Second, we've got to stimulate the demand for businesses in this country.

I think the main reason so many employers are not hiring is they legitimately fear there won't be enough customers to buy their appliances or their antibiotics or their software, that there isn't enough demand in our economy.

One of the reasons we don't have that demand is we send \$1 billion a day to Middle Eastern countries which sell us oil. Why don't we keep that \$1 billion here in the United States of America and put it to work by putting Americans to work, whether it's in building windmill farms off the coast or solar farms throughout our rural areas or in exploring regular, conventional sources of energy in a safe and environmentally conscious way. Let's do that.

Why aren't we investing to give ourselves a continued lead in the biotechnology industry? As scientists are figuring out ways to grow new tissue that heals hearts and livers and kidneys, why aren't we working to retain our leadership position in the world in order to create jobs here in our country?

So these are ways that we could and should work together.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Why aren't we doing far more than we're doing this afternoon on this airport bill?

Airport investment puts Americans to work, and good air travel makes growth possible, but look at what we're doing: a temporary, scanty extension of our investment in our air traffic system because we can't get our fiscal house in order to agree to the kind of extension that we need.

We have 196 days of missed opportunity. Let's not make tomorrow the 197th day of missed opportunity. Let's come together; work together as Republicans and Democrats, and create an environment where entrepreneurs can begin to create the jobs that we so desperately need here in our country. Yes, we have a deficit in America—it is a very serious deficit—but the most serious deficit we have is a jobs deficit, and until we can find a way to put 15 million unemployed Americans back to work, our deficits will continue.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the people who might be watching this that we're talking about House Resolution 357, which is a rule that would allow us to reauthorize an extension of the Airport and Airway Extension Act, which is called H.R. 2553. That's our discussion. That's what we're talking about.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would ask my good friend from Florida whether he has any other requests for time. I am prepared to close.

Mr. WEBSTER. No. I am ready to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. In so doing, Mr. Speaker, having now fully read Senator ROCKEFELLER's letter, I do ask that it be made part of the RECORD. I will read only four sentences from it. He says to Chairman MICA:

"I strongly urge you to reconsider your position and send over a clean FAA extension and appoint conferees for the FAA reauthorization bill, as the Senate did on April 7, 2011, to move this important legislation forward. Further efforts to add policy components to FAA extensions that have not been negotiated with the Senate will likely shut the FAA down."

As Transportation Secretary LaHood and FAA Administrator Babbitt have said, the United States faces a pivotal time in aviation history. In order to ensure the safety of the flying public and bring our air transportation system into the 21st century, the FAA needs a long-term reauthorization bill. While H.R. 2553 buys us a little more time, we cannot afford to continue ignoring the underlying problem.

Mr. Speaker, I try very much not to be as parochial as I can be in many instances, but in West Palm Beach, we are building a new airport tower, and we need the NextGen facilities. At the Fort Lauderdale Airport—that is my hometown airport—we are expanding the runway. It becomes increasingly difficult to complete the projects when money for doing so comes in increments rather than in a block that will allow that they go forward in a meaningful way.

Toward that end, the failure to enact a multiyear FAA reauthorization is just going to result in delays to much needed infrastructure improvements, including, as I have mentioned, the ground-based and NextGen technologies; and it will ultimately cost our Nation more in the long run with regard to passenger safety, jobs and the environment.

Enough is enough. We need a clean extension now in order to pass a long-term authorization as soon as possible. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and on the underlying bill.

UNITED STATES SENATE, COMMITTEE
ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND
TRANSPORTATION,

Washington DC, July 19, 2011.

Hon. JOHN MICA,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office
Building,
Washington, DC.

JOHN. As you are well aware, Congress has passed 20 routine Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) extensions since 2007. I was genuinely hopeful that we would have had a comprehensive bill after four months of negotiations, but appreciated that a handful of difficult issues remained to be resolved before agreement on a final bill could be reached. I was under the impression that we were still operating on a shared desire to complete this important legislation.

It is for this reason that I am deeply puzzled by your decision to introduce an FAA

extension with language that adversely affects the Essential Air Service (EAS) program. This surprise maneuver is a complete reversal from the discussions we have been having for several months, and strongly suggests you have not been negotiating in good faith.

As troubling and problematic as the extension you introduced is, I am even more taken aback by the blistering press release you issued in conjunction with it. Its hostility was unexpected. The tone and tenor of the release was so different than any of our previous interactions, I almost did not believe you wrote it.

As your press release inferred, you inserted the EAS language into the FAA extension in retaliation for the Senate's refusal to accept your language on the National Mediation Board (NMB). At no point during our discussions, have we ever linked reforms to the EAS program to language on NMB. I made it clear from the beginning of our negotiations that the NMB language included in your bill—or any other language adversely impacting workers rights—could not pass the Senate. As you know, the Senate voted on this issue last year and our Leadership considers this matter settled. Your attempt to punish the Senate by hurting small community air service has backfired—this language only guarantees that the Senate will reject the FAA extension.

As I told you on numerous occasions, EAS is critical to West Virginia. Specifically, I discussed how Morgantown and Clarksburg depend on the EAS program. Air service has been a critical factor in the economies of these communities, and drives economic growth across my state. Our every conversation had me convinced that you appreciated the reasons I am so dedicated to supporting this program. I believed you when you indicated you wanted to work with me on reaching language acceptable to both chambers. The language in the FAA extension you introduced with Congressmen Camp and Petri makes it harder to find a path forward on this issue.

Over the last twenty-four hours, it is my understanding that you have asserted to others that you had no role in developing this extension, claiming that it was a leadership decision. If this is true, I am unclear as to why you sponsored it, and issued such a searing press release along with it. If you truly have no authority to make final decisions on the FAA bill, I urge the House to formally appoint conferees and allow me to negotiate directly with your colleagues who can make decisions.

I strongly urge you to reconsider your position and send over a clean FAA extension and appoint conferees for the FAA reauthorization bill, as the Senate did on April 7, 2011, to move this important legislation forward. Further efforts to add policy components to FAA extensions that have not been negotiated with the Senate will likely shut the FAA down. You need to think about this very, very carefully. Any consequences resulting from such an action will fall squarely on your shoulders. Right now you are in control of the agency's immediate future.

Sincerely,

John D. Rockefeller IV.

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

Mr. WEBSTER. In closing, I would like to address one thing about the change that's in this particular reauthorization, that of essential air service, which has basically become the

government-funded corporate jet program. We've tried to reduce that. If you're a businessman and you live in a rural community, instead of being willing to drive an hour and a half to get on a plane at a medium- or small-sized hub, you're willing to have the government fund your airplane for you. It's basically a corporate member, somebody who has a business there. He gets on a jet, and to the tune of up to \$3,720, we subsidize that. The taxpayers of this country subsidize that, so it's like a subsidized corporate jet.

It's a sad thing. We want to reduce that. We'd like to do away with it, and a lot of us would like to do away with it altogether; but it would reduce that down to \$1,000 instead of having to drive, maybe, an hour and a half to an airport. It's a sad thing.

However, another sad thing is that we're here. I am sad about the fact that we're standing here on the floor once again to vote for another extension. I wish it had worked out. I wish we could get together, and I hope that happens in the next few weeks if we approve this. This extension is necessary to ensure continued safety for all who fly, be it for business or pleasure or for any other reason, in the American skies.

I ask my colleagues to join me today and vote in favor of this rule and of passage of the underlying bill.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 183, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 608]

YEAS—239

Adams	Brady (TX)	Cravaack
Aderholt	Brooks	Crawford
Akin	Broun (GA)	Crenshaw
Alexander	Buchanan	Culberson
Amash	Bucshon	Davis (KY)
Austria	Buerkle	Denham
Bachus	Burgess	Dent
Barletta	Burton (IN)	DesJarlais
Bartlett	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Barton (TX)	Camp	Dold
Bass (NH)	Campbell	Dreier
Benishek	Canseco	Duffy
Berg	Cantor	Duncan (SC)
Biggart	Capito	Duncan (TN)
Bilbray	Carter	Ellmers
Bilirakis	Cassidy	Emerson
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	Farenthold
Black	Chaffetz	Fincher
Blackburn	Coble	Fitzpatrick
Bonner	Coffman (CO)	Flake
Bono Mack	Cole	Fleischmann
Boustany	Conaway	Fleming

Flores	Lankford	Rivera
Forbes	Latham	Roby
Fortenberry	LaTourette	Roe (TN)
Fox	Latta	Rogers (AL)
Franks (AZ)	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)
Gallegly	Long	Rohrabacher
Gardner	Lucas	Rokita
Garrett	Luetkemeyer	Rooney
Gerlach	Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen
Gibbs	Lungren, Daniel	Roskam
Gibson	E.	Schick
Gingrey (GA)	Mack	Ross (FL)
Gohmert	Manzullo	Royce
Goodlatte	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Gosar	Marino	Scalise
Gowdy	McCarthy (CA)	Schilling
Granger	McCaul	Schmidt
Graves (GA)	McClintock	Schock
Graves (MO)	McCotter	Schweikert
Griffin (AR)	McHenry	Scott (SC)
Griffith (VA)	McKeon	Scott, Austin
Grimm	McKinley	Sensenbrenner
Guinta	McMorris	Sessions
Guthrie	Rodgers	Shimkus
Hall	Meehan	Shuler
Hanna	Mica	Shuster
Harper	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Harris	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)
Hartzler	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)
Hastings (WA)	Mulvaney	Smith (TX)
Hayworth	Murphy (PA)	Southerland
Heck	Myrick	Stearns
Hensarling	Neugebauer	Stivers
Herger	Noem	Stutzman
Herrera Beutler	Nugent	Sullivan
Huelskamp	Nunes	Terry
Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee	Thompson (PA)
Hultgren	Olson	Thornberry
Hunter	Owens	Tiberi
Hurt	Palazzo	Tipton
Issa	Paul	Turner
Jenkins	Paulsen	Upton
Johnson (IL)	Pearce	Walberg
Johnson (OH)	Pence	Walden
Johnson, Sam	Petri	Walsh (IL)
Jones	Pitts	Webster
Jordan	Platts	West
Kelly	Poe (TX)	Westmoreland
King (IA)	Pompeo	Whitfield
King (NY)	Posey	Wilson (SC)
Kingston	Price (GA)	Wittman
Kinzinger (IL)	Quayle	Wolf
Kissell	Reed	Womack
Kline	Rehberg	Woodall
Labrador	Reichert	Yoder
Lamborn	Renacci	Young (FL)
Lance	Ribble	Young (IN)
Landry	Rigell	

NAYS—183

Ackerman	Cooper	Hanabusa
Altmire	Costa	Hastings (FL)
Andrews	Costello	Heinrich
Baca	Courtney	Higgins
Baldwin	Critz	Himes
Barrow	Crowley	Hinojosa
Bass (CA)	Cuellar	Hirono
Becerra	Cummings	Hochul
Berkley	Davis (CA)	Holden
Berman	Davis (IL)	Holt
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Honda
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Hoyer
Boren	DeLauro	Inslie
Boswell	Deutch	Israel
Brady (PA)	Dicks	Jackson (IL)
Braleigh (IA)	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Brown (FL)	Doggett	(TX)
Butterfield	Donnelly (IN)	Johnson (GA)
Capps	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Carroll	Edwards	Kaptur
Carson	Engel	Keating
Chandler	Eshoo	Kildee
Chu	Farr	Kind
Cicilline	Fattah	Kucinich
Clarke (MI)	Flner	Langevin
Clarke (NY)	Frank (MA)	Larsen (WA)
Clay	Fudge	Larson (CT)
Cleaver	Garamendi	Lee (CA)
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Levin
Cohen	Green, Al	Lewis (GA)
Connolly (VA)	Green, Gene	Lipinski
Conyers	Grijalva	Loeb
	Gutierrez	Loeb
	Hahn	Lofgren, Zoe
		Lowey

Lujan	Peters	Sewell
Lynch	Peterson	Sherman
Maloney	Pingree (ME)	Sires
Markey	Polis	Slaughter
Matheson	Price (NC)	Smith (WA)
Matsui	Quigley	Speier
McCarthy (NY)	Rahall	Stark
McCollum	Rangel	Sutton
McGovern	Reyes	Thompson (CA)
McIntyre	Richardson	Thompson (MS)
McNerney	Richmond	Tierney
Meeks	Ross (AR)	Tonko
Michaud	Rothman (NJ)	Towns
Miller (NC)	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas
Miller, George	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Moore	Rush	Velázquez
Moran	Ryan (OH)	Vislosky
Murphy (CT)	Sánchez, Linda	Walz (MN)
Nadler	T.	Wasserman
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Schultz
Neal	Sarbanes	Waters
Olver	Schakowsky	Watt
Pallone	Schiff	Waxman
Pascrell	Schradler	Welch
Pastor (AZ)	Schwartz	Wilson (FL)
Payne	Scott (VA)	Woolsey
Pelosi	Scott, David	Wu
Perlmutter	Serrano	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann	Ellison	Runyan
Blumenauer	Giffords	Young (AK)
Capuano	Hinchey	
Castor (FL)	McDermott	

□ 1330

Messrs. CONYERS, CLYBURN and Ms. BROWN of Florida changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. LEWIS of California, CAMP, MCKINLEY, and CRENSHAW changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against: Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, due to official House business, I was unable to vote on the following measure:

Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule for H.R. 2553—Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV (H. Res. 357).

Had I been able to vote, I would have voted "nay."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 178, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 609]

AYES—242

Ackerman	Biggart	Buerkle
Adams	Bilbray	Burgess
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Burton (IN)
Akin	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Alexander	Black	Camp
Amash	Blackburn	Campbell
Austria	Bonner	Canseco
Bachus	Bono Mack	Cantor
Barletta	Boustany	Capito
Bartlett	Brady (TX)	Carney
Barton (TX)	Brooks	Carter
Bass (NH)	Broun (GA)	Cassidy
Benishek	Buchanan	Chabot
Berg	Bucshon	Chaffetz

Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxo
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt

Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
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
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souterland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud

Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oliver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky

Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Townes
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

port and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend the airport improvement program, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 357, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2553

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 "Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TAXES FUNDING AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) FUEL TAXES.—Subparagraph (B) of section 4081(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "July 22, 2011" and inserting "September 16, 2011".

(b) TICKET TAXES.—

(1) PERSONS.—Clause (ii) of section 4261(j)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "July 22, 2011" and inserting "September 16, 2011".

(2) PROPERTY.—Clause (ii) of section 4271(d)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking "July 22, 2011" and inserting "September 16, 2011".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 23, 2011.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 9502(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking "July 23, 2011" and inserting "September 17, 2011"; and

(2) by inserting "or the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV" before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 9502(e) of such Code is amended by striking "July 23, 2011" and inserting "September 17, 2011".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 23, 2011.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 48103 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following:

"(8) \$3,380,178,082 for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on September 16, 2011."

(2) OBLIGATION OF AMOUNTS.—Subject to limitations specified in advance in appropriation Acts, sums made available pursuant to the amendment made by paragraph (1) may be obligated at any time through September 30, 2011, and shall remain available until expended.

(b) PROJECT GRANT AUTHORITY.—Section 47104(c) of such title is amended by striking "July 22, 2011," and inserting "September 16, 2011,".

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES.

(a) Section 40117(1)(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "July 23, 2011," and inserting "September 17, 2011,".

(b) Section 44302(f)(1) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking "July 22, 2011," and inserting "September 16, 2011,"; and

(2) by striking "October 31, 2011," and inserting "December 31, 2011,".

NOT VOTING—12

Bachmann
Blumenauer
Capuano
Castor (FL)

Ellison
Giffords
Gutierrez
Hinchev

McDermott
Runyan
Scott (VA)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1337

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, due to official House business, I was unable to vote on the following measure:

H. Res. 357—Closed Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2553—Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV.

Had I been able to vote, I would have voted "nay."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2553 and to include extraneous material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2011, PART IV

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 357, I call up the bill (H.R. 2553) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Air-

NOES—178

Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)

Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle

Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda

(c) Section 44303(b) of such title is amended by striking “October 31, 2011,” and inserting “December 31, 2011.”

(d) Section 47107(s)(3) of such title is amended by striking “July 23, 2011,” and inserting “September 17, 2011.”

(e) Section 47115(j) of such title is amended by striking “July 23, 2011,” and inserting “September 17, 2011.”

(f) Section 47141(f) of such title is amended by striking “July 22, 2011,” and inserting “September 16, 2011.”

(g) Section 49108 of such title is amended by striking “July 22, 2011,” and inserting “September 16, 2011.”

(h) Section 161 of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (49 U.S.C. 47109 note) is amended by striking “July 23, 2011,” and inserting “September 17, 2011.”

(i) Section 186(d) of such Act (117 Stat. 2518) is amended by striking “July 23, 2011,” and inserting “September 17, 2011.”

(j) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 23, 2011.

SEC. 6. ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 41731(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iii) as subclauses (I) through (III), respectively;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(3) in clause (i)(I) (as so redesignated) by inserting “(A)” before “(i)(I)”;

(4) in subparagraph (A)(ii) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking “determined” and inserting “was determined”;

(B) by striking “Secretary” and inserting “Secretary of Transportation”; and

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

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) is located not less than 90 miles from the nearest medium or large hub airport; and
“(C) had an average subsidy per passenger of less than \$1,000 during the most recent fiscal year, as determined by the Secretary.”

(b) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO DECIDE A PLACE NOT AN ELIGIBLE PLACE.—Section 41731(b) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking “Secretary of Transportation” and inserting “Secretary”; and

(2) by striking “on the basis of a passenger subsidy at that place or on another basis” and inserting “on any basis”.

(c) EXCEPTIONS AND WAIVERS.—Section 41731 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) EXCEPTIONS FOR LOCATIONS IN ALASKA.—Subsections (a)(1)(B) and (a)(1)(C) shall not apply with respect to a location in the State of Alaska.

“(d) WAIVERS.—The Secretary may waive subsection (a)(1)(B) with respect to a location if the Secretary determines that the geographic characteristics of the location result in undue difficulty in accessing the nearest medium or large hub airport.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1340

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

Mr. Speaker, for the third consecutive Congress, we are working to pass a long-term reauthorization of the FAA.

This year both the House and Senate passed their own reauthorizations; but, unfortunately, negotiations with the Senate have slowed, and it is necessary for us to pass another extension to enable the FAA to continue to operate.

This bill is a short-term extension of FAA funding and programs through September 16 at current levels. This extension also includes important reforms to the Essential Air Service program. These reforms could result in as much as \$20 million in savings for the American taxpayer.

The first reform provision was adopted unanimously by the Senate and is included in its reauthorization bill. That provides that only airports that are 90 miles or more away from a large- or medium-hub airport would be eligible to participate in the Essential Air Service—90 miles away. People can obviously and in most instances would prefer to drive 90 miles rather than take a connecting flight. It seems like a sensible thing. We hadn't thought about it when we passed our original legislation; the Senate did. We are including their reform. So we are, in effect, acceding to the Senate. In the case of one airport under the current program which is within 90 miles, we are paying a per passenger subsidy of \$351, and the nearest hub is 82 miles away. That is a \$10 per mile subsidy.

So the second provision dealing with Essential Air Service caps the subsidies for each passenger, in addition to the fares they pay, at \$1,000. During this economically difficult time, it is not possible to justify using taxpayer dollars to pay a subsidy of \$1,000 per passenger at an EAS airport, and subsidies can frequently exceed that amount. If there are difficulties with that, there is other language that would allow the executive branch to waive this provision.

The EAS provisions included in the extension are limited and sensible reforms that target the most indefensible of the subsidies. If we can't do this, what can we do, especially after 23 or 24 extensions that have been holding the whole program and the efficiency and improvements in the air infrastructure of our country hostage.

The House-passed bill actually phases out the Essential Air Services program for all but Alaska and Hawaii. We are not insisting on that at all. We are modifying that and going along with largely what the Senate itself has been suggesting in this regard. So these provisions are a compromise, and EAS will continue to be discussed as we work to finalize the bill.

As Congress tries to find a way forward to address deficit and long-term debt issues, if we can't put an end to these extravagant subsidies, then we will never be able to rein in spending where really hard decisions are necessary.

Although I continue to hold out hope that we will reach a compromise with

the Senate in the near future, it is necessary to pass this extension to provide the FAA with continued funding authority and provide needed EAS reform. Ultimately, we need to get back to the negotiating table to work out a long-term FAA bill. Short-term extensions are not the way to run such an important agency.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, July 18, 2011.

Hon. JOHN MICA,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MICA: I am writing concerning H.R. 2553, the “Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV” which is expected to be scheduled for floor consideration this week.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Code. Sections 2 and 3 of this bill amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by extending the current Airport and Airway Trust Fund (AATF) expenditure authority and the associated Federal excise taxes to September 16, 2011. In order to expedite H.R. 2553 for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on the bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 2553, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, July 18, 2011.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2553, the “Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV.” The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure recognizes the Committee on Ways and Means has a jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2553, and I appreciate your effort to facilitate consideration of this bill.

I concur with you that forgoing action on H.R. 2553 does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include our letters on H.R. 2553 in the Congressional Record during House Floor consideration of the bill. Again, I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I look forward to working with the Committee on Ways and Means as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,
Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2553, the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011. This is the 21st extension of the FAA authority to fund airport improvement projects at current levels, through September 16, 2011. Regrettably, unlike all of the prior 20 extensions of the FAA authority, this bill includes a policy rider eliminating Essential Air Service eligibility for 13 airports in small and rural communities.

The issue today is not whether we support the Essential Air Service program or not. We should not be legislating on this extension. We should have a clean extension so we can move it over to the Senate and make certain that the FAA is funded through September 16.

There have been no hearings on proposals to reduce EAS this Congress and no hearings on this bill either. Members with affected communities should be allowed to make their case to the House and offer amendments to the bill that would preserve service to their communities.

Instead, this extension is inviting opposition and creating major problems because the Senate has indicated they will not accept this extension. Policy riders should be left out of the extension and taken up by the House and Senate conferees, if, in fact, we ever have conferees appointed here in the House.

Earlier this year, the House and Senate both approved comprehensive FAA reauthorization bills. In February, the Senate passed the FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 87-8. Passage of the Senate bill was widely applauded by both labor and industry stakeholders, and it was estimated the bill would create at least 10,000 jobs.

In contrast, in April of this year, the House passed an extremely controversial H.R. 658 by a vote of 223-196, the narrowest vote margin for House passage of an FAA reauthorization bill in nearly three decades. The bill has been harshly criticized by labor and industry stakeholders because it would undermine aviation safety, slash FAA funding, and destroy good-paying airport construction jobs.

Since Chairman MICA introduced the FAA reauthorization bill, we have been warned and we have warned, actually, that it contains a number of controversial poison pill provisions that seriously jeopardize the enactment of a long-term reauthorization act this year.

The failure to enact a long-term FAA reauthorization act is costing taxpayers millions of dollars and the Nation tens of thousands of good-paying jobs. Short-term stopgap funding au-

thorizations have stymied airport construction, job creation, and the FAA's overall ability to efficiently administer its programs. Further, multiple FAA extension acts have created uncertainty among local airport officials regarding the total amount of Federal funding available this year for airport construction. As a result, State and local airport officials are advancing fewer projects, less new construction is moving forward, and fewer jobs are being created.

Last week the Airports Council International of North America sent a letter stating that if Congress did not extend the airport grant program through September 30, "safety and security projects will go unfunded and the much needed jobs associated with these projects will not materialize." So I am puzzled why the majority would disregard this warning. It is time that we move forward and that we get a clean extension so we in fact can move to conference and get a bill that is agreed upon that we can bring to the floor that can be signed by the President.

For the majority of the House who claims to care about creating jobs, reducing bureaucracy, and listening to the business community, this extension bill goes out of its way to create unnecessary red tape and problems.

The FAA needs the certainty, stability, and direction that a long-term reauthorization act provides. Further, the American people and the American public deserve a long-term FAA reauthorization act that will create jobs, improve safety, and modernize our infrastructure. We need to stop playing partisan games, quit posturing, and pass a clean extension through September 16, appoint conferees, and in fact reach agreement on a long-term FAA reauthorization bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), chairman of the full Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank our chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, Mr. PETRI, for his leadership. Also Mr. COSTELLO, who formerly chaired the committee and now is the ranking member. I want to thank him for his dedication to our Nation's aviation system, safety. And also Mr. RAHALL. You couldn't ask for better partners. Mr. RAHALL is the Democrat leader of the committee, and we have a great working relationship. We have had a great working relationship to try to move forward legislation like a long-term reauthorization of FAA and other major transportation legislation that has been mired in delay. Quite frankly, my colleagues, I find myself very frustrated being here.

Now, this is the 21st extension. I complimented and don't let me not

compliment the staff on both sides. We have great professionals that deal with this.

□ 1350

The Congress is fortunate and the Nation is blessed to have the kind of leadership we have with staff working on these important issues to move what accounts for about 8 to 9 percent of our GDP. That's the aviation industry forward, setting the policy, the programs, the funding formula, all those things these folks are responsible for. And they're good stewards of that responsibility. So I thank them in advance. I also want to thank Senator ROCKEFELLER, Mr. Speaker, and others who have worked with us trying to bring this to a conclusion. KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, the ranking Republican on the Senate side, worked in good faith to try to get this, again, inexcusable delay in passing the long-term reauthorization.

That being said, again, I find myself so frustrated. This is the 21st delay. We have a former chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. PETRI now chairs it. He's been active on this. I was chairman for 6 years of the subcommittee. We were all wanting to do the same thing—and that's move forward with reauthorization.

The irony of this is I chaired the Subcommittee on Aviation in 2003, when we wrote the last reauthorization. And we did that in some 6 months. And there were controversial provisions. That 4-year bill expired in 2007. We have not passed a reauthorization, even when the other side had humongous numbers in this Chamber and control of the other body. At one point, I think 60 votes to get something done. Nothing was done. Seventeen extensions under their watch. And, quite frankly, I'm embarrassed that this is the fourth extension. But I'm trying to do in 6 or 7 months what couldn't be done in almost 5 years. And we're going to get it done. We're going to get it done one way or the other.

Now, we have also done three what they call clean extensions to move this process forward. And we did need some time. You have to be reasonable because this is a new Congress. The other body, the Senate, passed their bill in February. We passed the first day in April our legislation. And here we find ourselves on the fourth, again, extension, which is regrettable.

All this, I say, my colleagues, could be resolved I think in a matter of an hour. There's been great work and discussions, informal discussions, in what we call preconference, where some of the principles get together and discuss the terms. All these issues are not new. Mr. COSTELLO and I, Mr. Oberstar and I, we had discussed this. In fact, I think the other body took up the pending legislation from last time. My goodness, it was pending for 48 months. So there's

no new issues here. Again, we find ourselves stalled in the process.

That being said, I call on the Members to pass this extension. This is a clean extension, except for one change; and it has two parts. The first part deals with Essential Air Service. That's the program that underwrites, again, routes for air service from local communities. This is a program that started at about \$50 million a decade ago and now is approaching \$200 million. We had a vote here in the House, and we decided to sunset that program, I guess with the exception of two of our exceptional States, Hawaii and Alaska, who have some unique geographic limitations on service. But the other body passed a provision, the Senate, passed a provision that would eliminate service based on distance, I think it's 90 miles, and it affected some 10 communities. Mr. Speaker, I'll insert in the RECORD the 10 communities affected.

So this is language that the other body passed and we are including. Now, I have made one exception, and it affects three airports, three States: Nevada, Montana, and New Mexico. A provision I put in is that no State or no airport operation that has service where the subsidy exceeds a thousand dollars a ticket can receive that subsidy. I don't think that's unreasonable, when we've got from now until the beginning of August to get our Nation's finances together. I want to see folks come down here to vote to continue to see subsidies for more than a thousand. One of these subsidies, and I won't state the State but you can figure it out, is \$3,719 per passenger. That's obscene when our country is on the verge of debt crises and disaster.

If I have to take the entire reauthorization and we continue—now this extends through the 16th of September. I'm putting everybody on notice that each time we will pass reauthorization, if we have to do it extension by extension. So we're starting with this small part of what the other body has passed, and I'm adding what I think is a reasonable provision. A thousand-dollar subsidy in itself is almost obscene, if you ask the average Member of Congress. In fact, when I went to the Rules Committee, one of the members on the other side of the aisle was stunned that we were paying those kinds of fees.

Now, don't come here and tell me that we don't legislate on extensions. In fact, the other body put an entire bill, a regional safety legislation, on one of the past 17 extensions. So we've done this before. We need to work together on this. I would implore Members on both sides of the aisle to support this because this is in the people's interest. This has to move forward. I don't know of any other mechanism. I certainly am not going to allow this fiasco to continue and certainly I don't want the FAA to close down at midnight on Friday night. And that won't

happen. Essential services will continue. Air traffic controllers will be at their job. There may be some people furloughed. But it is not my fault. It will be the responsibility of the other body, who does not take this up and pass it. They will be furloughing people and putting people out of jobs.

If you want to see people work, then let's pass the FAA bill. It has the Next Generation air traffic control provisions. It has safety provisions in there that are long overdue.

So, again, I'm a bit frustrated. I want the best for the Nation. I want the best for our air traffic control system, our aviation system, and thousands of people who depend—not just working in the Federal Government, but in this important industry—to move forward. Again, I'm so disappointed. But we're going to find one way. I may not be the most powerful Member, I may not be the most intelligent Member, I may not be the highest ranking Member. But I'll tell you what: I am a persistent Member. And we will pass reauthorization one way or another. We're going to get it done. So I appreciate everyone's indulgence in working with me on this project.

SUBSIDIZED EAS COMMUNITIES AND DISTANCES TO NEAREST HUB—BASED ON FY 2009 HUB DATA
[Excludes communities located in Alaska]

EAS Community	Nearest large/medium hub	Miles
Athens, GA	Atlanta Hartsfield-Jackson Int'l, GA (L)	72
Morgantown, WV	Pittsburgh Int'l, PA (M)	75
Jamestown, NY	Buffalo Niagara Int'l (M)	76
Bradford, PA	Buffalo Niagara Int'l (M)	77
Hagerstown, MD/Martinsburg, WV	Washington Dulles Int'l, VA (L)	78
Jonesboro, AR	Memphis Int'l, TN (M)	82
Johnstown, PA	Pittsburgh Int'l, PA (M)	84
Oil City/Franklin, PA	Pittsburgh Int'l, PA (M)	85
Lancaster, PA	Philadelphia Int'l, PA (L)	86
Jackson, TN	Memphis Int'l, TN (M)	86

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. I commend our ranking member, Mr. COSTELLO, Chairman MICA, Subcommittee Chairman PETRI, my senior Senator, JAY ROCKEFELLER, in the other body and his ranking member, KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, for the tremendous efforts they have put in this legislation and so much other legislation important for our infrastructure in this country. I recognize that those on the majority, their heart is in the right place. Perhaps those whose pay grade is above them have different opinions and different agendas on this legislation. And perhaps that's the reason why we need to appoint conferees, as the other body has done, and move forward and let the normal process work its will in this legislation.

But instead, we're here to consider the 21st short-term extension of FAA programs and authority and the fourth

short-term extension this Congress, as our chairman has just stated. Twenty-one extensions. It's now old enough to drink. Instead of celebrating, however, this should give all cause for concern. This past Saturday marked the 100th day since the Senate appointed conferees on long-term reauthorization. The sun has risen and set over the Capitol more than 200 times since then. House and Senate negotiators have boiled down the remaining issues to just a few.

□ 1400

But the House Republican leadership still has not appointed conferees to move this process forward, despite the fact that, as Chairman MICA has acknowledged to the press late last week and even in his comments here today, the remaining differences are so few they could be resolved by conferees in 20 minutes. So I ask: What is the Republican leadership waiting for?

We find ourselves now faced with the need for a 21st extension. Unlike the three other extensions this Chamber has passed this year, this extension contains a policy rider that would cut 13 small and rural communities from the Essential Air Service program.

There have been no hearings on proposals, as Ranking Member COSTELLO has stated, to reduce EAS and no hearings on this proposal in particular. That said, I would note for the record that the provision of this extension dealing with EAS is an improvement over the proposal in the House-passed reauthorization bill that would have cut the EAS program altogether for the lower 48 States.

There's no question that a sunset of the program would not pass the Senate and be enacted, and at least my Republican colleagues have stepped back from the brink on that particular proposal. However, I am disappointed that instead of appointing conferees to address the future of the EAS program and other outstanding issues in this long-term reauthorization, my Republican colleagues have instead chosen to force a major policy provision into an otherwise clean FAA extension bill at the last minute.

Holding hostage the negotiations is not the way to move the reauthorization process forward. In fact, it is almost guaranteed to set us back in our efforts to work with the other body and reach agreement on a long-term reauthorization.

I object to the tactics used by my Republican friends and colleagues, and I implore them to act in good faith, appoint conferees, and work toward enactment of a long-term reauthorization bill that will put Americans to work and improve the safety of our skies.

Mr. PETRI. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Thank you so much for yielding again.

The question has been brought up to try to shift the responsibility for, again, the possibility of the other body's not acting here to the question of the Republicans not appointing conferees.

I might point out just for the record that in the 110th Congress—this is for an entire 2 years—the Senate never passed an FAA reauthorization bill, so we never even got to preconference. We never got to the issue. So they never appointed conferees. There was a bill passed. And, again, huge majorities on both sides.

In the 111th Congress, the House and Senate passed FAA reauthorizations and preconferenced for 5 months without naming conferees. They never named any conferees.

This process of preconfereencing is part of the bipartisan nature of our committee and our work and bicameral discussions. As I said, they've been excellent. The staff has been working well. These aren't new issues. The other side controlled the process for some 4 years. The bills have been out there for some time.

I have the commitment from the leadership, when we are ready to go and having resolved most of the issues, and, again, there are only a couple and everyone knows what they are, I think that they can fall in place. But we need the leadership of the other body, in fact, the leader of the other body, to step forward and act in a responsible manner in dealing with me or the leadership of the House or someone in responding to a major impediment that we have to move this process forward. Then our leadership has said they will appoint conferees. We can sit down, resolve those issues in a public forum, and pass this. We could do that tomorrow.

So, again, it's not the question of appointing conferees. And if I have to take more strident measures to get this job done, we're going to get the job done one way or the other, as I said.

Now, I had a Republican ask me to modify the language that the Senate passed before the Rules Committee. There's a tape. You can all see it; it's part of the RECORD. And I said, No, I don't want to do that. I want to take what the Senate passed. The only difference here in the Essential Air Service is that I provided language that says that if you get more than a \$1,000 subsidy that affects three airports, that will not be allowed. That's the only thing standing between us and shutting down part of our Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield myself 10 seconds just to make a point to the chairman.

The 5-month period that he referred to, one, the Republicans in the Senate, as he knows, blocked our ability to appoint conferees. In particular, the Senators from Tennessee put a hold on it

until the Colgan families made their point to let the hold move forward.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the former chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This used to be a legislative body. I'm not quite sure what it is now.

The way, traditionally, the House and the Senate resolve differences is the House and the Senate each pass a bill—most people learn this in their high school civics class. Then each side appoints conferees and they get together and hash through the differences. I've actually served on some of those conference committees. I've actually voted across the aisle on some provisions of bills in those conference committees.

But not now. What they're saying here is, after they have worked out all the differences with the Senate and only in the way that their bill passed the House—that is, my way or the highway, or, my way or your plane's grounded, however you want to look at it—then they will appoint conferees to a meaningless conference on something that's already agreed to and then we'll come back and pass their bill.

It doesn't work that way. It won't work that way. And this is just not a simple problem, because if the FAA has to close down all of its capital improvement programs—Friday night, very expensive, 4,000 people laid off—thousands of projects across the country that would put construction workers to work and suppliers to work won't happen. So this isn't a no-cost playing games kind of thing that they're doing here.

And what's it all about? The bottom line is it's about whether or not labor should have the right to organize. That is what hung up the bill in the Senate before because they wanted to have a level playing field. We wanted to have a level playing field between providers of railroad and airline services and allow people to actually organize, to be represented. And, of course, Federal Express hated that, and their two Senators held up the last conference in the last Congress, plain and simple.

Now they're on the same wavelength here. The Republicans here want to overrule the National Labor Relations Board and impose a rule for organizing that says you have to have a majority of people voting and a majority of the majority voting; i.e., if you apply the same rule that they want to the United States House of Representatives, not one Member of this House would have won their election. Not even some people who are in totally partisan districts, Democrat or Republican. No one would have won because no one got a majority of the majority of the votes. That's the rule they want to apply to labor.

So if you want to organize a union, there's 100 people. First off, you've got to get 51 positive votes. Anybody who doesn't vote counts as a negative vote. So if we apply those same things, we would never have Federal elections in this country. You would never be able to elect anybody to anything. And they say, oh, that'll be fair for labor.

That's what's hanging up this bill: their anti-labor fervor, their hatred of working people and their right to organize. It's absolutely obscene that they are going to do that and cost us more jobs by not having a capital improvement program.

Mr. PETRI. I would just point out to my colleagues that the provision that was changed by the National Labor Relations Board to which my colleague referred has been the law of this land for a generation. So it's not anti-labor fervor at all; it's more regular order.

Madam Speaker, how much time does each side have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentleman from Wisconsin has 12½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois has 19¼ minutes remaining.

□ 1410

Mr. PETRI. I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Thank you, my colleagues.

You just heard the comments. Again, I couldn't have a better friend or compatriot on many issues and on many improvements that we've made to transportation on the committee together: Mr. DEFAZIO, the gentleman from Oregon. He said this used to be a legislative body. Yes, it was a legislative body before the other side took over 4 years ago and closed down quite a bit of the process.

Now, has this been an open process on the FAA reauthorization? I submit to you that it has been from the committee.

Go back and check the committee records. We held more votes on this FAA reauthorization in committee than we held probably for the last 6 years—I know certainly for the last 4 years—on that one piece of legislation. On the floor, we had an open process. I think there were some 30 amendments, and 23, I believe, were made in order. So, unless they were duplicative or the Rules Committee took them out, it was an open process as opposed to a closed process with closed rules that, again, we had on major pieces of legislation for some time. So this has been an open process.

The House is going to act. The House is going to pass this. If we have to pass additional extensions, as I said, with the rest of the reauthorization piece by piece, then we are going to pass a reauthorization to set the policy, the programs, the projects, and the priorities

for our aviation industry and for FAA. The only projects that will be stopped are projects for which, if the other body doesn't act on this extension, they will be responsible for.

The only difference in the extension—and we gave them three clean extensions, and this is a clean extension with their provision that passed with their language unanimously in the other body—is that I added three States—actually, three airports—that subsidized in excess of \$1,000 per ticket, per passenger.

Again, when the Nation is going down the tubes almost literally because of debt, we can't make one little, tiny change and move this process forward? keep people working? put safety provisions that are in this reauthorization that we don't have now and move forward with it? There is something wrong.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me thank the leadership on the committee and then simply appeal to my chairman, Mr. MICA, to come and reason together, because this has been a committee that has had a history of reasoning together. Without my standing here and going through it, you are very aware of what the most objectionable part of this extension is.

If we are serious about passing an extension, let's pass the extension and deal with the other issues at another time. Yes, it has been since 2007, and it has been because of the battling back and forth. You're either pro-labor or anti-labor, but we are ruining the lives of workers. We are subjecting safety to the whims, and we are messing up projects and wasting money by allowing this bickering to continue.

I would simply appeal to our chairman to please come to the table, and let's pass a clean extension bill.

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

Madam Speaker, I just thought, as long as we were spending some time talking about the modest cleaning up of the series of, kind of, earmarks that have accumulated over the years in the Essential Air Service program, which was referred to by the chairman of the committee as a program that started out as a true essential air service to help provide access to the outside world to very isolated communities, it has gradually been kind of earmarked, going from \$50 million to some \$200 million in cost. They're not isolated, but they are subsidized. God knows why.

Let me just mention a few of the areas that would be affected by these modest changes: that it has to be more than 90 miles from another airport and, secondly, that we try to cap the subsidy, unless it's varied somewhat by the Secretary, at \$1,000 per seat, per flight.

One that would be affected that is currently being subsidized is Jonesboro, Arkansas. It's 82 miles from Memphis. You can't drive 82 miles, and you want the Federal Government to provide service?

Athens, Georgia, is 72 miles from Atlanta, and it's getting subsidized.

We're worrying about billions of dollars of subsidies. If we can't even do this, where do we start? They say a big journey starts with a single step, and we're not willing to take even in this small area the most modest of steps.

Harristown, Maryland, which is north of here, is 78 miles from the Dulles Airport. It's getting a subsidy of over \$800 per flight, and it's right near Baltimore as well.

There is Glendive, Montana, which is 60 miles from another essential airport in Montana. It's just 60 miles. You could drive over to Sidney—but no, they're asking for a \$1,357 subsidy, per passenger, flying from Glendive under this program.

Alamogordo, New Mexico, is 89 miles from a hub airport in El Paso, but instead of driving 89 miles, there continues to be a \$1,500 subsidy. You can rent a car. This is a profligate, hard-to-defend use of the taxpayers' money, yet people are talking about closing the government down or the FAA down unless they can spend \$1,500 to subsidize a flight when you can drive 89 miles to another airport.

This is what we're talking about, and this is why my constituents and many others are wondering when we're going to get serious out here about taking the modest steps to get our financial affairs and our stewardship of the Federal taxpayers' money under better control.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the debt limit isn't the only deadline that is upon us. Here we are, facing Friday—D-day for the Nation's aviation system. This is the third Congress where our committee has passed this bill. Most of the sections of the bill do not have major disagreement. But, now, we are going for a bare 2-month extension.

On the policy rider, all I've got to say is, why make it more difficult when you know that when it goes to the other body, it's either going to be stripped out or we're going to be facing another terrible deadline.

I appreciate that negotiations have been going on all along with staff. I do believe, though, that the failure of the majority to appoint conferees is a problem with this bill because, once members are appointed, it seems to me that sends another signal and gets another set of people in it to move the bill. So the conferees do matter and should have been appointed.

These are difficult issues, and they shouldn't be left to linger: Next Generation Air Transportation.

□ 1420

If we don't modernize our air transportation, we're going to be left behind even developing countries. Runway safety. We've had collisions on runways at airports right here where there are major airports. Aircraft noise, and we always have this issue, of whether or not the perimeter rule is going to be extended or violated again. Well, you know, I oppose increases of the perimeter rule, but I oppose even more not sitting down to figure it out with conferees at the table.

We've got the air ambulance operation issues, the oversight of foreign carriers and, of course, the notorious national mediation board issue, where what constitutes a majority could only be an issue in this Congress. Is it the majority of votes cast, or is the majority of those in the class or in the whole group? If it's a majority of votes cast, then, of course, it's what all of us in the Congress use every 2 years to get elected.

There are matters in this bill that the Congress has to do anyway that would be especially useful to do now as we recover from the Great Recession.

We should pass this bill providing jobs, which is something we have to do anyway, now, when it would count, would matter very much to the entire country. Let's reauthorize the entire bill and quit short-term extensions.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois has 15¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. PETRI. I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, the chair of the Aviation Subcommittee went through the list of the airports that are within 90 miles that would be affected by the provisions of this extension.

Now, all of those 10 airports were included in an amendment and a provision that's in the Senate bill and passed unanimously. The only difference, and he spoke briefly to one of them, again is the provision that I put in putting a restriction on paying more than a thousand dollars per ticket, per passenger subsidy. Those subsidies start in Montana at one airport with \$1,357.

Another airport, one airport in New Mexico, has a subsidization per ticket per passenger of \$1,563.

Now the granddaddy, the big enchilada in this whole thing is one airport in Nevada. Every ticket is subsidized \$3,719.

Now you're telling me that they are going to close down parts of the FAA

to preserve this subsidy when this Nation is on the verge of a financial debt crisis unheard of in the history of our Nation.

So, again, I've tried to deal on a bipartisan, bicameral basis working with folks to get this done. Twenty-one extensions over 4 years. I'm not adding an entire bill. I'm adding that one provision. The other side added in one of their extensions an entire bill.

The other language Mr. PETRI spoke to was 10 airports that are within the distance of 90 miles that the Senate passed unanimously. So it's not like I am taking some language.

A Republican tried to change that in the Rules Committee, and I recommended against it. And we did not change it because, again, I want to have language that the Senate passed.

So that's what we boil down to on the eve of a crisis with FAA, on the eve of a crisis with our Nation's finances, we're going to come and vote here. And I want people to go back and say, "I voted for a \$3,700 subsidy for air service for one passenger for one ticket." I want to see that list of names.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, at this time I would yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I rise today in continued opposition to the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, H.R. 2553. I will continue to oppose the FAA reauthorization until the FAA rethinks their ill-advised redesign for the airspace around New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia.

I have opposed this airspace redesign from day one, along with some of my Republican colleagues in New Jersey as well, and have thwarted its implementation every step of the way.

Time and time again, the FAA has pursued the airspace redesign while ignoring the concerns of my constituents in Rockland County, New York. The FAA created their proposal with zero input from the very people whose lives would be most harmed by the proposal. In fact, even when we brought this up to the FAA, they had to be dragged kicking and screaming into holding a public forum in Rockland County. This plan, which will only save minutes on flight time, will disrupt the lives of thousands of residents in my district in Rockland County in New York and in northern New Jersey who live under the new flight plans.

As my constituents have noted to me, the noise and air pollution in the area will increase. It is unknown how this increase in air pollution will affect the disproportionate rate of childhood asthma in my district. The modernization of our aviation system is necessary to bring it into the 21st century, to keep pace with the increased number of flights, and to also maintain our technological advancements by implementing new equipment to keep our system the safest in the world.

However, there are several alternatives to this plan, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposition to this reauthorization. Not only are we going to have planes going into Newark Airport fly directly over my constituents, but now there are other paths of planes coming in from JFK airport as well.

This is government at its worst running roughshod over the people that it's supposed to serve, not taking any kind of input. In fact, they come up with a redesign plan. And then when it's challenged, the person who decides the challenge was the very author of the redesign plan to begin with. Sounds like a kangaroo court to me.

So I am going to continue to oppose these things. I think at a time when we're all talking about government spending less and being more sensitive, this is a good place to start. And I will continue to oppose the FAA reauthorization until the FAA halts and revises their deeply flawed airspace redesign plan for New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, we heard from Chairman MICA, who we have worked with very closely. He has done, I think, his very best up to this point to try and get an FAA reauthorization bill both out of the House and to the point where we can get it to a conference committee.

So he said he is very frustrated with the process. We are very frustrated with the process. And today the extension that the majority is offering even frustrates us more because we know that this is an extension, not a clean extension, but it has a rider on it involving Essential Air Services.

The debate today and the discussion about this extension is not about Essential Air Service. Some members may support Essential Air Service, others may not support it. There's been a lot said on the floor today about subsidizing a \$3,000 subsidy per ticket. Just for the record, we are not debating that. That is to be taken up by conferees if we ever get to conference. Members can, in fact, have their opportunity to make changes in the EAS program at that time. It should not be a part of this extension.

But for the record let me say that in reference to an airport that was mentioned in Montana, it is actually 607 miles from Denver, to the Denver airport. So if you live in that community, it's not just a short drive to get in a rental car and drive to the Denver Airport. Also, the Nevada airport that was referenced from Salt Lake City, you are talking 234 miles. And the list goes on and on.

□ 1430

So that's an issue that we can debate at the appropriate time. Some changes

may need to be made to the Essential Air Service program. But I think also we need to keep in mind, we're not just talking about passengers getting from point A to point B when there's hundreds and hundreds of miles to get to the nearest large hub airport to catch a flight, but we're also talking about moving medical supplies, donor organs, and a number of other things. So it's not just passengers.

And let me also say, my friend Mr. MICA mentioned as well that we've had an open process here. Well, in fact, we have not. The process has not been open on this extension. In fact, the majority dropped the bill on Friday without consulting the minority. They did not consult with us about what may be in the extension. In addition to that, they went to Rules Committee and asked for a closed rule so that no Member who might be affected by this legislation or might have an Essential Air Service airport in their district that may want to go to the Rules Committee and, in fact, get an open rule or come to the floor to debate the merits of keeping their airport on the EAS program, they did not have that opportunity because the majority asked for a closed rule.

Had the majority come to us in the minority and said, We want a clean extension; we want to move it forward, we wouldn't be here today. We, in fact, would probably have voice voted this extension. It would have gone to the Senate. It would have been voice voted there. And, in fact, we would have been a step closer to making certain that the FAA is able to operate after the deadline on Saturday.

Finally, let me say that we are frustrated because I've heard Chairman MICA say many times and, as the ranking member, Mr. RAHALL, has said, We have worked closely together. We have done everything we can do in order to work together with Mr. MICA and Mr. PETRI in order to get a bill. But I have read reports and I have just heard Mr. MICA say on the floor again today that, you know, we could wrap this conference up in 20 minutes. And he said today we could wrap it up within an hour, that there is only one issue that is remaining.

Just for the record, let me say, if that's the case, we have not been consulted on that one issue. There are several issues. And just for the record, I would say major issues that have not been resolved on our side, on the House side between the majority and minority, let alone with the other body are: one, funding levels; two, Essential Air Service; three is repeal of the National Mediation Board rule; four is the DCA perimeter rule, often referred to as "slots."

Other outstanding issues are occupational safety and health protection for flight attendants, the 3-hour rule for tarmac delays, the lithium battery

issue, and the aircraft activity disclosure to the public, the BARR program. And I have a list of other things to our knowledge that have not been resolved.

So when the chairman or others say that we could wrap this up in 20 minutes or in 1 hour, I don't believe that is the case. In fact, I know it's not the case. We have not been consulted or negotiated to the extent that we could reach an agreement among ourselves on the House side, let alone with our colleagues over in the other body. So let me just say that it's a disappointment to me.

We have worked closely together to move the FAA extension on a permanent basis. We are here on Wednesday. The FAA extension, in fact, will expire—the FAA will have to lay off employees this Saturday if, in fact, this extension is not approved by both bodies and sent to the President. And the Senate has already told us that they are not going to accept this extension with this rider, in fact, in the extension. They will approve the clean extension. And it's my understanding the other body is going to pass a clean extension and send it over here sometime today or by the end of the week.

It would be my hope that the majority would, in fact, accept a clean extension so that the FAA can continue to serve the flying public and do all of the things that are essential to keeping the safest aviation system in the world as safe as possible so that we can begin to try and get a permanent bill and a long-term bill as well.

Finally, I would conclude by saying that we need to appoint conferees. The Senate has passed their bill in February of this year. We have passed our bill in April. And we are here now in the latter part of July, and Chairman MICA is saying that all of these issues have been resolved but one, and we do not even have conferees appointed. So I would just encourage the leadership—Ranking Member RAHALL. And I have sent a letter to the Speaker and to the leadership and to the majority saying, Look, let's appoint conferees. The Senate has appointed conferees.

The only opportunity we had to appoint conferees in the last Congress was, in fact, stifled and held up by the Senate and, frankly, by two Senators from the State of Tennessee over one issue.

Let's get the nonsense behind us. There are things in the Essential Air program that I would like to see changed. There are things in the bill that I would like to see us reach an agreement on. The only way to do that is to get an extension passed so the FAA can get past Saturday and operate until September 16. It will give us an opportunity to appoint conferees so that we can meet with the conferees who have already been appointed in the other body to reach a permanent agreement.

The American people deserve better than what they're getting today on the floor of this House, and the American people deserve to know that we, in fact, are doing everything that we can to move forward to keep the safest aviation system in the world exactly that—the leader in safety around the world.

So with that, I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this extension in the hopes that we could pass a clean extension.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, let me just conclude by urging my colleagues to support this 21st extension with a very, very modest change from a purely clean extension in that it yields to the Senate for a provision that's included in the Senate bill to eliminate, quote-unquote, "Essential Air Service for airports within 90 miles of another airport."

We've talked about the individual flight subsidy. Let me just look at this issue from another point of view to make it perfectly clear what we are talking about.

Eight of the 10 airports that would be affected are because they are within 90 miles of a hub airport. So that makes it much more convenient to just drive over. And what's the subsidy to each airport each year? Let me just mention it: Athens, Georgia, over \$1 million of Federal money so that people don't have to drive 72 miles. We have Morgantown, West Virginia, right near the Pittsburgh hub, nearly \$1.5 million. The same thing with Hagerstown, over \$1 million so you don't have to drive 70-some miles to Dulles. Jonesboro, Arkansas, gets an \$800,000 subsidy when it is right next to the Memphis International Airport. The same thing, \$1.6 million going to Johnstown, Pennsylvania, which is 84 miles from the Pittsburgh International Airport. Franklin/Oil City is getting a subsidy of nearly \$1 million a year. They are 85 miles from the Pittsburgh International Airport. Lancaster, Pennsylvania, nearly \$1.4 million, also by Pittsburgh. And Jackson, Tennessee, \$1.2 million in Federal taxpayer money, which is only 86 miles from the Memphis International Airport.

It's hardly essential use of Federal taxpayer money to provide non-essential, subsidized airport service for people who could otherwise drive in an hour, hour and a half to a hub airport that most of the people in the area probably are doing already. So it's a very modest step. We are just doing what the Senate provides. I would urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2553, the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011. This bill would add controversial policy riders that have not been negotiated and would cause undue harm to critical FAA programs

that support thousands of public and private sector jobs. I urge my colleagues to pass a clean FAA extension so that capital accounts which support Grants-in-Aid for Airports, Facilities and Equipment can continue to remain functional. Without this much needed funding stream these programs would be shut down, and approximately 4,000 employees would be furloughed. With a 9.2% unemployment rate nationwide Congress must act in a bipartisan manner to help stabilize and enhance job creation. Again I urge my colleagues to come to a reasonable consensus and support a clean extension of airport and airway funding.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 357, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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.

□ 1440

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RAHALL. Yes, I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rahall moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2553, to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 7. BAGGAGE FEES FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) FEES.—No air carrier may charge any fee for the transport of 4 or fewer items of baggage checked by a member of the Armed Forces who is—

(1) traveling in scheduled air transportation on official military orders; and

(2) being deployed on or returning from an overseas contingency operation.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "baggage" does not include an item whose weight exceeds 80 pounds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, in June, the American public learned that a major U.S. airline greeted a group of Army soldiers who were returning home from the front lines in Afghanistan with a bill for almost \$3,000, or \$200 apiece for each soldier to check four bags on a scheduled domestic flight. Americans were rightly outraged by the incident, which was explained in a YouTube video posted by one of our troops. In the video, one soldier notes that his fourth bag, for

which he was charged \$200, contained an M-4 carbine rifle, a grenade launcher and a 9-millimeter pistol, "the tools I used to protect myself and Afghan citizens while I was deployed."

A spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars told the Associated Press the fees were "the worst welcome home any soldier could receive. The shock of even being charged is enough to make most service men and women simply shake their heads and wonder who or what it is they are protecting."

Members of the Armed Forces who are serving our country on the front lines should not endure personal financial hardship when they are traveling to or returning from war zones. Yet, the media's reporting of the incident last month showed that major U.S. carriers were applying the same or similar policies across the board. Airlines were charging soldiers to check four reasonably sized bags and were profiting at the expense of the brave men and women of the Armed Forces who were going to or coming home from war.

This amendment, this motion to recommit, prohibits U.S. air carriers from charging soldiers for up to four bags of checked baggage. It applies to bags that weigh 80 pounds or less and is consistent with many airlines' published policies.

I urge my colleagues, in a bipartisan fashion, as they should, to support this amendment. If the amendment is adopted, it will not kill the bill. The House will vote on the bill immediately after this amendment is adopted.

This motion recognizes a tremendous debt of our gratitude owed by the United States to the men and women of our Armed Forces. Members of the Armed Forces who are going to the front lines or coming home from a war zone should not be given a bill with their boarding passes.

I urge my colleagues to join me in ensuring that our Nation's airlines treat our warriors with the respect they deserve for defending our country. This should be a bipartisan, overwhelming "yes."

And I close by saying, vote for our veterans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. I withdraw my point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. CRAVAACK. I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Madam Speaker, I think it is absolutely outrageous what happened to those soldiers. As a military officer for 24 years, and as an airline pilot for 17 years, I think it is absolutely heinous what happened to those soldiers. Quite frankly, it's outrageous. And I think we should ask

Chairman MICA for open debate on this issue. It's something that definitely should be taken a look into.

As a matter of fact, I think it is so critical I will ask Chairman MICA to make sure that this never happens to another United States servicemember.

But, unfortunately, Madam Chairman, we're bringing this up on a motion to recommit. My question would be, why didn't we bring this up earlier, this act? We should be debating this when—

Mr. RAHALL. Will the gentleman yield on his question?

Mr. CRAVAACK. Just a moment, sir, and I will yield.

We should have opened this up when we had open committee, and this should have been brought up then. But not now, in the motion to recommit, when we have FAA jobs on the line, and we need to get this bill moved forward.

I look forward to engaging in that debate a little bit further on, and I look forward to working with you and ensuring that this does not happen again, but now is not the time. We need to investigate this a little bit later on.

I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. In response to the gentleman's question asked a few seconds ago, it was a closed rule. There was no way we could have brought this up in the amendment process. The gentleman's party controls the rules of this body and controls the legislative debate.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Reclaiming my time, we did have an FAA open debate, Madam Speaker, and we could have brought this up at this time.

Mr. RAHALL. If the gentleman would continue to yield, the incident did not occur until after the markup of this bill, by the way.

Mr. CRAVAACK. We should not be opening this at this time on a motion to recommit. I will fully work with the other side in trying to make sure that this does not happen again to another soldier, and I look forward to that discussion, but having it right now is a little bit disingenuous on this FAA reauthorization.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. RAHALL. 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 any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 233, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 610]

YEAS—187

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

NAYS—233

Adams	Brady (TX)	Cravaack
Aderholt	Brooks	Crawford
Akin	Broun (GA)	Crenshaw
Alexander	Buchanan	Culberson
Amash	Bucshon	Davis (KY)
Austria	Buerkle	Denham
Bachus	Burgess	Dent
Barletta	Burton (IN)	DesJarlais
Bartlett	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Barton (TX)	Camp	Dold
Bass (NH)	Campbell	Dreier
Benishek	Canseco	Duffy
Berg	Cantor	Duncan (SC)
Biggert	Capito	Duncan (TN)
Bilbray	Carter	Ellmers
Bilirakis	Cassidy	Emerson
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	Farenthold
Black	Chaffetz	Fincher
Blackburn	Coble	Fitzpatrick
Bonner	Coffman (CO)	Flake
Bono Mack	Cole	Fleischmann
Boustany	Conaway	Fleming

Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford

Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Palazzo
Pallone
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera

Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
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
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantseco
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Kissell
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
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 177, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 611]
AYES—243

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachus
Bartetta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantseco
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Kissell
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
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson

Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn

Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Insee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Perlmutter

NOT VOTING—12
Bachmann
Blumenauer
Capuano
Castor (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANKFORD) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1523
Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”
So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 2596, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012

Mr. WOLF, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-169) on the bill (H.R. 2596) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies

NOT VOTING—12
Bachmann
Blumenauer
Capuano
Castor (FL)

□ 1513
Messrs. STEARNS, STUTZMAN, PEARCE, MARCHANT, CANTOR, and ROSKAM changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. WELCH, DOGGETT, SCHRADER, RICHMOND, BISHOP of Georgia, OLVER, and BERMAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.
A recorded vote was ordered.

NOES—177
Ackerman
Altmiere
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin

for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE**

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

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

**APPROVING RENEWAL OF IMPORT
RESTRICTIONS AGAINST BURMA**

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 66) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H. J. RES. 66

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress approves the renewal of the import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1) and section 3A (b)(1) and (c)(1) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This joint resolution shall be deemed to be a “renewal resolution” for purposes of section 9 of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

SEC. 2. PAYGO COMPLIANCE.

The budgetary effects of this Act, 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 Act, 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. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This joint resolution shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this joint resolution or July 26, 2011, whichever occurs earlier.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this joint resolution, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 66, which would continue the imposition of sanctions against the repressive regime in Burma for another year.

The purpose of imposing sanctions against Burma is to promote democracy and respect for human rights and improve living conditions for the Burmese people. Unfortunately, the ruling junta is still dedicated to working against, not toward, those objectives. For that reason I am in favor of continuing our practice of extending import sanctions against Burma for another year.

Burma’s regime is one of the world’s most repressive and continues to oppress democratic movements and humanitarianism. On November 7, 2010, the military junta, known, ironically, as the State Peace and Development Council, or SPDC, held an election for the first time in 20 years. However, while elections are usually considered a step towards democracy, in this case it was actually a step backwards. These elections were not transparent, inclusive, or credible.

Notably, Burma’s leading pro-democracy party, the National League for Democracy, as well as others, was not allowed to participate in the elections. And by ensuring that most candidates were former high-ranking government and military officials, the election “victory” by the government-backed Union Solidarity and Development Party simply means that the military junta remained in control with the veneer of an election to simply justify itself.

Shortly following the elections, Aung San Suu Kyi—freedom fighter, Nobel Peace Prize recipient and Congressional Gold Medal winner, and general secretary of the NLD—was finally released after having been falsely detained for 15 of the past 21 years.

However, in a move highlighting how little things have changed in Burma, the junta recently warned Suu Kyi that “there may be chaos and riots” if she continues on her cross-country tour to meet with supporters. The government also chided Suu Kyi and the NLD for their political work and threatened that “they should stop doing so to avert unnecessary consequences.” On Suu Kyi’s last tour in 2003, she was attacked by a pro-government mob that killed many of her followers and landed her under house arrest for the next 7 years.

In short, the recent election does not represent any kind of shift in domestic Burmese politics. In fact, the political situation in Burma and for the Burmese people has not changed at all.

The human rights situation is no better. The State Department human rights report on Burma, echoed by the March United Nations Human Rights Council Resolution, cites a laundry list of grave human rights violations that are simply appalling. According to the State Department, this repugnant regime, in which military officers wield the ultimate authority at every level of government, continues to use forced labor, denies participation in any democratic processes, and commits extrajudicial killings. The regime detains civic activists indefinitely and without charge, and it engages in harassment, abuse, and detention of human rights and pro-democracy activists. The regime is rumored to hold an estimated 2,100 political prisoners.

Ethnic violence inflicted by the army is also rife. There have been recent reports of renewed fighting in the northern Burmese province of Kachin between the government and ethnic minority villagers, resulting in reportedly up to 20,000 refugees. Not only have these people been driven from their homes and many killed, there have also been widespread reports of the rape of women and children.

What have we been doing on our end? I’m pleased that this Congress amplified our sanctions 3 years ago to eliminate trade in jewelry containing Burmese rubies and jadeite, even if the jewelry was made in, and exported from, a third country. The expansion was designed to bring about multilateral pressure on the regime through the United Nations and the World Trade Organization, similar to successful legislation on conflict diamonds. I urge similar campaigns against Burmese rubies and jadeite at the U.N. and WTO.

I must be clear that I generally view import sanctions with great skepticism. However, if there is a right way to impose sanctions, I think that these Burma sanctions are crafted to maximize the ability to effect change. For example, they require the administration to issue annual reports on Burma that include findings on whether U.S. national security, economic, and foreign policy interests are being served so that we can make an informed decision.

□ 1530

Perhaps the most critical aspect of the Burma sanctions program is that they require us to redirect our attention every summer to the question of whether these sanctions should be continued. Because they are not self-executing, we here in Congress must consider this issue and vote to continue them on an annual basis.

I continue to believe that our greatest hope for effecting real change in Burma is multilateralism. I am therefore disappointed that there has not been sufficient multilateral pressure against this regime.

I strongly urge the administration to put more pressure on our trading partners to place the leaders of this regime under targeted economic pressure that denies them access to personal wealth and sources of revenue.

I call on the United Nations, Burma's Southeast Asian neighbors in ASEAN, and the People's Republic of China to step up engagement considerably.

I support this resolution because it increases our chances to bring about this multilateral effort, to promote democracy and to end the longtime suffering of the Burmese people.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 66, a measure to renew the ban on imports for Burma.

Over the past 23 years, Burma's authoritarian regime has detained or killed political opponents, waged war against ethnic minorities and, in the process, accumulated one of the worst human rights records in modern history. Finally, in 2010, with continued pressure from Congress and the inspiring leadership of Nobel Peace Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi, Burma's military junta promised to lay down its arms and clear the way for democracy. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it was a sham.

Parliamentary elections held last November were rife with fraud. Opposition parties were intimidated by the police and banned from offering up candidates. Votes were rigged to provide electoral legitimacy to the existing military rule. Once again, the people of Burma were denied a free and fair opportunity to choose their own leaders. Human rights abuse is widespread and continues to go unprosecuted. Under the guise of a new civilian parliament, it is "business as usual" for the old regime.

In light of the unchanged political reality in Burma, the renewal of America's ban on Burmese imports could not be more urgent. We must send a message to Burma's new rulers, who turned out to be the same old rulers, that empty promises of democratic reform are unacceptable.

Now, there are some who question whether we should maintain our import ban following Burma's election and the formal dissolution of the military junta. Even our European allies have begun to rethink their strategy as EU travel and financial restrictions have been lifted on certain officials in the new government.

The problem with that approach, Mr. Speaker, is that meaningful reform has

yet to take place in Burma. By opening our borders to Burmese imports, we would only strengthen and enrich the same old regime that maintains a stranglehold on civic and family life in Burma. According to the U.N., the new government has failed to make any significant progress on land confiscation, forced labor, the internal displacement of people, extrajudicial killings, and sexual violence against women. The Obama administration affirms this view.

Burma's sanctions are unique because they have the widespread support of the Burmese people. Aung San Suu Kyi, herself, recently said, "Sanctions must remain in place" and "should only be lifted when something has changed here." Aung San Suu Kyi's political party, the National League of Democracy, also confirmed its view that American sanctions "do not hurt the public at large" as the true target is Burma's undemocratic leadership.

In response, true to form, the so-called "new government" warned publicly that Suu Kyi and members of her party could meet "tragic ends" if they continued to call for international sanctions.

In passing H.J. Res. 66 and reauthorizing the Block Burmese JADE Act of 2008, Congress will send a clear message of support to the people of Burma in their aspirations for true democracy and lasting peace.

Until there is meaningful reform in Burma, Mr. Speaker, we must keep steadfast in our support of the Burmese people and maintain the pressure on Burma's undemocratic rulers. I urge my colleagues to pass House Joint Resolution 66.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this important resolution to renew sanctions against the brutal military dictators in Burma.

The plight facing the people of Burma remains terrible. The ruling party in Burma continues to use the rule of law and government apparatus to deprive minority groups of their human rights and their lives, and it does so with impunity. The regime's human rights violations continue to be horrific. The regime in Burma is responsible for committing virtually every human rights violation imaginable. The atrocities perpetrated by the regime range from the use of rape as a weapon of terror, the recruitment of child soldiers, ethnic cleansing, forced labor, political detention, and the list goes on.

I have received firsthand reports in my office which detail the dictatorship's use of ethnic minorities as human landmine sweepers. Over 1 million refugees and 500,000 internally dis-

placed peoples have been forced to flee their homes, and 750,000 of the country's inhabitants remain stateless. Indicative of the times, the regime has now turned to the censorship of the Internet, as well as that of individual e-mail accounts and social networking sites, to block the dissemination of evidence related to the atrocities.

The Burmese Government must realize that such attempts to hide its record of abuse, as well as its dishonest elections and mock constitutional reforms, cannot cover up the junta's war against its own people. Such a record only demonstrates the regime's illegitimacy.

I call on the administration to renew its efforts in fulfilling the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, particularly the provision which requires our government to craft a multilateral sanctions regime against Burma.

By renewing these sanctions, Congress is making our Nation's concern for human rights paramount in our foreign relations interests. The administration should do the same. The people of Burma must know that we stand with them.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank my friend from Washington for yielding me such time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 66.

This measure is a sign of how we can all work together on foreign policy when we put our minds to it. I want to acknowledge the bipartisan support, both here in the House as well as in the Senate, for human rights in Burma.

The Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act and the Burmese JADE Act together have prevented hundreds of millions of dollars from getting into the hands of the Burmese military apparatus. By passing these bills into law and renewing them this year, we have ensured that the 65 million people of Burma see us, the United States, as an ally in their struggle for human rights, and we have helped send a signal to others around the world that the United States will not turn a blind eye to crimes against humanity.

There is no question that Burma is ruled by one of the world's most brutal governments. Over the past year, we have seen ongoing abuses committed by the Burmese military, including rapes, torture and killings. Just last week, Human Rights Watch released a report, documenting how villagers are subjected to summary executions, torture and being used as human shields during conflict. The women in Burma live in constant fear of rapes by soldiers of their own military. For the leaders of the Burmese military, rape is a tactic of war—one used to torment

and to intimidate entire populations, not just their immediate victims.

In fact, just 2 weeks ago, on July 5, the Burmese soldiers carried out four more rapes against ethnic civilians. The innocent victims were of all different ages. One of those victims was as young as 12 years of age. That's right. A 12-year-old girl was raped by a member of the Burmese military.

□ 1540

As a result of thousands of brutal rapes and other abuses, Burmese villagers continue to flee their homes into the jungle where they live as refugees or internally displaced people.

As bad as these abuses are, this bill is not only about stopping human rights abuses. We must remember that the inspiration for this measure came from the remarkable woman, Nobel Peace Prize recipient Aung San Suu Kyi. She led her political party to victory in Burma's last free and fair election in 1990. Many people call her the Nelson Mandela of Burma, and the U.S. House of Representatives voted to award her the Congressional Gold Medal.

Up until last November, she was also the world's only imprisoned Nobel Peace Prize recipient, and today, even though she is no longer under formal house arrest, the military has threatened her over and over again in an attempt to intimidate her into silence. She has called on the people throughout the world to take action saying, "Please use your liberty to promote ours."

She and the democracy movement in Burma have also called for us to maintain sanctions on Burma. This is similar to how the African National Congress led by Nelson Mandela called for sanctions on South Africa in the 1980s.

Passing this bill isn't all we must do. I want to urge the administration to fully implement the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act and Block Burmese JADE Act. The JADE Act gives the administration tools to implement tough bilateral financial sanctions on members of the Burmese regime and its cronies, and we should proceed as soon as possible.

It's important to remember that the United States isn't the only country that has imposed sanctions on Burma. This is not a bilateral effort. It is a multilateral effort. While every country has different types of sanctions, those that have taken action include Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the European Union, and more. We should be doing all we can to expand these sanctions into an even greater multilateral effort. That's why in the Burmese JADE Act, we ask the President to appoint an envoy to work internationally on increasing pressure on the Burmese regime.

Now that this envoy has been nominated, I urge our colleagues in the Senate to confirm him without haste, and

I hope he gets to work right away on strengthening and implementing multilateral pressure.

I also believe the administration should work proactively to establish an international investigation into crimes against humanity committed by the Burmese military. The Burmese leadership is clearly carrying out crimes against humanity. The sooner these abuses are investigated, the sooner they will end.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the right thing to do. I stand in strong support of this bill, and I urge its immediate adoption.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Washington, and I rise in support of this resolution.

When I first visited Burma decades ago, I learned what a difference a misguided regime can make. Burma had been a vibrant country known as the Rice Bowl of Asia. Burma had a rich history, fertile land, abundant resources, and a productive population.

In the years following the coup in the early 1960s, the authoritarian regime impoverished the nation and brutalized its people, a pattern that persists today. For more than 20 years, the United States Government has sought to use its influence to try to create conditions for a restoration of democracy and the rule of law in Burma. One tool has been the use of sanctions.

The Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act was signed into law 8 years ago this month, and it requires the President to impose a ban on the import of products from Burma. It blocks U.S. support for loans from international financial institutions and freezes the assets of and bans visas for key members of the military junta that has imposed its will on the Burmese people for decades. I believe these sanctions should be renewed because there is evidence they are working.

Last November, Burmese elections were clearly illegitimate and not a free expression of the will of the Burmese people. But the continuing international pressure on and scrutiny of the junta may be having some tangible effects.

As the international crisis group noted earlier this year, two senior junta leaders have resigned since the elections, and there is some evidence that pressure has eased on some of the minority ethnic groups in the country.

Burma's greatest human rights figure, Aung San Suu Kyi, told the Australian Broadcasting Network yesterday that continued use of targeted sanctions is important. "I think it's much better to have very, very clear targets," she said, and continued, "I do not think it's really very reasonable

just to say, 'We want an improvement in human rights, in your human rights record.' It's too vague. The release of political prisoners, the inclusion of all in the political process, the rule of law and so on—pick out the important points and say, 'Well, if you want sanctions removed, you've got to do these.'"

Mr. Speaker, we need to continue standing with Aung San Suu Kyi and all of the freedom-seeking Burmese. This resolution gives us a chance to do that, which is why I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this resolution.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I would only say that this bill expires on the 26th of July, so we need to act on it quickly.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I am in full agreement. We need to move and pass this, and I think we'll get it passed.

I must say to the gentleman from Washington, at least we have a trade bill on the floor. I hope there are many more to come. We're waiting for the President to send the three pending agreements to us so that we can move forward on these and embark on a very aggressive trade agenda.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 66, a resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act (P.L. 108-61). I am proud to have once again introduced this legislation this year with the gentleman from New York, Mr. CROWLEY.

In 2003, Congress passed the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, legislation that I co-authored with my friend, the late Tom Lantos. President Bush signed this bill into law and Congress has reauthorized these import restrictions every year since. The legislation bans imports from Burma and the issuance of visas to those officials affiliated with the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC), the military junta that rules Burma and brutally represses its people. This law also bans U.S. financial transactions that involve individuals or entities connected with the SPDC.

The sanctions are critically important to keeping the pressure on the Burmese junta. The government continues to have one of the worst human rights record in the world and routinely violates the rights of Burmese citizens, including the systematic use of rape as a weapon of war, extrajudicial killings, arbitrary arrests and detention, torture and child labor. Moreover, the Burmese regime has more child soldiers than any other country and has destroyed more than 3,700 ethnic villages, displaced approximately 2,000,000 people, more than 600,000 of which are internally displaced, and has taken nearly 2,000 political prisoners.

We must continue to stand with the Burmese people and expose the despicable and reprehensible actions of the SPDC. Sanctions are critical to putting pressure on the junta. In 2008, the Tom Lantos Block Burmese JADE Act (P.L. 110-286) was signed into law, which

bans the importation of Burmese gems into the United States and freezes the assets of Burmese political and military leaders. While these steps are significant, others must follow ours and the EU's lead. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) must impose multilateral sanctions against Burma's military regime including a complete arms embargo.

While I applaud the confirmation of Derek Mitchell as Special Coordinator for Burma, there are additional provisions of the Tom Lantos Block Burmese JADE Act that have yet to be implemented. I urge the Obama Administration to call for a UN Commission of Inquiry on Burma to investigate war crimes and crimes against humanity. This Commission is necessary to prevent further killings and to encourage a meaningful political dialogue.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 66, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A LITTLE LOCAL FLAVOR

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, two things come from a town called Kiln, Mississippi: a famous NFL quarterback and Lazy Magnolia Beer. We know Brett's story, but let me tell you about Lazy Magnolia.

One Christmas, Leslie Henderson bought her husband, Mark, a home brew kit. The two engineers started brewing beer and eventually turned their hobby into a business.

We can fix our faltering economy by giving small business owners more responsibility. H.R. 1236, the Small Brew Act, does that, allowing a much needed tax cut to our small brewers. By lowering the tax on the beer they produce, these companies will have more revenue to invest in maintaining and hiring employees. This legislation therefore promises to create over 4,000 jobs.

On that Christmas a few years ago, Lazy Magnolia Beer had no employees. Today it provides jobs to about 20 people in Hancock County. That, my friends, is an American success story.

CONGRATULATING NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS COUNCIL FOR HUMANITIES ON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, one of the most significant and enduring community groups in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands was formed, the Northern Mariana Islands Council for the Humanities. Since its founding, the council has become a well-respected, community-based organization committed to fostering awareness, understanding, and appreciation of the humanities in the Northern Mariana Islands through its support of educational programs that relate the humanities to the indigenous cultures and the intellectual needs and interests of the people of the Commonwealth. The Northern Mariana Islands Council for the Humanities has enhanced the lives of our residents as individuals and enhanced our community as a whole.

The council's board of directors is and has always been extraordinarily passionate and successful in setting and achieving goals that benefit our diverse and remote community. The council's achievements belie our modest population and resources.

Please join me congratulating the Northern Mariana Islands Council for the Humanities on its 20th anniversary of serving the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands community.

Twenty years ago this past April, one of the most significant and enduring community groups in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands was formed: the Northern Mariana Islands Council for the Humanities.

My island community is a melting pot of cultures, an amalgam of languages, the possessor of a 3,500-year-long and colorful history, and the newest participant in this great experiment called democracy in America. The National Endowment for the Humanities founding principle is that knowledge of the humanities—the ideas, people, and events that make up the record of human thought and experience—is both personally rewarding to Americans as individuals and critical to our common civic life as a nation. I suspect that nowhere is this sentiment as relevant as it is in the Northern Mariana Islands.

In the two decades since its founding, the NMI Council for the Humanities has become a well-respected community-based organization committed to fostering awareness, understanding, and appreciation of the humanities in the Northern Mariana Islands through its support of educational programs that relate the humanities to the indigenous cultures and the intellectual needs and interests of the people of the Commonwealth. The Council also sponsors programs that explore, document, and recognize the many contributions to our community made by the non-indigenous residents of the Northern Marianas. In furtherance of these programs, collaborative relationships have been established with a variety of local, regional, national, and international organizations and individuals.

The Council accomplishes its mission through financial support from the National Endowment for the Humanities, with which it is

affiliated, as well as from the local government, businesses, and individuals throughout our islands. The Council has also been designated an "educational institution" in the Commonwealth, enabling financial donors to take advantage of a local educational tax credit program.

The Council's 13-member board of directors is, and always has been, extraordinarily passionate and successful in setting and achieving goals that benefit our diverse and remote community. Its achievements over the past 20 years belie our modest population and resources. In fact, one former board member is a recipient of the National Humanities Medal—which is awarded to no more than 12 recipients each year whose work has deepened the Nation's understanding of the humanities, broadened our citizens' engagement with the humanities, or helped preserve and expand Americans' access to important resources in the humanities.

Some current programs undertaken by the Council include: the nationally-acclaimed Motherhead/Fatheread program that encourages literacy skills among parents and children; a teachers institute that provides primary-school instructors with a thorough overview of local history; a weekly radio show that provides wide-ranging humanities-based programming; a Micronesian authors initiative that publishes the work of local authors; a community lecture series on humanities topics of interest; a multiyear project to revise the Chamorro-English dictionary; an initiative to promote geotourism in the CNMI; a digital database of primary source documents and images to facilitate the study of local history; and diversified classroom programs that introduce students to the humanities at an early age, including a poetry competition, a junior high school mock trial competition, an annual Covenant Day debate, and curricula that explore multiculturalism in the Commonwealth.

Support of grassroots humanities projects in our community is also a primary focus of the Council. During the past 20 years, over 150 individual grants totaling approximately \$900,000 have been awarded to community groups through the Council's community grants program.

At a time in our nation's history when we encounter oftentimes fierce polemics and uncivil discourse, humanities councils serve an important role. The Northern Mariana Islands Council for the Humanities has, for the past 20 years, enhanced the lives of our residents as individuals and enhanced our community as a whole. I have faith it will continue to do so far beyond the next 20 years. It promotes teaching and learning of the humanities in our schools, facilitates research and original scholarship, provides opportunities for lifelong learning, preserves and provides access to cultural and educational resources, and strengthens the institutional base of the humanities in the Northern Marianas.

Please join me in congratulating the past and present directors, staff, and supporters of the Northern Mariana Islands Council for the Humanities on its twentieth anniversary of serving the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands community.

□ 1550

ISSUES FACING AMERICA

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

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, today we have a wonderful group of women who are going to come together and discuss the issues at hand right now in Washington and across America as we all are so concerned with what is happening to our economy.

Some of you out there are up late at night wondering how you are going to be paying that mortgage, wondering how the car payment is going to be made and which payments you'll make this month and which payments you may have to put off for another time. We're all doing it. We might as well all admit it. And it's time to come together for solutions and answers.

We, as GOP women in Congress, know how important these issues are. We are the women that are taking care of our children. We're taking care of our households. We're taking care of our parents and their health care needs, and we're watching out for our neighbors to make sure that they're okay.

And we continue on this path. We simply cannot run on this path of unsustainable spending and financial uncertainty. We need jobs back in this country. There are those who have jobs and are worried if they're going to be able to keep them. And yet there are others who have lost their jobs and wonder if they'll be able to find another job. We understand this. We understand that it's affecting all of our households, and we're going to come together and discuss these very important issues.

Before we get started, I'm just going to pass along to you one of the greatest quotes that I think hits home to all of us from Ronald Reagan: "All great change in America begins at the dinner table." How true is that.

Now, in many of our households, we don't all eat dinner together anymore like we used to. When I was growing up, dinnertime was a specified time and we all came together. And if you didn't get to the table, you didn't eat. Today we're all on different schedules, but that dinner table still remains. And we still sit there and we discuss these issues with our spouses.

My husband is a doctor. Brent is a surgeon. He practices in Dunn, North Carolina. We have a son, Ben, who's 16. I'm worried about his future. I'm worried about my husband's practice because he is suffering, realizing that the volume of patients he once was seeing has decreased. That's out of fear, and that's out of the health care system that we have created now.

So as we move forward, I am going to be introducing to you some of the greatest women that I have had the honor of getting to know here in D.C. I have many friends back home, but these ladies are my family here, and I'm going to start off with my esteemed colleague from North Carolina, Ms. SUE MYRICK. She has been a mentor to me but mostly a friend.

I thank you, SUE, for coming today and sharing your thoughts.

Mrs. MYRICK. Well, it's my honor to be here. And I thank you for yielding me the time.

As you said, we have a lot of colleagues here, and most of us share the same ideas relative to what we're about. You mentioned and are talking there about the dinner table and women being financial planners. We do the budget. We're the ones that take care of our families, as you said. We're the health care providers, all of that.

You mentioned your husband's in business, but I, also, am a former small business owner. And when I look at what's happening today, there are so many businesses—I think there are, like, 400 new businesses every day that are started by women in this country. And when I talk to business owners at home, they say to me: I am really concerned about the fact that I could expand my business, but I'm afraid to because of the uncertainty that's out there. I don't know what policies are coming down. I don't know what kind of health care costs I'm going to have. I don't know what tax policies and what, if I hire somebody, it's going to cost me to retain that employee. I don't want to go out and hire them and train them and then have to turn right around and, you know, maybe let them go because I can't afford to keep them.

So the policies that we're working on—and all of the women in Congress on our side of the aisle that really care about these issues—are to make sure that we put policies in place that help and promote those small businesses to exist because they hire most of the people in the country. Most of the jobs are provided by small business. And it's really important.

I also, from another standpoint, used to be the mayor of Charlotte. Unfortunately, the first and only female mayor. I wish somebody else would run on the female side, but that's beside the point.

What I wanted to say is that we had to operate with a balanced budget, very simple. And you can do it. We've been talking this week and actually passed a bill yesterday of cut, cap, and balance. I mean, what a novel idea. It's the way all of us live all the time. It's how we do our business. And there's no reason the Federal Government, like the 49 States that balance their budgets, can't be living under a balanced budget.

Yes, it's tough. We have to make some hard decisions. But the bottom

line in all of that is we can do it. And if we have the resolve and the American people want us to do it, there's no such thing as government money. It's all the taxpayers who send their money up here to Washington. That's what we're spending. And we've been spending too much of it.

So I'm encouraged by the fact that we really did have a vote on that bill yesterday that says we're going to live within our means, we're going to do what you do every day, and that we, as women, can have a voice in that and we'll continue to have a voice in that.

And I thank you so much for putting this together so that we have a chance to express that to the American people.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much.

I yield now to Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER from Washington. Thank you so much for coming today. She is one of my fellow freshmen, and we have gotten to be good friends.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Thank you so much. It's a pleasure to be here.

This is one of the most monumental times we face as a Nation. We are right now making decisions that are not just going to impact those of us here today but our children and our children's children.

I am so proud to be a part of this body that passed a bipartisan solution to our budgeting problems just yesterday. We passed, like the gentle lady spoke about, a balanced budget amendment.

I know there's a lot of controversy happening right now, and it's frustrating to watch people posture here in Washington, D.C. Folks back home are sending me emails, and they're calling me, saying, Can you just get some solutions done, Washington? And you know my what my response is? I completely agree.

It is frustrating to watch partisan bickering taking place. And I kind of smile to myself and I think, Just put more women in charge because we're going to fight for solutions. And that's what we are here doing today, promoting the solutions that we were able to pass on the floor just yesterday, solutions that require this House, this body, not to spend more money than it has coming in.

You know, it shouldn't be a radical concept. It shouldn't be controversial in the least. Every mother watching this, every mother in America, daughter, sister, aunt understands you cannot spend more money each month than you have coming in, no.

Women in the household tend to be the decisionmakers when it comes to finances, to health care, to education, to taking care of older parents or family. Women tend to be those decisionmakers, which gives us a solution-oriented bent, which is why we're here today saying we are willing to work with anybody who puts a plan on paper to move this country forward, that reduces government overspending.

Again, very simple, don't spend more than you have coming in every month. That is a plan to economic prosperity. Don't treat small business owners—many of whom are women—don't treat small business owners as your personal piggy bank. You can't just go back to the cash cow every time you want to spend more money.

It's ironic. Margaret Thatcher—in fact, I saw this quote, I think it was yesterday, which basically said—I'm going to paraphrase her a little loosely. But she said: The problem with socialists is eventually they run out of other people's money. And that's the reality. Women understand, you just can't live beyond your means for sustained amounts of time.

For too long people of both parties—right, Republicans and Democrats—overspent. People of both parties in the White House have overspent. We can talk a long time about what got us here, but that's not going to get us out of the mess. What we need now are our solutions. And the solution that was passed yesterday—again, a bipartisan solution to cut the overspending, cap future growth of government, and balance our budget—is a solution that's going to get our country on a path to prosperity. It's going to tell job creators, keep doing what you do best; entrepreneurs, keep dreaming, hire more people.

□ 1600

In my neck of the woods in southwest Washington, we have double-digit unemployment. Three years plus now of families hurting. Enough is enough.

I encourage the Senate, I encourage the White House to come to an agreement, show us something on paper. We're willing to work together and to negotiate. We're all about making a solution happen for the American people. But let's live within our means. It shouldn't be that difficult.

With that, I thank the gentlelady for putting this together, and I'm proud to be a part of it.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much.

I yield now to my very good friend from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), who is the mother of two, and she is wise beyond her years.

Mrs. ROBY. I thank you very much for those kind remarks, and, again, what an honor and a privilege to be here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives representing Alabama's Second District, but also here just to embrace the very quote that you began with: All great change in America begins at the dinner table, from President Ronald Reagan.

As I sit here, and I've been listening to my colleagues, I can't help but reflect back on my time as a child around the dinner table with my parents and my siblings. I am so grateful for the parents that I have that encouraged debate, yet taught me the respon-

sibility that I have as an American and as an individual. Certainly I credit my wonderful parents for the opportunities that I've had to lead me to this place today to have the privilege and honor of representing Alabama's Second District.

This week, this Congress is embarking on a historical path. We all understand the responsibility that we have, and each of us brings to the table a unique sense. As women, as those who pump gas and go to the grocery store and see the rising costs of milk, we bring a perspective to this Congress that I think is vitally important to demonstrate exactly where this country is now. The people that are having to make the choice between whether they're putting food on their table or gas in their car so that they can get to their job to provide for their family. So again, thank you for letting me be a part of this.

All of us that are here on the floor today, since the day we walked in, particularly this past January, we have been fighting to tighten the government's belt. Every American has done so in the past several years, and it's time that this Federal Government did the same. We did it with the continuing resolution. We did it with the House budget resolution, and we've been doing it throughout the appropriations process, and we have done it this week.

Our children, my children, my children's children, they deserve a future free of crushing taxes so that they have the same opportunity that I mentioned that I had before. They deserve to be free from a life of indebtedness to China.

The Cut, Cap, and Balance Act ensures that we fulfill our constitutional obligation to pay our debts. We're at a place right now, you and I could never call up our credit card company and say, hey, credit card company I've maxed out my card. I don't have any cash to pay you the interest on what I already owe, so could you just increase my credit limit? Can you imagine? Can you imagine going to your husband and saying, I maxed out, but I need a little bit more so I'm just going to call the credit card company. That's exactly what's going on here. And if we don't insist, just like you and I would in our home, just like our spouses would, just like we would for our children, if we do not insist that there are significant spending reforms where we cut up that credit card and say no more—your child wouldn't change his or her behavior if you just continued to give them more; nor would you change your behavior if your credit card company allowed that kind of action. We should require the same of our Federal Government as we do in our home.

It is so urgent that we provide the American people with honest, honest solutions, and I believe that we have

demonstrated that this week. I look forward to the next coming weeks as we can do all that we can, as Republican women, to help turn this tide of spending in this country so that we can save this country for the next generation. It cannot be about the next election. It must be about the next generation.

Mrs. ELLMERS. I would now like to yield to my very, very special friend, Mrs. BIGGERT from Illinois, who has been a voice of reason. She is a strong woman here in Congress for us in the GOP conference, and I appreciate all of her remarks, which are always extremely thoughtful.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Thank you, and I thank you for doing this.

I think that we've got such great women that have come into this Congress in this last term and are really, you are all moving forward and really, I think, setting the tone for what's going to happen in the future, and I appreciate that.

But, you know, it is time for America to live within its means. I got an email from a constituent from Lockport, Illinois recently, and she wrote to me imploring Congress to say no, no to all personal income tax increases. And she further explains that she's a single mom. Just think of how many single moms are out there having to work to keep their kids clothed and in school and keep her home going.

She said that she is a single mom, struggling to keep her home, raise her son, and pay her bills. She says, I cannot pay any more taxes. I will lose everything. There are so many like that out there.

A gentleman from Downers Grove, Illinois, wrote to me and said, it's sad to see the constant disagreement in Washington over almost all issues, including national security, foreign affairs, et cetera. But the budget must be controlled. This is the hard-earned money of American taxpayers that must be spent wisely. Less is better.

We must live on budgets and not be able to borrow whenever we run out of money, as the gentlelady just said. We don't have a credit card. Most people don't have the credit card that they can go and get their limit raised. Neither should we. We have to cut taxes and stop spending. So let's get people back to work so that this country can prosper and be great again.

For too long the government spent the taxpayers into a debt that they can not afford. And despite trillions in the so-called stimulus, the economy has grown only weaker as a result.

So consider these troubling statistics. Our tax burden is approaching the highest levels in our country's history and is expected to rise. Unless we take action now, it could exceed 20 percent of GDP in just 3 years, a record we've only seen once in 35 years.

Similarly, household taxes are excessively high. Even in the slow economy,

at over \$18,000 last year, the average household tax burden has almost doubled in the last 50 years. What's worse is that the interest on our debt for 1 year is equal to the entire budgets of the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and Veterans Affairs combined.

In individual terms, it means that each American's share of our debt is over \$46,000. When I think of my family and future generations, this means that my nine grandchildren would collectively owe over \$414,000 if they had to pay their share of our debt today. Before my youngest grandson graduates from college, he would owe \$103,000 on our national debt. This is unacceptable. And that's why we took this first step to address the crisis yesterday by passing the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act. And our colleagues across the aisle would argue that this plan goes too far by restricting future borrowing. But the reality is that this bill simply caps spending at the same sustainable rates as past generations, about 20 percent of GDP, a post World War II average. No more and no less.

Don't we care as much about our children and grandchildren as our parents did? I do, and so do the people who sent us here to Congress. So we need to show our creditors, our competitors, and the American people that we are willing to make the tough choices needed to restore confidence and growth in the United States.

I'm so proud of all the women that are participating in this and are really making a difference and showing that we can move forward and balance our budget and live within our means like families across America.

I thank you for leading this effort.

□ 1610

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you.

And to your point, I would just like to refer to this chart right here. As you can see, we have two individuals who are talking about how they're going to pay those taxes, and that checkbook right there, with obviously a nice lady's hand filling out that check. We don't know what it's for, but we all know that feeling. And this actually ran in *The Chicago Tribune* May 6, 2011. It says, "Financial planners say they are seeing more women becoming the sole decisionmakers when it comes to the family's finances," as you were speaking. "More and more women are taking on the role of their family's chief financial officer; they set the budget, pay the bills, make the grocery list, and can tell you how much it truly costs to run the family." And I believe that the American people, as you do, should be able to know how much it costs to run the country, and we should stick to that budget as well.

Thank you so much for your comments.

I would now like to yield to my good friend who, the last time we had a Spe-

cial Order, I just literally watched her because she is a numbers person, and I am always so impressed by that because I am not a numbers person. So thank you to the gentlelady from Kansas. She is, again, just so incredibly smart, and I thank you, LYNN JENKINS, for coming today to help us with this effort.

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding.

I am LYNN JENKINS from the Second Congressional District of Kansas, a proud Republican woman, a mother of two, and a CPA with nearly 20 years of experience helping small businesses, major corporations, and American families budget and return to solvency.

You see a family up there in the picture. I have spent nearly two decades working with families across the dinner table to help them chart their way back to prosperity and fiscal responsibility, and I can tell you that if you want to be serious about balancing your budget and returning to solvency, you have to look at both sides of the ledger; you have to look at what you're taking in and what you're spending, and you have to look at your assets and your liabilities.

When it comes to spending and liabilities, it seems that in this town there is some consensus that Washington does indeed have a spending problem. The time to rein in this out-of-control wasteful Washington spending and debt is long overdue. That is why the House has passed a responsible, fact-based budget that will curb Federal spending by more than \$6 trillion over the next 10 years, and why just yesterday we passed a measure to again cut spending by trillions of dollars and cap any future spending as part of a deal to grant the President his request to raise the debt ceiling.

But it is our assets that make our country truly blessed because our greatest asset is the strength, the drive, and the ingenuity of the American worker and the American business owner. That is why we need to enhance this asset and therefore increase our revenues in a way that grows the economy. And it is not to hit our small businesses with tax increases or more regulation, but rather to institute these pro-growth policies like House Republicans are doing in our efforts to reform the Tax Code to make it fairer and flatter, to increase exports by finally passing the three pending trade agreements, increase our energy production, and remove the burdensome regulations that are stifling growth and hiring.

You simply can't tax your way out of this mess and into a robust economy; you have to grow your way out of it. You don't have to take my word for it. The President himself agreed with me just last year when he said raising taxes would "just take more demand out of the economy and put businesses in a further hole."

Balancing our budget is critical to our future, just as it is critical to every business and family across this great country. So it's my hope that the establishment here in Washington can finally see the error of its ways, make real cuts to this out-of-control spending binge, put hard caps on the attempts to increase spending in the future, and establish some pro-growth policies that will lift us out of this stagnant economy and into the prosperity the American people deserve.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you very much.

I now yield to my good friend from South Dakota, part of our freshman leadership, part of our freshman class who has truly shown her leadership. Thank you for coming today, Mrs. NOEM. I am very excited to hear your comments.

Mrs. NOEM. Thank you, and I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me today. I certainly appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only as a proud Republican woman as well, as my good colleague from Kansas said, but also as a wife and as a mother and as an American concerned about Washington, D.C.'s spending habits.

We not only need a solution to dig ourselves out of the situation that we are in, but we need to make sure that we don't find ourselves back in the same place. We need to make sure that we are putting us on a new fiscal path that certainly addresses the problems that we have in front of us. The frustrating thing about that entire process is that this President has been on the sidelines. Certainly we all know the Biblical phrase that "without a vision the people perish," and that is truly what is happening to America today—that we don't have a leader who has been willing to step forward and give us a plan to tell us what he truly thinks are the options that are available to us. Instead, that has been left to others to lead, and he has been more than willing to stand on the sidelines and to criticize every single one of those options that have been brought forward. In fact, his original budget, which was proposed in February of this year, failed to even address our most difficult problems.

The Democrat-led Senate voted down his budget unanimously. No one jumped onboard because they recognized that, under his plan, that we doubled our debt in 5 years and tripled it in 10. It certainly wasn't going to be the answer to what we needed to prevent this most predictable financial crisis that we find ourselves in.

Since then, the executive branch has failed to provide the American people with a solid plan to move forward. During a House Budget Committee hearing the CBO director, Douglas Elmendorf, referenced President Obama's revised budget speech by saying this: "We don't estimate speeches. We need much

more specificity than was provided in that speech for us to do our analysis." And essentially what he was saying was, we can't score a speech, we don't know what a speech means. Anybody can give a really great speech; what we need is leadership. We need someone to step up to the table and tell us what we need to do to address our problems so that we can put it into action.

House Republicans have taken this lead in the looming budget crisis. We have shown time and time again that we are serious about cutting our spending, we're serious about balancing our budget. In January, we passed H.R. 1, which continued funding through 2011, only to have it stalled by the Senate, which in effect essentially delayed any action until it got down to the brink of a government shutdown. In March, we passed our budget plan for fiscal year 2012. We are still waiting—more than 800 days—for the Senate to pass anything that resembles a budget. We are doing our work here in the House, but we can't do it alone; we need a willing partner in the President, and we need a willing partner in the Senate.

Last night, the House again passed yet another plan to get our fiscal house in order. We voted overwhelmingly to support Cut, Cap, and Balance. I supported this plan because my constituents have been calling for weeks telling me to support serious change, serious spending cuts, and a balanced budget amendment. They realize they can't spend more money than what they have in their households; they want their government to have some common sense.

South Dakota families and businesses understand the need to balance a checkbook. Our country, just like our families, can't continue to spend more than it makes. Even my 9-year-old son realizes that. Recently, he had the chance to come out with me to Washington, D.C., and he wanted to spend some time at the Spy Museum, he had been talking about it for months. So he did a lot of chores around the ranch to earn some money, but when he got there and he got to walking through the gift shop, he realized he didn't have enough money to buy everything that he wanted. He saw a lot of things he wanted to take home with him, but he didn't have the money, so he had to prioritize. He had to pick and choose and leave some things there because he simply couldn't afford that. Was he disappointed? Absolutely. He was heartbroken. But I tell you what: That taught him a life lesson that he will only learn from people that have common sense, that understand you cannot spend money that you do not have and you have to prioritize and make choices.

America is out of money. We know this, and President Obama knows this. And yes, we do need fundamental tax reform; yes, we need to identify our

priorities; and yes, we absolutely have to stop spending money we don't have. Strong leadership, action, courage, along with responsible solutions, are needed from all of us if we want to preserve the American dream for our kids and our grandkids.

□ 1620

As a wife, mother, and a Republican woman, I support a balanced budget amendment, smaller government so my kids can grow up with the liberties and freedoms and so that they don't have to worry about paying the bills that we are continuing to rack up in this country. It is time to change our ways.

I certainly thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much for your comments.

You know, it's interesting, we all have our stories, our anecdotes about our household budgets and what we're dealing with. My son is 16 years old, and he received his driver's license a couple of months ago. But the deal with him is, Ben, you can't get a car until you finish that Eagle Scout project. And you're going to have to be responsible to pay for the gas that goes in it. Well, there's not a day that goes by here in Washington that I don't receive a picture that he texted me of the newest truck he's found or the newest Jeep. But there again, he understands the deal. The deal is no vehicle until the Eagle Scout project is at least under way. I'm yielding on that. I'm negotiating with him, but that's the plan.

Sometimes, as you said, we just can't have everything that we want. In a perfect world we could, but we can't because when taxpayer dollars are being spent, it's not an endless flow of money coming into Washington that is from some unknown source. It's taxpayer dollars that we are spending. We have to be good stewards of that. And what better way to do that than the Cut, Cap, and Balance plan that we passed here in the House yesterday evening.

It was so incredibly powerful to see those numbers up on the board and to think that we could actually put a balanced budget amendment in place, which is basically amending the Constitution. This would be a historic moment for us, and we will be part of it. And President Obama would be the President that puts that forward for future generations. I just again am so proud of it. Like I said, when you bring it home, we all have to deal with those budgets in our own household. Washington should be doing the same.

I would like to yield now to our vice-chair, the gentlelady from Washington, another member of leadership and a voice of understanding, reason and leadership for the GOP women, vice-chair of our GOP Conference. Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, thank you so much for coming to offer your comments.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you very much. I am proud to be here this evening to join the Republican women. I want to especially thank you as our leader from North Carolina. I am proud that you are one of the dynamic Republican women freshmen who joined the House this year.

As I think about what the solution is that faces America, I believe Republican women are a big part of that solution. We see that for all of the people in America that are frustrated with leaders in Congress who go behind closed doors and strike a deal without putting it to the people, Republican women, women are seen as being honest and trustworthy and problem-solvers. And Republican women are also seen as being fiscally responsible and the ones who, I believe, are a big part of the solution. So I am proud to join you all this evening.

In so many ways we are at a crossroads here in the country. We have had record unemployment, over 9 percent for a record amount of time. We have also reached a record in our spending. As I think most people in the country are aware, the President has asked Congress to raise the debt ceiling by \$2.4 trillion to get us through November of 2012. That is his request. The Republicans believe it is very important that as we look at our fiscal situation, that we are not just continuing down the current path of raising the debt ceiling, of adding to the credit cards, but that we are changing course and cutting up those credit cards.

I think it is important for people to realize what that means for them and their families. This request would be \$20,000 for every American family, \$20,000 in additional debt for every American family across this country. It is very important before we vote to raise that debt, add that debt to our families moving forward, that we change course. And the real question in my mind is whether or not the President recognizes that we cannot continue down this path. When you think about our future, economic opportunities, national security interests, it is very important that we change paths.

That's why I am proud of the legislation that passed the House last night with an overwhelming majority. We actually got some Democrat votes. It is a bipartisan bill that passed the House with 234 votes. Now it is over in the Senate. We already know that 37 Senators have signed on to support this bill. We want to make sure that America realizes that there is a plan on paper that has passed the House and does have support in the Senate, and we want to continue to build on that support.

Cut, Cap, and Balance is a reasonable, credible plan to addressing where we find ourselves as a country. Yes, it includes cuts in current-year spending. It includes caps as we move forward so

that we are going to bring down how much we are spending, and it includes a balanced budget amendment. I am a strong supporter of a balanced budget amendment.

When I was first running for Congress in 2004, I talked a lot about the balanced budget amendment. What I didn't appreciate was to what degree the Federal Government spends money, borrows money, and prints money with no limits. I thought there must be some limits. There are no limits on the Federal Government's ability to borrow, to spend, and print money; and the balanced budget amendment was one that even Thomas Jefferson, after they finished writing the Constitution, said: If I can make one change, it would be to limit the Federal Government's ability to borrow money. It's been a debate through the ages. It is long overdue. This is the time. It's about America's future, and I'm proud to stand here tonight in support of Cut, Cap, and Balance and the balanced budget amendment and getting our fiscal House in order for our economy today and for keeping the American Dream alive for many years to come.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much.

I would now like to yield to the gentlelady from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Thank you.

I would like to thank my colleagues here today for the opportunity to talk about something that is extremely important to every woman in America, every person in America. It is not really a man or woman thing, or a child or a grandparent thing. It is all of us. So I look at things a lot of times, like a lot of people, I try to put my own life filter over what is going on here.

I'm in the sandwich generation. I have elderly parents who are having bumpy roads with their health. I just today for the very first time had my only and most beautiful granddaughter with me today on the House floor. I realized poor little Celia has \$45,000 worth of national debt on her head. And then I think of my parents trying to manage their health care and their finances in their senior years: have they prepared enough, and did they make the right choices. I think about all of the in-between generation, the sandwich generation which I am, and I know that we want to make the right choices for ourselves so when our children are taking care of us, those decisions can be easier for them and we can be well prepared.

Quite honestly, with a \$14 trillion debt, I don't think we're going to be prepared. What kind of handcuffs are we putting on our future generation?

I think about times in my life when maybe I have gone up to the limit on my credit card or maybe things haven't been as—particularly when we were younger, trying to buy a house for the first time and trying to figure out how

we were going to manage the dollars when we were first getting started, and when we realized maybe we were going a little over the limit or spending too much, was the first thing we thought about, was it let's get a loan, let's ask our parents for more money?

No, the first thing you think about is how are we going to cut back? How are we going to save? How are we going to live within our means? Because that is the reasonable and rational way. That is the way that our parents did it, and that's the way we've tried to do it.

But that's not the way things go on here in Washington. A lot of people say why is it only about cutting spending. Because if we don't prove and show we can cut spending at the beginning before we talk about anything else, we are never going to do it. I think those are the hard decisions. Those are the kitchen-table decisions. All great change in America begins at the dinner table. That is a Ronald Reagan quote. That is absolutely true. That is why I think the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill that we passed yesterday makes so much sense to a lot of American women around the kitchen table because that's what they're doing.

□ 1630

And so I think when we think about it in terms of the balanced budget, when I listened to the debate yesterday, I think about my home State of West Virginia. We have a balanced budget. We have hundreds of millions of dollars in surplus right now because we are not permitted by law to spend more than we bring in. And so we had a good year this year for a lot of different reasons. But I think some of it is the smart budgeting that we did up front as a State—make tough decisions as a State to make sure that at the end of the year we're not dipping into the rainy day fund, that we're not finding ourselves saying the only way we can save ourselves is to raise somebody's taxes. It's because the spending decisions that were made in the front end with a budget—we have a budget for the first time in, I think, 3 years in the House.

And everybody around their kitchen table makes a budget. If they don't make it every year, certainly when they're in trouble they start making a budget. You do really simple things like decide not to go out to eat, stop your magazine subscriptions. The easy things first and then the really hard decisions. That's where we are right now are the hard decisions.

I think as a daughter and as a mother of a daughter and a mother of now a granddaughter, I think women make a lot of these decisions. I see the generations changing. I see the decisions maybe that my mom made were not as involved as the ones that I'm making. And I certainly can see that my own daughter, independent, on her own, is

going to be so much more empowered financially to make decisions. So let's not leave her and the next generations holding a big IOU on their back. Let's take the opportunity.

Another question I get is that we've raised the debt ceiling how many times in the past—numerous times in the past. I think they were quoting 17 times under Ronald Reagan or something like that, if I recall correctly. And that is correct. We have raised the debt ceiling. I've voted to raise it before. But this is different. We need to seize this opportunity. Because if we don't seize the opportunity to clamp down on the spending now when the American people realize what an issue and what a problem and what a generational burden we're passing on—we have the ear of the American people, and that's the difference. That's the difference.

A lot of things in our lives are all about timing. Certainly political lives are all about timing. Sometimes you can have the greatest candidate in the world, and if it's not the right time, they can't make it. And this is the time. This is the time for us to grab the reins, to say to the Senate and the President and the American people, We're ready, you're ready, and let's join together and do this.

So I look forward to hopefully Cut, Cap, and Balance making it through the Senate. But at least if it doesn't make it in the form we pass today, the concepts within this—cutting, capping, and balancing our budgets—are everyday events in people's lives. We need to do it here. I look forward to joining with all my fellow women Republicans we're talking with today, with the rest of the women in the country, but also every man, woman, and child in this country, because it's all about every American, and we don't want to see an overburden on either the older generation, the younger generation, or the generations to come.

Thank you for having us. I look forward to working together.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much.

I would like to now yield to one of my fellow freshman colleagues who I have gotten to be very good friends with. She is an incredible individual. She is a great person to be serving with. I truly appreciate all of her input, thoughtful comments. We discuss issues every day here in Congress. I yield to my good friend, SANDY ADAMS, from Florida.

Mrs. ADAMS. Thank you.

I join my fellow Republican women today to come and talk to you about what we passed yesterday, Cut, Cap, and Balance. I want to reach out to the American people and tell them why. August 2 is quickly approaching, and what we have heard from our President is, first, the Biden talks. Then it was the "grand bargain." Then it was the McConnell-Reid deal. Then it was Gang

of Six. Again, all of these are proposals, all of these are ideas. Nothing on paper. Nothing to be scored by the Congressional Budget Office. Not one thing put down in writing so that the American people and, quite frankly, Congress knows what is truly in these plans.

So now, just yesterday, the House Republicans passed Cut, Cap, and Balance with bipartisan support. It's the only legislation that has been introduced to Congress that actually addresses the debt, the deficit, and the ability to get our budget back in order, balancing our budget, the only one scored by the Congressional Budget Office. I supported that legislation and I will continue to support it because it is the only legislation that has been brought forth to handle our debt, deficit, and our budget. Not any of these other plans that have been floated out there, spoken about, talked about, nothing in writing.

As I heard one of my colleagues say earlier, the Congressional Budget Office said, We can't score a speech. And the American people don't really know what's in that legislation unless you write it down and let them take a look at it. That is so important for the American people. They want to know what we are doing. That's why it was so important that we had Cut, Cap, and Balance out there. The American people had a chance to read it, review it. They've seen what we have done. And I'm hearing from the people in my district that they're happy. They're happy that we have passed a responsible bill.

We're facing \$14.3 trillion in debt. It's equal to about 95 percent of our entire economy. And \$3.7 trillion of that was just accrued under President Obama's watch. To put that in perspective, it took the United States from 1776 to 1992 to accrue that same amount of debt that we've accrued in about 2½ years. We're mortgaging our children's future. We're borrowing 40 cents on the dollar, much of it from the Chinese. And we are sending the bill to our children and grandchildren. This has got to stop.

If we don't listen to the American people, then shame on us. We have heard them loud and clear. We know they want us to get our fiscal house in order because every day the American people are making their hard decisions on what they're going to buy, whether it's gas, whether it's prescription drugs, whether it's food, because everything is going up. And the jobs are going away. We have a high unemployment rate. We have different credit rating places telling us, Get your fiscal house in order or we are going to downgrade you. If that happens, the American people are the ones that suffer with us. This affects each and every one of us.

That is why I am proud to have supported Cut, Cap, and Balance. That is

why we stand here today talking with you, the American people, letting you know we heard you. I'm ringing the alarm. My colleagues in the House are ringing the alarms. But the Senate Democrats and this President don't seem to be listening. We have a problem, and it is not a tax problem. It is a spending problem here in Washington. We need to get that spending under control.

Since 1917—I think that's when they first passed this debt ceiling legislation, and I think, personally, they passed it with hopes that Congress would never spend more than they took in. That's my opinion. I wasn't here back then. But I will tell you that year after year, Congress has voted to ignore, to move on, to continue the spending without addressing the true drivers of our debt. We have to address those drivers.

If Congress isn't willing and the President isn't willing, then the American people are willing, and they're saying, Send us the balanced budget amendment. Let us show you where we are on this. Forty-nine States have a balanced budget requirement and they're able to live within their means. We should do no less. The American people live within their means, States live within their means, and Congress and the Federal Government should do no less.

□ 1640

Years of kicking the can down the road have come to an end. Reckless spending needs to stop. And the Senate's repeated failure to pass a budget and do their jobs that has led us to this economic crossroads needs to stop.

I'm asking my colleagues in the Senate, take up this bill, pass this bill. Listen to the American people. They want the opportunity to vote on a balanced budget amendment. Let them. What are you afraid of? Let the American people's voices be heard. Let them vote.

Americans deserve better, and we have proven that here in the House. I hope that our Senate colleagues are listening. I hope our President is listening. August 2 is quickly approaching. You do not have a scorable plan written down. We need to make sure that we protect our American heritage for our future generations.

Mrs. ELLMERS. I thank the gentlelady.

I now yield to the gentlelady from Ohio.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I thank my good friend Mrs. ELLMERS from North Carolina for hosting this Special Order this evening because this is about America's future and about America doing what each and every woman, each and every man, each and every family has to do each and every week at their table, and that's balance the budget and pay the bills.

The greatest President, they say, in the last century was Ronald Reagan. And in his farewell speech, he said, "All great change in America begins at the dinner table." And it does. It's the universe of our home life. It's where we educate our children, where we feed our children, where we stake out the ideas on how we want our future to go, where we plan parties, where we plan events, and where we discuss Grandma's departure. It is the center of our home. And it is from that that I want to focus on what I think needs to be said tonight.

We have to balance our budget in America, in this House, in this Chamber, at this kitchen table. We have all seen what it is to take a checkbook, take the bills, and make them come together. That's what we need to do, and that's what I believe a balanced budget amendment will force this Congress and future Congresses to do: balance our checkbook.

Just like mothers and grandmothers across this country, I have a major stake in the future of our Nation, and that is not just my daughter and her wonderful husband, but my Michael and my Anthony, my wonderful little grandchildren.

My father was the epitome of the American Dream. He came from nothing, but he worked hard and started his business and paid the bills of those businesses at their little, small kitchen table. And he grew that and gave us the opportunity to make sure that what we wanted to accomplish in the United States was available to us. And that's what I did for my daughter. And, you know, when she started her little business, do you know where she started it? At the kitchen table in the house she grew up in. And she's got a thriving little business. But she's got two little children, and we want that American Dream for them.

We've got to get our fiscal house in order. We cannot keep creating the debts and deficits that we are creating in this country. A balanced budget amendment will force us to do the right things for our country just as moms and dads across the Nation have to do all the time at their kitchen tables; that's live within their means.

I urge the Senate to take up the balanced budget amendment. I urge this Chamber to adopt it, I urge the Senate to adopt it, and to make it a reality.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much.

I now yield to my other—I say "other" but we have many—good friend from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), who is one of those great freshmen that I'm serving with.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, RENEE. We certainly appreciate your hosting this today, and I certainly am glad to lend my support for a balanced budget amendment.

It goes back to my childhood. I've shared this before, but I wanted to share this again because this is what I

grew up with, and I believe it's what most Americans grew up with.

I grew up on a farm, and it was just my mom and my dad and my sister and me. And every January my mom would get out all these ledger papers and lay them out on the kitchen table. That was before the days of the computers. Each page represented a month. And she and my dad would spend days, literally, charting out the cash flow for our farm for the rest of the year. And they would try to estimate how much the yield was going to be on the corn and the soybeans, and they had to guess how much the price was going to be, and they researched the cost of the seed and the other inputs and the fuel, and they charted that all out, and then our mortgage payments.

They were able to, through working that pencil and erasing and reworking it, figure out how they were going to make everything work, how they were going to be able to live within their means. It wasn't always easy, but as the years went on and conditions changed, Mother would get that eraser out and she would readjust that cash flow to make sure that we stayed in balance, make sure that we had everything that we needed. And that's just common sense. That's families balancing their budget.

I carry on that tradition. I do it, and people all over Missouri's Fourth District do it. Families I talk to, they say, Every year we balance our budget, how come Washington doesn't? Every small business I visit says, We balance our budget, how come Washington doesn't? Every farmer and rancher I visit with says, We balance our budget, how come Washington doesn't?

We have got to start taking the common sense from the people and apply it here in Washington.

Even the States, they certainly are one up on us here—49 out of the 50 States have a balanced budget amendment. They live within their means.

Yet Washington thinks they don't need it. Well, I think they do. With a \$14.3 trillion debt that we have now, it is evident that people here cannot live within their means, and they need to have the constraints of a budget.

So we've passed it here in the House. It was the right thing to do. It's supported by the American people. Now the Senate and the President need to get on board.

Why the President would oppose our cut, cap, and balance plan, I have no idea. I want the President to share with me and with all of us and the American people why he does not support balancing our budget. We do it at home. We need to do it in Washington, and we need to do it now.

Thank you.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much.

The gentlelady from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) will be finishing this evening's comments.

She is a good friend to all of us as freshmen, a mentor to us, and I thank you for coming this evening as well. It means very much that you contribute to this.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about my experience balancing budgets because I had to manage many different kinds of budgets, and some all at the same time.

As a business owner for 23 years, I had to balance my insurance company's budget. As the mayor of Fort Worth, I had to balance the city's budget. And as the mother of three, I had to balance the household budget.

What is the same about every budget I have ever balanced is that there was never any choice. There were very serious consequences for not being fiscally responsible, whether it was in my business, at city hall, or at home.

Most Americans have had the same experience I've had. We all sit around the kitchen table and figure out how to make ends meet, and then we ask why can't Washington do the same thing?

Families and businesses have to balance their budgets every single day. It's only right that the Federal Government, with \$14.3 trillion in debt, should finally have to do what all Americans already do. But when Washington is asked to balance the budget for the American people, this seems to be too tall an order.

Washington could learn a thing or two from the women in Congress: 10.6 million businesses owned in the United States are owned by women, and women now make up the majority of the workforce. We're the leaders of Fortune 500 companies. But as we've taken an even greater responsibility, we haven't given anything up. We're balancing budgets at our business during the day, and when we get home, we're taking care of our families' finances, and many of us care for our aging parents and their budgets too.

□ 1650

We know what it means to make ends meet, and we've lived up to that responsibility in every part of our lives. It's now time for Washington to do the same.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much.

My good friend was pointing out the need to be following our finances as more and more women are becoming businessowners. They are the breadwinners, as you can see from this chart here, once again figuring out the bills, balancing the budget, taking care of our family members and their health care needs. It's so important.

In order for us to be good stewards of taxpayer dollars here in Washington, it's time for a balanced budget amendment. I am very proud of what our House did in a bipartisan effort yesterday, and I'm hoping that the Senate

and the President will also be part of that very significant, historic move so that we can get this country back on sound financial ground.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to be joined by my colleagues today, and we are going to talk about the financial situation here in the United States and about the meaning of the various ideas and proposals that have been put forward.

I want to compliment my colleagues on the Republican side for their tenacity in putting out their sound bites, but I think it's very, very important for the American people to understand in detail exactly what is being proposed here. Yesterday, we did what was called the Cut, Cap, and Balance proposal. You might also call it the "Cut, Slash, and Burn" proposal because, once you get past the sound bites and get into the details of what has actually been proposed, you've got to stand back and go, Whoa. Wait a minute. Is that really what a balanced budget amendment is all about?

We're going to go into that in a few moments to really understand exactly what this balanced budget amendment is and the effect that it will have on Americans, particularly on women in America; but before we go there, we need to step back a bit and understand how it is that we got into this situation with this deficit of \$14 trillion. How did we get here? It's really important to understand that. Before you go off and try to solve the problem, you need to know what is the situation, what is the circumstance.

This little chart here lays out where the deficit came from. Now, understand that, at the end of the Clinton administration in January 2001, the United States Government was running a surplus, a \$300 billion-plus surplus. It had run that for the previous 2 years. So we had a surplus, and we were on the path during the decade 2001–2010 to literally pay off the entire American debt. It would be paid off. Now, whether that's a good idea or not, you can debate that, but that's what we were on. So the trajectory was, had we maintained the same policies, the same growth in

our economy, we would have paid off the total debt. However, something happened.

Now, what happened?

What happened was a change in policies and two wars: the Iraq and the Afghanistan war following the 9/11 event in 2001 and then the Iraq war in 2003—neither war paid for. For the first time in American history, neither war was paid for—all borrowed money for the first time ever in America's history. Another thing happened along the way, and that is: in 2001, the first George W. Bush tax cut followed in 2003 by the second George W. Bush tax cut.

Here is what they meant. Take a careful look at this. This is where the deficit started. We started here with the Bush-era tax cuts and then over the years so that in 2019—20 years—we have this extraordinary growth in the deficit caused by those tax cuts. Of course it assumes the tax cuts will continue on into 2019.

The red area here are the wars. Again, not paid for. So the Iraq war and the Afghanistan war.

The other thing is this downturn in the economy. The downturn in the economy occurred in 2008. How did it happen? Why did we have that crash of the American economy?

We had it because the Federal Government stepped back from regulating the financial institutions, allowing them to run wild, assuming that they would be smart enough to regulate themselves. That didn't happen. They were smart enough to be extraordinarily greedy. Wall Street went on a greed binge, and the result was the collapse of the financial industry. Needless to say, there are other players in this game. Many Americans, hundreds of thousands of Americans, joined in the game and took out mortgages and bought houses, but there was no way they could possibly afford them. It was the financial industry, the mortgage industry and the Wall Street bankers, and we wound up with the great collapse of 2008.

To deal with that, the bailout of Wall Street occurred. Most of that has now been paid back. It worked. Did it work for the benefit of Americans? It stabilized the financial institutions, and it certainly worked for the benefit of Wall Street. That program occurred in the final months of the George W. Bush administration. Unfortunately, the American economy has not recovered despite the spending of some \$700 billion in the stimulus program. It actually worked. It didn't work enough to get the economy moving forward, so we wound up with this huge deficit.

Going forward, the deficit remains in place because the wars continue: \$178 billion a year spent on the war in Afghanistan and Iraq. Also continuing are the George W. Bush tax cuts. This is where the deficit is coming from. Thirdly, the economy has not recovered. That's where the deficit is.

Now, what do you do about that? Do you put in place a constitutional amendment that has something really interesting? When the American public understands what is in that amendment, it's not just a balanced budget; there are real things in that amendment. Then that amendment, if ever put in place, will have extraordinary consequences for America—in my view, none of them positive.

A sound bite is great: Balance the budget. Force the government to balance the budget just like we do at home. Hello, America. Do you really balance your budget every month? every year? I don't think so. We take out a mortgage to buy a house. That's borrowing money, folks. That's not balancing your daily budget. That's borrowing money, and now you've got to pay the mortgage, pay the interest. When you lose your job or when you're laid off or when you're cut back in hours, what do you do? You do your best to cut expenses, and then you probably are going to borrow more money—maybe the home equity loan, maybe the credit card—to get by. We all do that, all of us. It's not so easy to at the end of every year balance the budget.

Forty-nine States? Yes, they have balanced budget amendments. I'm from California. Democrat Jerry Brown: facing a balanced budget amendment. Guess what? He borrows money. He doesn't balance the budget. Oh—and his predecessor, Arnold Schwarzenegger—Republican, said he was going to “blow up the boxes” and balance the budget. It happened twice in the 7 years that he was Governor that he was able to balance the budget.

Why did this happen? Why did it happen? America, ask the question: What is in the balanced budget amendment? I'll tell you what's in it: a requirement that a two-thirds vote be enacted for every expenditure and every tax increase—a two-thirds vote. This is a fundamental shift in the very nature of American democracy.

□ 1700

We had a dozen wonderful Representatives of the Republican Party talk for an hour here, and not once did they mention that the American democracy will be forever changed. No longer majority rule. A fundamental tenet of American democracy, majority rule, pushed aside. And now should this ever become law, a minority rule, one-third of this House, one-third of this Senate dominating the will of 65 percent of every elected Representative and Senator. The end of the most fundamental tenet of American democracy, the end of majority rule.

It also works in a very pernicious and bad way. You can cut taxes with a majority vote. It takes a two-thirds to raise taxes.

So years and years ago, the oil industry had the opportunity in our democ-

racy to receive a tax reduction. They got a tax reduction. And the oil industry went on with that tax reduction, called a subsidy, so that they can explore for oil and gas. For a hundred years they have had a tax break. Now, we can give them another tax break; but under the balanced budget amendment, it would take a two-thirds vote to take away the tax reduction, the tax break, the subsidy that they have received for a hundred years, a century, would take a two-thirds vote to do that because that would be considered to be a tax increase.

So what does it mean to the oil industry? Well, here's their profits from last year. Let's see: Exxon, \$10.7 billion; Oxy, \$1.6 billion; Conoco, \$2.1; Chevron, \$6.2 billion; BP, of gulf fame, \$7.2 billion, that's their profit. Part of that profit is your tax dollar. Part of that profit is the tax dollar of every American that has been given to the oil companies for more than a century so that they can go explore for oil.

Is there an American that believes that the oil industry needs our tax dollars to continue to be viable? I don't think so. But if the constitutional amendment passes, becomes part of our Constitution, a majority of this House and the Senate could increase the subsidy, but it would take a two-thirds vote to get our money back. We need to understand the details of what a balanced budget amendment means.

I've been joined by my wonderful friend and extraordinary Representative from the great State of New York representing the Hudson River Valley in the capital region.

We had a discussion last night about a piece of this, and I've been waiting for you to arrive when we could talk about how the balanced budget amendment and the cuts in the legislation that was passed yesterday would affect women.

We just had 20 women from the Republican Party here telling us that we ought to enact a balanced budget amendment. What does it mean for women who are 65 and over?

Would you please join us and enter this conversation.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, and thank you for bringing us together on some very important discussions and laser-sharp focus which is essential as we face this default crisis, where there are those who are dragging their feet and not resolving the default crisis and refuse to have us pay our bills. And when we default on our debt, it's very problematic because it can disrupt our pensions, it can disrupt our 401(k)s, it can disrupt our mortgages because of the interest rate being somewhat fluctuated by that default crisis and our failure to pay our bills.

What I think is important here is that you outline how unfair this process can be, how it can be routed to support easily deep pockets, efforts to give

windfall industries a mindless handout, the big oil companies getting a handout. It's much easier to retain that benefit, and it's very difficult to save Medicare. It's a simple majority that can end Medicare.

Many of us go home every week, others as frequently as they can because of the distance they have to travel to get to their districts, and we're greeted by signs like this: Hands off my Medicare.

And it's no wonder, because what we've seen yesterday was the third attempt in this given few months of the 112th Congress to end Medicare. Three votes. One with the Republican Study Committee, one with the Ryan plan, a Path to Prosperity—which we have redesignated as the Road to Ruin. And then yesterday with this cut, burn and whatever, slash-and-burn attempt. I won't even get into the nomenclature because it's misrepresenting what would really happen.

Yesterday, we had a vote on this floor to make it easy to end Medicare and easy to maintain handouts to the oil companies. And when we look at the dollars that are saved by ending Medicare, we see where they somehow are transitioned over to tax cuts that are maintained for the millionaire-billionaire community, mindless handouts, the Big Oil industry.

So this is buyer beware week. We've seen this three times over, and it's an assault on the middle class.

When you talk about the impact on women, you know, an armchair scientist can take a look at the population of seniors and understand the proportional representation to the greater degree is women in that category. So this is an assault on senior women who require Medicare.

We talked about this last night on the floor, that things have changed since 1965 when President Truman and Mrs. Truman were the first to sign up for Medicare with that wonderful legislation. They began a process of dignity for our Nation's seniors where affordable, accessible care, a certainty in their lives, became a much-needed concept because there was cherry-picking going on. There was the unaffordable notion, the inaccessible notion of health care insurance coverage.

And to put that now at risk and develop and mess with our Constitution to make that all work, it's no wonder Wall Street, The Wall Street Journal, called it a very foolish approach. They labeled it in just very negative tones.

And certainly Bruce Bartlett, who was the economic adviser to President Reagan, said that it was akin to an intern writing a bill on a napkin. Well, I think that's a pretty tough slam for our interns. They would do better.

So we need to go forward with sensible strategies. We need to solve the default crisis. And let's face it, it should be about investing in jobs.

The jobs crisis is the number one priority of the American public. We see it

in public opinion surveys over and over again. And that job crisis when we resolve it addresses any revenue crisis, any spending crisis, any deficit crisis. This is the best solution: Create jobs, invest in innovation, infrastructure, education.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, once again you are on the right track here.

Earlier before you came in I was discussing our Republican colleagues, Women's Day, and they were all talking about the great value in the balanced budget constitutional amendment.

My colleague from Colorado, JARED POLIS, came running over and said, They don't understand. They need to know what's in this. And I'd like you to explain.

I started off with the majority, two-thirds vote. You're a constitutional specialist. What does all of this mean to America if they really understood and got past the sound bite? "Balanced budget" sounds good, but what does it actually mean?

□ 1710

Mr. POLIS. It's particularly ironic that this session of Congress opened with a recital of the United States Constitution which really just, in the vote yesterday, has been debased. And our democratic Republic has been debased to an extent that I certainly have not seen in this body prior under either party.

Let's talk about exactly what was attempted yesterday in this constitutional amendment that would have essentially passed as part of a resolution. It's one thing to say that we want to eliminate Medicare. The House worked its will through the Ryan budget, phasing out Medicare for those who are under 55 years of age. The people of this country will have the opportunity to change that. We saw an election in upstate New York where I think and most people think that the people of this country soundly rejected the effort to eliminate Medicare.

But regardless, that's what elections are about. I know that in the last election, Democrats didn't fare too well. A majority of this House was elected that wanted to phase out Medicare for people under the age of 55. Likewise, in the next election, if people run on that, a majority might arise in this body that supports keeping Medicare solvent for the next generation.

What was attempted yesterday was circumventing the public will by inserting into the United States Constitution exact fiscal policy that essentially wouldn't allow Medicare to exist in any form similar to what it is today. It would actually specify an exact percentage of the gross national product that the public sector can contain in our governing document.

This is unprecedented. Who hears of putting numbers, 19.7 percent, 19.5 per-

cent, 20, 21 percent—we're talking about the percentage of the economy that can be public sector versus private sector. Who knows what the ideal percentage is? That's what elections are about. That's what we fight off every day here on the floor of the House. Some will say we should have it a little bigger; others will say we should have it a little smaller. The people of the country have their say. To somehow take that out of the realm of public discourse and insert that into our governing document is unprecedented. It castrates the United States Congress. It castrates and eliminates our ability to make public policy, for better or worse.

I had an exchange with one of my colleagues on the Rules Committee as we were bringing this to the floor the other day. I said, This is such an absurd concept. Imagine for a minute that there was a Democratic majority and we were saying, You know what, we want to put in our Constitution that public expenditures have to be at least 22 percent of GNP or—but it never even crossed our minds. There is no Democratic proposal like that because it just doesn't make any sense. That's what elections are about.

And yet here the Republican majority is trying to insert into our governing document—the one that they say that they have great respect for, the one that they began this session of the House by reading—inserting exact formulated fiscal policy regarding the exact size of the public sector, taking that ability away from the voters of this country, taking the discussion away from the deliberative bodies of the House and the Senate, taking it out of the hands of an election for President of the United States, removing the fundamental issue of what role government should play from political debates.

That is grossly undemocratic. It should be an insult to all of us who value our democratic Republic, who value our democratic institutions.

However flawed, our representational system of democracy is the most effective in the world. The people's voice will be heard. By taking away the people's voice and castrating the United States Congress to specific policies prescribed in the Constitution, we remove the ability of present and future voters of the country to have their voices heard. Regardless of where anyone comes down on the policies, regardless of what percentage of the GNP you think it should be, I hope that most Americans believe that it's a fundamental value to have a say in our system of governance and to have these debates and to have them be part of the public discourse, and that was proposed to be taken away completely by a bill that passed yesterday in this body by a majority vote from the Republican side.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so much for bringing our attention to the way in which the balanced budget amendment would fundamentally alter the very nature of our government.

Earlier I talked about the majority vote versus the minority rule that is in this amendment. And now you bring to our attention the percentage that is in the amendment. Those percentages have real meaning beyond the issue of just a very, very important issue, the very nature of our government, and the reason why we have representative government, why we have the Senate, why we have a Congress.

But there's something else to it and that is, the percentage that they have chosen would force the government expenditures to go back to the 1965 level where there was no Medicaid and no Medicare program in America. So, once again, there are different ways of assaulting and terminating Medicare. One was the direct way that was in the Republican budget that passed this House earlier in which they explicitly said that for all Americans who are not yet 55, there would be no Medicare. They would be given a voucher, and they would have to go buy insurance from the private insurance market, which all of us understand is a very difficult place to get a fair deal. The other way of doing it is in a constitutional amendment, as was proposed yesterday, that would make it impossible to fund Medicare and similarly impossible to fund things like natural disasters.

Let's assume we were at 18 percent, which is the number they've chosen, of GDP and the Federal budget, and we have the great Mississippi flood or the great Missouri flood or the earthquake in California or the hurricane in Florida, billions of dollars. The Federal Government would have no ability under this amendment to step in.

Let me turn to Mr. TONKO. I know you had some other things that you wanted to bring to our attention.

Mr. TONKO. Well, by their own acknowledgement, their own leaders indicated that this would enshrine the Republican agenda to end Medicare in the United States Constitution. So what we end up with is that we have these very bold statements made, that right there after the freedom of religion and the freedom of thought, the freedom of assembly, we can have the freedom from health care for anyone age 65 and older. That's not quite an honorable position to follow or to promote.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Freedom "from" health care.

Mr. TONKO. Yes. I just think that what we have witnessed is a messing with a very precious document, one that governs this democracy, this Republic in a way that was carefully planned by our founding parents. And to take that precious document and to use it in order to promote a political agenda and one that denies access to a health care concept is wrong.

When we look at this 1966 threshold, when we take it back to spending opportunities at that vintage, we need to keep in mind that Medicare, assisting grandparents, grandma and grandpa, means that they're denying the fundamental fact that since 1966, grandparents, grandma is living 10 years longer, on average. So it's not real to take us back to this unwarranted threshold of 1996. And also, we've had much progress in technology and research in medicine so that there are new opportunities for which we avail ourselves the funds.

So I think that a lot of this is not based on reality. It's not based on the desire to serve. It's rather based on denial. And that's not what this should be about. There is a certain bit of dignity. There is a respect factor shown to the senior population. And I can tell you, when you get messages like this at home, Keep your hands off Medicare, we're getting this in letter format, email format, faxes coming into the office, phone calls. Nine to one, every 10 calls coming in, you'll get nine phone calls of advocacy to not only keep Medicare but to strengthen it.

And what we did, as you know, Representative GARAMENDI, we went through and provided those screenings and those annual checkups and made certain that no copayments or deductibles would hold back the opportunity for our seniors. We made certain that we began the process of filling the doughnut hole, and we found savings in the Medicare situation.

And, yes, they're right. They talk about cutting back. We found savings by reducing the profit columns of the insurance industry when it came to Medicare and then transferred—in a very fungible way, we transferred those savings into the development, positive outcome for seniors in the pharmaceutical area because we know that the doughnut hole is a very pricey thing for many people. In just a few months into a calendar year, seniors are dipping into their own pockets to pay for the pharmaceutical costs in order to stay well or to recover from an illness.

So there was great compassion shown here, and we moved forward with a way to fill the doughnut hole completely, completely. And we began that process last year. That is denied again in this process.

Again, to the fact of being concerned about women, if you are concerned about women, why would you cut Head Start programs? Many working moms require Head Start, not only to maintain a career or perhaps work, because you may be a single parent, or even a double income household still needs that job.

□ 1720

Head Start is a good way to develop the social, the educational, and the cognitive skills of youngsters. Why

would you deny a quarter of a million of children Head Start? That's that attack on women, working women.

Why would you reduce education by 12 percent in title I areas, as they had suggested, as they did with their budget. That's an attack on educators, most of whom are women. It's still a very highly predominant field for women.

So when we look at some of the attacks here by gender, by age, by income strata, it's clearly assumed here, and documented, that it's an assault on middle class America, on working families. And it is time to grow the middle class, strengthen the middle class, enhance their purchasing power. In so doing, you develop a stronger America.

And so we need to go forward with a laser sharp focus and an honesty that's built by truth, not fiction, and do what is best as we go forward to invest in infrastructure, education, and certainly the improvements that we need to make in innovation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Before we leave the balanced budget amendment, the bill that was on the floor yesterday had two other pieces to it. One of them was to go after the budget of the United States and reduce it by \$111 billion, beginning in October of this year. That has real impact. Part of that impact would be felt on Medicare.

Let's just put some understanding into what Medicare is all about. Our colleague from Connecticut did this last night, but it really, I think, is well worth repeating, and so I am going to just read off some statistics, so please bear with me.

In 1965, when Medicare was established, 44 percent of all seniors 65 and over did not have health insurance. Now, of those, 40 percent of the seniors lived in poverty. So you had heavy poverty and you had no insurance. The two are tied together. You get sick, you lost your money, you spent everything you had. The life expectancy at that period was 70 years.

Now, what's happened in the intervening years since 1965? Now, 40 million seniors, nearly every senior in the United States, has health insurance. Not just a little health insurance, they have a comprehensive health insurance policy that covers most everything they need—doctors, hospitals, and drugs.

The poverty rate for seniors has fallen from 40 percent to 10 percent. Why? Social Security and Medicare.

Now, they lived to 70 in 1965. Today, seniors live to an average age of 78½ years. Why? Because they have medical care and they have Social Security providing them with the basics of life.

Now, what happens if the Republican budget were to pass and Social Security were to end, not only for those who are 55 years of age now and want to have Social Security 10 years later in their lives when they become 65, but immediately for seniors, now, if the

Republican bill passed, would become law that passed yesterday, and the previous one, the budget bill were to become law? \$880 billion would be removed from Medicaid.

Medicaid's a different program than Medicare. This is for impoverished people in America, almost all of whom are in nursing homes. \$880 billion, over 10 years, removed from Medicaid. So those seniors, most of whom are women—and I would remind you that we heard from the Republican women here earlier promoting a program that would cut \$880 billion out of Medicaid, 70 percent of which goes to nursing homes, the majority of whom in those nursing homes are women. This is not a women's program that they've put forward.

And on the drug side, you were talking about this, Mr. TONKO. This is an immediate reduction, an immediate reduction in the drug benefits, so that 3.9 million seniors would wind up paying \$2.2 billion more immediately if the Republican budget were to go into law because of the reduction in the Affordable Care Act that provided this benefit.

These are just some of the things that the American public needs to understand when you get past the sound bites. We must balance the budget and, therefore, the balanced budget amendment.

Well, wait. What is it? What does it really do? It terminates majority rule in America and institutes minority rule so the fundamental of American democracy is trashed; requires that the budget of the United States be ramped back, back, back to the 1965 percentage of GDP, before there was Medicare, which, inevitably and inextricably means that Medicare is over once that balanced budget amendment passes.

Mr. TONKO, please continue.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, what I didn't hear, though, was the resolve of the default crisis. I didn't hear advocacy from the other side about paying our bills. I'm hearing about cutting away at middle class values and middle class needs. I didn't hear about the default crisis and paying our bills.

We're saying we need to respond to a default crisis, and we're also talking about a jobs agenda. We haven't seen one jobs bill in the House brought forward. And that is a major concern, because the jobs crisis, when resolved by producing jobs and investing in jobs, resolves the revenue crisis, the spending crisis, the deficit crisis. So we need to go forward.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You've moved to a subject that we really want to get to, which is jobs, but this is my favorite.

Mr. TONKO. Just on the Medicaid/Medicare piece, if I could just say one thing.

When we fall short on the Medicaid side, it falls again upon the property

taxpayer, and again, if you're on a fixed income, as many seniors are, and again, the disproportionate number of women in households in the senior years are going to be, again, impacted by a property tax that, when levied on that home, doesn't know if you're unemployed, on fixed income, underemployed, so it will be hitting a retiree on fixed income very, very hard.

And so we're transferring from a progressive income tax and a progressive series of taxes at the Federal level on over to a State situation where it's going to trickle down into a property tax, which is grossly unfair.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And on the individuals.

Let's move on beyond it. But this is something that I always put up when we talk about Medicare, and that is it was 1965. This is a tombstone, and it says: Medicare 1965–2011. Created by LBJ. Destroyed by the GOP. No doubt about it.

Mr. TONKO. We've had three votes to end Medicare.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Three votes in the first 6 months, now 6½ months of this new Congress, three votes by the Republicans that have put up three different measures that terminate Medicare as we know it.

Mr. TONKO. To give tax cuts to the job creators.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Oh, to the job creators. You must mean those wealthy folks.

Mr. TONKO. We're told it's the millionaire-billionaire tax cut that responded to the needs of the job creators.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We've been joined by an individual from the great State of Vermont who has spoken many times on this floor about jobs and about what we need to do.

Thank you for joining us. Share your thoughts.

Mr. WELCH. We are in a very serious situation now. We're what, 11 days away from perhaps, the first time in the history of this country, not paying our bills. And it's extraordinarily damaging what that will do to our economy. I mean, interest rates will go up. If we have a 1 percent increase in our debt service, that's going to mean \$140 billion more in taxpayer expense to service the debt. And I don't care whether you have a NANCY PELOSI point of view that we could use that money better on infrastructure or an ERIC CANTOR point of view that you could use that for tax cuts, that's money out the door. That is squandered money. And the damage to the economy and to this asset, the AAA rating, is enormous, and that ripples through the economy and starts hurting people, individuals.

If you have a mortgage, your mortgage rates can go up on an adjusted rate loan. If you want to buy a car, you have to borrow some money, your rates

are going to go up. If you have put aside money for your kids to go to college, which is, as we all know, incredibly expensive, the markets are going to create an immense amount of turmoil, and the likelihood is you'll take a real hit on that.

□ 1730

If your retirement savings, if you're about to retire and you've been saving all your life, that can get whacked. This is reckless and irresponsible. We have to pay our bills.

Now it is true that we've got a long-term fiscal challenge that requires a long-term fiscal plan, but this first time in the history of our country literally holding hostage our obligation to pay our bills to getting your way on your design of how we should have a long-term fiscal plan, that's never been done before.

You know, in all candor, both sides in the past have tended to grandstand when it comes to the debt ceiling. The custom has been around here that the party that's out of power and doesn't have the responsibility to get the debt ceiling passed so that we pay our bills grandstands about it, but neither side has ever actually held that debt ceiling and that obligation to pay our bills hostage.

Ronald Reagan, who was not at all shy about engaging in tax fights and budget fights, raised the debt ceiling. He never would use the full faith and credit of this country to win his battles because he knew that would cause too much harm to the economy; it's putting a loaded gun at the head of the American economy. We have got to get back to the basics here. We've got to pay our bills.

My hope is that then we would work together because we don't have to cut Medicare to get to fiscal solvency. We do have to reform the way we deliver health care to bring down the cost of health care, but if we have a balanced approach where we include revenues, we include the Pentagon, and we, as Democrats, look very hard at various spending programs and are willing to share in the effort to get ourselves onto fiscal solvency, we can do that. So we can make progress if we work together and just recognize the obvious: we've got to pay our bills, and we also have to work together to get a long-term fiscal plan.

Mr. GARAMENDI. PETER, as we stand here on the floor of this House debating an extraordinarily important moment in time about the direction we're going to go, this issue of paying our bills, we need to understand that what we're really talking about here is not tomorrow's bills; we're talking about expenditures that have been made over the years dating back to World War II and even before World War II, expenditures that have been made, votes by the majority of this

House and by the Senate, signed by the President, America decided to spend the money. Earlier, I put up a chart here talking about where it came from—this House. And George W. Bush voted to reduce taxes, created a deficit, had to borrow money, voted to start and to carry out two wars, Afghanistan and Iraq, borrowed money to do it. These are past expenditures. And here we are 12 days away from the default crisis where our Republican friends are using this moment in time where we're not really discussing tomorrow's expenditures; we're talking about yesterday's expenditures, and they're saying give us our way or else America defaults.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, I think that the message from the Democrats in the House of Representatives is straightforward and very logical: Don't end Medicare. We saw three votes to end Medicare in the House. We say save Medicare, make it stronger. But then we talk about cutting, cutting programs that don't create jobs; do those cuts where there are not jobs created. Where there are, save those programs, strengthen them; provide for jobs by investing in education, in innovation, and in infrastructure. And it's very easy when you take the education investment, the infrastructure investment, and certainly the education investment, that equals jobs for Americans, for middle class Americans. And that's what it's all about. If we create jobs, it drives down the unemployment factor, drives down the deficit. And there's no stronger form of medicine, bar none, than jobs being created. It solves a revenue crisis, it solves a deficit crisis, it solves a spending crisis.

Some of these programs are correlated directly with unemployment. There is a need to address the needs of the unemployed, the poor. If you put people to work, if you invest in retraining programs, education, if you invest in R&D to grow, move ideas along to a manufacturing mode and then you make it in America, these are the values that we embrace as a party in the House.

I think it has been a refreshing message, one that really gets to something here. And at the same time we're speaking to the default crisis, we're saying this is how we resolve that default crisis. Don't walk away from the obligation, the responsibility to pay our bills. And as you said, two wars, a pharmaceutical deal for part D for Medicare, and millionaire and billionaire tax cuts were all spent, those were all forms of spending. And all of that, all of that was borrowed in order to spend on tax cuts. And now the bills have come home to be paid. It happened a decade ago—it doesn't matter, they are bills that have to be paid. We cannot put the economic vitality and viability of this Nation at risk or trig-

ger an international economic crisis by not paying our bills.

So we address the default crisis, we save Medicare and strengthen Medicare, and we have a formula of innovation, education, and infrastructure that equals jobs for Americans, working families, and middle class Americans. It's straightforward. It's straightforward.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We kept hearing from our Republican colleagues that what America needs is a cut, balance—how does that work?

Mr. TONKO. I don't know because it was messing with the Constitution. And The Wall Street Journal advised, don't mess with the Constitution, leave the Constitution out of this. And there were those who were economic advisors to President Reagan who said this is frightening—the exact words were very denouncing. And so no one took that seriously. And we spent hours here debating on a format that adjusts the Constitution, and some of the best minds who have worked in government from very conservative perspectives have said this was a wasteful measure.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, the Republican—we heard it here over and over again, it was cut, balance—whatever. What I kept hearing is cut, slash, and burn because they're going to cut and slash critical programs for seniors.

I think what Americans really, really want, they want a job.

Mr. TONKO. They want to work.

Mr. GARAMENDI. They want to go to work. They want an invest, grow, and build policy—not a cut, slash, and burn policy, but an invest, grow, and build. They want to invest, as you say, in education. They want their kids to have an education. They want to build the infrastructure. And they want to see the economy grow. But I'll tell you what happens when you start cutting, slashing, and burning. Here's what happens: If you take a look at the American economy, beginning in December of 2009, just start right there, just say that's the equilibrium point—wasn't a good day at all in America, a lot of jobs were not available. But we've seen 2.8 million jobs created in the private sector, okay. Simultaneously, we have seen cut, slash, and burn at the Federal level, as the Republicans have taken control and put in their continuing resolutions and reduced the Federal budget—and at the State level, and we've seen 378,000 jobs lost in the public sector. These are police, firemen, teachers, people that are out there making sure that our food is safe, and so forth.

So the reality is, we're seeing the government jobs go down. For every 100 government jobs that are cut, 30 private sector jobs are lost because those people depend upon the payroll from those government jobs.

The Simpson Bowles deficit commission said it very clearly: This is a long-term problem. We need to solve the

deficit over the long term. We cannot and should not solve it with immediate cuts because it will impair the recovery of America. And here's what's happening: We're seeing the growth in the private sector retarded as the public sector reduces. This is the effect of the cut, slash, and burn strategy that our Republican colleagues want to put forward.

So what's going on in Vermont?

□ 1740

Mr. WELCH. Well, let's talk about the balanced budget amendment. We in Vermont don't have a balanced budget amendment. We're the only State that doesn't have it. We have always managed to balance our budget. And we have done that when we have had Republican administrations and Democratic administrations.

The balanced budget amendment in Congress I think has some hazards because the Federal Government at certain times is the one tool that the American people have to be countercyclical. If the economy is really going down and it requires the Federal Government to step up to try to maintain purchasing power, that is debatable; but it is the only tool that we have as citizens is the Federal Government to do that.

I think what the balanced budget amendment suggests is that you can legislate away your future problems. You can come up with a fix that is going to guarantee you're not going to have to suffer through trying to figure out how to solve very difficult problems, either because it is a national security threat, it's a collapse in the economy like we had with the collapse of Wall Street.

And by and large it's not any way for us to avoid making direct and difficult decisions where we balance our revenue needs and we balance our spending needs based on the circumstances, and that's the constant work of Congress. It requires the application of judgment, it requires cooperation, and it requires the ability to be flexible and responsive to the circumstances that exist.

A balanced budget amendment is one size fits all that puts us in handcuffs in an effort to try to avoid getting out of balance.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. WELCH.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) has joined us, and directly in front of me is the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Let me turn to the gentleman from Colorado first.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI.

I think you all have been focused on the real issue in front of us. We have some budget issues, but the best way to handle our debt is to put people back to work. The quickest way to reduce the debt or the deficit is to put people

back to work. All of a sudden you have revenue coming in, and you don't have to pay unemployment and COBRA and you don't have to pay so much Medicaid. That's the first order of business. Plus, it really makes people feel valuable. Anybody knows that a job gives you dignity. That's what you're looking for, a good job to care for your families and provide for the future. That's what we have to do here.

And Democrats, our formula is innovate, educate, rebuild our infrastructure, equals jobs, equals good jobs that are long lasting that people can rely on and they can work and feel good about their lives and the future for their family.

Now, one of the things that we have said as Democrats is if we make it in America, we will make it in America. Instead of sending jobs overseas, let's have them here. We have the finest people in the world, some of the most talented and skilled people anywhere, and we need to be making things in this country.

In Colorado, for instance, one of the places where we can see these jobs is in our energy sector, both in traditional energy, oil and gas development, but also in new energy—energy efficiency, renewable energy, solar, wind, biomass, new jobs, good jobs. And so all this budget talk, all of this balanced budget stuff that I think does real damage to the Constitution, that should be going to the side. We have to focus on putting people back to work with good jobs that last a long time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let's just get ourselves into a good discussion here. The great Midwest, Ohio, the industrial center of America, being rebuilt by BETTY SUTTON.

I yield to the gentlelady from Ohio.

Ms. SUTTON. Thank you. I thank my colleagues for being down here fighting the fight that the American people want us to fight. And that's a fight for jobs. The American people, the people I represent in Ohio, their number one priority by all means is about putting people back to work. As Representative PERLMUTTER just stated so eloquently, it is really about empowering people. They don't want a lot from their government, but they do want a government that works with them and for them, and to the extent possible plays that role that will help spur our economy, invest in infrastructure which puts people back to work, and levels the playing field for our manufacturers.

I come from a place where we have a very strong manufacturing base, and it hasn't always been treated fairly. We have had a lot of unfair trade deals that have been passed that hurt the people that I represent, and we have a lot of policies that frankly didn't do them well. We can do better.

But here we are 200-some days into this new Congress under this Repub-

lican leadership and not a single jobs plan to come before this body. It is quite amazing to think about. Instead, what are they talking about, imposing a budget that ends Medicare and protects the very tax breaks that end up shipping our jobs overseas.

Well, I am proud to stand with you tonight and work on those policies that will put America back to work and strengthen not only our infrastructure but our economy which will keep our place in this world as leaders. And so as we move forward, I hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will get focused on what America needs, and that is jobs, jobs, and jobs.

We have a role to play. We can deal with the deficit. We should deal with the deficit; but the kinds of cuts that they are talking about, ending Medicare, taking this out of our seniors instead of cutting those tax breaks that have existed for those oil companies and others at the very top that have been a burden to our middle class because they are the ones who have to make up the difference, let's focus on jobs. Let's encourage our colleagues in the GOP to get on board and start working on what America needs, and that is to put America back to work.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And we're going to make it in America. America is going to make it. This is a great, strong country. Yesterday, I heard during the debate that we're broke. We're not broke at all. We've got a deficit problem; we can deal with that with some good policies when we put people to work.

This is America, and we're going to make it in America.

Let's look at that chart that Mr. PERLMUTTER has over there. Trade policies. We talked about that a little bit.

Taxes. We're spending our tax money on buying equipment that's made overseas when it ought to be made in Ohio—the buses, the trains, the solar panels, and the wind turbines. How about doing those in Colorado? You have a plant there. Use our tax money to buy American-made equipment.

Talk to me about research. Mr. TONKO, you come from one of the great early research centers of America.

Mr. TONKO. The original tech valley. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI. I know we don't have much time. I'll do this quickly.

The 21st Congressional District that I represent in upstate New York is the host community to the Erie Canal barge canal. It gave birth to a necklace of communities dubbed mill towns that became the epicenters of invention and innovation. That same pioneer spirit is fed today. It's part of our DNA. But you need investments in R&D. It's why my region is now one of the top five in the country for the growth of green collar jobs, innovation that is being advanced simply by investing, as we did

in the prior Congress, in job creation. Not cutting programs that provide opportunities for work.

Instead, they are going and building up programs like handouts to the oil companies that aren't producing a job, tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. They need the dollars for that. They're cutting valuable programs that either speak to the dignity factor for our seniors through Medicare or advancing research and development that grows jobs. That's what we need to do.

The Democrats are on message. Jobs, jobs, jobs. Solve the jobs crisis, you'll resolve the deficit situation, the revenue situation, and the spending situation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We're going to put people back to work, and one way we're going to do it is with a clean energy policy. We need a national security policy on energy. I know that part of that solution is going to come from Colorado where they are doing the research and where they are making some of this equipment and from middle America. And I suspect even Vermont will have a piece of this puzzle.

Mr. PERLMUTTER, tell us about energy systems in Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I know time is short, but in Colorado, we are very fortunate to have the National Renewable Energy Lab which is the finest lab of its kind anywhere in the world to help us develop ways to better use our energy. A gallon saved is a gallon earned, you know that kind of thing, but focus on energy efficiency, renewable energy, solar, wind, biomass, geothermal, those are new jobs. And to be more efficient with traditional energy sources, to be smarter about how we use them and how we extract them.

This is about restoring the American Dream for people, that they have good jobs, a good education, dignified and healthy lives of seniors. That's what we want to restore for America, not all of this gloom and doom and all that we're hearing and cuts. This is about restoring the American Dream, and we can do this.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Okay, we are going to have our bullet session here. We'll start with Ms. SUTTON from Ohio.

Ms. SUTTON. Thank you again for having this hour. It is so important that we do make it in America. I talked a little bit about jobs. I have a bill right now that is pending that I would encourage the Republicans to join me in passing. It's called the Keep American Jobs From Going Down the Drain Act. It says that as we rebuild our infrastructure here, our water infrastructure and sewer infrastructure, we do it with American iron and steel and manufactured goods. It's a jobs bill; it's a strengthening bill. It's good for America. This is a strong and great country. And I agree with my colleague, we can do better by it.

□ 1750

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Our country is strong. Our economy is one that is bolstered by job creation. And we've said it so many times over and over again: Don't cut valuable programs. Allow our seniors the dignity of Medicare. That enables them to have economic sustainability, vitality. That is important. And we invest from children to seniors in a way that produces jobs, strengthens regional, State, and the national economies, and we go forward.

And I think the optimism is there. Our message is one of can do, not denial, cuts, slash, burn.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH. Three points:

One, let's pay our bills. We always have; we always will;

Two, let's have a long-term budget plan to stabilize our budget with a balanced approach—revenues as well as cuts, the Pentagon as well as reforming how we deliver health care;

Three, let's make it in America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We're going to make it in America. When we do, America will make it. We will put forth, as Democrats, a jobs program. We're going to invest, we're going to grow, and we're going to build this economy. That's our promise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE FORMER LIBERIAN REGIME OF CHARLES TAYLOR—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112-45)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RENACCI) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed: *To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication stating that the national emergency and related measures dealing with the former regime of Charles Taylor are to continue in effect beyond July 22, 2011.

The actions and policies of former Liberian President Charles Taylor and other persons, in particular their unlawful depletion of Liberian resources and their removal from Liberia and sequestration of Liberian funds and property,

continue to undermine Liberia's transition to democracy and the orderly development of its political, administrative, and economic institutions and resources. These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 20, 2011.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1835

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT) at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1315, CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2011

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-172) on the resolution (H. Res. 358) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1315) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2551, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-173) on the resolution (H. Res. 359) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after 3 p.m. and July 21 on account of attending a funeral.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 21, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2554. A letter from the Acting Director, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Competitive and Noncompetitive Non-Formula Federal Assistance Programs — Administrative Provisions for the Sun Grant Program (RIN: 0524-AA64) received July 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2555. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement; Prohibition on Interrogation of Detainees by Contractor Personnel (DFARS Case 2010-D027) (RIN: 0750-AG88) received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2556. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Simplified Acquisition Threshold for Humanitarian or Peacekeeping Operations (DFARS Case 2011-D032) (RIN: 0750-AH29) received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2557. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule — Truth in Lending [Regulation Z; Docket No.: R-1422] received July 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2558. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Consumer Leasing [Regulation M; Docket No.: R-1423] received July 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2559. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Truth in Lending [Regulation Z; Docket No.: R-1424] received July 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2560. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2561. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Ear, Nose, and Throat Devices; Classification of the Wireless Air-Conduction Hearing Aid [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0361] received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2562. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; 2011 Management Measures; Correction [Docket No.: 110223162-1295-02] (RIN: 0648-XA184) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2563. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; 2011 Specifications for the Spiny Dogfish Fishery [Docket No.: 110303179-1290-02] (RIN: 0648-XA163) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2564. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No.: 110111018-1279-03] (RIN: 0648-XA109) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2565. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Alaska Plaice in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XA482) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2566. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Alaska Plaice in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XA483) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2567. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Groupers Fishery of the South Atlantic; Snapper-Groupers Management Measures [Docket No.: 110422261-1309-02] (RIN: 0648-BA70) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2568. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 2011 and 2012 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish; Correction [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XZ90) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2569. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Operation and Maintenance of the Neptune Liquefied Natural Gas Facility off Massachusetts [Docket No.: 0808041026-1295-02] (RIN: 0648-AX09) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2570. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Limited Access for Guided Sport Charter Vessels in Alaska [Docket No.: 110601314-1313-01] (RIN: 0648-BA99) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2571. A letter from the Assistant Department Administrator for Operations, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Limited Endangered and Threatened Species: Threatened Status for the Oregon Coast Coho Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit [Docket No.: 110531311-1310-02] (RIN: 0648-XA407) received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2572. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures [Docket No.: 100804324-1295-03] (RIN: 0648-BA01) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2573. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Monkfish; Amendment 5 [Docket No.: 090225241-1233-03] (RIN: 0648-AX70) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2574. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Optional Standard Mileage Rates [Announcement 2011-40] received June 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 290. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to ensure that memorials commemorating the service of the United States Armed Forces may contain religious symbols, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 295. A bill to amend the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998 to authorize funds to ac-

quire hydrographic data and provide hydrographic services specific to the Arctic for safe navigation, delineating the United States extended continental shelf, and the monitoring and description of coastal changes (Rept. 112-157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 441. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue permits for a microhydro project in non-wilderness areas within the boundaries of Denali National Park and Preserve, to acquire land for Denali National Park and Preserve from Doyon Tourism, Inc., and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 112-158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 470. A bill to further allocate and expand the availability of hydroelectric power generated at Hoover Dam, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-159, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 489. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the C.C. Cragin Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 643. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain land located in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 670. A bill to convey certain submerged lands to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in order to give that territory the same benefits in its submerged lands as Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa have in their submerged lands (Rept. 112-162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 686. A bill to require the conveyance of certain public land within the boundaries of Camp Williams, Utah, to support the training and readiness of the Utah National Guard; with an amendment (Rept. 112-163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 765. A bill to amend the National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986 to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture regarding additional recreational uses of National Forest System land that is subject to ski area permits, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-164, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 944. A bill to eliminate an unused lighthouse reservation, provide management consistency by incorporating the rocks and small islands along the coast of Orange County, California, into the California Coastal National Monument managed by the Bureau of Land Management, and meet the original Congressional intent of preserving Orange County's rocks and small islands, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1022. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of alternatives for commemorating and interpreting the role of the Buffalo Soldiers in the early years of the National Parks, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1141. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System (Rept. 112-167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1160. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey the McKinney Lake National Fish Hatchery to the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLF: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2596. A bill making appropriations for Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 320. A bill to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California (Rept. 112-170). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 266. An act to redesignate the Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge as the Sam D. Hamilton Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge (Rept. 112-171). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 358. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1315) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-172). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 359. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-173). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Budget discharged from further consideration. H.R. 470 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 2594. A bill to prohibit operators of civil aircraft of the United States from participating in the European Union's emissions trading scheme, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. SCHOCK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LATHAM, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GRIMALVA, and Mr. ENGLAND):

H.R. 2595. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of permanent national surveillance systems for multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, and other neurological diseases and disorders; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 2596. A bill making appropriations for Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 2597. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to allow for certain claims of nationals of the United States against Turkey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on 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. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 2598. A bill to establish a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) Master Teacher Corps program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. HAYWORTH (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. COLE, Mr. HANNA, Mr. DOLD, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. CAPPAS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2599. A bill to prevent Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and other Federal residential and commercial mortgage lending regulators from adopting policies that contravene established State and local property assessed clean energy laws; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KISSELL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BARROW, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. JACK-

SON LEE of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SIREN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PENCE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 2600. A bill to provide for implementation of the National Pediatric Acquired Brain Injury Plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2601. A bill to provide permanent authority for the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to enter into stewardship contracting projects with private persons or other public or private entities to perform services to achieve land management goals for National Forest System lands and the public lands that meet local and rural community needs; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. SHULER):

H.R. 2602. A bill to improve the accountability and transparency in infrastructure spending by requiring a life-cycle cost analysis of major infrastructure projects, providing the flexibility to use alternate infrastructure type bidding procedures to reduce project costs, and requiring the use of design standards to improve efficiency and save taxpayer dollars; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 2603. A bill to prohibit the enforcement of a climate change interpretive guidance issued by the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 2604. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of securities of a controlled corporation exchanged for assets in certain reorganizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H. Res. 360. A resolution expressing support for the sixth IAS Conference on HIV Pathogenesis, Treatment, and Prevention and the sense of the House of Representatives that continued commitment by the United States to HIV/AIDS research, prevention, and treatment programs is crucial to protecting global health; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. BASS of California):

H. Res. 361. A resolution concerning efforts to provide humanitarian relief to mitigate the effects of drought and avert famine in the Horn of Africa, particularly Somalia, Ethiopia, Djibouti, and Kenya; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 2594.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 2595.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 2596.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2597.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 2598.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. HAYWORTH:

H.R. 2599.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause (Art. I, §8, cl. 3) of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 2600.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 1.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 2601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2602.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 2603.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8 Clause 18

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2604.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 104: Mr. SARBANES.
 H.R. 121: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 140: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 198: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 207: Ms. BASS of California.
 H.R. 343: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 350: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 361: Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 422: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 452: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SCHILLING, and Mr. LEWIS of California.
 H.R. 507: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BOSWELL, and Ms. HANABUSA.
 H.R. 576: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 591: Mr. HOLT and Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 615: Mr. WOODALL and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 637: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
 H.R. 687: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 692: Mrs. BLACK.
 H.R. 721: Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 733: Mr. PAULSEN.
 H.R. 735: Mr. HURT.
 H.R. 791: Mr. JONES and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 808: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 835: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 942: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H.R. 969: Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 1001: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 1025: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 1070: Ms. HAYWORTH.
 H.R. 1084: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 1155: Mr. RENACCI.
 H.R. 1156: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1172: Mr. COHEN and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 1283: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 1297: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mrs. EMERSON.
 H.R. 1325: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 1340: Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 1344: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 1351: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 1370: Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 1385: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1397: Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 1416: Mr. AUSTRIA.
 H.R. 1418: Mr. MCKEON and Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 1465: Ms. RICHARDSON.
 H.R. 1466: Mr. REYES, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FARR, and Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 1513: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H.R. 1533: Mr. LANDRY.
 H.R. 1588: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 1648: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 1653: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 1683: Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 1700: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
 H.R. 1712: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 1744: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 1781: Mr. TONKO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 1802: Mr. TONKO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 1822: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1872: Mr. CRITZ.
 H.R. 1897: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 1919: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 1947: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FILLNER, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 1974: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 1980: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 2005: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 2010: Mr. NUNNELEE.
 H.R. 2014: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BONNER, and Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 2036: Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 2076: Mr. ROSS of Florida and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 2137: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 2146: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 2164: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 2182: Mr. SULLIVAN.
 H.R. 2198: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 2204: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 2236: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
 H.R. 2239: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 2245: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 2250: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. SULLIVAN.
 H.R. 2257: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 2267: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 2268: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 2324: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WU, Mr. FILLNER, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 2341: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 2397: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 2402: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mrs. BLACK.
 H.R. 2407: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. BOSWELL.
 H.R. 2412: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 2433: Mrs. ROBY.
 H.R. 2442: Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 2447: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 2457: Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 2458: Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 2492: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. DENT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 2499: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 2505: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2514: Mr. SCHILLING and Mrs. LUMMIS.
 H.R. 2527: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 2529: Mr. HECK and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 2530: Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. REYES, Mr. JONES, and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 2541: Mr. BOREN.
 H.R. 2544: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 2557: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H.R. 2570: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 2581: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PITTS, Mr.

PALAZZO, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 2587: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 64: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H. Res. 137: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H. Res. 262: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Res. 317: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 333: Mr. PAYNE.

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 ELLISON, or a designee, to H.R. 1315, the Consumer Financial Protection Safety and Soundness Improvement Act of 2011, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. COLE

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement any rule, regulation, or executive order regarding the disclosure of political contributions that takes effect on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING
R.E.A.D.E.R.L.E.A.D.E.R.S.
OF
COPLÉ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding group of students from Cople Elementary School in Westmoreland County, Virginia. The "R.E.A.D.E.R.L.E.A.D.E.R.S." took part in the Community Problem Solving contest of the Future Problem Solving Program International competition, which involves students using problem-solving skills to tackle an important issue in their community. The team from Cople chose to promote youth reading, a goal highlighted in their name, which stands for, "Reading Each And every Day and Educating others to Read and become Lifelong readers so Every Cople student is Able to Dream, imagine, love, and Experience how Reading can be Super fun." Among other endeavors, the members of the R.E.A.D.E.R.L.E.A.D.E.R.S. sponsored book fairs, read to fellow students, promoted book giveaways, and even composed a resolution urging that March be named "Young Reader's Month" by the Westmoreland County School Board.

The group's hard work paid off, with their efforts culminating in First Place awards in the Junior Division at both the state and national levels. The students represented America's First District with the highest degree of dedication and perseverance, exhibiting skills of reasoning and team work that will certainly serve them well in the future. At the same time, I am impressed with the devotion these students have shown for serving their community. I am proud of the R.E.A.D.E.R.L.E.A.D.E.R.S. of Cople Elementary School, and I commend them on their impressive achievements.

SPEAKER WILLIAM O'BRIEN CELEBRATES HIS 60TH BIRTHDAY WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS

HON. FRANK C. GUINTA

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, on July 20, 2011 Speaker William O'Brien will celebrate his 60th birthday with family and friends. Speaker O'Brien is a principled and selfless public servant having served our nation, state, and local communities in various capacities for many years.

Known as a principled, honest, and forthright man, Speaker William O'Brien's public service includes serving as a past member of

the Mont Vernon School Board, past member of the Mont Vernon Police Advisory Commission, three terms as a member of the New Hampshire House of Representatives, and Speaker of the New Hampshire House in 2011.

Known as a fiscal conservative, under Speaker William O'Brien's leadership, the New Hampshire legislature passed a fiscally responsible budget reducing spending by over \$1.2 billion, enacted 43 laws to reduce burdensome regulations on employers allowing more flexibility and opportunity to grow and create jobs, and passing a state budget that restores fiscal discipline while including no new or increased taxes and fees.

Speaker O'Brien is a long-standing advocate and leader of conservative values and principles. He has served in numerous conservative leadership capacities including Chairman of the New Hampshire Republican Party Platform Committee, Vice-Chair of the Granite State Taxpayers, and Co-Chair of the House Republican Alliance.

However, Speaker O'Brien's greatest joy and accomplishment is as a loving husband of thirty-seven years, father of three children, and three grandchildren. This is a great day for Speaker O'Brien, his wife Roxanne, and his family and friends. I wish him the very best on his 60th birthday. This is truly a very joyous occasion.

IN MEMORY OF PETE MOLLICA

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Pete Mollica, a fixture of Niles and the Mahoning Valley, who passed away on July 14th. Pete fought a long, hard battle with cancer, and the loss of his voice in our community is a void that will be impossible to fill.

A graduate of Niles McKinley High School, Pete was himself an athlete, competing on the football and baseball fields. Sports was in his blood, whether it be as a player, coach or official. Fortunately for the people of Northeast Ohio, he made his love of competition a career as a sports writer.

He leaves behind his high school sweetheart, Bonnie, two children, and six grandchildren. They will continue his legacy of kindness, generosity and optimism, but no one can ever fully replace what he brought to our community.

As a Valley athlete, I grew up reading Pete's writing. He covered it all with heart—high school, college, football, golf, softball, you name it. His uplifting stories of competition and athleticism helped inspire local children and adults alike.

Being named in one of Pete's columns was a badge of honor; you could be certain friends, family, and the community would take notice. And therein was Pete's true gift, his understanding of how sports bring communities together. Through his craft, for just a moment, we could forget about our differences and embrace our shared excitement and appreciation of sports.

RECOGNIZING THE EDWARDS FAMILY AS THE 2011 SANTA ROSA COUNTY OUTSTANDING FARM FAMILY OF THE YEAR

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to rise today to recognize the Edwards family for being selected as the 2011 Santa Rosa County Outstanding Farm Family of the Year.

Alan Edwards is a fifth generation farmer whose love for farming came at an early age. At fourteen, he bought his first cotton picker. Since then, he has never lost sight of the value of hard work and good soil and continues to instill those values in his family today. He and his wife Michele, along with their three daughters, Shelby, Madison, and Brianna, sow and harvest 750 acres of cotton, peanuts, soybeans, hay and wheat, and raise beef cattle.

The Edwards family, like all farm families, knows too well that taking care of a farm while raising a family is a full-time job. However, Alan and Michele remain very involved with their community. Michele works for the Century Correctional Institution, and Alan serves on numerous agricultural organizations, including the Santa Rosa County Farm Bureau, Florida Farm Bureau Peanut/Cotton Advisory Board, the Santa Rosa County Extension Advisory Committee, the West Florida Research and Education Center Advisory Committee, and the Florida Peanut Producers Association. This past year he was appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture to represent Florida on the USDA Cotton Board, the oversight and administrative arm of the Cotton Research & Promotion Program. He was also selected as one of two Florida growers to participate in the Peanut Leadership Academy. Among other community activities, Alan has served area schools through his involvement with the Future Farmers of America.

Mr. Speaker, our great nation was built by farmers and their families. The Santa Rosa County Outstanding Farm Family of the Year award is a reflection of the Edwards family's tireless work and dedication to family, faith and trade. On behalf of the United States

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Congress, I would like to offer my congratulations to the Edwards family for this great accomplishment. My wife Vicki and I wish them best wishes for continued success.

HONORING THE WORLD WAR II
VETERANS OF ILLINOIS

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the World War II veterans from my district who are traveling to Washington, DC, with Honor Flight Chicago, a program whose goal is to provide as many World War II veterans as possible the opportunity to see the World War II Memorial here in Washington, DC, a memorial that was built to honor their courage and service.

The American veteran is one of our greatest treasures. The Soldiers, Airmen, Sailors, Marines, and Coast Guardsmen traveling here today answered our nation's call to service during one of its greatest times of need. From the European Campaign to the Pacific Asian Theatre to the African Theater, these brave Americans risked life and limb, gave service and sacrificed much, all while embodying what it is to be a hero. We owe them more gratitude than can ever be expressed.

I welcome these brave veterans to Washington and to their memorial. I am proud to submit the names of these men and women for all to see, hear, and recognize, and I call on my colleagues to rise and join me in expressing gratitude.

Eugene L. Andrews, Raymond Appler, Gus Banakis, Preston Beard, Wallace E. Beaver, Frank J. Bernd, Frederick J. Boland, Edward Brown, Alfred Burton, Konstantine Costa, Donald DeBraal, Theodore DeJong, Edwin H. Enyart Sr., Arthur J. Fiddelke, Bernard Fine, David J. Floyd, James E. Folliard, Virginia L. Gary, Stanley G. Golaszewski, Byron G. S. Gronlund, Elmer Hajek, Lester Hansen, Wesley Earl Hardin Jr., Leonard P. Hasse, Roy E. Hilgendorf, Charles Hirsh, Robert Iftner, Anna Incinelli, William Isaacson, John Isenberg, Joseph G. Kacey, Vernon G. Kanz, Chris Karabatsos, Adam Joseph Keke, James F. Kerr Jr., Edward Kerschbaum, Lauri V. Koski, Ernest Krause, Chester Kwilosz, Daniel H. LaBella, Jerome L. Landsman, Rodney Latimer, Raymond J. Lesniewski, Jerry C. Levin, Paul T. Lorenzo, Donald E. Maas, John J. Maisch, Allen Mann, Earl McGarry, F. Edward Meksto, William Mihalo, Stephen Mileusnich, Jerrald Miller, Roy J. Mocer, James Morgan, Tony D. Morgese, William J. Murtha Sr., Thomas John Nagel, Carmen C. Nespeca, George Novak, Cornelius J. O'Connor, Dwain Eldon Parker, Stanley Piorkowski, Peter G. Polmen, Stanley Porch, Harry Clayton Price, Lloyd Quamme, Samuel S. Radford, Curtis D. Ramlet, Ora J. Royal, Thomas B. Ryan, Lester Schuenemann, Roland C. Schwarz, Mary S. Senn, Milton H. Shatswell, Burton J. Shulhafer, Bernard Joseph Siegel, David Simpson, George P. Slivinski, John F. Smith, Demetri Michael Spiro, Donald Springer, Leonard J. Sytsma, Daniel J. Trahey, Robert J.

Trauscht, Marven Treiber, Robert Turner, Henry Van Westrop, Harold Verdak, William A. Vicich, John B. Wallar, Barry R. Wallis, Mathew A. Wardynski, Bernard J. Wavra, Theodore B. Winters, Chester B. Wojcik.

AMERICA'S SON . . . IN HONOR OF
ROBERT DOLE, ON HIS BIRTHDAY

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this poem in honor of one of America's greatest son's, Senator Robert Dole of Russell, Kansas, "America's Son" penned by Albert Caswell . . . in honor of his birthday on July 22nd when he turns 88.

AMERICA'S SON . . .

America's Son . . .
One of her most blessed, of all one's!
A man of such charm and grace . . .
A true reflection of our Lord's heart and
courage's face!
All in what he so faced!
From out of the Midwest . . .
One of Russell Kansas, and America's very
best!
Who has, but our nation so blessed!
Who all in times of war, helped Save The
World . . . let's hear the yeas!
The True Measure, of a what great man so is!
A 10th Mountain Man . . .
Who in his way, would not let any mountain
so stand!
All In His Profiles of Courage, who came
armed with but only his faith!
A Man of God, a future Angel one day!
Who has touched so many hearts, all alone
his way . . .
Who with his sense of humor, helped wipe all
of those tears away!
Whose kindness and great heart, to Heaven
has so shown us all the way!
Who married up with Elizabeth, I must say!
The Soldier's Friend! Time and time again!
Who put the A in Army my friend!
Whether, over at Walter Reed . . . helping
recoveries to so speed!
As a shining example to of all of those heroes
in need!
Showing all of those harmed by war, that up
ahead but lies so much more!
Or on The Mall, those Freedom Flights . . .
with his Brothers In Arms so bright!
Bob Dole . . . Bob Dole . . . a man with a
heart of gold!
What happens, when Leader's Lead!
America's Heart And Soul!
Yea Bob, you make me so proud to be . . . an
American!
God Bless America, for in your life Bob you
make freedom sing!
America's Son!

How one man can touch so many lives, is a reflection of our Lord's heart!

Bless you Bob and your family, as you have blessed our Nation.

—Albert Caswell

COMMEMORATING THE TURKISH
INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, July 20th marks the 37th anniversary of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus. In 1974 over 200,000 Greek Cypriots were driven from their homes, becoming refugees in their own country. The legacy of this occupation still weighs heavily on the northern third of the island, which remains occupied by Turkish troops.

There is consensus in the international community that any solution to the Cyprus problem should include a bizonal, bicommunal federation with political equality, a single sovereignty, and single citizenship. I believe the United Nations led negotiations that are currently underway are the best means to achieve a fair and permanent settlement which will reunify the island. We are at a critical juncture in the pursuit of peace and prosperity for all Cypriots, and I urge all parties to move toward a peaceful resolution and reunification effort that will build a more united and prosperous Cyprus.

I commend President Demetris Christofias for following through with his promise to make the solution of the Cyprus problem his top and principal concern. Since 2008 he has participated in United Nations led negotiations with Turkish Cypriot leaders Mehmet Ali Talat and Dervis Eroglu. I am confident that these negotiations will result in a solution that will safeguard the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all Cypriots.

Cyprus is a strategically important ally of the United States, and Cyprus has proven itself to be a reliable partner in efforts to counter terrorism. I look forward to a reunified and prosperous Cyprus where Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots can live together in peace, security and stability.

THE THIRTY-SEVEN YEAR
OCCUPATION OF CYPRUS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address ongoing human rights violations in occupied northern Cyprus. Today is the 37th anniversary of the illegal 1974 invasion—a terrible tragedy, and an ongoing one, as the continued occupation of that country by tens of thousands of Turkish troops continues to deprive of their homes all those forced to flee the north—estimated to number approximately 200,000. Many Greek Cypriots escaped the north with little more than the clothes on their backs. While some have returned to visit their own homes or ancestral villages, none have been allowed to take back their rightful property—those despoiled include an estimated 5,000 Americans of Cypriot descent. Several hundred courageous Greek Cypriots, mainly elderly people, refused to be

uprooted and today live in enclaves, the remnant of once-thriving Greek Cypriot communities which have effectively been ethnically cleansed.

Hundreds of churches, chapels and monasteries once dotted the rugged landscape of the region, part of Cyprus's rich religious cultural heritage. Indeed, St. Paul visited the island nation on one of his early missionary journeys, and St. Barnabas, a native of the Cypriot city of Salamis, was martyred nearby for his defense of Christianity. The Helsinki Commission, of which I am the Chairman in this Congress, has documented the desecration and destruction of some of the over 500 religious sites in the occupied area looted of their priceless icons, mosaics and frescoes once revered by the faithful. Many of these sacred objects, stolen from churches inside or adjoining Turkish military bases, have landed on the international art market. Even the dead are not allowed to rest in peace with destruction of cemeteries rampant throughout the region. Cypriot authorities interdicted a container originating in the occupied area filled with metal destined for a recycling facility in Asia. Upon inspection agents found that the unit consisted of metal crosses and stolen grave markers.

Mr. Speaker, I remain deeply concerned over ongoing violations of freedom of religion and other rights in northern Cyprus. Let there be no mistake, the Turkish government is responsible for what happens in the occupied part of the island. Last Christmas, a small group of Orthodox believers gathered in the village of Rizokarpaso to celebrate the divine liturgy—only to have their worship disrupted by Turkish security forces, who ordered them to disperse. The Helsinki Commission continues to receive reports of the demolition of churches in the region even as others are converted to commercial use as warehouses, barns, or casinos.

Mr. Speaker, the nearly four-decade-long illegal occupation of northern Cyprus by Turkey is an affront to the principles enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act and an encroachment on the fundamental freedoms and human rights of Greek Cypriots living in the region's enclaves and those forced to flee the area following the 1974 invasion. Our government must continue to engage on behalf of the human rights of Greek Cypriots.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE POMPEO

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, on July 18th, I missed rollcall votes numbered 601 and 602 because I was in Kansas on official business.

Rollcall No. 601 was a vote on passage of H.R. 33, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to specify when certain securities issued in connection with church plans are treated as exempted securities. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Rollcall No. 602 was a vote on the Approval of the Journal. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 229, I was delayed in leaving a Members meeting and was unable to reach the House floor to cast my vote before the vote was closed.

Had I been present, I would have voted, "no".

CONGRATULATING SOUTH SUDAN'S INDEPENDENCE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Republic of South Sudan on achieving their independence. This is a long awaited step for a nation that has experienced many years of struggle and strife.

South Sudan has fought for their independence for a long time: first from Egypt and the United Kingdom, which was achieved in 1956, and then years of civil war with Northern Sudan that culminated with the horrific genocide in Darfur. Thanks to the efforts of Secretary of State Colin Powell in 2005, an end to civil war was reached and the framework for an independent Southern Sudan was established.

There are many people who deserve credit for fostering this momentous occasion. I thank President Barack Obama and Vice-President JOE BIDEN for their leadership in rallying the international community to push this referendum through; Secretary of State Hillary Clinton for helping broker peace in the region; Ambassador Susan Rice for building support for South Sudan in the United Nations; and Special Envoy Princeton Lyman, his predecessor, Scott Gration, and numerous other U.S. Government officials who worked tirelessly to bring peace and independence to a troubled region.

A special word of praise goes out to the tireless efforts of dozens of American diplomats who, in the face of considerable danger, have been on the ground throughout Sudan. They helped to forge independence for South Sudan through guidance, advice, and collaboration with both sides and helped facilitate negotiations that culminated in the referendum for South Sudan's independence. Our heroic diplomats will continue to remain in both countries to support them through this time of transition.

The United States has worked long and hard for this moment. Our commitment, however, does not end with the declaration. I look forward to working with my colleagues and the State Department in helping the new African nation establish their economy, strengthen their democracy and meet the needs of the people. This is a joyous event for South Sudan and an inspiration to the world for achieving peace and stability.

HONORING CORPORAL FRANK GROSS

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life, sacrifice, and heroism of Army Corporal Frank Gross, of Oldsmar, Florida.

CPL Gross, a member of the 38th Cavalry Regiment, lost his life on July 16th in Khost, Afghanistan, when the vehicle he was riding in was struck by an improvised explosive device.

As Vice-Chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I constantly find myself in awe of the sacrifices and efforts that are made on behalf of our great country by the men and women who have worn the uniform of our Armed Services. CPL Gross personified this dedication by postponing a bright career to enlist in the United States Army and follow in the footsteps of his grandfathers into military service.

Outside of the Army, Frank was an outstanding baseball player who attended college on a baseball scholarship. Off of the baseball diamond, CPL Gross demonstrated a talented artistic ability and ultimately earned bachelor's and master's degrees from Full Sail University in digital arts and entertainment business.

Mr. Speaker, though proud to have such a fine example from the Tampa Bay community, it is with great remorse that I rise to commemorate the life of CPL Gross. As I stated, I am in awe of the young men and women, such as Frank Gross, who choose to serve alongside their countrymen in our military. As professionals in all that they do, they exhibit honor, courage, and commitment in every pursuit. Their sacrifices, such as that made by CPL Gross, will not be forgotten.

COMMENDING J.J. O'CONNOR AND THE OTHER PARTICIPANTS IN THE 1918 TRENCH FEVER STUDY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the American soldiers who participated in the 1918 Trench Fever study, conducted by the American Red Cross. Their service was brought to my attention by one of my constituents, Eugene O'Connor, whose father, Joseph John O'Connor, served as a private in the U.S. Army during World War I and participated in the study.

After volunteering along with 19 other American soldiers, Pvt. O'Connor, at the time only 19 years old, was selected to participate in the study to determine the causes and progression of trench fever, an illness that was one of the most prevalent diseases amongst soldiers during World War I. From 1915 to 1918, nearly 1 million soldiers became ill from trench fever, many of whom remained ill for months.

On February 23, 1918, Pvt. O'Connor was directly injected with 15 c.c. of plasma from soldiers suffering from trench fever, eventually

becoming severely ill while researchers documented the progression, effects, and transmission of the disease. After two continuous months of the illness, and having suffered from its debilitating effects, Pvt. O'Connor recovered and returned to the front lines as an ambulance driver and stretch-bearer until the end of the war.

Mr. Speaker, Pvt. O'Connor and the other soldiers who participated in the Trench Fever study were never recognized, compensated, or acknowledged for their sacrifice. They deserve to be properly recognized for the courage and sacrifice they made to help doctors understand and treat a disease afflicting their fellow soldiers. Because of their participation, this illness has been all but eradicated in modern times. We owe Joseph John O'Connor and these other brave men a debt of gratitude.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 601 and 602: I regret that I was unavoidably absent on Monday, July 18, 2011, due to a family obligation. Had I been present for the two votes which occurred, I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 33, rollcall No. 601 and "aye" on Approving the Journal, rollcall No. 602.

RECOGNIZING THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKEY'S ILLEGAL INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 37th anniversary of Turkey's illegal occupation of Cyprus. I hope that my colleagues in the House of Representatives will join me in calling for an end to this occupation.

On July 20th 1974, Turkey invaded Cyprus in violation of international law and at great cost to the citizens of Cyprus. Turkish troops established a heavily-armed force which occupied the northern part of Cyprus and continues to occupy close to 37 percent of Cyprus' territory. The invasion forced nearly 200,000 Greek Cypriots to flee their homes and made one-third of the Cypriot population refugees in their own country.

Turkey continues to illegally occupy northern Cyprus with a force of approximately 43,000 troops. This incredible number of troops amounts to almost one Turkish soldier for every two Turkish Cypriots. The military occupation of northern Cyprus continues in the face of international pressure to achieve a peaceful settlement.

While military occupation of northern Cyprus continues to be a constant threat to peace, the forcible expulsion of Greek Cypriots and U.S. citizens has resulted in the mass colonization of their homes and property. At the time of the invasion this amounted to almost one-third of

the total population of the island being expelled and having their property taken. Once again this illegal colonization comes in defiance of international calls on Turkey to take action to stop the illegal occupation and ensure the return of properties to their rightful owners.

In fact, since 1974 more than 75 resolutions have been adopted by the U.N. Security Council and more than 13 by the U.N. General Assembly calling for a withdrawal of Turkish troops and the return of refugees to their rightful homes. However, the Turkish government continues to remain defiant, plainly ignoring these calls to withdraw and continuing to display blatant disrespect towards Greek Cypriots and their property.

We continue to see Turkey pursuing policies that not only hurt its relations with nations that should serve as true democratic allies, but also policies that hurt regional stability. I have been an outspoken opponent of Turkey's irresponsible regional relations, which in many ways negatively impact the United States. Turkey plainly disrespects international law and provides support to rogue nations and organizations that threaten the United States and our regional partners.

It is unfortunate that I must again this year say enough is enough and ask my colleagues to join me in taking principled steps to prevent further destabilizing actions by Turkey. As a member of the Hellenic Caucus, I have long advocated for the withdrawal of Turkish forces from northern Cyprus and called on Turkey to support a settlement that comes from the Cypriots themselves.

Cypriot President Christofias has begun meetings with Turkish Cypriot leader Mr. Eroglu and U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki Moon in attempts to come to a peaceful settlement. The leaders have agreed to intensify their diplomatic contacts in order to establish a practical plan for overcoming the major remaining disagreements. It is my hope that this agreement will come in a fair and expeditious manner that is in the best interest of the Cypriot people.

The U.S. must also do its part to foster a united Cyprus. It is in the best interest of the United States, and I believe all involved parties to ensure that the goal is a reunified Cyprus where Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots live together in peace and security. A successful settlement effort must build on the work towards a bizonal, bicommunal federation with political equality that represents U.N. Security Council resolutions. In the end, Cyprus must have a single sovereignty and single citizenship which all Cypriots can enjoy.

Now is the time for Turkey to show that they are willing to take a sincere approach to allowing a peaceful resolution to the dispute. The leadership in Ankara must show that the will and support behind a peaceful settlement is in the best interest of Turkey and that it is fully supported. Without such a signal by the Government of Turkey, a final settlement will continue to dwindle as Turkish settlers pursue the policies of their home nation. The Government of the Republic of Cyprus has shown their willingness to work constructively with the Cypriots towards a reunified island. It is time for Turkey to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation that is just one step towards achieving

justice for those who have been unfairly expelled from their rightful property in occupied Cyprus. My legislation, the American Owned Property in Occupied Cyprus Claims Act, will enable U.S. citizens who own property in the Turkish-occupied territory to seek financial remedies with either the current inhabitants of their land or the Turkish government. Passage of this legislation will not only return rights to U.S. citizens but send an important message to Turkey and the international community that the status quo cannot stand.

Mr. Speaker, as we remember the 37th Anniversary of Turkey's illegal invasion and occupation of Cyprus, I remain hopeful a united Cyprus can become a reality. However, the United States can not be complacent in this goal or the protection of its citizens.

WILL COLLEGE BUBBLE BURST FROM PUBLIC SUBSIDIES?

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it shocks students at the University of Tennessee when I tell them it cost me only \$270 tuition my freshman year and \$405 my senior year in 1969.

George Washington University, where I attended law school, was private and "expensive" at around \$1,000 a semester. Students there now marvel at that figure.

Students could attend college in the late 60s and early 70s and pay all their expenses just by working part time.

No one got out of school deeply in debt for tuition and fees.

But costs simply explode on anything the federal government subsidizes. Healthcare was cheap and doctors even made house calls until the government got into it.

Since the federal student loan program started, college tuition has gone up three or four or five times the rate of inflation, ranging from school to school, almost every year.

Before the government started "helping," tuition went up at the rate of inflation. Now costs are 300 or 400 percent higher than if we had just left things alone.

A few years ago, I heard excerpts from a book called Going Broke by Degree. That is what many students are doing today by incurring huge student loan debts.

And the colleges and universities have been able to tamp down any opposition to tuition increases by encouraging an attitude of "don't worry—we'll just give you an easy, no-interest student loan."

I have been concerned about this for several years and especially after I started noticing so many college graduates working as waiters and waitresses in restaurants.

This is why I was so pleased to read a great column on this topic by Michael Barone in the July 20 edition of the Washington Examiner newspaper.

Mr. Barone is very respected, and he is right on target in this column, which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

[From the Washington Examiner, July 20, 2011]

WILL COLLEGE BUBBLE BURST FROM PUBLIC SUBSIDIES?

(By Michael Barone)

When governments want to encourage what they believe is beneficial behavior, they subsidize it. Sounds like good public policy.

But there can be problems. Behavior that is beneficial for most people may not be so for everybody. And government subsidies can go too far.

Subsidies create incentives for what economists call rent-seeking behavior. Providers of supposedly beneficial goods or services try to sop up as much of the subsidy money as they can by raising prices. After all, their customers are paying with money supplied by the government.

Bubble money as it turns out. And sooner or later bubbles burst.

We are still suffering from the bursting of the housing bubble created by low interest rates, lowered mortgage standards, and subsidies to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Those policies encouraged the granting of mortgages to people who should never have gotten them, and when they defaulted the whole financial sector nearly collapsed.

Now some people see signs that another bubble is bursting. They call it the higher education bubble.

For years government has assumed it's a good thing to go to college. College graduates tend to earn more money than non-college graduates.

Politicians of both parties have called for giving everybody a chance to go to college, just as they called for giving everybody a chance to buy a home.

So government has been subsidizing higher education with low-interest college loans, Pell Grants and cheap tuitions at state colleges and universities.

The predictable result is that higher-education costs have risen much faster than inflation, much faster than personal incomes, much faster than the economy over the past 40 years.

Moreover, you can't get out of paying off those college loans, even by going through bankruptcy. At least with a home mortgage you can walk away and let the bank foreclose and not owe any more money.

Peter Thiel, co-founder of PayPal, is adept at spotting bubbles. He cashed out for \$500 million in March 2000, at the peak of the tech bubble, when his partners wanted to hold out for more. He refused to buy a house until the housing bubble burst.

"A true bubble is when something is overvalued and intensely believed," he has said. "Education may still be the only thing people still believe in in the United States."

But the combination of rising costs and dubious quality may be undermining that belief.

For what have institutions of higher learning accomplished with their vast increases in revenues? The answer in all too many cases is administrative bloat.

Take the California State University system, the second tier in that state's public higher education. Between 1975 and 2008 the number of faculty rose by 3 percent, to 12,019 positions. During those same years the number of administrators rose 221 percent, to 12,183. That's right: There are more administrators than teachers at Cal State now.

These people get paid to liaise and "facilitate" and produce reports on diversity. How that benefits Cal State students or California taxpayers is unclear.

It is often said that American colleges and universities are the best in the world. That's undoubtedly true in the hard sciences.

But in the humanities and to a lesser extent in the social sciences there's a lot of garbage. Is a degree in Religious and Women's Studies worth \$100,000 in student loan debt? Probably not.

As economist Richard Vedder points out, 45 percent of those who enter four-year colleges don't get a degree within six years. Given the low achievement level of most high school graduates, it's hard to avoid the conclusion that many of them shouldn't have bothered in the first place.

Now consumers seem to be reading the cues in the marketplace.

An increasing number of students are spending their first two years after high school in low-cost community colleges and then transferring to four-year schools.

A recent New York Times story reported that out-of-staters are flocking to low-tuition North Dakota State in frigid Fargo.

Politicians, including President Obama, still give lip service to the notion that everyone should go to college and can profit from it. And many college and university administrators may assume that the gravy train will go on forever.

But that's what Las Vegas real estate developers and home builders thought in 2006. My sense is that once again, well-intentioned public policy and greedy providers have produced a bubble that is about to burst.

INTRODUCING A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE 6TH IAS CONFERENCE ON HIV PATHOGENESIS, TREATMENT, AND PREVENTION

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution in support of the 6th IAS Conference on HIV Pathogenesis, Treatment, and Prevention (IAS 2011), which takes place from July 17, 2011, through July 20, 2011, in Rome, Italy. This year's conference is of particular importance given the first documented case of a patient being cured of HIV infection and global resurgence of tuberculosis (TB), including multidrug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) and extensively drug-resistant tuberculosis (XDR-TB). My resolution supports a strong international response to HIV/AIDS; the rights of those infected; and increased access to testing, treatment, and care.

There are currently 33.4 million people living with HIV/AIDS worldwide and more than 25 million have died of AIDS since the first cases were reported in 1981. In the United States, approximately 1.1 million people are living with HIV/AIDS and someone is newly infected with HIV every 9.5 minutes. To make matters worse, one in five individuals living with HIV is unaware of their infection, and significant disparities persist across different communities and populations with regard to incidence, access to treatment, and health outcomes.

The biennial IAS Conference on HIV Pathogenesis, Treatment, and Prevention is the world's largest open scientific conference on

HIV/AIDS, attracting about 5,000 delegates from around the world. Together with the International AIDS Conference, which will next be held in Washington, DC from July 22, 2012, through July 27, 2012, it provides the world's leading scientists, clinicians, policymakers, and community leaders with a unique opportunity to examine the latest developments in HIV research and how scientific advances can practically guide the national and global response to HIV/AIDS.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, TB is the leading cause of death among persons with HIV worldwide and XDR-TB is resistant to the most powerful first-line and second-line drugs. The improper treatment of TB in HIV-infected individuals perpetuates the spread of this infectious disease as well as bolsters drug resistance, which poses a tremendous threat to public health in the United States and abroad. Improved efforts to prevent and treat TB among people living with HIV, including the development of new, transformational antibiotic drugs, can save millions of lives.

Several organizations, including small business biotechnology companies, developing therapeutic vaccines and other immune-based therapies are presenting updates on their clinical research at IAS 2011. In addition, the National Association of People With AIDS (NAPWA) and Health People, the first community-based organization for women infected with HIV in the United States, are hosting the NAPWA "Treatment Horizons: Pathways to a Functional Cure" satellite symposium, which is officially affiliated with IAS 2011. Therapeutic vaccine candidates and immune-based therapies such as those being presented at IAS 2011 may lead to a "functional cure" for HIV/AIDS.

Mr. Speaker, continued commitment by the United States to HIV/AIDS research, prevention, and treatment programs is crucial to protecting global health. I urge my colleagues to support my resolution, which recognizes the important contributions of the 6th IAS Conference on HIV Pathogenesis, Treatment, and Prevention in the global struggle to end the HIV/AIDS pandemic. If we are to be successful in preventing the transmission of HIV and tuberculosis and improving the health outcomes of people living with HIV/AIDS, we must encourage the ongoing development of innovative therapies, advances in clinical treatment, and new, transformational antibiotic drugs to treat infectious diseases.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 601 and 602, I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the anniversary of Turkey's invasion of Cyprus, which occurred on July 20, 1974. In violation of international law, Turkish troops occupied the northern part of Cyprus, and established an armed force that continues to occupy nearly over one third of Cyprus' territory.

The invasion and continuing occupation of the northern part of the island has resulted in the continuing presence of a force of thousands of Turkish troops, mass violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the Cypriot people, and the destruction of cultural and religious artifacts. On September 28, 2010, the U.S. House of Representatives unanimously passed H. Res. 1631 which calls for the protection of religious sites and artifacts from and in Turkish-occupied areas of northern Cyprus, as well as for general respect for religious freedom.

Over the years, Cyprus has proven itself to be a reliable partner of the U.S. Throughout the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, Cyprus has provided over-flight and landing rights to United States aircraft and port access for U.S. ships. Furthermore, during the Lebanon crisis of 2006, Cyprus served as the principal transit location for people evacuating Lebanon, including some 15,000 U.S. citizens.

Cyprus and the U.S. also share a deep and abiding commitment to upholding the ideals of freedom, democracy, justice, human rights, and the international rule of law. It is time for Turkey to share this goal with the Government of the Republic of Cyprus and work earnestly and constructively with the Cypriots for a true reunification of the island as a bizonal, bicomunal federation with political equality, as defined in the relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions.

Such a solution would not only serve the best interests of all Cypriots, but ultimately the interests of the U.S. in promoting stability in the Eastern Mediterranean.

The aim remains to work towards a solution which will establish a bicomunal, bizonal federation with respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all Cypriots.

IN MEMORY OF PEGGY GREENWAY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great American and faithful public servant of the State of Georgia, a woman of great faith, and a personal friend, Peggy Greenway.

Although she was born and raised in Alabama, Peggy's heart and home was our great State of Georgia. She was an active part of the Albany community for 37 years before moving to Vienna, Georgia, and finally relocating to Dublin, Georgia.

Peggy loved Southern Gospel music and had a deep faith in the Lord. She was a cherished member of the Byne Memorial Baptist Church in Albany, the Pinecrest Baptist Church in Vienna, and the Dublin Baptist Church in Dublin. Through her work with the Byne Memorial youth group, she touched many lives; those who knew and loved her described Peggy as a fine Christian and loving lady.

In addition to her devout faith, Peggy was an enthusiastic employee; I first witnessed Peggy's dedicated work ethic during my first term in Congress. Peggy served as a case-worker and as Director of Constituent Services for my district in our Albany office. For more than a decade, she worked tirelessly to fight for the citizens of the Second Congressional District of Georgia. Whether it was an issue with Social Security or the VA, Peggy was an expert at providing constituent care.

Peggy's expertise was a great asset to the Second District, a calling which first began under Rep. Charles Hatcher. Peggy also faithfully served the Eighth Congressional District of Georgia, handling casework for the constituents of Representatives Jim Marshall, and AUSTIN SCOTT. She also worked for Congressman J. Roy Rowland.

As Members of Congress, we are well aware of Peggy's dedication to improving her community. She honed her commitment to excellence when she began her career working at WALB, the local television station in Albany, and also for Judge Asa Kelley.

Peggy's unyielding strength of character will truly be missed. She lived a full life, and her selfless dedication to the citizens of Georgia is her lasting legacy. My thoughts and prayers are with her family, especially her daughters, Tammy and Julee, and her beloved grandchildren, Cade Greenway, Cole Bailey, Camryn Bailey, Cara Bailey and Conner Bailey.

Leonardo da Vinci said, "As a well-spent day brings happy sleep, so a life well used brings happy death." Peggy Greenway utilized her God-given gifts to improve the lives of others, and her days were well-spent; therefore, Mr. Speaker, I know that she can rest happy.

THE FUTURE OF CYPRUS

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, for several years, I have come to this Floor to urge my colleagues to support efforts to achieve a resolution to the dispute on Cyprus. Tragically, I find myself here once again as yet another year has gone by with no end to the conflict.

While the Cyprus dispute is most directly between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, it has larger implications for regional security and prosperity. Over the past few decades this dispute has involved not only the Cypriot communities, but also Turkey, Greece, the United Kingdom, the United States, the United Nations, and the European Union. Moreover, Turkey's membership to the European Union,

which the United States enthusiastically supports, is unfortunately being impacted because of the impasse over Cyprus.

In 2003, it looked like we were on the cusp of a resolution when Cypriots voted on the United Nations backed Annan Plan which would have created the United Cyprus Republic, as a loose confederation of two component states—the Greek Cypriot State and the Turkish Cypriot State.

That plan provided a strong framework for a bi-zonal, bi-communal unified Cyprus; and the U.S. House of Representatives strongly endorsed the plan by unanimously approving a Sense of the House to that effect. Regrettably, the Annan Plan did not succeed when put to a referendum.

Since the collapse of the Annan Plan peace efforts have moved forward sporadically. The latest round of talks began on July 7th of this year when Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot leaders met in Geneva under the auspices of the UN Secretary General. I welcome these meetings. The status quo on Cyprus clearly benefits no one. It must end and the time is now.

Ultimately, the Cypriots themselves are the ones who must make the tough decisions that will ensure a peaceful future for their island. Nevertheless, I urge the administration to work with all stakeholders to ensure that a future unified Cyprus is a Cyprus that respects human rights and the fundamental freedoms for all Cypriots. Any unnatural or unnecessary artificial limitations imposed on either community are a recipe for future disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that a lasting, fair and comprehensive solution to the conflict on Cyprus is possible. If we avoid inflammatory rhetoric and political statements and instead work in unison to bolster the efforts of the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots to work together in good faith for the future of all Cypriots; the future will be bright for Cyprus.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today our national debt is \$14,342,898,467,069.07.

On January 6, 2009, the start of the 111th Congress, the national debt was \$10,638,425,746,293.80.

This means the national debt has increased by \$3,704,471,720,775.27 since then.

This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

THE PASSING OF MYRA HIATT KRAFT

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in great sadness to mark the passing of one of

the most beloved residents of Massachusetts, my good friend, Mrs. Myra Hiatt Kraft.

Myra lived her life according to the Jewish principle of "Tikkun Olam"—to repair the world—striving each day to make our community, our country, and our world a better place for the less fortunate. Myra was the absolute embodiment of Tikkun Olam, living according to its values of justice, compassion, and peace.

Myra was a community leader and philanthropist without equal. Whether it was through the New England Patriots Charitable Foundation, the Robert K. and Myra H. Kraft Foundation, the Boys and Girls Club of Boston, or her alma mater Brandeis University, Myra's tireless work gave a voice to victims, a stage for performing artists and a home to countless disadvantaged youth. Her love for Israel was rivaled only by her commitment to making Massachusetts and Boston beacons of social and cultural goodwill worldwide. She was guided by an incredibly strong moral compass and an unrelenting drive to help others.

Massachusetts has lost a hometown hero, and the Kraft family also has lost a loving wife, mother, and grandmother. My thoughts and prayers are with the entire Kraft family and with all of those whose lives have been touched by Myra's formidable and gracious spirit. We mourn Myra's passing, while we know that her incredible legacy of acts of loving kindness will live on forever.

H.R. 2018, CLEAN WATER COOPERATIVE FEDERALISM ACT OF 2011

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2018, the so-called Clean Water Cooperative Federalism Act. It would be far more accurate to title this legislation the "Dirty Water Act" due to the damage it would inflict on our nation's waters.

This legislation severely weakens the Clean Water Act by prohibiting the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) from challenging state water quality standards in cases when those standards threaten the quality of the nation's waters. Further, the bill removes the EPA's authority to protect water bodies and waterways from pollution resulting from mining, development and water resource projects. This unprecedented unraveling of federal authority would have very real and negative consequences for the country, especially my state of Minnesota.

Minnesota is known as the land of 10,000 lakes. It is the headwaters of the mighty Mississippi River and the longest shoreline of Lake Superior—the largest of the Great Lakes. Our quality of life is inexorably linked with the quality of our state's rivers, lakes, streams and wetlands. Minnesota's economy depends on clean water to support its multibillion dollar tourism and outdoor recreation industry, which sustains tens of thousands of jobs. In addition to the economy, responsible EPA regulation helps to protect the health of millions of Minnesotans who rely on the Mississippi River

and other surface waters for their drinking water. Minnesotan's strong commitment to clean water is best evidenced by passage of a state constitutional amendment in 2008 dedicating funding to protect and restore the states' waters—the first of its kind in the nation.

H.R. 2018 undermines the ability of Minnesota or any other state to protect the quality of its waters. This legislation eliminates Clean Water Act protections that prevent states from setting lax environmental laws and weak enforcement policies that send pollution flowing over its borders into neighboring states. Minnesota's public health, economic vitality and quality of life should not be at the mercy of other states. H.R. 2018 is a serious threat to states' rights and demands a full and public debate. Unfortunately, House Republicans are rushing this highly controversial bill to the floor without holding even a single Committee hearing.

The Clean Water Act is one of our country's most successful environmental laws. For over forty years, Democrats, Independents and Republicans have worked together to protect and restore America's waters using the authorities in this law. Members of Congress today have a responsibility to protect this important legacy. H.R. 2018 is an unprecedented attempt to dismantle the Clean Water Act and return to the days when waterways in America were so polluted they caught fire.

H.R. 2018 is the latest in a series of Republican proposals that benefit polluters, not American families, communities or the vast majority of American businesses that follow the law. I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation and put an end to the Republicans' dangerous policy of regulatory retreat.

TRIBUTE TO NATIONAL JROTC INSTRUCTOR OF THE YEAR JUSTIN BLUM

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of my constituents, Justin Blum, of Florence, South Carolina. Lt. Col. Blum has been selected as the 2011–2012 National JROTC Instructor of the Year by the United States Army Cadet Command. It was because of Lt. Col. Blum's distinguished work and long history with the JROTC that he was bestowed this great honor.

JROTC is a citizenship program devoted to the moral, physical and educational uplift of American youth. Originally the JROTC was a source of enlisting recruits and officer candidates into the United States Military. It has now shed some of its early military content, but the program has retained its military structure and the resultant ability to infuse in its student cadets a sense of discipline and order. Lt. Col. Blum has been with the JROTC for 16 years now, following his 21 year tenure in the United States Army before retiring with the rank of Lieutenant Colonel.

During his time with United States Army, protecting our country, he was also fighting

another battle. Lt. Col. Blum was fighting ulcerative colitis and a diagnosis of early stage colon cancer. He did not let this deter him in life. Being the resolute person that Mr. Blum is, there was no doubt in his mind that he would be able to return to a full schedule. After the surgery, Lt. Col. Blum, used his struggle to inform others that no matter what you are hit with, you can overcome if you put your mind to it.

Lt. Col. Blum is the recipient of the 2011 Tony Snow Public Service Award, presented by the Great Comebacks Program. This program raises awareness of quality of life issues for people with Crohn's disease, ulcerative colitis, colorectal cancer and other diseases that can lead to ostomy surgery. Since receiving this award Mr. Blum has continued to work hard and his determination is shown again through being selected as the 2011–2012 JROTC National Instructor of the year. This is the second time Mr. Blum has received the JROTC National Instructor of the year award, also receiving the award in 2003. Being a two-time recipient, demonstrates his commitment and dedication to the JROTC, a program which is near and dear to my heart as a former educator and the grandfather of a JROTC student.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to take the time and get to know JROTC instructors, like Lt. Col. Blum. Their devotion to uplifting American youth is worth our time and help. These instructors motto is, "Instruct Young People to be Better Citizens." With this dictum we see the uplifting manner of the JROTC and why the instructors are such an influential part of America's youth. Please join me in congratulating Lt. Col. Justin Blum of Florence, S.C. for being chosen as the JROTC National Instructor of the year from a group of amazing individuals who are changing the lives of scores of young people every day.

GOP WOMEN SPECIAL ORDER

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, our nation's budget is out of control. Two years ago, our nation experienced our first trillion dollar Federal budget deficit. Last year, we experienced our second trillion dollar deficit.

This year, our annual deficit is projected to reach over \$1.6 trillion—the largest in history. We are spending more than we can afford and in the process saddling future generations with a grim economic future. This is unacceptable.

It is also why my colleagues and I are here this evening. As women, we know the importance of creating and sticking to a budget.

The finances of many households are run by women.

We know that a family cannot wildly spend beyond its means. And yet this is what our government is doing on a daily basis.

Our government has acted recklessly with our financial security and prosperity. Just as our families and neighbors have had to tighten our belts during this recession, the Federal government must do the same.

Women have to juggle various household necessities while still remaining within their budget constraints. This is why Republican women support a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget to help reign in Federal spending.

It will help us start to get our fiscal house in order. A constitutional amendment will help ensure the future stability and solvency of our economy. Our grandchildren deserve nothing less.

LEGISLATION TO FAIRLY TAX
"REVERSE MORRIS TRUST"
TRANSACTIONS

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that would eliminate a tax loophole that puts at risk telecommunications services and workers in states across the country. The bill seeks to limit "Reverse Morris Trust" (RMT) transactions, a tax avoidance loophole that continues to be utilized by companies, including publicly regulated utility companies. RMT transactions regularly allow companies to avoid paying millions of dollars in taxes while having adverse consequences for consumers, workers and the Federal Treasury.

Under an RMT, a parent company can spin off a subsidiary that merges into an unrelated company tax free if the shareholders of the parent company control more than 50 percent of the voting rights and economic value of the resulting merged company. The result deprives the federal treasury of hundreds of millions of dollars. And all too frequently, the new entity incurs too much debt and lacks the capital needed to maintain services and perform system upgrades that it depends on to provide quality services to its customers and create good paying jobs.

The legislation I am introducing would restrict the benefits of the RMT transaction by removing an incentive for companies to sell off assets tax free by creating a spinoff company that assumes massive amounts of debt. The bill would help protect the interests of consumers and workers, while preventing this unintended loophole from resulting in the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars of federal revenues at a time when our federal deficit is soaring. Based on analysis from the Joint Committee on Taxation in the 111th Congress, closing the RMT loophole would raise approximately \$250 million over 10 years.

One recent RMT transaction provides a prime example of the dangers of this loophole. Despite objections from the public and Congressional members, Verizon utilized the RMT to avoid taxes on a similar transaction with FairPoint Communications in Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont almost four years ago. As predicted, the result was unprecedented consumer complaints lodged with state regulators who were unable to reverse the negative consequences. On October 26, 2009, FairPoint declared bankruptcy, leaving the future of telephone service across all three

states uncertain, and potentially putting at risk the compensation and benefits of thousands of employees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to close this loophole that cheats the American public and helps large companies evade paying taxes by saddling smaller ones with debt.

THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF
TURKEY'S INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the 37th anniversary of Turkey's invasion of Cyprus to call upon the Government of Turkey to end its unlawful military occupation of the Island.

For 37 years, Greek Cypriots have had to live with the memory of being forcibly removed from their homes only to become refugees in their own country. For years, they endured a policy of systematic ethnic cleansing and, despite the insistence of the international community, to this day Cyprus remains under occupation. Forty-three thousand Turkish troops occupy a third of the island, making the area they control among the most militarized regions in the world.

For 37 years, it has been the goal of the international community to reunify Cyprus into a stable and prosperous country where Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots can live together in peace and security.

Attempts to reunify the country have undergone various levels of negotiation for over 45 years yielding few lasting achievements along the way. Even the occasional success has produced little of enduring material value.

For example, in 1979, the U.S. and UN applauded Turkey's agreement to withdraw and handover the uninhabited city of Famagusta to its rightful inhabitants. Every year, the UN calls upon Turkey to honor its commitment, but, to this day, Famagusta remains in the hands of the Turkish government.

The U.S. and the EU and the UN have demonstrated their willingness to work with Turkey toward a lasting settlement in Cyprus that reunifies the country into a bi-zonal federation. By continuing its occupation, by closing its seaports to Cypriot-flagged ships, and by refusing to follow through on its promises, Turkey has continued to ignore the will of the international community.

So, on this 37th anniversary of Turkey's illegal occupation of Cyprus, I ask my colleagues to join me in condemning the continued occupation and join me in calling for Turkey to withdraw its troops from the island.

TRIBUTE TO REV. DR. FRANKLIN
D. COLCLOUGH

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man of great faith, who has

been a tremendous blessing to the State of South Carolina. The Rev. Dr. Franklin D. Colclough is retiring from the Presbytery of New Harmony after 23 years of faithful service and 42 years with the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.). He is deserving of recognition for his lifetime of service to his community and spiritual guidance to his congregants.

Dr. Colclough began his ministry in 1969 after receiving his Master of Divinity at Johnson C. Smith Theological Seminary in Atlanta, Georgia. He earned a Doctoral Degree in Ministry at McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago, Illinois.

His first ministerial position was as pastor of the Carmel Presbyterian Church in Chester, South Carolina and Mt. Tabor Presbyterian Church in Blackstock, South Carolina from 1969-1971. In 1972 he accepted a call as the fourth, and youngest, installed pastor of the Goodwill Presbyterian Church in Mayesville, South Carolina. Goodwill was founded in 1867, and is the oldest African American Church in Sumter County, South Carolina and one of the oldest in the Sixth Congressional District. He served as Goodwill's pastor from 1972 until 1988. It is worth noting that Dr. Colclough served only three churches in rural South Carolina during his 19 years as a parish minister.

In September 1988 he was called to serve on the staff of New Harmony Presbytery which is headquartered in Florence, South Carolina. Presently Dr. Colclough serves as the Head of Staff and Stated Clerk for New Harmony Presbytery.

Dr. Colclough has served on many boards including the Board of Trustees at Johnson C. Smith University Theological Seminary in Atlanta and the Columbia Theological Seminary in Decatur, Georgia. He has served the Presbyterian Church at all levels including Member, Board of Pension, Moderator, Synod of South Atlantic, Stewardship Consultant for Mission 20/20, and member of the President's Council, Montreat Conference Center.

While serving the church, Dr. Colclough also served 26 years as a Military Chaplain in the United States Army Reserve retiring in 1996 with rank of Colonel.

Dr. Colclough is married to Eddie Segars Colclough. They are the parents of four adult children, Franklin, Jr., Glenys, Shelley, Kriston and grandparents of a granddaughter Kellen and grandson Kriston.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and our colleagues to join me in congratulating Rev. Dr. Colclough for his faithful service to his community and his state. I sincerely appreciate Dr. Colclough's friendship and guidance over the last 19 years, and his generous advice from the first day I offered to run for Congress. He has been a true leader in the State of South Carolina, and while he will no longer serve in the Presbyterian Church on a daily basis, I am confident he will continue to be a guiding force in the community.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all

meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 21, 2011 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 22

9:30 a.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine minority at risk, focusing on Coptic Christian in Egypt and renewed concerns over reports of disappearance, forced conversions and forced marriages of Coptic Christian women and girls.

210, Cannon Building

JULY 26

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of General Martin E. Dempsey, USA for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

SD-106

10 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Martin J. Gruenberg, of Maryland, to be Chairperson and to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Thomas J. Curry, of Massachusetts, to be Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, and S. Roy Woodall, Jr., of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council.

SD-538

Finance

To hold hearings to examine perspectives on deficit reduction, focusing on a review of key issues.

SD-215

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine building a ladder of opportunity, focusing on what's working to make the American dream a reality for middle class families.

SD-430

Judiciary

Immigration, Refugees and Border Security Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the economic imperative for enacting immigration reform.

SD-226

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine small business contracts, focusing on how oversight failures and regulatory loopholes allow large businesses to get and keep small business contracts.

SD-342

Intelligence

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Matthew G. Olsen, of Maryland, to be Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

SD-562

2 p.m.

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine Federal workers' compensation.

SD-342

2:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider S. 1280, to amend the Peace Corps Act to require sexual assault risk-reduction and response training, and the development of sexual assault protocol and guidelines, the establishment of victims advocates, the establishment of a Sexual Assault Advisory Council, S. Res. 216, encouraging women's political participation in Saudi Arabia, S. Con. Res. 147, expressing the sense of Congress that Taiwan should be accorded observer status in the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), S. Res. 227, calling for the protection of the Mekong River Basin and increased United States support for delaying the construction of mainstream dams along the Mekong River, S. Res. 175, expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to ongoing violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Georgia and the importance of a peaceful and just resolution to the conflict within Georgia's internationally recognized borders, Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Rwanda Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, signed at Kigali on February 19, 2008 (Treaty Doc. 110-23), Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Hungary for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed on February 4, 2010, at Budapest (the "proposed Convention") and a related agreement effected by an exchange of notes on February 4, 2010 (Treaty Doc. 111-07), Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed on May 20, 2009, at Luxembourg (the "proposed Protocol") and a related agreement effected by the exchange of notes also signed on May 20, 2009 (Treaty Doc. 111-08), Protocol Amending the Convention between the

United States of America and the Swiss Confederation for the Avoidance of Double Taxation with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on October 2, 1996, signed on September 23, 2009, at Washington, as corrected by an exchange of notes effected November 16, 2010 and a related agreement effected by an exchange of notes on September 23, 2009 (Treaty Doc. 112-01) and the nominations of Jonathan Don Farrar, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Nicaragua, Derek J. Mitchell, of Connecticut, to be Special Representative and Policy Coordinator for Burma, with the rank of Ambassador, Frankie Annette Reed, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Fiji Islands, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, Tuvalu, and the Republic of Kiribati, Paul D. Wohlers, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Macedonia, William H. Moser, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Moldova, Thomas M. Countryman, of Washington, to be an Assistant Secretary for International Security and Non-Proliferation, Jeffrey DeLaurentis, of New York, to be Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, and to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, all of the Department of State.

S-116, Capitol

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

JULY 27

10 a.m.

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine ten years after 9/11, focusing on emergency communications.

SD-342

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine fulfilling our treaty obligations and protecting Americans abroad.

SD-226

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the lifetime costs of supporting the newest generation of veterans.

SD-562

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine maximizing America's prosperity, focusing on how fiscal rules can restrain Federal over-spending.

SH-216

10:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine defending United States economic interests in the changing arctic, focusing on if there is a strategy.

SR-253

2 p.m.
 Armed Services
 Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee
 To hold hearings to examine financial management and business transformation at the Department of Defense.

SR-232A

2:30 p.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance Subcommittee
 To hold hearings to examine improving highway and vehicle safety, focusing on reauthorization of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

SR-253

Judiciary
 To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.

SD-226

JULY 28

1:30 p.m.
 Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
 To hold hearings to examine United States policy and the Organization for Co-operation in Europe, focusing on making good on commitments and challenges, including unresolved conflicts, ethnic tension, corruption and lack of governance, racism and intolerance, and trafficking in persons.
 210, Cannon Building

2:15 p.m.
 Indian Affairs
 To hold an oversight hearing to examine enforcing the "Indian Gaming Regulatory Act", focusing on the role of the National Indian Gaming Commission and tribes as regulators.

SD-628

2:30 p.m.
 Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
 To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Mark D. Acton, of Kentucky, and Robert G. Taub, of New York, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission.

SD-342

Energy and Natural Resources
 National Parks Subcommittee
 To hold hearings to examine S. 264, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, S. 265, to authorize the acquisition of core battlefield land at Champion Hill, Port Gibson, and Raymond for addition to Vicksburg National Military Park, S. 324, to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission, S. 764, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to make technical corrections to the segment designations for the Chetco River, Oregon, S. 864, to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, S. 883, to authorize National Mall Liberty Fund D.C. to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia to honor free persons and slaves who fought for independence, liberty, and justice for all during the American Revolution, S. 888, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 925, to designate Mt. Andrea Lawrence, S. 970, to designate additional segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, in the States of Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 1063, to allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in the State of Alaska, S. 1134, to authorize the St. Croix River Crossing Project with appropriate mitigation measures to promote river values, and S. 1235, to recognize the memorial at the Navy UDT-SEAL Museum in Fort Pierce, Florida, as the official national memorial of Navy SEALs and their predecessors.

SD-366

Intelligence
 Closed business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SH-219

AUGUST 3

10 a.m.
 Foreign Relations
 To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Wendy Ruth Sherman, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

SD-419

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
 Business meeting to consider S. 958, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program of payments to children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs, and S. 1094, to reauthorize the Combating Autism Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-416), an original bill entitled, "Workforce Investment Act Reauthorization of 2011", and any pending nominations.

SD-430

Judiciary
 To hold hearings to examine cybercrime, focusing on updating the "Computer Fraud and Abuse Act" to protect cyberspace and combat emerging threats.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.
 Energy and Natural Resources
 Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee
 To hold hearings to examine S. 1024, to designate the Organ Mountains and other public land as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System and the National Landscape Conservation System in the State of New Mexico, S. 1090, to designate as wilderness certain public land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee, S. 1144, to amend the Soda Ash Royalty Reduction Act of 2006 to extend the reduced royalty rate for soda ash, S. 1149, to expand geothermal production, and S. 1344, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to take immediate action to recover ecologically and economically from a catastrophic wildfire in the State of Arizona.

SD-366